



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 826, 16 July 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <a href="#">Most Of Russians Against Nuclear Disarmament – Poll</a>          | <a href="#">China Reiterates Call To Resume Six-Party Talks</a>                |
| <a href="#">START May Be Ready For Ratification In November</a>              | <a href="#">US Willing To Talk If N.Korea Recommits To Denuclearization</a>    |
| <a href="#">Obama Courts Senators on Arms Treaty Ratification</a>            | <a href="#">Bulava Missile Launch Planned Next Month, Report Says</a>          |
| <a href="#">US Denies Abducting Iran Scientist</a>                           | <a href="#">A Trident Nuclear Submarine Could Be Cut To Save Costs</a>         |
| <a href="#">Israel's Nuclear Program Implicated In U.S. Investigation</a>    | <a href="#">U.S. Plans To Increase Nuclear Spending</a>                        |
| <a href="#">Russia Up To Date On Iranian Nuclear Developments – Medvedev</a> | <a href="#">Nuclear Arms Labs Say 'Fiscal Realities' Weigh On U.S. Arsenal</a> |
| <a href="#">'Abducted' Iranian Amiri Denies Being Nuclear Scientist</a>      | <a href="#">EDITORIAL: NPT Framework In Peril</a>                              |
| <a href="#">'Abducted' Nuclear Scientist Returns To Iran</a>                 | <a href="#">MONROE: No New START With Russia</a>                               |
| <a href="#">Iran Says Nuclear-Fuel Talks Should Open In September</a>        | <a href="#">Russia Nuke Treaty Also Aimed At Rising Powers</a>                 |
| <a href="#">An Attack On Iran: Back On The Table</a>                         |  |
| <a href="#">U.S. Says Scientist Aided C.I.A. While Still In Iran</a>         |  |
| <a href="#">U.S. Reiterates</a>  |  |

---

*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.*

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Most Of Russians Against Nuclear Disarmament - Poll**

15 July 2010

The majority of Russians (60 percent) are against further nuclear disarmament, with numbers in favor dropping significantly since the end of the Soviet era, the Russia Public Opinion Research Center (VTsIOM) said on Thursday.

Half of Russians believe the country needs nuclear weapons to assure its security in case of war, according to VTsIOM's latest survey. A quarter said nuclear weapons should be preserved to demonstrate Russia's political power, with only 4 percent saying the stockpile is needed to counter U.S. military potential.

In 1991, almost half of Russians (48 percent) were in favor of nuclear disarmament, the pollster said. Now, the figure stands at 19 percent.

VTsIOM analyst Yulia Baskakova said the drop indicated that Russians no longer welcome disarmament as the country's defense potential has already decreased significantly since Soviet times. They believe that further cuts of nuclear stockpiles would pose a threat to Russia's security.

However, Baskakova said the figures also showed significant changes in Russians' mentality since the collapse of the Soviet Union.

"Then, there was a mass euphoria, many hoped that the fall of the Iron Curtain would bring universal peace and strengthen cooperation with other countries. But practice has showed that Russia has maintained its own interests in the political arena, and these do not always coincide with those of other nations - namely, a bid to maintain its place among great powers," she said.

When asked who benefited more from the signing of a new arms cuts treaty between Russia and the United States, 33 percent said both countries, 22 percent answered Washington, and 4 percent said Russia. More than a quarter of Russians (27 percent) said the pact benefited the entire world.

The treaty, signed by the Russian and U.S. presidents in Prague in April, stipulates that the number of nuclear warheads is to be reduced to 1,550 on each side, while the number of deployed and non-deployed delivery vehicles must not exceed 800 on each side. The document, which is now being considered by the two countries' parliaments, is to replace the START 1 treaty that expired in December 2009.

A total of 1600 people in 140 localities across Russia took part in the poll. The statistical margin of error is 3.4 percent.

MOSCOW, July 15 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100715/159825463.html>

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

Voice of Russia – Russia

## **START May Be Ready For Ratification In November**

July 15, 2010

The Russian-US strategic arms reduction treaty (START) may be submitted for ratification in November, Speaker of the State Duma, the lower house of parliament, Boris Gryzlov told a press-conference in Moscow Thursday.

He said that now the document is in the State Duma and being prepared for ratification.

He added that the State Duma plans to honor the agreement of the US and Russian presidents on simultaneous ratification.

He said that the Duma has already considered the treaty three times both at closed and opened sessions.

The deputies have a number of doubts on some figures and in order to remove all uncertainties the discussion will continue in July and August.

The new START obliges Russia and the US to cut the number of their war heads and carriers by one third.

<http://english.ruvr.ru/2010/07/15/12448785.html>

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

## Obama Courts Senators on Arms Treaty Ratification

Friday, July 16, 2010

The Obama administration this week was lobbying Republicans on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to support ratification of a new U.S.-Russian nuclear arms control treaty, *Foreign Policy* reported (see *GSN*, July 13).

U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April signed the replacement to the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. The "New START" pact would obligate both nations to cap their fielded strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 warheads, down from the maximum of 2,200 allowed each country by 2012 under the 2002 Moscow Treaty. The deal would also limit U.S. and Russian deployed nuclear delivery vehicles to 700, with another 100 platforms allowed in reserve. The pact must be approved by the U.S. Senate and by Russia's legislature.

U.S. ratification of the treaty would require at least 67 Senate votes, a number that must include at least eight Republican endorsements in this Congress. To date, though, Senate Foreign Relations Committee ranking member Richard Lugar (Ind.) is the only Republican senator to openly support the pact. The committee's seven other Republicans last month signed a letter criticizing a call by Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass.) for the panel to send the pact to the Senate floor ahead of the August congressional recess (see *GSN*, July 6).

Committee member Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) suggested Wednesday he could vote for ratification if he is convinced that Washington has a credible plan for ensuring the reliability of its nuclear deterrent. President Obama is also expected to pen a letter to Senator Jon Kyl addressing the Arizona Republican's similar concerns about the pact.

"I'm undecided but I'm very open (to supporting the treaty)," said Corker, who discussed the treaty in a Monday meeting with Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

"The big issue at the end of the day in my opinion that's going to affect the approval of the treaty is going to be the real commitment to modernization and a real concrete plan over time of what specifically is going to happen," the lawmaker said. "If we knew everything we had was modern and up to date, we could reduce even more."

Republicans have sought an arsenal refurbishment plan that extends beyond steps outlined in the administration's fiscal 2011 budget request. The Energy Department submitted its proposed stockpile management plan to lawmakers in May (see *GSN*, July 13).

Republican senators might seek to delay a floor vote on ratification until after the November midterm election. Democratic lawmakers hope to vote on the treaty before a new Congress takes power, raising the prospect of a December vote (Josh Rogin, *Foreign Policy*, July 14)

Meanwhile, former Secretary of State George Shultz and former Senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) called for the treaty's prompt ratification.

"We strongly endorse the goals of this treaty -- to achieve a near-term reduction of nuclear weapons with mutually agreed verification procedures," the statesmen said in letters to Senators Kerry and Lugar. "We believe the threat of nuclear terrorism remains urgent, fueled by the spread of nuclear weapons, materials and technology around the world. While this is a global issue, there are two countries -- the United States and Russia -- whose cooperation is absolutely essential in order to successfully deal with current nuclear threats. With New START, our odds of establishing a more cooperative relationship with Russia improve -- recognizing this will be a process of engagement broader than any one treaty."

