



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 832, 6 August 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[NonSTARTer? Obama's Troubled Nuclear Treaty](#)

[US Negotiator Says NKorea Not Ready For Talks](#)

[Arms-Treaty Vote Delayed in Senate](#)

[N. Korea Avoids U.S. List As State Sponsor Of Terrorism](#)

[Kerry Says Russia Nuclear Treaty Has Senate Ratification Votes](#)

[Hiroshima Urges End Of Nuclear Umbrella](#)

[U.S. Senator Sets Conditions For Backing New START](#)

[N.Korean Leader's Son To Join Party Leadership](#)

[U.S. Remains Optimistic About Arms Reduction Treaty Ratification](#)

[Obama Thinks It Appropriate To Recognize Hiroshima: Clinton](#)

[Iran Claims To Have Smuggled Anti Aircraft Missile Systems Into Country](#)

[US Still Concerned About A.Q. Khan Network](#)

[Belarus Has Not Sold S-300 Air Defense Systems To Iran?](#)

[India Pursues Laser-Based Missile Defenses](#)

[UN Chief In Nagasaki Calls For Nuclear Disarmament](#)

[AP Exclusive: Iran Defiant In Nuclear Documents](#)

[Report Urges Genetic IDs For Bioterror Germs](#)

[Ahmadinejad Says Iran Building Three-Stage Rocket](#)

[Federal Agencies Still Unprepared For Weapons Of Mass Destruction, 9 Years After 9/11: Justice Dept](#)

[U.S. Military Strike Against Iran Unlikely: Expert](#)

[Foreign Policy: Rethinking The "Nuclear Revolution" Accelerate Nuclear Disarmament](#)

---

*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.*

Time

## NonSTARTer? Obama's Troubled Nuclear Treaty

By MICHAEL SCHERER / WASHINGTON

Wednesday, August 04, 2010

Congressional Republicans have mostly been bystanders in the foreign policy arena over the past 18 months, unable to muster the votes to block President Barack Obama remaking U.S. foreign policy to fit his more diplomatic, consensus-building vision. But now, with months to go before the midterm elections, they are flexing their muscles: for the first time in his presidency, Obama needs a super-supermajority of 67 Senators — including at least eight Republicans — to ratify the new START nuclear arms-control treaty with Russia, a cornerstone of his plan to seek the eventual elimination of atomic weapons.

For weeks, the White House, the Pentagon and Senate Democrats have been working overtime to cajole, convince and placate Republicans who have raised concerns over the treaty's details, the ongoing efforts to modernize the nuclear-weapons force and the future missile defense. But the efforts have not yet borne fruit, as Republicans continue to ask for more assurances.

On Tuesday, Foreign Relations Committee chairman John Kerry decided to delay a scheduled Wednesday-morning vote on the treaty until mid-September, a setback that puts at risk the White House goal of ratifying the treaty before the end of the year. "Similar arms-control agreements have passed by overwhelming majorities, and it is the Senator's hope that this one too will be passed by an overwhelming majority," said Frederick Jones, a Kerry spokesman, earlier in the week.

"There is still time to get this done," says Kingston Reif, the director of nuclear nonproliferation at the Council for a Livable World. "It sets up a September endgame for the new START." But Reif's vision may be optimistic. In the heat of a campaign season, Republicans will have even less incentive to give Obama a foreign policy win. For months, Senate aides have complained that the entire ratification process is being rushed, saying more time is needed to review the full record and get answers to additional questions. "This notion that [ratification] is going to happen before November is completely absurd," says one Republican Senate aide. "It reeks of politics."

With the exception of one Republican, Indiana's Richard Lugar, no one from the party has yet indicated support for the treaty. And many Republicans, from sitting Senators to would-be presidential contenders, have expressed serious reservations. The outstanding issues range from technical questions about funding for new laboratory buildings at Los Alamos, N.M., and Oak Ridge, Tenn.; the fate of programs to train a next generation of nuclear engineers; and, in some cases, the charge that Administration negotiators conceded too much in talks with Russia. And then there are the pressures raised by the political calendar: Mitt Romney, a would-be 2012 presidential contender with no policy role in Washington, has been the most vocal opponent of ratification, authoring a *Washington Post* op-ed calling the treaty "Obama's worst foreign policy mistake."

