



# ***USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER*** ***CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL***

***Maxwell AFB, Alabama***

---

**Issue No. 810, 21 May 2010**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Administration Officials Make Case For “New START” Pact](#)

[Statement To The Senate Foreign Relations Committee Regarding The New START Treaty](#)

[Martin Rees Calls On UN To Establish Nuclear Disarmament Laboratories](#)

[U.S., Partners Agree To Sanctions On Iran](#)

[Iran Rejects UN Sanctions Resolution Draft](#)

[Iran to Scrap Nuclear Deal If UN Sanctions Approved](#)

[America's New 'Dual Track' Approach To Iran Nuclear Program](#)

[Brazil And Turkey Urge UN Security Council Against Iran Sanctions](#)

[Iran Doubts West Sincerity In Swap Deal](#)

[UN Discussions On Iran Should Not Stop Uranium Swap Deal – Lavrov](#)

[Russian Official: Iran's Reactor Ready By August](#)

[Iran Nuclear Deadline Looms](#)

[‘Fuel Swap Deal Does Not Address All Concerns’](#)

[Is Korea Going To War?](#)

[Nuclear Factor Complicates Korean Standoff Over Sunken Ship](#)

[Russia Postpones Bulava Missile Tests Until November](#)

[Lee And Bridgewater Support N-Weapons Testing](#)

[Analysis: UN Sanctions Unlikely To Stop Iran](#)

[LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Obama's Nuclear Policy Signals Weakness](#)

[Obama Should Call Iran’s Bluff](#)

---

*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.*

## Administration Officials Make Case For "New START" Pact

Wednesday, May 19, 2010

By Martin Matishak, *Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- The Obama administration's top diplomatic and defense officials yesterday urged senators to approve the proposed successor agreement to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, warning that not doing so could set back U.S-Russian relations and endanger international security (see *GSN*, May 18).

"The choice before us is between this treaty and no treaty governing our nuclear-security relationship with Russia; between this treaty and no agreed verification mechanism on Russia's strategic nuclear forces; between this treaty and no legal obligation for Russia to maintain its strategic nuclear forces below an agreed level," Secretary of State Hillary Clinton told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

She said treaty negotiations had created a "level of understanding" between Moscow and Washington, particularly toward Iran and its nuclear program. That improved relationship helped the former Cold War foes convince other countries to agree on draft language for what would be the fourth U.N. Security Council sanctions resolution against Tehran, Clinton said (see *GSN*, May 18).

Senate rejection of the new nuclear arms control pact would undermine U.S. leadership on nuclear nonproliferation, an issue in which the administration has sought a global leadership role, according to Clinton, who discussed the treaty's progress on ratification yesterday with her Russian counterpart, Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov.

"I am not suggesting that this treaty alone will convince Iran or North Korea to change their behavior, but it does demonstrate our leadership and strengthens our hand as we seek to hold these and other governments accountable," she said.

"The U.S. is better off with this treaty than without it, and I am confident that it is the right agreement for today and for the future," Defense Secretary Robert Gates told lawmakers.

He said the treaty would foster transparency, predictability, strategic stability and access to Russian facilities and weapons.

"This treaty has the full support of your uniformed military," added Adm. Michael Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April signed the "New START" agreement. The deal would require the sides to cut their fielded strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 warheads, down from the ceiling of 2,200 demanded of each by 2012 under the 2002 Moscow Treaty. It would also limit their respective deployed nuclear delivery vehicles to 700, with another 100 platforms allowed in reserve.

The treaty must be approved by lawmakers in Moscow and Washington before entering into force. The White House last week formally submitted the agreement to the Senate, where 67 votes are needed for the pact to achieve ratification in the United States.

The treaty has already come under intense criticism from some Republicans, including a number on the Foreign Relations Committee, who claim it could constrain the nation's ballistic missile defenses.

"I am concerned when, at the end of the day, after all the discussions, we have irreconcilable differences with the Russians," said Senator James Risch (R-Idaho). "We say this doesn't impede our abilities. The Russians say, 'Yes, it does.'"

Senator Jim DeMint (R-S.C.) said that he interpreted the pact's language to mean that the United States can develop missile defenses "as long as it does not threaten [Russian] offensive capabilities."

The national security team countered that the United States is not bound by Moscow's unilateral statement that it reserved the right to withdraw from the treaty if the United States augments its missile defenses beyond a certain level. Russia has regularly expressed concerns that U.S. missile defenses -- under both the Bush and Obama administrations -- would undermine its strategic deterrence.

Clinton noted that a similar statement was issued when the 1991 pact was established and "here we are billions of dollars later" spent on missile defense.

The fiscal 2011 budget blueprint unveiled in February sets aside \$9.9 billion for ballistic missile defense. Last week, a House subcommittee approved \$10.3 billion for those programs (see *GSN*, May 13).

"It's the latest chapter in a long line of Russian objections to our proceeding with missile defense, and frankly, I think it's because ... we can afford it and they can't," said Gates, who noted he started working on strategic arms control in 1970.

Mullen also told senators that the treaty would have no impact on missile defense programs.

Senator Johnny Isakson (R-Ga.) argued that the proposed treaty would reduce U.S. verification of Russia's nuclear capabilities. The pact would cut down the number of inspections agreed to in the original treaty, which allowed each country to conduct 28 annual, on-site inspections of the other nation's nuclear weapons facilities, he said. The United States also maintained a full-time inspection team at the Votkinsk missile production facility in Russia.

The newly minted agreement does not renew that inspection team and calls for just 18 inspections a year, the Georgia lawmaker noted.

Gates and Mullen responded that the new inspection regime would allow U.S. officials to monitor 27 Russian nuclear facilities, compared with the 73 that required scrutiny in the Soviet Union.

In addition to on-site inspections, verification measures would include data exchanges and notifications related to strategic offensive arms and facilities covered by the treaty. The treaty also provides for the exchange of telemetry, or the transmission of data from missiles being tested. Washington and Moscow will exchange telemetric information on up to five ICBM and submarine-deployed ballistic missile launches each year.

DeMint decried the treaty for making what he called assumptions that "suggest a different role for America in the future." In particular, he said it was "absurd and dangerous" to think that the United States "should seek parity" with Russia.

He said he would seek the "full negotiating record" of the arms reduction treaty.

Despite the criticisms the panel's top Republican, Senator Richard Lugar (Ind.), indicated he could support the nuclear arms control deal.

"Distancing ourselves from nuclear engagement with Russia would greatly reduce our knowledge of what is happening in Russia, hinder our ability to consult with Moscow in a timely manner on nuclear and other national security issues, further strain our own defense resources, weaken our nonproliferation diplomacy worldwide, and potentially heighten arms competition," according to Lugar, whose approval for the new treaty has been vigorously sought by the White House and panel Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass.)

He said rejecting the pact would be an "extremely precarious" strategy.

Another panel member called on his colleagues to move quickly in their review of the treaty so that the full chamber could conduct its vote.

"We need to move on this, and my fervent hope is that we'll get this done now in the next month or so, clearly before we adjourn" for the August recess, Senator Christopher Dodd (D-Conn.) said. "I can't imagine adjourning from this Congress and not having completed this work."

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100519\\_7622.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100519_7622.php)

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

U.S. Department of Defense  
May 19, 2010

## **Statement To The Senate Foreign Relations Committee Regarding The New START Treaty**

*Testimony as Delivered by Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Room 106,  
Washington D.C., Tuesday, May 18, 2010*

Mr. Chairman, Sen. Lugar, members of the committee:

Thank you for the opportunity to speak today regarding the agreement between the United States and Russia on the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. This treaty reduces the strategic nuclear forces of our two nations in a manner that strengthens the strategic stability of our relationship and protects the security of the American people and our allies.