"Noting the full support of the secretary of state, secretary of defense, and chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and following our own review of the treaty, we urge the Senate to give its advice and consent to ratification of New START as early as is feasible," they added (U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee release, July 15).

/EDITOR'S NOTE: Sam Nunn is co-chairman and chief executive officer of the Nuclear Threat Initiative. NTI is the sole sponsor of Global Security Newswire, which is published independently by the National Journal Group./

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100716\\_1517.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100716_1517.php)

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

Al Jazeera.net

Wednesday, July 14, 2010

## US Denies Abducting Iran Scientist

The United States has admitted that Iranian nuclear scientist Shahram Amiri has been living in the US, after he said he had been kidnapped by US agents and sought refuge at the Pakistan embassy, asking to go home.

But Washington denied kidnapping him and said he "lived freely" in the US, with Hillary Clinton, the US secretary of state, saying: "He's free to go, he was free to come. Those decisions are his to make."

The Pakistani foreign ministry confirmed on Tuesday that Amiri had been "dropped off" at its embassy in Washington DC on Monday night.

Iran and the US have no diplomatic relations, so Tehran's interests in Washington are handled by a separate "interests section" at the Pakistani embassy.

Iranian authorities have repeatedly said that Amiri was seized by the CIA as he visited Saudi Arabia last year – allegations US officials have denied – and Iranian state television broadcast the text of what it said was an interview with Amiri conducted on Tuesday.

### **'Gun to my side'**

Amiri was quoted in the interview as saying that he was abducted at gunpoint by US agents, while attending the Hajj pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia.

"There were three people in the van - a driver, another person in a formal suit and beard, and a third person in the back.

"When I opened the door to get in and sit down, the person at the back put a gun to my side and said 'please be quiet, don't make any noise'," he was quoted as saying.

PJ Crowley, a spokesman for the US state department, said on Tuesday that Amiri had been living in the US for "some time".

"I'm not going to specify for how long, but he has chosen to return," Crowley said.

"In fact he was scheduled to travel to Iran yesterday and wasn't able to make all the necessary arrangements to reach Iran through transit countries," he added.

Iran's semi-official Fars news agency said Amiri was handed over to the embassy by US agents, calling it a defeat for US intelligence services.

"Because of Iran's media and intelligence activities, the American government had to back down and hand over Amiri to the embassy on Monday night," Fars said.

Amiri was quoted in the interview as saying: "They intended to send me back home without much noise in order to cover up the kidnapping through denying the whole case, but they couldn't do that in the end."

When Clinton was asked about the case, she chose instead to focus on the fate of American citizens detained in Iran.

"Iran holds three young Americans against their will and we reiterate our request that they be released and returned to their families on a humanitarian basis," she said.

Sarah Shourd, 31, her boyfriend Shane Bauer, 27, and Josh Fattal, 27, were arrested last July along the Iran-Iraq border and accused of espionage.

Their families say they were simply hiking in Iraq's largely peaceful mountainous northern Kurdish region and that if they crossed the border, it was accidental.

### **Video confusion**

Amiri's fate has been the subject of confusion for weeks. On June 29, Iranian state television aired a video of a man claiming to be Amiri.

The man said he had managed to escape from US intelligence agents in the state of Virginia.

"I could be rearrested at any time by US agents ... I am not free and I am not allowed to contact my family. If something happens and I do not return home alive, the US government will be responsible," he said.

"I ask Iranian officials and organisations that defend human rights to raise pressure on the US government for my release and return to my country," the man said, adding he had not "betrayed" Iran.

US officials dismissed the allegations in the Iranian broadcast.

Before that video, two others said to show Amiri appeared on the internet. In the first, broadcast on Iranian TV, a man said he was abducted and was being held in the United States.

He said he was forced to take part in a media interview "to claim that I was an important figure in Iran's nuclear programme and that I had sought asylum in America of my own free will".

In a second video, a man also purporting to be Amiri said he was actually studying in the US.

Iran says it has numerous citizens in secret detention in the US, including a former deputy defence minister who disappeared in 2007.

Earlier this month, Iranian authorities said they had evidence that Amiri had been abducted and had handed it over to the Swiss embassy, which represents US interests in Tehran.

Source: Agencies

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/americas/2010/07/20107142356756792.html>

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

Ha'aretz Daily – Israel

July 15, 2010

## **Israel's Nuclear Program Implicated In U.S. Investigation**

*According to Institute for Science and International Security researchers U.S. based Israeli company Pelogy violated export regulations.*

By Yossi Melman

Israel's nuclear program has been implicated in an investigation conducted in the United States by the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS), according to a report published on Wednesday by the researchers of the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS).

The investigation began in spring 2010 when the BIS charged Pelogy, a U.S. based company and its Belgian affiliate, with violating U.S. export administration regulations by attempting to export controlled goods to Israel, India, China and South Africa.

According to the investigation, in the case of Israel and India, the goods could have been used to manufacture nuclear weapons and missile programs.

The charges followed a voluntary self-disclosure by the companies.

In the case of Israel, the BIS neither identified the equipment or components purchased in America nor the suspected purchaser of these goods.

No further details have been provided about the case.

It is worth mentioning that in the 1980s, regardless of Jonathan Pollards' espionage activities for Israel, Israeli companies and individuals were involved many cases of technological espionage, stealing U.S. secrets, technology and equipment.

The most outstanding case involved Milco, a U.S. based company owned by Israeli tycoon Arnon Milchan, which bought and shipped equipment with which could have also been used as triggers for nuclear weapons.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/israel-s-nuclear-program-implicated-in-u-s-investigation-1.302006>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Up To Date On Iranian Nuclear Developments - Medvedev**

15 July 2010

Russia possesses information indicating that Iran is continuing to develop its nuclear technology, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said on Thursday.

"The information that is being received comes both from open sources and from special services that deliver relevant reports and shows that these [nuclear] programs are being developed," Medvedev said during a joint news conference with German Chancellor Angela Merkel in the Russian Urals city of Yekaterinburg.

"Iran should have enough courage to begin full-fledged cooperation with the international community, even if it does not like some questions that are being asked," the Russian president went on.

International pressure on Iran increased in early February when Tehran announced it had begun enriching uranium to 20%, ignoring a proposed swap agreement that would provide it with fuel for a research reactor.

Western powers suspect Iran of attempting to build nuclear weapons under the guise of civilian nuclear generation.

On June 9, the UN Security Council passed a resolution imposing a fourth set of sanctions on Iran over its nuclear program, including tougher financial controls and an expanded arms embargo.

During a meeting in Moscow on Wednesday, the Russian and Iranian energy ministers, Sergei Shmatko and Masud Mir-Kazemi, pledged that the sanctions would not affect Russian-Iranian cooperation.

The ministers approved a "roadmap" for oil and gas projects, including a possibility of establishing a joint bank to finance those projects and work out mechanisms to use national currencies. Shmatko said Russian companies were ready to supply oil products to Iran.

Medvedev said on Thursday that Iran was an "active" trade partner.

"This, however, does not mean that we are indifferent to how Iran is developing its nuclear program, as well as... how military components of the program look like," the president said, adding that Russia was expecting "relevant explanations from Iran."

Russia, a permanent member of the UN Security Council, has long opposed sanctions against the Islamic Republic, saying that the issue should be resolved through diplomatic means. However, Moscow finally approved the sanctions after Iran failed to prove the peaceful nature of its nuclear activities.