Others like Senator John McCain, who faces a difficult primary in the coming weeks, have been tacking to the right on the treaty, raising questions about language in the treaty that even he admits has raised no concerns for the military. In a hearing on Thursday, McCain blasted the White House for agreeing to a "clear, legally binding limitation on our missile-defense options" in the treaty. The language in question would bar the U.S. from converting any more of its intercontinental-ballistic-missile (ICBM) sites to missile-defense locations, an option the U.S. military had already rejected as too costly and strategically risky. Analysts are concerned that a defensive missile launched from an existing ICBM base could be misinterpreted by the Russians as an offensive nuclear strike.

In recent weeks, Arizona Senator Jon Kyl and others have been meeting with Senate leaders and Vice President Joe Biden to discuss their concerns. Last Friday, Kyl joined South Dakota's John Thune, Tennessee's Bob Corker and Idaho's James Risch on a tour of the facilities at Los Alamos, but the group made no statement following the visit. The White House, also, has worked for months to address Republican concerns. "We have tried in many different ways to signal and make clear that the President is committed to the modernization of the nuclear-weapons complex," says a senior Administration official. President Obama has said that he wants the treaty ratified this year, and his aides have emphasized a lingering concern over maintaining a status quo in which both Russia and the U.S. lack access to verifying each other's nuclear activities. "The intelligence community would tell you that they would rather have more information than less," says the Administration official.

Negotiations between Republicans and the White House have so far mostly taken place in private. But if tensions continue to rise, the debate may become public, as some in the Republican Party clearly hope. Joseph Cirincione, a nonproliferation specialist at the Ploughshares Fund and a supporter of the treaty, sees a problem facing Republicans attempting to block passage from a hawkish posture. "They can't 'death panel' this treaty, particularly when you have every senior national-security strategist in the country supportive of it, including Republicans," Cirincione says. "To

vote against this you would have to go against the recommendation of the U.S. military and the defense establishment."

Republicans opposing the treaty appear unlikely to be moved by Cirincione's warning. Not when they believe, as Romney wrote last month in language straight from the campaign trail, "The security of the United States is at stake."

<http://www.time.com/time/politics/article/0,8599,2008429,00.html>

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

New York Times  
August 4, 2010

## **Arms-Treaty Vote Delayed in Senate**

By **PETER BAKER**

WASHINGTON — President Obama's ambitious agenda to curb nuclear weapons during his term has to a large extent stalled as he struggles to assemble a bipartisan coalition in the Senate to approve his arms control treaty with Russia.

The treaty, called New Start, was supposed to be the relatively quick and easy first step leading to a series of much harder and more sweeping moves to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Instead, a Senate committee on Tuesday shelved the treaty until fall, when it faces an uncertain future in the midst of a hotly contested election season.

The White House remains confident that it will get the pact approved eventually, possibly in a postelection lame-duck session, and it accepted the delay as a way to win over Republican senators who asked for more time to address their concerns. But even if the treaty does pass in the end, the long process of negotiation and ratification has pushed back the rest of Mr. Obama's program and has raised obstacles to the more controversial measures.

Mr. Obama planned to follow the ratification of the pact by resurrecting the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty a decade after it was first rejected, but he will now have to wait until next year, when he could face a less friendly Senate. He also wanted to negotiate a second, more comprehensive treaty with Russia that would make bolder cuts, but if it takes two years to get New Start ratified, it seems unlikely that he will get a more ambitious pact approved before his term expires.

"If this treaty's going to be so complicated, God knows how difficult it's going to be for the test ban treaty, particularly after an election when Republicans are expected to pick up seats," said John Isaacs, executive director of the Council for a Livable World, an advocacy group that promotes arms control.

Some arms control advocates speculate that Republicans have intentionally made the road to ratification more difficult for New Start to block more meaningful action down the road. Republicans reject that assertion, saying they are simply applying responsible scrutiny and arguing against a rush to judgment.