America's nuclear arsenal remains a vital pillar of our national security, deterring potential adversaries and reassuring allies and partners. As such, the first step of the year-long Nuclear Posture Review was an extensive analysis which, among other things, determined how many nuclear delivery vehicles and deployed warheads were

needed. This in turn provided the basis for our negotiations of START. The results of those studies give me confidence that the Department of Defense will be able to maintain a strong and effective nuclear deterrent while modernizing our weapons to ensure that they are safe, secure and reliable, all within the limits of the new treaty.

The U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent will continue to be based on the triad of delivery systems – intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and nuclear-capable heavy bombers – within the boundaries negotiated in the “new START” treaty. Those are:

- an upper boundary of 1,550 deployed warheads;
- up to 700 deployed ICBMs, deployed SLBMs and nuclear-capable heavy bombers; and
- up to 800 deployed and non-deployed ICBM launchers, SLBM launchers and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments.

Under this treaty, we retain the power to determine the composition of our force structure, allowing the United States complete flexibility to deploy, maintain and modernize our strategic nuclear forces in a manner that best protects our national-security interests. The Defense Department has established a baseline force structure to guide our planning, one that does not require changes to current or planned basing arrangements.

- The department will retain 240 deployed submarine-launched ballistic missiles, distributed among 14 submarines, each of which will have 20 launch tubes. This is the most survivable leg of the triad. And reducing the number of missiles carried on each submarine from 24 to 20 will facilitate Navy planning for the Ohio-class submarine replacement.
- Recognizing the flexibility of the bomber leg of the triad, we will retain up to 60 deployed heavy bombers, including all 18 operational B-2s. At the same time, we will – we have to consider the Air Force is planning for a long-range strike replacement and plan to convert a number of B-52Hs to a conventional-only role.
- Finally, the U.S. will retain up to 420 deployed single-warhead Minuteman 3 ICBMs at our current three missile bases.

Let me also address some of the things that the “new START” treaty will not affect, echoing Secretary Clinton.

First, the treaty will not constrain the United States from deploying the most effective missile defenses possible, nor impose additional costs or barriers on those defenses. And I’m speaking of stories in the news this morning and the last couple of days. I’ll be happy to discuss the article in The New York Times this morning about the SM-3 missile.

As the administration’s Ballistic Missile Defense Review and budget plans make clear, the United States will continue to improve our capability to defend ourselves, our deployed forces and our allies and partners against ballistic missile threats. We made this clear to the Russians in a unilateral statement made in connection with the treaty.

Furthermore, the “new START” does not restrict our ability to develop and deploy prompt global strike/prompt conventional strike capabilities that could attack targets anywhere on the globe in an hour or less. The treaty’s limit of 700 deployed delivery vehicles, combined with the associated ceiling of 1,550 deployed warheads, accommodates the limited number of conventional warheads we may need for this capability. We are also currently examining potential future long-range weapons systems for prompt global strike that would not be limited by the treaty.

In my view, a key contribution of this treaty is its provision for a strong verification regime. While the intelligence community will provide a detailed classified assessment, I would like to emphasize some of the key elements of this regime, which provides a firm basis for monitoring Russia’s compliance with its treaty obligations while also providing important insights into the size and composition of Russian strategic forces.

- The treaty allows each party to conduct up to 18 on-site inspections each year at operating bases for ICBMs, SSBNs and nuclear-capable heavy bombers, as well as storage facilities, test ranges and conversion and elimination facilities.
- The agreement establishes a database which will be initially populated 45 days after the treaty enters into force and updated every six months thereafter that will help provide the United States with a rolling overall picture of Russia’s strategic offensive forces. This picture is further supplemented by the large number of notifications required which will track the movement and changes in status of the strategic offensive arms covered by the treaty.
- Unique identifiers for the first time will be assigned to each ICBM, SLBM and nuclear-capable heavy bomber, allowing us to track the disposition and patterns of operation of accountable systems throughout their life cycles.

- The treaty provides for noninterference with national technical means of verification such as reconnaissance satellites, ground stations and ships. This provides us with an independent method of gathering information that can assist in validating data declarations.
- While telemetry is not needed to verify the provisions of this treaty, the terms nonetheless call for the exchange of telemetry on up to five launches per year, per side.

I am confident that the “new START” treaty will in no way compromise America’s nuclear deterrent. In many ways, the primary threat to the effectiveness and credibility of the American deterrent is one that we control ourselves, and that is failing to invest adequately in our nation’s nuclear weapons infrastructure, a point I have made a number of times in recent years. Maintaining an adequate stockpile of safe, secure and reliable nuclear warheads requires a reinvigoration of our nuclear weapons complex, that is, our infrastructure and our science, technology and engineering base.

To this end, the Department of Defense is transferring \$4.6 billion to the Department of Energy’s National Nuclear Security Administration through fiscal year 2015. This transfer will assist in funding critical nuclear weapons life-extension programs and efforts to modernize the nuclear weapons infrastructure. The initial applications of this funding along with an additional \$1.1 billion being transferred for naval nuclear reactors are reflected in the Defense and Energy Departments’ FY ’11 budget request, which I urge the Congress to approve. These investments and the Nuclear Posture Review strategy for warhead life extension represent a credible modernization plan to sustain the nuclear infrastructure and support our nation’s deterrent.

I would close with a final observation. I first began working on strategic arms control with the Russians in 1970, 40 years ago, a U.S. effort that led to the first strategic arms limitation agreement with Moscow two years later. The key question then and in the decades since has always been the same: is the United States better off with a strategic arms agreement with the Russians, or without it? The answer for successive presidents of both parties has always been, with an agreement. The U.S. Senate has always agreed, approving each treaty by lopsided bipartisan margins.

The same answer holds true for “new START”. The U.S. is better off with this treaty than without it, and I am confident that it is the right agreement for today and for the future. It increases stability and predictability, allows us to sustain a strong nuclear triad, and preserves our flexibility to deploy the nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities needed for effective deterrence and defense.

In light of all these factors, I urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification on the new treaty.

<http://www.defense.gov/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1470>

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

London Guardian

## **Martin Rees Calls On UN To Establish Nuclear Disarmament Laboratories**

*The president of the Royal Society, Sir Martin Rees, wants the UN to set up the laboratories to verify that countries are keeping their promises on nuclear disarmament*

By Ian Sample, science correspondent

Wednesday, May 19, 2010

Britain's most senior scientist has called on the United Nations to establish a network of laboratories specialised in detecting and dismantling nuclear weapons.

The labs would take a central role in policing countries' efforts to reduce their stockpiles of warheads, a move experts see as crucial for building trust with other states that are thinking about developing their own nuclear weapons.

Sir Martin Rees, the president of the Royal Society, said scientists needed to develop verification technologies now so they are in place when agreements to cut nuclear stockpiles are reached.

The call comes as UN diplomats meet in New York to review the "grand bargain" of the organisation's nuclear non-proliferation treaty, in which five states with nuclear weapons – the US, Russia, China, France and Britain – agree to negotiate nuclear disarmament and other states resist acquiring the weapons.

Last month, the US and Russia renewed a bilateral arms reduction treaty that limits the number of warheads they deploy, but there are no procedures in place to check that the warheads have been decommissioned.

Writing in the journal Nature, Lord Rees and policy advisers at the Royal Society make the case for a new advisory group to guide international disarmament research, and a network of laboratories to build devices that can verify whether nuclear warheads have been dismantled and disposed of properly.

Britain has already taken a lead in disarmament technologies after the creation of a verification research programme at the Atomic Weapons Establishment in Berkshire. "More international disarmament laboratories in this vein should be founded," the authors write.

Weapons inspectors need gadgets that can identify live warheads, while other technologies are required to confirm via satellite and other remote means that countries do not hold any clandestine nuclear weapons materials or bomb facilities.