Medvedev said Iran's nuclear program was "an issue of national pride for Iranians," which, however, was also being "actively exploited by Iranian authorities in order to achieve their own political goals."

YEKATERINBURG, July 15 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100715/159823618.html>

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

Sydney Morning Herald - Australia

## 'Abducted' Iranian Amiri Denies Being Nuclear Scientist

By HIEDEH FARMANI and JAY DESHMUKH, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

July 15, 2010

An Iranian who claimed he was "abducted" by US spies last year denied upon his arrival in Tehran Thursday that he was a nuclear scientist, but said he was questioned by Israelis during his captivity.

Shahram Amiri, who vanished from Saudi Arabia in June 2009 while on a pilgrimage, arrived in Tehran on Thursday after surfacing in Iran's Interest Section in Washington two days ago.

Immediately after his arrival he told reporters that he was just a "simple researcher", refuting earlier claims by Iranian officials that he was a nuclear scientist.

"I had nothing to do with Natanz and Fordo sites," Amiri said referring to Iran's two uranium enrichment plants.

"It was a tool the US government brought up for political pressure. I have done no research on nuclear. I am a simple researcher who works in a university which is open to all and there is no secret work happening there."

Amiri's denial is the latest twist to a bizarre saga which has baffled the world media for months and which began with his mysterious disappearance, followed by conflicting video footages of a man claiming to be Amiri and talking of being abducted.

On Thursday, Amiri said during the initial two months of his captivity he was put through "harshest mental and physical torture".

He said his kidnapping was a "psychological warfare against Iran and proving those lies that the US wanted to tell other countries about Iran".

Amiri said that during his interrogations, "there were interrogators from Israel present in some sessions and it was evident that they had planned of moving me to Israel".

Israel is Iran's key regional foe and has not ruled out a military strike against Tehran to stop its galloping nuclear programme.

Iranian officials claim Amiri was kidnapped by the Central Intelligence Agency of the United States, while US media has reported he defected to Washington. US officials have denied these claims.

Amiri told reporters that in due time he would talk and prove his point as certain issues were sensitive and could hurt national interests.

He also dismissed US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's comments that he had freely come to the United States and was free to go whenever he wanted.

"I am really amazed by the US foreign minister who says I was free there and went there freely. I was not free there and I was under the control of armed people of the intelligence service," he said.

Clinton said on Tuesday there was nothing to stop Amiri from leaving after he had surfaced in Washington.

"He's free to go. He was free to come. These decisions are his alone to make," she said.

Amiri said US officials had even offered him "50 million US dollars" if he changed his mind and decided to stay in the United States. They also assured to take his family out of Iran, he said, but added that during his captivity there were "threats issued against my family".

Before jetting out of Washington, Amiri gave an interview to Iranian state televisions which was broadcast Wednesday in which he said he had been abducted at gunpoint in Saudi Arabia.

He said he had been approached by besuited Farsi-speaking men in a car in the Saudi city of Medina and offered a ride to the mosque.

"As I opened the door, one of the passengers pulled out a gun and told me to be quiet. They gave me an injection and when I came around I was in a big plane. I was blindfolded. It was likely a military plane," he said.

The speculation over Amiri's mysterious disappearance was further compounded when a man claiming to be him was shown in two different video footages on June 7 -- one saying he was kidnapped by US agents and the other that he was studying in Tucson, Arizona.

These videos were followed by a third one a few weeks later in which the man said he had escaped from the custody of US spies in Virginia.

US officials consistently denied Amiri's kidnapping but on Tuesday Crowley confirmed that Washington had been in touch with him.

"The United States government has maintained contact with him," he said, adding that Amiri "has been here for some time, I'm not going to specify for how long."

Iranian foreign ministry spokesman Hassan Ghashghavi meanwhile denied Amiri's return would lead to a prisoner swap with the United States.

"Amiri's freedom has nothing to do with the (exchange of) Americans," he said referring to three American hikers arrested in Iran when they strayed into the country last year.

<http://news.smh.com.au/breaking-news-world/abducted-iranian-denies-being-nuclear-scientist-20100715-10bz4.html>

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

Charlotte Observer

## 'Abducted' Nuclear Scientist Returns To Iran

By NASSER KARIMI and BRIAN MURPHY, Associated Press Writers

Thursday, July 15, 2010

TEHRAN, Iran Flashing a victory sign, an Iranian nuclear scientist who claims he was abducted and abused by U.S. agents a year ago returned Thursday to his homeland and into the heart of the latest crossfire between Washington and Tehran.

The conflicting accounts about Shahram Amiri - captive or defector who got cold feet - are unlikely to alter the Western-led pressure on Iran over its nuclear program.

But Iran's leaders are expected to use Amiri to ring up as many propaganda points as possible against Washington - showing that relations remain in a deep freeze and hopes of breakthrough talks appear as distant as ever.

It also gives the ruling clerics a welcome distraction at a time when domestic protests are growing over Iran's stumbling economy and worries about the fallout from international sanctions.

Amiri's return "shows the strength of the Islamic republic," boasted lawmaker Amir Taherkhani. Another prominent parliament member, Alaeddin Boroujerdi, called the alleged kidnapping a "terrorist act."

But the Washington Post reported that the CIA paid Amiri \$5 million to provide intelligence on Iran's nuclear program. The Post in its online edition late Wednesday said the money came from a secret program aimed at inducing scientists and others with information on Iran's nuclear program to defect.

U.S. officials also told the Post that Amiri should be unable to get to that money now that he's returned to Iran, which is under financial sanctions.

It remains unclear how Iranian authorities will ultimately deal with Amiri - and the U.S. claims he cooperated with American authorities - despite his hero-style welcome.

Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki called Amiri a "dear compatriot" and said Iran was keenly interested in learning more about the reasons for his alleged abduction.

Journalists were allowed to cover Amiri's first steps back in Iran in a rare relaxation of media restrictions. The last such press gathering permitted at Tehran's international airport was linked to another tussle with Washington: the May visit by the mothers of three jailed Americans arrested last year on the Iran-Iraq border.

Amiri's pre-dawn arrival capped a stunning tumble of events over the past month that included leaked videos with mixed messages, Amiri surfacing at a diplomatic compound in Washington and the White House finally acknowledging his presence in the country.

The U.S. says he was a willing defector who changed his mind and decided to board a plane home from Washington. Amiri has told a very different tale, claiming he was snatched while on a pilgrimage in Saudi Arabia and bundled off to the United States to be harshly interrogated and offered millions of dollars by the CIA to speak against Iran.

Amiri was embraced by his family - including his tearful 7-year-old son - and greeted by a top envoy from Iran's Foreign Ministry. The 32-year-old Amiri smiled and gave the V-for-victory sign.

Speaking to journalists after a flight via Qatar, Amiri repeated his earlier claims that he was snatched while in the Saudi holy city of Medina and carried off to the United States.

The first months were full of intense pressures, he alleged. "I was under the harshest mental and physical torture," he said at the Tehran airport, with his young son sitting on his lap.

He also alleged that Israeli agents were present during the interrogations and that CIA officers offered him \$50 million to remain in America. He gave no further details to back up the claims or shed any new light on his time in the United States, but promised to reveal more later.

"I have some documents proving that I've not been free in the United States and have always been under the control of armed agents of U.S. intelligence services," Amiri told reporters.