Some conservatives said that Mr. Obama's agenda was never all that realistic and that he would be wise to seek a broader consensus. "Trying to do treaties and national security policy as if they're health care is a bad call," said one such critic, Henry D. Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center. "You don't do this by one vote. You do this by overwhelming majority. They need to learn to work with the other side."

Treaties require a two-thirds vote by the Senate, meaning that Mr. Obama needs at least eight Republicans, but the White House wants the sort of overwhelming vote that past arms control treaties have received. So Senator John Kerry, Democrat of Massachusetts and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, agreed to Republican requests to put off a Wednesday meeting to consider the treaty.

"If it can build a bigger majority and help us get it passed more easily, it's worth doing," Mr. Kerry said in an interview. While he expressed confidence that the treaty could pass either way, he said he worried about the message sent by a close vote. "I don't want that misread in the Duma and misread in the Kremlin," he said, referring to the Russian Parliament, where the treaty is also subject to approval.

The White House said it was not surprising that senators wanted more time. "The treaty deserves the same bipartisan support that past arms control treaties with Russia have received," said Mike Hammer, a White House spokesman. "The treaty provides strategic stability between the world's two leading nuclear powers."

In a letter to fellow committee members, Mr. Kerry noted that he had held 12 hearings on the treaty, which drew support from national security veterans of both parties. He said he would reschedule the treaty to be considered in his committee on Sept. 15 or 16.

In the interview, Mr. Kerry said that if the treaty passed the committee then, he was not sure whether it could be approved by the full Senate before the election or in a lame-duck session. "Either is equally possible," he said.

But Mr. Kerry said further arms control treaties might be harder to get through in the next Senate, particularly the test ban treaty, known by its initials. "C.T.B.T. is a heavy lift," he said. "Wanting to do it is fine. Whether we can do it or not is still up in the air."

The test ban treaty was adopted by the United Nations in 1996 and has been ratified by 153 countries. But the Senate rejected it in 1999 out of concern that it would tie American hands. Even if the United States ratified it, it would not go into force unless other nuclear states like China, India, Israel, North Korea and Pakistan also approved it.

Mr. Obama made the treaty a central point of his nuclear agenda last year, and as recently as February, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. said the administration would push the Senate to approve it. But the administration has held off any action until New Start is approved first.

Likewise, the administration has planned to open new negotiations with Russia in the hope of achieving a more expansive arms control treaty that for the first time would reduce the thousands of tactical nuclear weapons and stored strategic weapons. But no talks have been held pending the Senate consideration of the first pact.

Given the complexity of the matter, some administration officials have privately confided to arms control colleagues that it no longer looks realistic to complete a second treaty with Russia by the time Mr. Obama's current term expires.

But others rejected that. "Everyone recognizes that doing the New Start treaty took longer than we expected and no one has any illusion that the next negotiation would be easy," said a senior administration official, who insisted on anonymity in order to discuss what comes after New Start. "But I don't think anyone's giving up on getting it done in his first term, or at least getting it started."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/04/world/europe/04start.html?bl>

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

Businessweek

## **Kerry Says Russia Nuclear Treaty Has Senate Ratification Votes**

August 04, 2010

By Viola Gienger

Aug. 3 (Bloomberg) -- Senator John Kerry said he has enough votes to ratify a treaty with Russia to cut nuclear weapons, a priority for President Barack Obama, though he delayed a committee vote to round up more bipartisan support.

Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat, put off a roll call by the Foreign Relations Committee until after the Senate returns in September from a month-long recess. The extra time may help get more Republicans on board, Kerry said. Democrats control the Senate 59-41, with 67 votes, or two-thirds, needed for ratification.

The president "believes as I do the treaty will be stronger with a larger vote in favor of the treaty," Kerry told reporters on a conference call in Washington today. "If, on the other hand, people decide to make it partisan, we will deal with that at that moment, and people will see that for what it is."

The annual United Nations General Assembly in late September also may spur congressional support, he said. The U.S. will need to set an example of arms cuts as Obama and other top officials press their counterparts to impose more of their own sanctions on Iran over its nuclear program to complement UN penalties adopted earlier this year, Kerry said.

Republicans including Arizona Senator Jon Kyl have balked at a treaty they say could hamstring U.S. plans for a European missile defense system that Russia opposes. The agreement would replace the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START, that expired in December and left the former Cold War rivals with no way to verify each other's nuclear weapons.