In many cases, the scientific difficulties have already been overcome, but there has been no concerted effort to design and build suitable devices.

The plutonium in warheads can be detected from the streams of gamma rays and neutrons emitted by the material. These can also reveal whether the plutonium is of weapons grade. Other radioactive signatures can be used to identify highly enriched uranium in nuclear warheads.

One hurdle that remains is that any devices used to check for illicit nuclear technology must not, under the non-proliferation treaty, reveal sensitive details about how the weapons are designed.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/science/2010/may/19/martin-rees-un-nuclear-disarmament>

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

Washington Post

## **U.S., Partners Agree To Sanctions On Iran**

By Glenn Kessler and Colum Lynch, Washington Post Staff Writers

Wednesday, May 19, 2010

Page - A08

The United States reached agreement Tuesday with Russia, China and other major powers on a draft U.N. Security Council resolution that would modestly expand and stiffen sanctions on Iran for its failure to abandon its nuclear ambitions.

The 10-page resolution in many ways falls short of the Obama administration's stated objective to impose "crippling sanctions" on Iran, but it gives new momentum to the sanctions push one day after Turkey and Brazil -- two junior Security Council members -- swooped in with their own deal with Iran to forestall new penalties on the Islamic republic.

Among other measures, the resolution would expand an asset freeze and travel ban against individuals and entities linked to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps. A critical element still to be negotiated is a list of those names.

The resolution would establish an embargo on large weapons systems such as battle tanks, combat aircraft and missiles -- a previous U.N. resolution called on nations only to "exercise vigilance and restraint" in such trade -- but would not include the comprehensive arms embargo sought by the United States and France. Iran could continue to buy light weapons.

### **'An answer' to Tehran**

"This announcement is as convincing an answer to the efforts undertaken by Tehran over the last few days as any we could provide," said Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, who finalized the deal and its announcement Tuesday morning in a phone call with her Russian counterpart. "We don't believe it was any accident that Iran agreed to this declaration as we were preparing to move forward in New York."

But Brazilian and Turkish officials were outraged at Clinton's announcement just one day after they had secured a pledge from Iran to ship some of its stockpile of low-enriched uranium to Turkey. Maria Luiza Ribeiro Viotti, the Brazilian ambassador to the United Nations, denounced the U.S. move, saying that Brazil "will not engage on any draft resolution" and that there "is still room for negotiations."

The reaction signified potential difficulties ahead in winning unanimous approval for the resolution. Three previous sanctions resolutions on Iran were approved without any "no" votes -- usually, a draft agreement among the five permanent members of the council faces little opposition from the 10 rotating members -- and anything less than that would represent a fracturing of international unity on Iran.

"The United States just slapped Turkey and Brazil in the face and spit on them afterwards," said Mohammad Marandi, head of the North American studies department at Tehran University, whose views on the nuclear issue are close to those of Iran's leaders. "Iran is rational, but the U.S. is throwing a tantrum."

### **With U.S. key partners**

The Obama administration and its key partners on Iran -- Britain, France and Germany -- have always made clear that U.N. action would be the weakest of three steps intended to force Iran to return to negotiations on its nuclear program. Those other steps include a European Union resolution and then tough unilateral sanctions by individual countries.

But nothing can happen without the imprimatur of a new U.N. resolution, because some European countries will not act on sanctions without U.N. approval. Diplomats said that some of sanctions were proposed with the full knowledge they would be removed by the Russians and Chinese -- but then could be revived in an E.U. resolution. Individual country sanctions could follow, and would be led by the United States and like-minded nations.

The draft cites recent Iranian activities, such as the construction of an undisclosed nuclear facility near Qom and the enrichment of uranium to levels of nearly 20 percent, and reaffirms previous Security Council demands that Iran suspend uranium enrichment and fully cooperate with International Atomic Energy Agency. It also stresses that penalties would be lifted if Iran halts banned nuclear activities.

The draft specifically says that nothing in it should be construed as allowing the "use of force or the threat of force."

The resolution would establish a "framework" for inspections of suspect cargo at sea or in ports. Vessels would be inspected if there are "reasonable grounds" to believe they are carrying banned goods, but there is no mandatory requirement that Iranian vessels suspected of carrying banned materials be boarded.

Moreover, financial institutions that establish "reasonable grounds" to believe Iranian banks or other firms are evading sanctions are called upon to block any financial transactions, including the issuance of insurance or reinsurance, related to banned proliferation activities. Countries are obligated to require their nationals to "exercise vigilance" in business dealings with Iranian firms.

The Obama administration failed to win approval for key proposals it had sought, including restrictions on Iran's lucrative oil trade, a comprehensive ban on financial dealings with the Guard Corps and a U.S.-backed proposal to halt new investment in the Iranian energy sector.

*Lynch reported from the United Nations. Correspondent Thomas Erdbrink in Tehran contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/18/AR2010051801988.html>

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

Seattle Times

May 19, 2010

## **Iran Rejects UN Sanctions Resolution Draft**

*Iran on Wednesday dismissed as "illegitimate" a draft U.N. Security Council resolution seeking to impose harsher sanctions against Tehran for its refusal to halt uranium enrichment.*

By ALI AKBAR DAREINI, Associated Press Writer

TEHRAN, Iran — Iran on Wednesday dismissed as "illegitimate" a draft U.N. Security Council resolution seeking to impose harsher sanctions against Tehran for its refusal to halt uranium enrichment.

Mojtaba Hashemi Samareh, a top adviser to Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, said the draft proposed by the U.S. was a reactionary response to a deal in which Iran agreed to ship much of its low-enriched uranium to Turkey.

The surprise deal, brokered by Turkey and Brazil Monday, didn't ease concerns in the West that Iran's nuclear program has military dimensions primarily because Tehran has said it will continue to enrich uranium to higher levels.

Uranium enriched to a low level is used for nuclear fuel, but if processed to much higher levels it can be fashioned into a weapon.

"The draft resolution being discussed at Security Council has no legitimacy at all," the official IRNA news agency quoted Samareh as saying Wednesday after a Cabinet meeting.

The deal would deprive Iran - at least temporarily - of some of the stocks of enriched uranium that it would need to process further to create a weapon, if that were its intention. Iran insists its nuclear program is peaceful.



But - because seven months have elapsed since the agreement was originally floated and Iran continues to enrich - it would still have enough material to make such a weapon even if Tehran shipped out the original amount stipulated by the U.N.

The material would be returned to Iran in the form of fuel rods, which cannot be processed further. Iran needs the fuel rods to power an aging medical research reactor in Tehran that produces isotopes for cancer treatment.

But to the U.S. and its allies the deal is too little now too late.

The six powers that have been trying to get Iran back to the negotiating table over its nuclear program - the U.S., Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany - had backed a similar uranium swap deal in October proposed by the U.N. nuclear agency as a confidence-building measure. It called for sending the low-enriched uranium to Russia and France to be turned into fuel rods.

The U.S., British and French ambassadors to the United Nations stressed that the sanctions resolution circulated Tuesday was a response to Iran's refusal to suspend uranium enrichment and plans to build 10 new nuclear facilities - not a response to the Iran-Turkey-Brazil deal.

In contrast to that deal which was negotiated very recently, the United States first circulated a new sanctions proposal to the five other powers tackling the Iran issue in February, and the six parties have been engaged in intense negotiations for the past six weeks.

A senior diplomat at U.N. headquarters familiar with the negotiations said ambassadors from the six countries reached agreement on the text on Friday and their capitals signed off on it over the weekend, which is why the draft resolution was circulated on Tuesday.