Previously he claimed that CIA agents "pressured me to help with their propaganda against Iran," he said, including offering him up to \$10 million to talk to U.S. media and claim to have documents on a laptop against Iran. He said he refused to take the money.

On Thursday, Amiri sought to play down his role in Iran's nuclear program - which Washington and allies fear could be used to create atomic weapons. Iran says it only seeks energy-producing reactors.

"I am a simple researcher who was working in the university," he said. "I'm not involved in any confidential jobs. I had no classified information."

His case was often raised by Iranian officials in the past year, but Washington offered no public response. It took a higher profile after Iranian authorities decided to pursue charges against the three Americans arrested along the border with Iraq in July 2009.

Iran's deputy foreign minister, Hassan Qashqavi, said there would be "no link" between Amiri's return and the case of the three Americans, whose families say they were hiking in northern Iraq and that if they crossed the border, they did so inadvertently.

U.S. officials also have repeatedly asked Iran for information about Robert Levinson, a former FBI agent who disappeared in Iran in 2007.

Amiri was generally a footnote in the international showdown over Iran's nuclear ambitions until last month. Iranian state TV aired a video he purportedly made from an Internet cafe in Tucson, Arizona, to claim he was taken captive by U.S. and Saudi "terror and kidnap teams."



The video was shortly followed by another, professionally produced clip in which he said he was happily studying for a doctorate in the United States. In a third, shaky piece of video, Amiri claimed to have escaped from U.S. agents in Virginia and insisted the second video was "a complete lie" that the Americans put out.

U.S. officials never acknowledged he was on American soil until Tuesday, hours after he turned up at the Iranian interests section at the Pakistani Embassy in Washington asking to be sent home. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said Amiri had been in the United States "of his own free will and he is free to go."

On Thursday in Tehran, he asked American authorities to explain their secrecy.

"Why didn't they allow me to have an open interview with the media in the United States?" he said. "Why didn't they ever announce my presence?"

U.S. officials would say little about the circumstances of what they assert was a willing defection by Amiri and what went wrong. But there were suggestions that threats to his family in Iran pushed Amiri to first make the claims he was kidnapped.

Amiri, however, claimed his family faced no problems.

"My family was completely free and they were under financial support of the Iranian government," he said.

*Murphy reported from Dubai, United Arab Emirates. Associated Press writers Robert Burns and Matthew Lee in Washington contributed to this report.*

<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2010/07/15/1564025/abducted-nuclear-scientist-returns.html>

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

Washington Post

## **Iran Says Nuclear-Fuel Talks Should Open In September**

By Ladane Nasser

(c) 2010 Bloomberg News

Thursday, July 15, 2010

July 15 (Bloomberg) -- Iranian Foreign Minister Manouchehr Mottaki said that talks between his country and the world powers on a plan to supply fuel for a Tehran nuclear reactor should start around late September.

Iran has said it is ready for negotiations with the five veto-holding members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany on a deal brokered by Turkey and Brazil in May. It proposed supplying enriched uranium in a form usable in the medical-research reactor in exchange for part of Iran's supply of the material that has yet to be transformed into fuel.

"Turkey and Brazil still adopt the same stance and we welcome their presence in talks," Mottaki said today at a Tehran news conference aired live by state-run Press TV. The two countries "will see that the negotiations be held in the proper way," he said.

The five Security Council members and Germany have pressed Iran to agree to talks on its nuclear program since the council voted to impose a fourth round of UN sanctions last month. The U.S. and the European Union subsequently imposed their own restrictions on Iran.

Mottaki said on July 12 that the world powers had agreed to let Turkey and Brazil participate in the talks, according to Press TV. Western nations last month rejected the plan for a fuel swap because Iran vowed to continue enriching uranium after it receives a supply of the material in a form needed to run the reactor. The facility makes isotopes for medical uses such as X-rays and radiation therapy.

Iran has refused international demands to suspend uranium enrichment, saying it is entitled to produce the material under the terms of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which it has signed. The U.S. and its allies say Iran's nuclear development may be cover for a weapons program. The Persian Gulf country denies the allegation and maintains the work is necessary for civilian purposes such as power generation.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said on June 28 that Iran won't take part in the talks unless the six powers acknowledge that Israel already has nuclear-arms capability. Israel's policy is to neither confirm nor deny that it has such weapons.

The U.S., U.K., France, China, Russia and Germany would be represented in the negotiations by the EU's foreign-policy chief, Catherine Ashton.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/07/15/AR2010071501788.html>

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

Time

## **An Attack On Iran: Back On The Table**

By JOE KLEIN

Thursday, July. 15, 2010

In late 2006, George W. Bush met with the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the Pentagon and asked if military action against Iran's nuclear program was feasible. The unanimous answer was no. Air strikes could take out some of Iran's nuclear facilities, but there was no way to eliminate all of them. Some of the nuclear labs were located in heavily populated areas; others were deep underground. And Iran's ability to strike back by unconventional means, especially through its Hizballah terrorist network, was formidable. The military option was never officially taken off the table. At least, that's what U.S. officials always said. But the emphasis was on the implausibility of a military strike. "Another war in the Middle East is the last thing we need," Secretary of Defense Robert Gates wrote in 2008. It would be "disastrous on a number of levels."

Gates is sounding more belligerent these days. "I don't think we're prepared to even talk about containing a nuclear Iran," he told Fox News on June 20. "We do not accept the idea of Iran having nuclear weapons." In fact, Gates was reflecting a new reality in the military and intelligence communities. Diplomacy and economic pressure remain the preferred means to force Iran to negotiate a nuclear deal, but there isn't much hope that's going to happen. "Will [sanctions] deter them from their ambitions with regards to nuclear capability?" CIA Director Leon Panetta told ABC News on June 27. "Probably not." So the military option is very much back on the table.

What has changed? "I started to rethink this last November," a recently retired U.S. official with extensive knowledge of the issue told me. "We offered the Iranians a really generous deal, which their negotiators accepted," he went on, referring to the offer to exchange Iran's 1.2 tons of low-enriched uranium (3.5% pure) for higher-enriched (20%) uranium for medical research and use. "When the leadership shot that down, I began to think, Well, we made the good-faith effort to engage. What do we do now?"

Other intelligence sources say that the U.S. Army's Central Command, which is in charge of organizing military operations in the Middle East, has made some real progress in planning targeted air strikes — aided, in large part, by the vastly improved human-intelligence operations in the region. "There really wasn't a military option a year ago," an Israeli military source told me. "But they've gotten serious about the planning, and the option is real now." Israel has been brought into the planning process, I'm told, because U.S. officials are frightened by the possibility that the right-wing Netanyahu government might go rogue and try to whack the Iranians on its own.

One other factor has brought the military option to a low boil: Iran's Sunni neighbors really want the U.S. to do it. When United Arab Emirates Ambassador Yousef al-Otaiba said on July 6 that he favored a military strike against Iran despite the economic and military consequences to his country, he was reflecting an increasingly adamant attitude in the region. Senior American officials who travel to the Gulf frequently say the Saudis, in particular, raise the issue with surprising ardor. Everyone from the Turks to the Egyptians to the Jordanians are threatening to go nuclear if Iran does. That is seen as a real problem in the most volatile region in the world: What happens, for example, if Saudi Arabia gets a bomb, and the deathless monarchy there is overthrown by Islamist radicals?