Strategic Warheads

The treaty requires each nation to further limit deployed strategic warheads to no more than 1,550, from 2,200 now, and no more than 800 deployed and non-deployed land-, air- and sea- based launchers. It also updates measures to verify compliance.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton has said the treaty is particularly important because Russia is putting more focus on modernizing its nuclear weapons as finances and a shrinking military recruiting base squeeze its ability to develop conventional forces.

Republicans have demanded more assurances that an Obama plan to maintain the existing U.S. stockpile of nuclear weapons will get the \$80 billion in funding promised over the next decade.

"We could have passed the treaty out in May," Kerry said.

He dismissed the absence of publicly stated support from most Republicans, saying he's confident he has the votes. "I don't care what people say publicly. The answer is yes, I do."

*Editors: Jim Rubin, Laurie Asseo.*

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2010-08-04/kerry-says-russia-nuclear-treaty-has-senate-ratification-votes.html>

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

Moscow Times – Russian Federation

## **U.S. Senator Sets Conditions For Backing New START**

05 August 2010

By Reuters

WASHINGTON — U.S. President Barack Obama must show greater commitment to modernizing the U.S. nuclear arsenal to gain Republican support for the New START arms control treaty with Russia, the Senate's No. 2 Republican said.

Senator Jon Kyl denied setting a price to support New START. But he told reporters Wednesday that the commitment he was seeking could cost up to \$10 billion more than the amount the administration has pledged to modernize U.S. nuclear weapons.

Obama wants the treaty ratified this year, but it needs 67 votes in the Senate, meaning that it cannot pass without substantial Republican support.

Kyl's demands would be difficult to meet by the end of the year. He wants Congress to appropriate extra funds, and he also wants to see administration budget plans.

Kyl said Republicans were seeking "a more precise and higher degree of commitment" to modernizing the U.S. nuclear arsenal, "so that we know that this program is not going to go for a while and peter out."

Obama signed the treaty with President Dmitry Medvedev in April and sent it to the Senate in May. The treaty suffered a setback on Tuesday when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee delayed a ratification vote until mid-September after only one Republican, Senator Richard Lugar, publicly pledged support.

Since it might be hard to get everything done before Nov. 2 congressional elections, the Senate might need a "lame duck" session if it wants to vote on New START this year, Kyl said.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/us-senator-sets-conditions-for-backing-new-start/411785.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **U.S. Remains Optimistic About Arms Reduction Treaty Ratification**

5 August 2010

The U.S. administration hopes that the new strategic arms reduction treaty with Russia will be ratified by the end of this year, the Department of State said in a statement on Thursday.

On Tuesday the U.S. Senate's Committee on Foreign Relations delayed the vote on the treaty for at least a month and a half, citing the need for additional study of the document.

"The Administration remains optimistic about the prospects for New START. Over the course of the past two and a half months, no significant opposition or credible arguments have emerged," a spokesman for the Department of State told a daily press briefing.

"We have said all along that we hope to have the Senate approve the treaty by the end of the year, and we believe they are on track to do that," Philip Crowley added.

He added that Secretary of State Hillary Clinton discussed the treaty with Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, John Kerry, on Wednesday.

"The fact that the Senate has delayed the vote until September 15th or 16th, it's neither a surprise nor a cause of concern, and we understand that the treaty will be the first item of business for the committee the week the Senate returns next month," Crowley said.

The new START treaty was signed on April 8 in Prague, replacing the START 1 treaty that expired in December 2009. The new pact obligates both nations to cap their fielded strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 warheads, while the number of deployed and non-deployed delivery vehicles must not exceed 800 on either side.

The Russian and U.S. presidents have agreed that the ratification processes should be simultaneous.

WASHINGTON, August 5 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100805/160076604.html>

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Iran Claims To Have Smuggled Anti Aircraft Missile Systems Into Country**

*Iran claimed it had smuggled four S-300 anti aircraft missile systems with a 90 mile range in defiance of United Nations sanction that prompted a Russian ban on selling the sophisticated defence system to Tehran.*

By Damien McElroy

4 August 2010

US and British officials responded with delight when Moscow unexpectedly pulled out of a deal to sell the system to Iran after the UN passed sanctions including an arms embargo on the Islamic state in June. But Tehran now claims it received two S-300s from Belarus and two others from another unspecified source.