U.S. Ambassador Susan Rice stressed that the draft resolution and the uranium swap deal have nothing to do with each other and told reporters that Iran's decision to continue enriching uranium to 20 percent intensifies its violation of sanctions and "eliminates any confidence-building potential."

The senior U.N. diplomat raised a number of questions about the Iran-Turkey-Brazil agreement, noting that in its first paragraph it says that Iran has the right to enrich nuclear material, which is not explicitly authorized under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and is banned under previous U.N. Security Council resolutions.

The agreement also does not state where the 1,200 kilograms of high-enriched uranium to be shipped to Iran will come from and who will pay for it, the diplomat said, speaking on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the issue.

Nonetheless, the diplomat said, the deal does have some value, especially if it can spark new engagement with Iran.

The United States and its Western allies won crucial support from Russia and China for new sanctions against Iran but face tough opposition from non-permanent U.N. Security Council members Turkey, Brazil and Lebanon.

Vice President Ali Akbar Salehi, who is also the head of Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, said world powers would discredit themselves if they passed new sanctions.

"By issuing resolution, they would further discredit themselves in the public opinion," he said on state TV.

"Discussions of imposing sanctions has faded away and this is a last effort by the Western countries."

But Rice said Tuesday that adopting the resolution would "increase the cost to Iran's leadership" of defying the international community and hopefully persuade the government that it's in their interest to peacefully resolve concerns about the country's nuclear program.

*Associated Press Writer Edith M. Lederer contributed to this report from the United Nations.*

[http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/2011901024\\_apirannuclear.html](http://seattletimes.nwsources.com/html/nationworld/2011901024_apirannuclear.html)

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

Business Week

## **Iran to Scrap Nuclear Deal If UN Sanctions Approved**

May 20, 2010

By Ali Sheikholeslami

May 20 (Bloomberg) -- Iran said it will back out of an agreement to swap enriched uranium for reactor fuel if the United Nations Security Council approves a U.S.-sponsored proposal for a fourth round of sanctions aimed at curbing the country's nuclear development.



“If the fourth round of sanctions gets approved, Iran’s commitments stipulated in the recent statement on the agreement and sending enriched uranium abroad will be annulled,” Deputy Speaker of Parliament Mohammadreza Bahonar was cited as saying today by the state-run Mehr news agency.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee May 18 that, with cooperation from Russia and China, the U.S. had created “a strong draft” of a sanctions resolution. The proposed measures are “as convincing an answer to the efforts undertaken in Iran in the past few days as any we could provide,” she told senators.

The U.S. move came a day after Iran said it agreed to hand over to Turkey about half of its enriched-uranium stockpile in exchange for fuel in a form that can be used only to run a Tehran reactor that produces medical isotopes. Iran said the swap would be supervised by the UN’s International Atomic Energy Agency.

Iran said the fuel-exchange deal brokered by Brazil and Turkey would make sanctions unnecessary. The U.S. and its allies said the agreement announced in Tehran sidestepped the dispute over Iran’s continued uranium enrichment.

Uranium can fuel a reactor or, enriched to higher degrees, form the core of a bomb. UN inspectors said in February that Iran was close to the 20 percent threshold that can open the way to the production of weapons-grade uranium. Iran would continue enrichment to 20 percent after any fuel exchange takes place, the government said after the deal was announced.

*Editors: Heather Langan, Philip Sanders*

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-05-20/iran-to-scrap-nuclear-deal-if-un-sanctions-approved-update1-.html>  
(Return to Articles and Documents List)

Christian Science Monitor

## **America's New 'Dual Track' Approach To Iran Nuclear Program**

*At first, the US said, the new push for sanctions on Iran was a rebuff of a fuel swap deal. But now, it says, both the sanctions and the deal should try to address the Iran nuclear program.*

By Howard LaFranchi, Staff writer

May 20, 2010

Washington — The US appears to have switched its tune.

When it unveiled an accord among the big powers of the United Nations Security Council for new sanctions on Iran, the US said it was a rebuff of a deal reached this week by Turkey and Brazil for an Iran nuclear fuel swap.

But now, the Obama administration says, both sanctions and the fuel swap should be able to proceed: Both address aspects of Iran’s nuclear ambitions, although they take separate paths in doing that.

The United States is hoping for as close to unanimity in the 15-member Security Council on Iran sanctions as possible. This means the support of smaller, nonaligned countries that have expressed sympathy for Iran’s position. Thus, the US is now following a dual-track approach to Iran diplomacy.

Susan Rice, US ambassador to the UN, said Wednesday that the sanctions resolution “has nothing to do with” the proposed fuel-swap deal, which she compared to a “confidence-building measure” that the US and other powers proposed to Iran last fall.

In a statement on a telephone conversation Wednesday between President Obama and Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan, the White House said the president “acknowledged the efforts of Turkey and Brazil.” But Mr. Obama also informed the prime minister that negotiations on the new resolution “will continue” because of “concerns about Iran’s overall nuclear program” and its continuing failure to meet its “international obligations.”

The new tack amounts to an argument in favor of additional sanctions, some nuclear experts say, because it is saying that it’s the heat from all sides that is forcing Iran to respond to the international community.

The US dual track is really an argument that “it’s only the continuing pressure that is making Iran agree to this fuel swap,” says Ivan Oelrich, vice president of the strategic security program at the Federation of American Scientists in Washington.

“Was Iran’s sole intention [in accepting the fuel swap] to derail sanctions?” Mr. Oelrich adds. “If that’s your judgment, then this [Turkish-Brazilian] proposal is not legitimate.” But, he says, the US should accept the fuel-swap deal “as a test” of Iran’s intentions.

He says, “It gets a bomb’s worth of fuel out of Iranian territory” – low-enriched uranium that under current conditions in Iran would take a year to amass. If nothing else, he adds, “You’ve added a year to the clock.”

Both the US-proposed Security Council resolution and the Turkish-Brazilian fuel-swap deal would put new pressures on the regime in Tehran. Yet neither would force Iran's nuclear program to grind to a halt. Iran says the nuclear program is for peaceful purposes, but Western powers believe it is aimed at producing a nuclear weapon.

The proposed resolution of sanctions is aimed at making further nuclear progress by Iran increasingly costly and thus forcing Iran into serious diplomacy and transparency over its program. The fuel-swap deal, which would remove about half of Iran's stockpile of low-enriched uranium to Turkey, is designed to reduce international tensions over Iran's growing pile of fuel and thus to give diplomacy a chance.

The new resolution toughens existing international economic constraints on Iran in a number of ways:

- Establishes a "framework" for inspection of suspicious cargo ships, either on the high seas or in ports.
- Sets new asset freezes and travel bans for individuals and companies linked to the Iranian revolutionary Guard Corps.
- Expands an existing arms embargo to missiles, combat aircraft, and battle tanks.
- Calls on financial institutions to block the transactions of Iranian banks that are considered under reasonable doubt to be related to banned activities and purchases – for example, of materials that could be used in the nuclear program.

The resolution as negotiated among the Security Council's permanent members does not include a comprehensive arms embargo, which the US and France wanted. And it is devoid of any measures targeting Iran's oil sector – measures the Chinese and Russians rejected.

The US and other members of the international community should have learned this week that Iran does respond to pressure, says Patrick Clawson, deputy director for research at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy. Iran, he says, only accepted the Brazilian-Turkish plan after Tehran became convinced that a UN resolution was advancing.

Iran is seeing its "circle of diplomatic partners" shrink, Mr. Clawson writes in a commentary on the week's events. Whereas in past years Tehran tried to play the US and Europe off each other, the Iranians now have decreasing sway with the Russians and even the Chinese, he says.