For the moment, the White House remains as skeptical as ever about a military strike. Most senior military leaders also believe Gates got it right the first time — even a targeted attack on Iran would be "disastrous on a number of levels." It would unify the Iranian people against the latest in a long series of foreign interventions. It would also unify much of the world — including countries like Russia and China that we've worked hard to cultivate — against a recowboyfied U.S. There would certainly be an Iranian reaction — in Iraq, in Afghanistan, by Lebanese Hizballah against Israel and by the Hizballah network against the U.S. and Saudi homelands. A catastrophic regional war is not impossible.

Of course, it is also possible that this low-key saber-rattling is simply a message the U.S. is trying to send the Iranians: it's time to deal. There have been rumblings from Tehran about resuming negotiations, although the regime has very little credibility right now. The assumption — shared even by some of Iran's former friends, like the Russians — is that any Iranian offer to talk is really an offer to stall. A specific, plausible Iranian concession may be needed to get the process back on track. But it is also possible that the saber-rattling is not a bluff, that the U.S. really won't tolerate a nuclear Iran and is prepared to do something awful to stop it.

<http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2003921,00.html>

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

New York Times

July 16, 2010

## U.S. Says Scientist Aided C.I.A. While Still In Iran

By DAVID E. SANGER and MARK MAZZETTI

The Iranian scientist who American officials say defected to the United States, only to return to Tehran on Thursday, had been an informant for the Central Intelligence Agency inside Iran for several years, providing information about the country's nuclear program, according to United States officials.

The scientist, Shahram Amiri, described to American intelligence officers details of how a university in Tehran became the covert headquarters for the country's nuclear efforts, the officials confirmed. While still in Iran, he was also one of the sources for a much-disputed National Intelligence Estimate on Iran's suspected weapons program, published in 2007, the officials said. For several years, Mr. Amiri provided what one official described as "significant, original" information about secret aspects of his country's nuclear program, according to the Americans.

This account by the Americans, some of whom are apparently trying to discredit Mr. Amiri's tale of having been kidnapped by the C.I.A., provides the latest twist in one of strangest tales of the nuclear era. It also provides the first hint of how the United States acquired intelligence from Iranian scientists, besides its previously reported penetrations of Iranian computer systems.

Mr. Amiri arrived in Tehran early Thursday morning, repeating his allegation that he had been grabbed in Saudi Arabia by the C.I.A. and Saudi intelligence, and that he was tortured. After an immediate news conference, government officials led him out of the airport to an unmarked white S.U.V. His whereabouts were unclear on Friday.

American officials, clearly embarrassed that he had left a program that promised him a new identity and benefits amounting to about \$5 million, said his accusations that he had been kidnapped and drugged were manufactured, and an effort to survive what will almost certainly be a grilling by the Iranian authorities.

"His safety depends on him sticking to that fairy tale about pressure and torture," insisted one of the American officials, who spoke on the condition that he not be identified while discussing a classified operation to attract Iranian scientists. "His challenge is to try to convince the Iranian security forces that he never cooperated with the United States."

On Thursday, even as Mr. Amiri was publicly greeted at home by his 7-year-old son and held a news conference, Iran's foreign minister gave the first official hints of Iranian doubts about his story. "We first have to see what has happened in these two years and then we will determine if he's a hero or not," the BBC quoted the foreign minister, Manouchehr Mottaki, as saying to a French news agency. "Iran must determine if his claims about being kidnapped were correct or not."

After more than a year of denying any knowledge of Mr. Amiri while he was living undercover in Tucson and then briefly in Virginia, American officials in recent days have been surprisingly willing to describe their actions in the case. That may be in part to fend off charges that the handling of the Amiri case was badly bungled.

The Washington Post first reported that Mr. Amiri had been given \$5 million, which officials described Thursday as standard for someone who had provided essential information. But the money would have been paid over an extended period, the officials said, and Mr. Amiri was not able to take it with him because American sanctions prohibited financial transfers to Iran.

It is unclear how Mr. Amiri's information fed into the 2007 intelligence estimate. That document contended that Iran halted its design work on a nuclear weapon in 2003. A new national intelligence estimate, which has been repeatedly delayed this year, is likely to back away from some of the conclusions in the earlier document. For example, American intelligence officials now believe the design work on a weapon was resumed and continues to this day, though likely at a slower pace than earlier in the decade.

Mr. Amiri, a specialist in measuring radioactive materials, is not believed to have been central to any of Iran's efforts at weapons design. But he worked at the Malek Ashtar University, which some American officials think is used as an academic cover for the organization responsible for designing weapons and warheads that could fit atop an Iranian missile. Those operations are run by Mohsen Fakhrizadeh, an Iranian academic with long and close ties to the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps. Mr. Fakhrizadeh, United States officials maintain, is now effectively the head of the university, and in an effort to evade international inspectors has reorganized the structure of the Iranian program.

The National Council of Resistance of Iran, an opposition group based in France, in 2004 disclosed the existence of what it called a secret administrative headquarters for the military aspects of the Iranian program. The group made

public more information in 2008, saying the site was in a suburb of Tehran adjacent to the university, giving it academic cover, and was called Mojdeh, after an adjacent street.

Mohammad Mohaddessin, head of the group's foreign affairs committee, said the school "does not operate like a university." Instead, he said, it is "a center for research and development of weapons" and works in cooperation with the Mojdeh site.

The American officials said that at some point while working as a secret informant, Mr. Amiri visited Saudi Arabia, and the C.I.A. arranged to spirit him out of that country and eventually to the United States, where he settled in Arizona. It is unclear whether Mr. Amiri tried to bring his wife and child with him.

Administration officials conceded that Mr. Amiri's decision to come out of hiding and return to Iran was both a large embarrassment and a possible disincentive to future defections.

But the incident is also an embarrassment for Iran. Analysts said that even if he is publicly greeted as a hero, Mr. Amiri will probably be viewed with suspicion by the Iranian government.

After Mr. Amiri arrived in Tehran, he added details to his claims that he had been abducted by the C.I.A. and Saudi intelligence officers on a pilgrimage to Saudi Arabia in June 2009. He said that he had no connection with Iran's nuclear program and that he was the victim of an American conspiracy to wage "psychological warfare" against Iran.

Mr. Amiri told reporters he had been offered \$10 million to say on CNN that he had arrived in the United States to seek asylum.

He said that just before his departure for Iran, he was offered \$50 million and the chance for a new life in a European country of his choosing if he decided to stay.

"I don't think that any Iranian in my place would have sold his dignity to another country for a financial reward," Mr. Amiri said.

Mr. Amiri refused to describe how, if he was under armed guard, he had been able to release video messages in which he said that he had been kidnapped. He also did not answer questions about how he had eventually escaped detention.

*William J. Broad contributed reporting.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/07/17/world/middleeast/17iran.html>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
13 July 2010

## **China Reiterates Call To Resume Six-Party Talks**

By Kim Young-gyo

HONG KONG, July 13 (Yonhap) -- China reiterated its call Tuesday to resume stalled multinational talks aimed at denuclearizing North Korea.

It was the second call from the Chinese foreign ministry following last Friday's adoption of a U.N. Security Council (UNSC) statement on the deadly sinking of a South Korean warship in March.

The 15-member Council, including China, unanimously approved the statement a month after South Korea referred the North Korean attack on the South's naval ship to the global security body. A North Korean torpedo sunk the Cheonan ship in the Yellow Sea, killing 46 South Korean sailors.