If the news is confirmed, the threat posed by the system would be a serious deterrent to military planners contemplating a strike on Iran's nuclear programme.

The S-300 is capable of shooting down aircraft, cruise missiles and ballistic missile warheads at ranges of more than 90 miles and at altitudes of about 90,000 feet.

Alexander Lukashenko, the Belarusian dictator, forged close ties with Tehran, while Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who visited the ex-Soviet nation in 2007, has called the Belarusian leader one of his best friends.

Admiral Mike Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, said on Sunday the United States has drawn up the plan to prevent Iran getting nuclear weapons, but was "extremely concerned" about the consequences of an attack.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/7926854/Iran-claims-to-have-smuggled-anti-aircraft-missile-systems-into-country.html>

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

Russia Today – Russian Federation

## **Belarus Has Not Sold S-300 Air Defense Systems To Iran**

By Sergey Borisov, RT

05 August, 2010

Minsk has denied an Iranian new agency's report on selling S-300 surface-to-air missiles to Tehran. Fars agency earlier said that Iran had obtained four such missiles.

The Belarusian State Military-Industrial Committee denied the information on the delivery of S-300s to Tehran. "Belarus has held no negotiations with Iran, nor has it supplied any S-300s or components for them to that country," the committee's spokesman Vladimir Lavrenyuk told Interfax.

Lavrenyuk stressed that Tehran "has never sought to buy any S-300 systems, launchers for them or other components from Belarus." The spokesman also added that Minsk abides by its international commitments on export control.

Russian state arms exporter Rosoboronexport has not supplied the systems to Iran either, the company's spokesman Vyacheslav Davydenko told Itar-Tass. Rosoboronexport is strictly guided in its activities by the existing restrictions imposed by the UN Security Council, he noted.



According to Fars, the semiofficial news agency, Tehran's possession of the missiles was revealed last year by Al-Menar TV. The two missiles were reportedly purchased from Belarus and two others from another unspecified source, Fars said. Iranian government officials never denied the report.

S-300s can track targets and fire at aircraft, cruise missiles and ballistic missile warheads 120 kilometers away, and are able to simultaneously engage up to 100 targets. Israel fears the possible delivery of the systems to Iran would change "the balance of forces" in the region. Analysts say Tehran may use the S-300 in case of a military strike against the country.

Russia has been delaying the delivery of the S-300 surface-to-air missile to Iran since 2007, when the two countries concluded a contract. In June this year, Moscow said the new UN Security sanctions against Iran would block the delivery.

Nevertheless, Russia has not yet cancelled the contract on supplying the systems to Iran, the head of Russia's Rostekhnologii company Sergey Chemezov said in July. Tehran has insisted that Moscow should fulfill its commitments and deliver the missiles, threatening otherwise to "build" its own systems.

The media speculated recently that Russia could have sold the S-300 air defense systems to Azerbaijan. However, Russian state arms exporter Rosoboronexport denied a report by daily Vedomosti.

On August 2, an anonymous high-ranking source from the Russian Defense Ministry described the reports of the deal with Azerbaijan as "a mere bluff and profanation." "There are no contracts regarding S-300s and they are unlikely to be signed any time soon," He told Interfax news agency. "Today, the supply of Russian S-300s to Azerbaijan is impossible."

Analysts see two main reasons behind Fars' latest information on S-300s. Tehran has once again shown Israel and the US that the country is ready to defend itself from a possible attack. Iran may also try to exert additional pressure on Moscow in order to force it to fulfill its commitments and supply the air defense systems.

Meanwhile, Tehran says it is prepared to repel possible military attacks against the country. Iran has already defined the necessary strategies and drawn defensive plans to confront an enemy invasion, Iranian Defense Minister Brigadier General Ahmad Vahidi said on August 3, Fars reported.

Vahidi referred to "the intensified war rhetoric" by senior US military officials. Chairman of the US's Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen told NBC's "Meet the Press" on August 4 that "military actions have been on the table and remain on the table." "I hope we don't get to that, but it's an important option," he stressed.