But, he says, the basic challenge of Iran's continuing will to enrich uranium remains unresolved. "Neither the new [fuel-swap deal] nor the proposed sanctions address that matter directly," he says.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Foreign-Policy/2010/0520/America-s-new-dual-track-approach-to-Iran-nuclear-program>

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Brazil And Turkey Urge UN Security Council Against Iran Sanctions**

*Brazil and Turkey have urged their fellow UN Security Council members to heed a deal they struck with Iran over its nuclear programme, in a last-minute bid to block a sanctions vote against Tehran.*

20 May 2010

The missive was sent as the UN Security Council was examining a US-drafted resolution calling for Iran to be punished with a new round of sanctions for pursuing uranium-enrichment activities.

The resolution was submitted to the vexation of Brazil and Turkey, which believed they had achieved a breakthrough on Monday when Iran agreed with them to deposit a significant part of its uranium stockpile in Turkey in exchange for better-enriched nuclear fuel.

Although the agreement was hailed as a diplomatic coup by Brazilian President Luiz Inacio Lula da Silva, the United States and its allies Britain and France said it did not go far enough to avert the sanctions push.

Washington fears Tehran is seeking to build a nuclear arsenal under cover of its civilian nuclear program - a charge Tehran denies.

While Brazil itself admitted its three-way deal did not address the underlying issues boiling over, it said Iran's uranium-swap offer was a confidence-building measure that should be properly considered.

"This agreement is a new fact that has to be evaluated," Foreign Minister Celso Amorim, who led the Iran-Brazil-Turkey negotiations, insisted to reporters in Brasilia late Tuesday.

"To ignore this agreement would be to discard the possibility of a pacific solution," he said.

Mr Lula, on a visit to Madrid, said the UN Security Council should show "a willingness to negotiate."

The deal "is exactly what the United States wanted to do five months ago," he said.

A vote in favor of UN sanctions would be a blow to the efforts and prestige employed by Lula to secure the deal with Iran during a Sunday-Monday visit they made to Tehran.

Mr Lula, who is stepping down as president at the end of this year, was hailed at home and in some big-name newspapers abroad as a master diplomat when the deal was announced.

But the United States, France and Britain poured cold water on the "triumph," saying Iran had broken many promises before and was defiantly saying it would continue to enrich part of its uranium stock staying in the country.

The United States, Britain, France, Russia and China - the five veto-wielding permanent members on the UN Security Council - have all indicated they support the idea of sanctions.

Brazil and Turkey are two of the 10 non-permanent members which have no veto. A resolution would require nine votes in the 15-seat council to pass.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/7742621/Brazil-and-Turkey-urge-UN-Security-Council-against-Iran-sanctions.html>

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

Al Jazeera Magazine – U.K.

May 20, 2010

## **Iran Doubts West Sincerity In Swap Deal**

Iranian Parliament Speaker Ali Larijani has cast doubt on the sincerity of the West about a proposal to provide fuel for a research reactor in Tehran.

Larijani said that the West's reaction to a recent nuclear declaration announced by Iran testified to its insincerity in nuclear dealings with Tehran.

"Their reaction to the Tehran declaration proved that they are not sincere in the fuel swap," he said.

Following the three-way talks between Iran, Turkey and Brazil, Tehran announced a nuclear declaration on Monday whereby it would send some 1,200 kg of its low-enriched uranium to Turkey in exchange for a total of 120 kg of higher enriched uranium.

The declaration came as part of an earlier plan to supply fuel for the Tehran Research Reactor which produces medical isotopes for cancer patients.

Iran had earlier refused to ship out its uranium under the original deal, citing guarantee concerns. Iranian officials, however, believe that the new declaration can provide Tehran with objective guarantees over the fuel delivery.

While the UN, Russia and China hailed the declaration, the US said that Washington and its allies were "seriously concerned" about the nuclear program although the transfer of low-enriched uranium outside Iranian soil would be a positive step.

The US said that it would continue to push for more sanctions against Iran with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton saying that the six powers discussing Iran's nuclear work had "reached an agreement on a strong draft."

The new draft resolution, the details of which were made public on Wednesday, calls on Iran to suspend its uranium enrichment activities or face further UN Security Council sanctions.

If ratified, the draft will ban countries from selling new categories of heavy weaponry to Iran and will impose restrictions on the country's banking sector.

With the new draft resolution, Larijani said, the US showed that it was not willing to bring about change in its foreign policy on Iran.

Iran says the declaration leaves no excuse for the West to block the nuclear fuel swap, as Tehran has accepted their prior condition to ship out its uranium to a third country.

"Their previous excuse was that Iran has not accepted [their] demand to ship out 1,200 kilograms of its 3.5 percent-enriched uranium. They insistently said that it is Iran that is avoiding the acceptance of the proposal. Now that we

have accepted this condition, they are creating other excuses," Head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) Ali Akbar Salehi told Press TV on Wednesday.

*Source: Press TV*

<http://aljazeera.com/news/articles/34/Iran-doubts-West-sincerity-in-swap-deal.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **UN Discussions On Iran Should Not Stop Uranium Swap Deal - Lavrov**

20 May 2010

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said on Thursday that UN Security Council talks on new sanctions against Iran should not hamper the implementation of an uranium swap agreement signed by Iran, Brazil, and Turkey.

"We are in favor of Iran filing a request to the International Atomic Energy Agency as soon as possible... This should not be hampered by discussions in the UN Security Council," Lavrov said during a joint news conference with his Italian counterpart Franco Frattini in Rome.

"We will treat the position which other UN Security Council members take in discussions over a new resolution [on sanctions against Iran] with the utmost respect," the Russian foreign minister added.

The Iran Six, which comprises France, Britain, Germany, the United States, Russia and China, began discussing on April 19 the text of a draft resolution to impose sanctions on the Islamic Republic, which is accused by Western powers of attempting to build nuclear weapons under the guise of peaceful energy generation.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said last week that the U.S., Russia and China had reached an agreement over the resolution.

Moscow and Beijing have long opposed U.S.-backed sanctions against the Islamic Republic over its controversial nuclear activities, insisting that the issue should be resolved by diplomatic means.

Clinton's announcement came on Tuesday, a day after the Iranian, Brazilian, and Turkish foreign ministers signed an agreement on the exchange of low-enriched uranium to fuel Tehran's scientific research reactor. An Iranian Foreign Ministry official representative said that Tehran had agreed to swap in Turkey most of its 3.5%-enriched uranium for 20%-enriched fuel.

The countries agreed that a letter be sent to the IAEA within one week to declare Iran is ready for the fuel exchange. After the letter is received by the IAEA, an agreement between Tehran and the agency must be drawn up and signed.

Frattini also called for Iran to prove to the IAEA the peaceful nature of its nuclear program.

"We have discussed the Iran issue. We are convinced that Iran should formulate its proposal concerning enriching uranium in Turkey for the IAEA and express its readiness to negotiate on all aspects of its nuclear program," Frattini said.

The news conference in Rome followed the first Russian-Italian talks involving the two countries' foreign and defense ministers.

ROME, May 20 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100520/159090789.html>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

## **Russian Official: Iran's Reactor Ready By August**

Thursday, May 20, 2010

MOSCOW, Russia (AP) -- Russia's top nuclear official says that work on Iran's first nuclear plant is on schedule and the reactor will start operation by August.

Rosatom chief Sergei Kiriyenko said Thursday that possible international sanctions being drawn up against Iran will not impede the launching of the reactor in Bushehr.

Work on the plant began over 35 years ago by a German company that eventually abandoned the project after the Islamic revolution in 1979.

Russia agreed to complete the project in the 1990s but has delayed the launching due to numerous problems.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2010/05/20/international/i045013D49.DTL&type=business>

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

Al Jazeera.net – Qatar

May 21, 2010

## **Iran Nuclear Deadline Looms**

Iran has less than 24 hours to sign a nuclear swap deal brokered by Turkey and Brazil.