"We hope the parties concerned enhance trust, reduce differences and improve relations through dialogue and contact while contributing to peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula," Qin Gang, spokesman for the Chinese foreign ministry, said at a semiweekly press briefing.

The remark came after South Korea urged the North to apologize for the attack in recognition of the spirit of the statement before resuming the six-party talks. The United States also called on North Korea to renounce further provocations and hold to its denuclearization pledge with an eye toward resuming the six-party talks.

The spokesman also reconfirmed that China is still against the proposed South Korea-U.S. joint naval exercises in the Yellow Sea.

"We call upon the relevant parties not to escalate the (already) tense situation," Qin said. "By enhancing dialogue and negotiations, we should together maintain regional security, rather than undermine it. Then we will be able to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula and bring peace and stability to the region."

South Korea and the U.S. plan to stage massive anti-submarine exercises later this month in waters between the Korean Peninsula and China in a show of force against North Korea.

Beijing has strongly opposed the planned drills that will reportedly include a U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, saying they are "provocative actions toward China."

Confronted with strong resistance from China, Seoul hinted that it may consider moving the venue of the joint naval exercise to its southern or eastern coasts.

"I cannot confirm what you mentioned," said Qin, when asked by a reporter whether he was aware of the possible change of the venue. "Our position on this issue has been clear, and we will closely monitor developments."

Qin also said China supports talks that were originally scheduled to take place earlier Tuesday between North Korea and the U.S.-led United Nations Command (UNC).

North Korea's military was to have a rare meeting with military officers from the UNC to discuss the Cheonan sinking, but the North requested a delay about two hours before the meeting's scheduled start.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/07/13/22/0401000000AEN20100713009400320F.HTML>

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

Arirang News – South Korea  
July 16, 2010

## **US Willing To Talk If N.Korea Recommits To Denuclearization**

The United States government says it's prepared to hold discussions with North Korea but the communist country must first drop its hostile policy and recommit to denuclearization.

That's according to Kurt Campbell the US assistant secretary of state for East Asia.

Quoting President Lee Myung-bak Campbell said South Korea and the US "do not want to talk for talking's sake" and he stressed that Pyeongyang must stop its provocations and show determination toward a nuclear-free Korean Peninsula.

With regards to Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's planned visit to Seoul next week Campbell said she will meet with South Korean officials to coordinate their policies on North Korea.

[http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News\\_View.asp?nseq=104970&code=Ne2&category=2](http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News_View.asp?nseq=104970&code=Ne2&category=2)

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Bulava Missile Launch Planned Next Month, Report Says**

Friday, July 16, 2010

Russia plans late next month to conduct a new test launch of its experimental Bulava submarine-based ballistic missile, Interfax reported yesterday (see GSN, June 15).

The Bulava is designed to deliver as many as 10 nuclear warheads as far as 5,000 miles. The weapon has failed in seven of 12 flight tests to date, most recently in December, according to official figures. However, Russia's armed forces have continued defending the weapon as an irreplaceable component of the country's future nuclear deterrent.

"The commission investigating the failed launch of a Bulava has completed its investigation and recommended continuing the missile's tests. The next test-fire of the Bulava from the *Dmitry Donskoy* nuclear submarine in the White Sea is planned for the end of August," a Russian navy insider said.

Russia intends to conduct three such tests of the weapon in 2010, the source said, adding that the new Borei-class ballistic missile submarine *Yuri Dolgoruky* would carry out one of the launches.

"There is no alternative to arming the new Project 955 Borei missile cruisers with the Bulava missile. Its commissioning has been somewhat delayed, but in any case, the tests will be completed successfully and the missile will be adopted for service. There are no insurmountable obstacles to this," the source added.

Russia's Sevmash shipyard is constructing several Borei-class submarines slated to carry the new missile: the *Alexander Nevsky*, the *Vladimir Monomakh* and the *Yuri Dolgoruky*, Interfax reported. Each vessel could be armed with up to 12 solid-fuel ballistic missiles, according to Interfax (Interfax, July 15).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100716\\_6435.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100716_6435.php)

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

BBC News – U.K.

July 13, 2010

## **A Trident Nuclear Submarine Could Be Cut To Save Costs**

The UK's four Trident nuclear submarines could be cut to three as the Ministry of Defence studies areas where it can save money, Liam Fox has said.

The defence secretary said the MoD was looking at "the absolute mother of horrors of a spending review".

He said the fleet would only be reduced if it was possible to do so without compromising the UK's sea defences.

The government is carrying out a strategic defence review of the shape and size of the UK's armed forces.

The Trident vessels currently provide a nuclear deterrent because the submarines, under the waves in secret locations, would be almost impossible to destroy in a pre-emptive strike.

### **'War-fighting edge'**

But critics say Trident is too expensive, and there have been calls to either scrap the nuclear deterrent or switch to a cheaper land-based missile system.

Dr Fox told the Chatham House policy think tank in London that a decision about the fourth submarine would be made in 2014/2015.

Earlier, he told attendees that the British military needed a "war-fighting edge" with "robust and well-equipped armed forces, capable of intervening abroad whenever necessary".

The government has said it is committed to maintaining the UK's independent nuclear deterrent and the strategic defence review will not be looking at whether to replace the ageing submarines.

However, Dr Fox said the review would look at whether Trident could be kept "while reducing the cost of the successor submarine and ballistic missile systems, including by shifting the balance between financial savings and operational risks".

He said the government would follow the steps taken by the previous Labour government and investigate whether technology would be able to play a role in dispensing with the fourth submarine while ensuring at least one was kept in the sea all the time.

He said: "That reality is still there. We would have to look at what technology was available and what risks we were taking as we come to make that decision on the fourth submarine sometime in 2014/15."

### **'Mother of horrors'**

Dr Fox said economic conditions were tough but the review would be watched by allies and enemies alike.

He said: "This is not just a spending review.

"This is a full-scale strategic review with the absolute mother of horrors of a spending review on its back.

"Therefore this will be more difficult than some of our previous reviews, but it does offer an opportunity for us to reshape and to realign our security policy with our foreign policy and I think that is very long overdue."

He said the UK must not send signals which could be seen as lessening its commitment to engage with the world, or curtail an ability to respond to threats.

These could include nuclear rogue states, warlords and pirates, he added.

His comments came as it emerged that a YouGov survey carried out on behalf of Chatham House has suggested that 29% of the public want Trident replaced with something similar.

The researchers spoke to 877 opinion-formers and 2,481 members of the public between June 24 to July 2.

They also found that 30% wanted a cheaper deterrent while 20% wanted Trident to be culled.

Dr Fox said: "Our opponents need to be convinced that we have the political will to oppose them, the support of our people and the means to follow through.

"We would put this country at risk if we did not make every effort to make deterrence credible, on all counts."

He said an effective defence strategy needed "the capacity, either independently or with allies, to project credible land, air and maritime power with considerable geographic reach".

In his Budget last month, Chancellor George Osborne said departments would face average cuts of 25% when the government's public spending review is completed in October - potentially bigger than anything attempted by a previous UK government.

Health and overseas aid spending will be ring-fenced, while defence and education will face cuts of between 10% and 20%.

The strategic defence review, the first since 1997, will examine what sort of armed forces are needed in future and the cost involved.