<http://rt.com/Politics/2010-08-05/iran-belarus-s300-missiles.html>

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

Bellingham Herald

Thursday, August 5, 2010

## **AP Exclusive: Iran Defiant In Nuclear Documents**

By GEORGE JAHN

Associated Press Writer

As Iran and world powers prepare for new nuclear talks, letters by Tehran's envoys to top international officials and shared with The Associated Press suggest major progress is unlikely, with Tehran combative and unlikely to offer any concessions.

Two letters, both written late last month, reflect Iran's apparent determination to continue the nuclear activities that have led to new rounds of U.N., EU, and U.S. sanctions in recent weeks over fears that Tehran might be seeking to develop nuclear arms.

At the same time, world powers preparing to talk to Tehran are unwilling to cede ground on key demands concerning Iran's uranium enrichment activities, dimming prospects that the new negotiations will ease tensions.

Iran insists it want to enrich uranium only to make fuel for a planned reactor network and denies accusations that it will use the program to make fissile warhead material.

But international suspicions are strong. Tehran hid its enrichment program until it was revealed from the outside. And it acknowledged constructing a secret nuclear facility last year to the International Atomic Energy Agency last year only days before its existence was publicly revealed by the U.S. and Britain.

Since its enrichment program was unmasked eight years ago, Tehran has defied four U.N. Security Council sanctions meant to pressure it into freezing enrichment. Sporadic negotiations between Iran and all or some of the permanent U.N. Security Council members plus Germany have also failed to make headway.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, in its latest tally in June, said Iran was now running nearly 4,000 uranium-enriching centrifuges and had amassed nearly 2.5 tons of low-enriched uranium that can be used for fuel.

That's also enough for two nuclear bombs if enriched to weapons-grade levels.

Reinforcing his country's hard line, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad on Wednesday warned the West against "resorting to lies and hue and cry" in attempts to pressure his country into making nuclear concessions.

The letters, provided to the AP by an official on condition he not be named because of their confidential nature, address two sets of talks tentatively set to resume this fall.

In one negotiation round, the U.S. Russia, China, France Britain and Germany will again push for an Iranian commitment to freeze enrichment. The other will try to revive talks between Iran Washington, Paris and Moscow on a fuel swap for Tehran's research nuclear reactor.

A letter addressed to Catherine Ashton, the EU foreign policy chief, slams her offer to resume talks a day after the U.N. Security Council passed its fourth set of sanctions, calling it "astonishing," and describing subsequent E.U. and U.S. sanctions as "even more astonishing."

"This kind of behavior ... is absolutely unacceptable," says the letter, from Iran's top nuclear negotiator, Saeed Jalili.

The second letter says that "irrational conditions" imposed by the West are blocking a new round of the fuel swap talks. Addressed to International Atomic Energy Agency chief Yukiya Amano and signed by Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's chief IAEA delegate, the letter accuses the five permanent members of the U.N. security council of poisoning the atmosphere "through (the) imposition of another illegal resolution."

While both letters say Iran is ready to talk, the one to Ashton - the point person for the six big powers - sets the bar perhaps unreachably high, suggesting that Tehran is prepared to come to the table only if the other side ends its "hostility," avoids "any kind of pressure or threat" and states its "clear position on the nuclear weapons of the Zionist regime."

The previous meeting between Iran and the five permanent Security Council members plus Germany in October ended inconclusively on an enrichment freeze but led to agreement to start the fuel swap negotiations. That, in turn foundered after Tehran balked at shipping out most of its low-enriched uranium in exchange for fuel rods for the research reactor.

While Iran says it is now ready for a swap, its interlocutors say the terms must be renegotiated because Tehran has since enriched much more uranium, meaning that it would still have enough to enrich to weapons grade even if it now shipped out the original amount agreed upon.

Additionally, Iran is now enriching to higher levels, which can be turned into weapons grade uranium more easily - material it says it needs to turn into fuel rods after the deal stalled last year. The West demands the process be stopped before any consideration of new fuel swap talks.