If Iran signs the deal, US plans for a new round of sanctions against Tehran at the UN Security Council could suffer a setback.

Iran must write and deliver a letter to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to kick start the fuel swap agreement reached on Monday.

Under the proposed deal, Iran agreed to ship much of its stockpile of low enriched uranium to Turkey in exchange for fuel for a research reactor for medical isotopes - something that the US had proposed in 2009.

But the deal notwithstanding, the US has been pushing for fresh sanctions.

"The US announced a deal with China and Russia for new sanctions right after Turkey and Brazil brokered a deal with Iran," Al Jazeera's Anita McNaught said, reporting from Ankara, Turkey's capital.

"Turkey saw that as a slap in the face.

"US officials never believed the Turkish-Brazilian brokered deal would succeed.

"No one [in the US administration] thought Iran was amenable to anything other than sanctions," she said.

### **US displeasure**

The US is unhappy with the deal because it does not include a commitment from Iran to suspend its nuclear enrichment activities.

"There are American officials who think Iran just used the Brazil-Turkey deal to slow down sanctions," our correspondent said.

The controversy over Iran's nuclear programme has dragged on for years with the US and its allies accusing Tehran of seeking to covertly develop atomic weapons. Iran insists its nuclear programme is for generating electricity for civilian use.

Brazil and Turkey have growing ambitions in international affairs. Both countries are non-permanent members of the UN Security council who do not have veto power.

Turkish officials had been in touch with their US counterparts throughout negotiations with Iran, a Turkish foreign ministry spokesman said. The US and Turkey are strategic allies.

"Hillary Clinton [the US Secretary of State] did not want them [Brazil and Turkey] to fail but she never thought they would succeed. So the US went ahead with the sanctions draft," our correspondent said.

"If Iran signs the letter, then sanctions may not be an option. China might want to give the Brazil-Turkey deal a chance."

*Source: Al Jazeera and agencies*

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/middleeast/2010/05/201052183017311861.html>

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

The Hindu – India

May 21, 2010

## **‘Fuel Swap Deal Does Not Address All Concerns’**

By Press Trust of India (PTI)

The White House has said Iran's recent nuclear fuel swapping deal with Turkey and Brazil does not address all the concerns of the US and its international partners about Tehran's nuclear weapon program.

"While we acknowledge and appreciate the efforts of the Turks and Brazilians, I think it is important to understand that that agreement alone does not address or that proposal alone in its limited form does not fully address all of the concerns that the P5-plus-1 and the larger international community have with Iran's nuclear program," White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs said at his daily press briefing.

"I think it's important to understand that the proposal that Iran says they've entered into now is less than what they agreed to eight months ago. They did not agree to, as they had in October, sit down with the P5-plus-1 to have a broader, fuller discussion about Iran's nuclear program," he said in response to a question.

Iran did not agree to provide unfettered access to its nuclear facilities, Mr. Gibbs said, adding the proposal does not address in any form the increased enrichment that Tehran claimed it was undertaking to provide material for its research reactor.

Asserting that there are responsibilities that the Iranians have and that they must undertake, Mr. Gibbs said: "While the proposal that was outlined on Monday would be a step in the right direction because of the amount of low-enriched uranium that would be transferred -- again, assuming that the Iranians kept up their end of the deal, which has not -- has almost never been the case -- we have had eight months of progression."

The progression has included increased enrichment, Mr. Gibbs said, adding the proposal, again, failed to live up to even what Tehran wanted to do eight months ago

The White House spokesman appreciated the role played by Brazil and Turkey in this regard.

"I would again acknowledge the role that they played in trying to get Iran to live up to its obligations. I think the international community, by releasing the consensus of the P5-plus-1 after that, understands that there is more that has to be done," Mr. Gibbs said.

<http://beta.thehindu.com/news/international/article434875.ece>

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

London Daily Telegraph

## **Is Korea Going To War?**

*The sinking of a South Korean warship by North Korea has prompted condemnation from the United States, the United Nations and Britain. But what will happen next?*

20 May 2010

### **NEGOTIATION**

The unprovoked attack has effectively killed any further talks on North Korea's nuclear disarmament. The United States, South Korea, China, Russia and Japan had all been pushing Pyongyang to return to the negotiating table after last year's nuclear test.

The so-called six party talks have not been hugely successful to date, but without a framework of negotiation, North Korea is likely to continue to increase its nuclear arsenal.

### **FURTHER NORTH KOREAN ATTACKS**

Analysts believe that the attack on the South Korean warship may have been prompted by the current North Korean succession. Kim Jong-il is widely thought to be in the process of handing power on to his third son, Kim Jong-un. In order to cement the younger Kim's power, and control of the army, North Korea could continue to launch strikes against the South. The North is also rumoured to be considering a new nuclear bomb test.

A similar set of terrorist attacks occurred in the run-up to Kim Jong-il's succession. In 1983, South Korea accused North Korea of a bombing of an official trip to Burma, which killed 17 touring South Korean officials and in 1987 a Korean Air flight was destroyed, with the loss of 115 lives.

### **SANCTIONS**

Last year, when North Korea tested an atomic bomb, the United Nations adopted resolution 1874 which imposed economic sanctions on the country and authorised UN member countries to inspect North Korean cargo ships and destroy any weapons.



New sanctions against North Korea would aim at cutting off the regime's flow of foreign currency without triggering any further calamitous poverty among the general population. The United States could also put North Korea back on its list of states that sponsor terrorism. The Bush administration removed North Korea from the list in 2008.

## **WAR**

South Korea is likely to increase the number of troops on the border with the North, and Seoul could decide on a shoot-on-sight policy against ships that approach South Korea's sea border. Military experts believe a full-scale war is extremely unlikely, on account of North Korea's instability and its nuclear capability. However, skirmishes along the demilitarised zone and at sea could take place. The United States and China will urge both sides to keep their tempers under control.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/7745077/Is-Korea-going-to-war.html>

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

FOXNews.com

May 20, 2010

## **Nuclear Factor Complicates Korean Standoff Over Sunken Ship**

The delicate standoff on the Korean peninsula over charges that North Korea sank a South Korean ship -- killing 46 sailors -- stands as a compelling example of why rogue states want nuclear weapons.

Nobody wants to mess with them.

"No other state their size on Earth has that kind of military capability," said Bruce Bechtol, author of "Red Rogue: The Persistent Challenge of North Korea."

South Korean and U.S. officials are now weighing their options for how to handle the findings of an investigative report that formally blamed a North Korean torpedo attack for sinking the frigate Cheonan on March 26. Defense Secretary Robert Gates stressed Thursday that the South Koreans are calling the shots and "we will be consulting very closely with them as we move ahead." The State Department said there would be "consequences."

But the early response is almost certain to come in the form of public condemnation and economic sanctions rather than military action, observers say. Administration officials would not go so far as to label the attack an act of war -- White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs said he would not get into "hypotheticals" when asked if the dispute could lead to war. Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the United States is focused on supporting its "strong ally" while at the same time considering "stability in that region."

The nuclear arsenal isn't necessarily the biggest worry, since the regime is incapable of delivering those weapons on a long-range missile that could hit, say, the United States. The country's sizable military and arsenal of conventional weapons -- which are well in range of Seoul -- make the prospect of all-out war on the peninsula terrifying. That's what North Korea is threatening as it accuses South Korea of fabricating evidence.

But Bechtol, a professor at the U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College, said North Korea holds a major "deterrent" in its hands with its nuclear arsenal. While delivery methods are limited, he said the North is capable of using aircraft or ships to attack the South with a nuclear weapon and could also use a medium-range missile to hit countries as far away as Japan.

All this inevitably factors in as South Korea and its allies consider a response. And it demonstrates why the Obama administration is so keen on halting the development of nuclear weapons.