Labour has said it backs the review and that "difficult" decisions will be needed.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/10623343>

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

Los Angeles Times

## **U.S. Plans To Increase Nuclear Spending**

*Obama administration officials say that as the U.S. shrinks its number of nuclear warheads, it must modernize and be prepared to ramp up production quickly if a threat arises.*

By Paul Richter, Tribune Washington Bureau

July 15, 2010

Reporting from Washington

Even as it touts U.S. efforts to sharply reduce its number of nuclear warheads, the Obama administration plans to increase spending on the aging nuclear weapons infrastructure to levels reminiscent of the Cold War, a new budget document shows.

A 20-year spending plan from the agency that manages the nuclear arsenal shows that the administration wants to hike nuclear weapons spending to an average of more than \$8 billion a year, compared with recent spending levels of \$6 billion to \$7 billion a year.

The National Nuclear Security Administration plan is drawing criticism from some arms-control groups, who contend that the increased spending is unjustified and may prompt other world powers to doubt President Obama's pledge to reduce U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons.

"We have to think carefully about what signal we're sending to other countries," said Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists.

Advocates of the plan within the Obama administration and Congress say the spending increase is overdue to modernize the nuclear support complex, parts of which haven't been updated since World War II.

Administration officials also argue that even as they reduce the number of U.S. warheads, they need to bolster the government's ability to increase weapons production quickly if a new threat arises.

Obama has made reduction of the nuclear arsenal a central element of his foreign policy agenda. The president hopes that by shrinking the U.S. stockpile, his administration can persuade other nuclear states to do likewise and encourage nonnuclear states to decide against starting nuclear weapons programs.

The Senate is now considering the New START nuclear treaty, a pact with Russia that would reduce the number of active long-range nuclear warheads by about 30%.

The increase in nuclear spending has political value for the White House: Administration officials hope it will help win the votes of conservative senators who have reservations about the treaty with Russia.

Kristensen said the plan suggests that the agency is preparing to draw down the U.S. nuclear stockpile to between 3,000 to 3,500 weapons by 2021, a drop of 30% to 40% from the current arsenal of about 5,000 weapons. An agency spokeswoman declined to comment on the estimate.

Other analysts said such a drop would be consistent with the kind of reduction that Obama has already described. "It's not surprising," said Daryl Kimball of the Arms Control Assn.

Reductions already underway will reduce the stockpile to 4,700 weapons by 2012. In the last four-plus decades, the U.S. arsenal has fallen 85% from its peak of 31,000 warheads in 1967.

But in the world of nuclear weapons, there's a lot more to pay for than just warheads. The plan calls for the United States to spend \$175 billion from 2010 to 2030 on new weapons production, testing and simulation facilities, and on extending the life of nuclear weapons in the arsenal.

And that's not all: The Pentagon's spending to maintain and operate the equipment that delivers the warheads — missiles, bombers and submarines — is not included.

Spending for the weapons complex would peak between 2014 and 2018 under the plan.

Henry Sokolski, a Pentagon official under President George H.W. Bush, cautioned that despite the Obama administration's planning, the nuclear stockpile ultimately could be vastly different from what is being forecast.

"For the first year or two any spending plan for the executive branch will be quite firm and useful," said Sokolski, now with the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center in Washington. But because of changing threats and fiscal realities, he added, in future years "they become exponentially more speculative, no matter what they say."

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-nuke-report-20100715,0,1912167.story>

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

Business Week

## **Nuclear Arms Labs Say 'Fiscal Realities' Weigh On U.S. Arsenal**

July 15, 2010

July 15 (Bloomberg) -- Directors of the three U.S. nuclear weapons laboratories said today they are worried the nation's fiscal troubles and a lack of political consensus may threaten their ability to maintain the stockpile of warheads.

While President Barack Obama's proposed budget increase of more than \$600 million for the fiscal year starting Oct. 1 will help restore cuts of recent years, Los Alamos National Laboratory Director Michael Anastasio said he is concerned "that program expectations may already be out of line with the fiscal realities faced by the country."

Anastasio and his counterparts at the two other labs testified to the Senate Armed Services Committee in Washington as lawmakers consider ratification of a new treaty with Russia to reduce the number of nuclear weapons held by each country. Republicans have criticized as insufficient Obama's plans to spend \$80 billion over 10 years to maintain and modernize the existing weapons.

"How we design, manufacture, field and evaluate the nuclear arsenal becomes increasingly important as we reduce the size of our stockpile," said Arizona Senator John McCain, the top Republican on the panel.

The Department of Energy oversees the labs with the aim of ensuring a safe and reliable stockpile of nuclear weapons without the need for testing. The U.S. hasn't built a nuclear weapon from scratch since the W88 in the late 1980s and early 1990s, said George Miller, director of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California. The government hasn't conducted an atomic test since 1992.

1960s' Components

Sandia National Laboratories, operated by Bethesda, Maryland-based Lockheed Martin Corp., develops non-nuclear components of the arms and is working to extend the life of B61 bombs. Some have components dating to the 1960s, Paul Hommert, president and director of the Sandia facility, told the committee. Also, almost half of the lab's staff experienced with major weapons programs is over the age of 55, he said.

"This puts a premium, going forward, on stable, multiyear program direction and resources to provide opportunities for new technical staff to work with experienced designers," said Hommert, whose lab is based in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Los Alamos in New Mexico faces pension shortfalls of almost \$200 million in two years, Anastasio said. Livermore, one of two nuclear design labs, has cut about 2,000 jobs since 2007, about a third of them "highly trained scientists and engineers," Miller said.

The fiscal 2011 budget "does not include all of the things that we will need over the long term, but it is an extraordinarily good first step," Miller said.

The directors discounted concerns by Republicans who cited a letter earlier this year from a group of former lab directors that said Obama's nuclear strategy limits the methods that can be used to properly sustain the stockpile.



Anastasio said the restrictions provide an “adequate level of technical flexibility to carry out our mission,” while Miller said the guidelines are “workable.”

*Editors: Don Frederick, Edward DeMarco*

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-07-15/nuclear-arms-labs-say-fiscal-realities-weigh-on-u-s-arsenal.html>

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

OPINION

## **EDITORIAL: NPT Framework In Peril**

July 14, 2010

China is interested in cooperating on nuclear power plant construction with Pakistan, a country that not only armed itself with nuclear weapons without joining the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NTP) but also has suspected ties to the world's "black nuclear market."

Should China go ahead with this cooperation, it will further strain the already frayed seams of the NTP.

To contain India's growing presence in Asia as an emergent powerhouse, China has been supplying neighboring Pakistan with weapons and other forms of aid while deepening its ties with Sri Lanka and Myanmar (Burma) through port construction and other joint projects.

But exporting nuclear power plants is on a totally different plane from these forms of cooperation. It will further weaken the NTP framework, which would be unacceptable.

Japan is one of 46 members of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), a multinational body that controls the export and transfer of nuclear technology and materials that could be applied to nuclear weapons development.

The NSG was formed in keeping with the basic principle of the international community to withhold cooperation with non-NTP countries, even with respect to peaceful utilization of nuclear energy.

China joined the NSG in 2004. But China now justifies its cooperation with Pakistan on the construction of two nuclear power stations in central Pakistan on the grounds that the deal is based on a bilateral agreement before China became an NSG member. We must say China is deliberately obfuscating the issue.

Pakistan is suspected of having armed itself with nuclear weapons through espionage activities and other means and later passing on its nuclear technology to North Korea and Iran via the black market.