In what the West sees as a further complication, Iran has enlisted Turkey and Brazil in pressing for a return to the fuel swap talks essentially under the original terms now rejected by its interlocutors. Russia has welcomed Iranian calls to invite Brazil and Turkey to the negotiations, while the U.S. and France are skeptical.

"The Iranians say they want to meet without preconditions, then they lay out a bunch of preconditions," said a Western official from a European capital who is familiar with the issue. The official, who asked for anonymity because his information is confidential said there is a "long way to go before we know who will be at the table, and when."

A diplomat from an IAEA member nation familiar with the talks said that Brazil and Turkey may not be keen to join any negotiations and risk sharing the blame, should they fail. He too asked for anonymity because his information was confidential.

<http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2010/08/05/1557224/ap-exclusive-iran-defiant-in-nuclear.html>

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

SpaceDaily.com

## **Ahmadinejad Says Iran Building Three-Stage Rocket**



By Staff Writers  
Tehran (AFP)  
August 5, 2010

TEHRAN (AFP) – President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said Iran is working on a three-stage rocket to carry a satellite 1,000 kilometres (more than 600 miles) into space, Fars news agency reported on Thursday.

"The country's scientists are working on a three-stage rocket that will take us to 1,000 kilometres," the agency quoted Ahmadinejad as saying to a local television in the western city of Hamedan on Wednesday.

"Last time, we sent a satellite to 250 kilometres... Next year it will be sent to 700 kilometres, and the year after that to 1,000 kilometres," he said.

In February 2009, Iran launched its first home-built satellite, named Omid (Hope), into orbit to coincide with the 30th anniversary of the 1979 Islamic revolution.

The launch raised fresh concerns among world powers already at odds with Tehran over its nuclear drive.

"The rocket that we used for the first satellite had an engine thrust of 32 tonnes at the time of launch, but the rocket that we are building will have the thrust of 120 or 140 tonnes," Ahmadinejad said.

Western countries suspect Iran is secretly trying to build a nuclear weapons capability and fear the technology used to launch the space rocket could be diverted into development of long-range ballistic missiles capable of carrying nuclear warheads.

Tehran strongly denies the charges, saying its nuclear programme is for peaceful purposes and that it has the right to the technology already in the hands of many other nations, including its archfoe the United States.

Ahmadinejad also disclosed details about another satellite, which he said would be launched in the "near future."

"We plan to launch an experimental telecommunication satellite with a lifetime of one year," he said.

Telecommunication Minister Reza Taghipour had said in July that a home-built satellite, Rasad 1, was being readied for launch for the last week of August, without giving other details.

Ahmadinejad also announced that Iran had plans to put telecommunication satellites in the 35,000-kilometre (about 22,000 miles) orbit -- where geostationary satellites are placed -- within "five or six years," Fars reported.

In July, Ahmadinejad said the country planned to send a man into space by 2019 as a blow to Western powers pressing Tehran over its continued uranium enrichment work in defiance of UN Security Council demands.

"Iran was due to send a man into space by 2024 but in response to threats and Security Council resolutions against Iran, the plan was pushed forward by five years and the project will be launched in 2019," he said.

The hardline president has made scientific development one of the main themes of his presidency, asserting that Iran has reached a peak of progress despite international sanctions and no longer needs help from foreign states.

He has also rejected that the ambitious space programme has military goals.

In February 2010, Iran launched a home-built rocket carrying live animals -- a rat, turtles and worm -- in a capsule, marking the country's first experiment in sending living creatures into space.

It also unveiled another home-built rocket designed to carry satellites, dubbed Simorgh (Phoenix) equipped to carry a 100-kilogram (220-pound) satellite 500 kilometres (310 miles) into orbit.

Defence Minister Ahmad Vahidi said then a refinement of the Simorgh design would allow satellites to be placed in a 1,000-kilometre (more than 600 miles) orbit.

The 27-metre (90 foot) tall multi-stage rocket weighs 85 tonnes and its liquid fuel propulsion system has a thrust of up to 100 tonnes.