The administration has been on a high-profile campaign over the past several months to reduce nuclear arsenals around the world and keep nations like North Korea and Iran from developing them. The United Nations this week reviewed a proposal for new sanctions against Iran over its nuclear program, which the country's government insists is for peaceful purposes.

Doug Bandow, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, said it's unlikely Kim Jong Il would try to deploy a nuclear weapon, but the danger of the country's weapons getting loose should the regime fall apart in the throes of a military conflict is what worries officials.

In the near-term, he said North Korea's ability to inflict major damage on South Korea with conventional weapons is what will lead nations like the United States to urge restraint.

White House Press Secretary Robert Gibbs said in a written statement Wednesday that the United States "strongly condemns the act of aggression," but left open the door to what options the United States is considering.



"This attack constitutes a challenge to international peace and security," he said. "It reinforces the resolve of its neighbors to intensify their cooperation to safeguard peace and stability in the region against all provocations."

But Badow said that if the South Korean's investigative findings are correct, "This suggests the North committed an act of war."

He said the challenge is to punish North Korea without triggering a military conflict.

"To sink a South Korean ship is a major provocation," he said. "There are no good answers here."

A U.S. official told FoxNews.com that the United States is waiting until South Korean President Lee Myung-bak meets with his government on Monday and will take its cues from there.

"South Koreans have the lead on this issue. Obviously we support them," the official said.

Bechtol said that while South Korea has probably not taken military action off the table, such a response is unlikely.

He added: "If North Korea conducts another provocation then all bets are off."

<http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2010/05/20/nuclear-factor-complicates-korean-stand-sunken-ship/>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Postpones Bulava Missile Tests Until November**

21 May 2010

Russia has postponed test launches of the troubled Bulava ballistic missile until November this year, the Russian defense minister said on Friday.

The latest launch of the missile, which Russia hopes will be a key element of its nuclear forces, from the Dmitry Donskoy nuclear submarine in the White Sea ended in failure in early December 2009. Only five of 12 Bulava launches have been officially reported as being successful.

The Russian Navy earlier planned at least four new test launches of the missile at the end of June, but defense industry experts suggested they would need to build three missiles under identical conditions to establish the causes of the failures.

"We should be ready to resume the [Bulava] tests by November, I think," Anatoly Serdyukov said during talks in Italy, which involved the defense and foreign ministers of both countries.

Serdyukov said that the problems with the missile apparently originate from the faulty assembly process.

"It all comes from the poor quality of assembly. But each failed launch has experienced different problems," the minister said, adding that only the testing of three identical missiles would allow the experts to pinpoint the cause of failures.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) is a three-stage liquid and solid-propellant submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM). It carries up to 10 MIRV warheads and has a range of over 8,000 kilometers (5,000 miles).

The missile has been specifically designed for Russia's new Borey class nuclear submarines.

The future development of Bulava has been questioned by some lawmakers and defense industry officials who suggest that the Russian Navy should keep using the more reliable Sineva SLBM.

The Russian military has insisted that there is no alternative to the Bulava and pledged to continue testing the missile until it is ready to be deployed with the Navy.

MOSCOW, May 21 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20100521/159103248.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100521/159103248.html)

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

Salt Lake Tribune

## **Lee And Bridgewater Support N-Weapons Testing**

By Robert Gehrke, The Salt Lake Tribune  
May 20, 2010

Both Republican Senate candidates say they would support a resumption of underground nuclear weapons tests, presumably in Nevada, to help modernize the nation's weapons stockpile.

Mike Lee signed a "Peace Through Strength" pledge Monday, crafted by a handful of national security organizations. The pledge consists of several defense policy positions, including protecting national sovereignty, not trying enemy combatants in U.S. courts, energy security and the modernization and testing of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

"We need to always have our eye on the ball for developing new weapons systems and that is going to require new testing," Lee said in an interview with *The Salt Lake Tribune*.

He said he wouldn't support above-ground testing -- which hasn't been conducted in the United States since 1963 -- but believes the U.S. could conduct underground testing. He said he assumes that would be done at the Nevada Test Site.

"I think we need always to be modernizing our equipment, including our nuclear weapons," Lee said in an interview Tuesday. "I think any time you do that, you have to weigh the risks of it against the benefits. I think the big picture moving forward is you have to update technology and that's going to have some testing with it."

Lee's Republican primary opponent, Tim Bridgewater, agrees and would support underground tests "if it was deemed necessary by our military experts."

"I would support that," Bridgewater said. "I would prefer that we don't have to move down that road, but nuclear weapons are a deterrent, and we shouldn't give up our strong position in the world because more nations are becoming nuclear powers and the greater the deterrent the less likely we ever have to use them."

The issue of weapons testing is sensitive in Utah, as untold number of residents -- who became known as Downwinders -- developed various types of cancer that has been linked to fallout from the Cold War-era weapons tests.

Both Lee and Bridgewater's fathers were Downwinders.

Lee's father, former Reagan administration solicitor general Rex Lee, died of non-Hodgkins lymphoma in 1996.

Lee backtracked somewhat Wednesday evening, saying the statement he signed doesn't specifically call for nuclear detonations -- merely testing, which can be done on weapons systems.

But his statements in the interview were specific to blasts and he left open the option of full-scale tests.

Mary Dickson, a Downwinder and author of the book *Exposed*, said there is no need to move toward renewed testing.

"I just think that's going completely down the wrong road," she said. "Given the history of what nuclear weapons testing did to the people of this country, I just think it's irresponsible to even talk about ever testing weapons on our soil ever again."

Joe Cirincione, an arms control expert and president of the Ploughshares Fund, said there is no scientific study indicating more nuclear tests are needed.

"We've conducted over 1,000 tests in our history, more than every other nation combined," said Cirincione. "We know more about nuclear weapons than any other nation and the scientific consensus is that our nuclear weapons are safe, secure and astonishingly effective and can be kept that way indefinitely without further explosive tests."

Cirincione is in Utah this week advocating for the ratification of The New START Treaty, an agreement that the Obama administration is pressing the Senate to ratify, which would reduce nuclear arsenals to the lowest levels since the 1950s.

The United States conducted more than 900 weapons tests at the Nevada Test Site up until 1992, when President George H.W. Bush imposed a moratorium on testing.

President Bill Clinton extended the moratorium and in 1995 signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, prohibiting further testing. The Senate rejected the treaty, but no tests have been conducted.

It is in the U.S. interest, Cirincione said, to be part of a global agreement not to test weapons, because it keeps other countries from improving their weapons and maintains the U.S. strategic advantage.

"As soon as we start testing nuclear weapons, there will be a nuclear test chain that will ripple around the globe, from India to China to North Korea," he said. "If we test, bang! It's off to the races."

But Frank Gaffney, president of the Center for Security Policy, who helped write the "Peace Through Strength" pledge, has argued in favor of modernizing and testing American weapons.

Gaffney, who was a Defense Department official in charge of nuclear weapons programs, argued in an essay that the United States needs to maintain an effective deterrent, but the weapons stockpile is aging and hasn't been tested since 1992.

The Obama administration has requested \$80 billion for a 10-year modernization program.

"The trouble is that President Obama says that expenditure will not buy a single new weapon," Gaffney wrote. "Nor will any of it go towards testing the ones we have by exploding any of them underground -- the only way to be absolutely certain they work."

[http://www.sltrib.com/D=g/ci\\_15121079](http://www.sltrib.com/D=g/ci_15121079)

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

Washington Post

ANALYSIS

## **Analysis: UN Sanctions Unlikely To Stop Iran**

By ROBERT BURNS, The Associated Press

Wednesday, May 19, 2010

WASHINGTON -- Proposed new U.N. penalties on Iran fall far short of what it would take to cripple the Islamic republic's nuclear program, and even military strikes might merely delay Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Ultimately, the only country capable of stopping Iran is Iran.