And given the infiltration of Islamic extremists into areas bordering Afghanistan, there are also serious security concerns about the planned nuclear power stations.

The exclusion of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT) from negotiations at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament owes primarily to Pakistan's objection to this treaty. Naturally, the United States and Japan do not support nuclear cooperation with such a nation.

But the NSG created a problem for itself two years ago when it exempted India, a nuclear power that has not joined the NTP, from its own rules banning nuclear technology export to non-NTP members. This enabled the United States to conclude a civil nuclear agreement with India.

Japan under the Naoto Kan administration has also begun negotiating with India on a civil nuclear agreement, although the administration has yet to figure out how to reconcile this move with its anti-nuclear diplomacy. Tokyo is obviously eyeing the huge business opportunity presented by the nuclear power generation market.

China will definitely point out the NSG's 2008 decision concerning India as another justification for its nuclear cooperation with Pakistan. President Hu Jintao's position was clearly set during his summit last week with Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardani in Beijing.

As cases continue to pile up concerning nuclear cooperation involving countries that conduct nuclear tests and refuse to join the NTP, the treaty's basic premise--that nuclear cooperation is extended only to non-nuclear nations that are NTP members--will erode steadily.

And we must not forget that lax export controls are responsible for nuclear proliferation to India, Pakistan and North Korea. Exporting nuclear power plants is big business, and it can also help curb global warming. But is it right to develop this business at the price of damaging the NTP?

We need to discuss this question comprehensively and not lose sight of the sort of 21st century civilization we should be seeking.

The Asahi Shimbun, July 14

<http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201007140415.html>

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

Washington Times

OPINION

## **MONROE: No New START With Russia**

*Treaty leaves United States at unacceptable disadvantage*

By Robert R. Monroe

Wednesday, July 14, 2010

To date, Senate ratification hearings on the New START nuclear weapons treaty with Russia have been "love-ins." A parade of witnesses - mostly Obama administration members, elder statesmen committed to "a world without nuclear weapons," and veteran arms controllers - have painted the treaty as another modest, responsible reduction in numbers of weapons, a new nonproliferation initiative and an important element for "resetting" our relations with Russia.

This one-sided approach to a key national decision is not serving the country well. Ratification of New START would be a major mistake, immensely damaging to national security. Some of the reasons have been touched upon in testimony but not emphasized or seriously discussed. For example:

The treaty is unbalanced. It reduces U.S. nuclear weapons while allowing Russia unlimited increases in new tactical nuclear weapons, multiple independent re-entry vehicles, nuclear cruise missiles and nuclear bombs.

The treaty reduces U.S. strategic delivery vehicles (SDVs) below the minimum recommended by the Defense Department last year while allowing Russia to increase its SDVs.

The treaty is unverifiable. It does not even include the on-site inspections, telemetry access and missile-production monitoring of START-I, which it replaces.

The treaty gives Russia virtual veto power over future improvements in U.S. missile defense - America's vital first line of defense in tomorrow's world.

The treaty seriously undermines our promising Prompt Global Strike program (with conventional warheads) by requiring that each missile be counted as a nuclear SDV.

Our nuclear weapons modernization program - which is required by law to be considered with treaty ratification - is totally inadequate. It omits modernization of the nuclear weapons themselves; it omits testing of nuclear weapons to prove their viability; it omits construction of a pit (trigger) production facility of adequate capacity to rapidly replace our overaged stockpile; and it omits replacement of SDVs for two legs of our strategic triad.

But beyond these powerful reasons for denying ratification are other - more damaging - aspects of New START.

President Obama has pledged to maintain, for decades, a nuclear weapons stockpile that is "safe, secure and effective." Let's focus on "effective." The principal purpose of our stockpile is to deter adversaries from nuclear threats or use. The most essential element of deterrence is credibility. Our adversaries will not be deterred unless - in their minds - they believe we will use our weapons in retaliation. But the weapons in our stockpile are simply not credible for use against today's adversaries. These weapons are remnants of the Cold War, designed decades ago for massive retaliation, with huge yields, only moderate accuracy and "dirty" radiation outputs. Adversaries such as Iran and North Korea know we would not use them. To achieve credibility, we need new weapons with low yields, great accuracy, reduced residual radiation, intrinsic security and specialized capabilities such as earth penetration. To gain these capabilities, we will have to design and test new nuclear weapons - activities that Mr. Obama has prohibited. Thus, the effective deterrent he has promised the American people does not exist and cannot be produced.

Now let's focus on the word President Obama left out of his description of our future nuclear stockpile - reliable. For more than half a century, America has insisted that its nuclear weapons be reliable as well as safe, secure and effective. Reliability has been a hallmark of U.S. nuclear weapons. And the most essential tool for achieving and maintaining this reliability was underground nuclear testing. Today we have far less confidence in the reliability of our nuclear weapons, which are years beyond the end of their design life. We have not conducted a single nuclear test for almost two decades. Radiation has been inducing changes in the 6,000-odd parts of each nuclear weapon. Failed parts have been replaced with untested parts of different design. Anomalies are being discovered that cannot be answered with confidence. And Mr. Obama plans to rely on these same weapons for many decades in the future. It's not surprising that the word "reliable" was omitted.

In sum, the Senate owes it to America to expand the New START ratification debate so that it fully addresses the true issue at stake - should America rely on strength or weakness as it faces the dangerous and unknown future? Hopefully, these hearings will stimulate the national debate the issue deserves.

*Robert R. Monroe, a retired U.S. Navy vice admiral, is a former director of the Defense Nuclear Agency.*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jul/14/no-new-start-with-russia/>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

OPINION

Editorial

## **Russia Nuke Treaty Also Aimed At Rising Powers**

Thursday, July 15, 2010

Page – A13

This summer, possibly as soon as this month, the U.S. Senate can show whether it's ruled by political gridlock or far-reaching vision when it takes up a nuclear treaty with Russia.

The chamber has the historic duty of passing on the weapons reduction plan signed by President Obama and Russian president Dimitri Medvedev this spring. The deal reduces missile warheads and launch systems such as bombers and submarines.

There's a wider message as well. In a post-Cold War world, the leading nuclear powers with 90 percent of the weapons need to showcase reductions to convince rising powers to do the same. This treaty is aimed at Iran, North Korea, Pakistan and India along with the familiar Moscow-Washington twosome.

So far the debate is a rerun of dried-out disarmament battles. Republican critics - there aren't any Democrats of note in opposition - worry about monitoring Russian reductions and giving ground on anti-missile defenses where the United States has a huge advantage. But the treaty calls for strict monitoring and Obama withheld any promises to drop missile defenses.

The treaty, in fact, is a modest one, calculated to nudge the issue forward as far as politics in both capitals will allow. The numbers call for a reduction to 1,500 long-range warheads from 2,200 under present agreements. It still leaves both countries with thousands more warheads and other delivery systems. While Washington hangs on to anti-missile capabilities, Russia will retain short-range tactical warheads, which it prizes.

So why the fuss? Because fall elections loom and a politically vulnerable president is doing the asking. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty needs 67 votes, meaning at least eight GOP senators must join Democratic ranks.

Signing the new START treaty would push Russia and the United States toward further weapons agreements and lend concrete substance to demands that other nations stop nuclear work. That's an important message at the pivotal time.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2010/07/14/ED841EEA0E.DTL>

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