Knowing this, the Obama administration figures that economic pressure is worth a stab. Officials hope that enough added pressure might convince Iran that benefits of the bomb are not worth the costs.

But through three previous rounds of sanctions, Iran has shown that it doesn't mind being an international pariah.

Still, the administration has few options. If this latest round doesn't work, the choices will grow narrower - go to war or learn to live with a nuclear Iran.

The problem is at the heart of one of the administration's highest foreign policy priorities: halting the spread of nuclear weapons. American officials believe that if Iran goes nuclear, other nations in the greater Middle East will feel compelled to follow suit, including Turkey, Egypt and possibly Saudi Arabia.

Iran insists its network of nuclear reactors and enrichment facilities is meant only to produce energy and medical material for civilian use. But it has defied repeated demands by the U.N. Security Council to halt the enrichment of uranium.

Last year Iran announced plans to greatly expand its enrichment capability. And in February it began enriching its uranium to a higher level, an important step toward eventually producing bomb-grade material.

The draft U.N. sanctions resolution that the U.S., Russia and China introduced Tuesday goes further than earlier sets of penalties against Iran, with stiffer measures meant to curtail its military, financial and shipping activities. It would freeze assets of nuclear-related companies linked to the Revolutionary Guard, and it calls on member nations not to provide fuel or port services to ships carrying banned cargo to the Islamic republic.

The U.N. sanctions, also backed by France, Britain and Germany - are meant to lay a foundation for adoption of complementary and likely tougher penalties by Congress and the European Union.

But Iran has a history of deftly adapting to outside pressure.

"Sanctions by themselves will not do the trick," said Alireza Nader, an Iran specialist at the RAND Corp. think tank. He believes Iran's ruling clerics view their pursuit of a nuclear weapon as a matter of survival.

"I don't think anybody thinks these particular sanctions are going to trigger Iran to give up its nuclear program," said Sharon Squassoni, a nuclear proliferation expert at the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

But sanctions can make life more difficult - technically, financially and politically - for Iran.

"These sanctions are making it costlier, so that goes into the calculations that Iranians are making" about the future of their program, Squassoni said.

The initial set of U.N. sanctions against Iran was based on a Security Council resolution passed in December 2006.

It called for member nations to take "necessary measures" to prevent the supply, sale or transfer - by land, sea or air - of all materials, equipment, goods and technology which could contribute to Iran's nuclear activities.

Subsequent U.N. resolutions in March 2007 and March 2008 made similar requests, while repeating demands that Iran come clean on its nuclear program.

Despite this, Iran has made substantial advances in its nuclear program, parts of which are still shrouded in secrecy.

U.S. officials say it remains unclear whether the top Iranian leadership has made a decision on whether to actually build a bomb. But they add that they are still on a path to be able to do so someday.

Gen. James Cartwright, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told Congress last month that if and when Iran decides to build its first bomb, it could amass enough highly enriched uranium to do so in as little as 12 months.

Tuesday's proposed new U.N. sanctions resolution is markedly tougher than its predecessors, although the penalties could be watered down during deliberations by the 15-member Security Council.

The sanctions would target individuals and institutions with links to Iran's nuclear program, including the Revolutionary Guard, which controls companies, as well as organizations tied to weapons proliferation.

Both organizations and individuals would be added to a list of those subject to an asset freeze and travel ban that is still being compiled.

The March 2008 resolution had authorized inspection of cargo suspected of containing banned items on planes and ships owned or operated by Iran Air Cargo and the Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Line.

The new proposal would call on U.N. member nations to ban the supply of fuel or services to Iranian owned or contracted vessels suspected of carrying prohibited cargo. The vessels could be boarded and inspected only if the ship's flag state agrees.

*EDITOR'S NOTE - Robert Burns has covered national security and military affairs for The Associated Press since 1990.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/05/19/AR2010051903968.html>

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

Washington Times  
OPINION

## **LETTER TO THE EDITOR: Obama's Nuclear Policy Signals Weakness**

May 20, 2010

Frank J. Gaffney Jr., in considering the Senate review of the new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty START, has exposed the bait-and-switch approach of President Obama's nuclear policy in his article "The president's new clothes" (Opinion, Tuesday).

It should not be overlooked that in his effort to support his long-term objective of eliminating nuclear weapons, the president has totally distorted the long-established practice of developing an objective Nuclear Posture Review (NPR). The president used the review process to force the national security fiefdoms in his administration to sign on to his vision of nuclear deterrence.

The policy expounded in the NPR has moved from deterrence to responsive reaction. Instead of relying upon perception and uncertainty to avoid a hostile attack, the NPR specifies what reaction would be taken to an attack, and more importantly, what actions would not lead to a nuclear response. This reduces our security in the nuclear-proliferated world.

Deterrence contributes to security by leaving an opponent uncertain of what would trigger a nuclear response while at the same time demonstrating with a high degree of confidence that if nuclear weapons have to be used, the effect of the warheads would be devastating. The new NPR has removed the uncertainty factor and the refusal to consider the development of a new warhead greatly diminishes confidence that our aging stockpile will perform as required, if it ever is used.

By these actions, the president has made it abundantly clear to our enemies that America no longer has the strength of purpose to retain its security in this new, increasingly proliferated environment. Unfortunately, while the commander in chief sports his new clothes, he is stripping America bare.

STANLEY ORMAN

Former undersecretary of state in the United Kingdom  
Rockville, Md.

EUGENE FOX  
Major general, U.S. Army (retired)  
Plano, Texas

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/may/20/obamas-nuclear-policy-signals-weakness/>

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

Boston Globe  
OPINION  
GLOBE EDITORIAL

## **Obama Should Call Iran's Bluff**

May 21, 2010

FACING NEW UN sanctions for refusing to suspend its uranium enrichment, Iran executed a clever evasive maneuver, announcing a deal with Turkey and Brazil to ship some of its low-enriched uranium overseas, where it would then be converted for peaceful uses. In responding to Iran, President Obama needs to match shrewdness with shrewdness.

Obama should declare that he accepts the notion that Iran can demonstrate its peaceful intentions by shipping its low-enriched uranium for conversion abroad. But he must insist that Iran relinquish enough low-enriched uranium to ensure the country cannot make a nuclear weapon for at least a year. That would provide enough time to negotiate a deal that allows Iran a supply of nuclear fuel for peaceful uses while providing assurances to the rest of the world that it cannot build a nuclear weapon.

The agreement Iran cooked up with Turkey and Brazil differs in crucial ways from a deal Iran worked out last October with the so-called Vienna Group — the United States, Russia, France, and the International Atomic Energy Agency — but refused to implement. Under the earlier terms, Iran was to send 1,200 kilograms out of a total of 1,500 to Russia and France to be converted into fuel rods for a research reactor producing isotopes for medical use. Back then, 1,200 kilograms accounted for 80 percent of Iran's total — enough to preclude the production of a nuclear weapon for about a year. But today Iran has about 2,300 kilograms of low-enriched uranium. So the 1,200 kilograms Iran told Turkey and Brazil it would send abroad is now only 55 percent of its stockpile, leaving Iran just a few months away from having enough fuel for a weapon.

Since Russia and China agreed this week to vote for new sanctions in the UN Security Council, Obama has a strong hand to play. He should thank Turkey and Brazil for their exertions and declare that a properly revised version of their agreement with Iran would be welcome — and then seek to make it happen.

[http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial\\_opinion/editorials/articles/2010/05/21/obama\\_should\\_call\\_irans\\_bluff/](http://www.boston.com/bostonglobe/editorial_opinion/editorials/articles/2010/05/21/obama_should_call_irans_bluff/)

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