[http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Ahmadinejad\\_says\\_Iran\\_building\\_three-stage\\_rocket\\_999.html](http://www.spacedaily.com/reports/Ahmadinejad_says_Iran_building_three-stage_rocket_999.html)

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

China Radio International (CRIEnglish.com) - China  
August 6, 2010

## **U.S. Military Strike Against Iran Unlikely: Expert**

By Xinhua News Agency

Despite remarks by Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen, the United States is unlikely to launch a military strike against Iran, a renowned Iran expert told Xinhua in a recent interview.

"My assessment is that we probably will not do this (military strike)," said Michael O' Hanlon, director of research of foreign policy at the Washington-based Brookings Institution. He cited reasons such as President Barack Obama's policy against preemptive strikes, the ineffectiveness of military options and fear of losing international support.

Mullen said Sunday on NBC's "Meet the Press" that a military option against Iran has not been ruled out, yet he thought a military strike is probably a bad idea.

Mullen's remarks elicited a furious response from Iran, which vowed to retaliate against any attack. However, some suspect that Mullen's move is aimed to ease Israel's concern in the wake of its Defense Minister Ehud Barak's recent visit to Washington.

In order to garner international support, the Obama administration has been trying the "dual-track" approach, namely diplomacy and sanctions, when dealing with Iran.

But Israel has always been skeptical of this effort, refusing to rule out the possibility of a military strike on Iran's nuclear facilities.

According to his interpretation, O'Hanlon believed that what Mullen said does not imply imminent military action.

"To say that an option is on the table is not the same thing as to say there is a detailed plan. Detailed plan implies real preparation and readiness to carry this out. It implies the almost potential imminence, whereas keeping this as an option is just that," he said.

O'Hanlon believed it is unlikely that the current administration will resort to a military option. "Because, in the end, this will in many ways be a form of preemption. President Obama campaigned against the idea of preemption," the expert said.

The United States will more likely seek cooperation with other world powers -- China, France, Britain and Russia -- and try to put Iran under economic pressure, he said.

The other reason, O'Hanlon believed, is that a military option would not be very effective in stopping Iran from pursuing its nuclear program.

"It (a military strike) will probably set Iran back a couple of years. But Iran could relocate and build new facilities," he said, adding the country will have much more determination and domestic support to carry out its nuclear program.

Besides, "a lot of countries around the world, in the aftermath of the strike, may decide not to continue to apply sanctions, so we might lose ground on sanctions. In all the political and economic fronts, a military attack will set us backward," he said.

"If you add up the pros and cons, the equation looks fairly unfavorable for using force," the expert concluded.

O'Hanlon said the military strike will complicate the U.S. ability to maintain a strong coalition because it might make the United States look like a unilateral power, which would be a nod towards the Bush administration's policy.

<http://english.cri.cn/6966/2010/08/06/2641s587104.htm>

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

Washington Post

## **US Negotiator Says NKorea Not Ready For Talks**

By The Associated Press

Wednesday, August 4, 2010

TOKYO -- North Korea's recent actions indicate it is not yet ready to rejoin multilateral talks aimed at getting it to give up its nuclear weapons program, a senior U.S. negotiator said Wednesday.

Robert Einhorn, the State Department's special adviser for nonproliferation and arms control, said North Korea's recent alleged sinking of a South Korean warship - which Pyongyang denies - and its aggressive rhetoric suggest it is not willing to make serious commitments toward denuclearization.

"I don't know that we are ready today to resume those talks," Einhorn told reporters in Tokyo. "North Korea's actions raise legitimate questions about whether they are willing to live up to their commitments."

Five nations - China, Russia, South Korea, the U.S. and Japan - have been trying for years to convince North Korea to dismantle its nuclear program in exchange for aid and other concessions.

North Korea walked out of those talks last year after being condemned by the U.N. Security Council for firing a long-range rocket. Weeks later, North Korea carried out a nuclear test, its second.

Both nuclear tests resulted in Security Council resolutions, one in 2006 which imposed sanctions and another in 2009 that tightened them.

The U.S. and South Korean accuse North Korea of sinking a South Korean warship in March, killing 46 sailors in the worst military attack on the South since the 1950-53 Korean War.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton announced new sanctions against North Korea during a recent visit to Seoul. Einhorn said on Monday those measures would further isolate the North financially and pinpoint "illicit and deceptive" activities such as drug trafficking, currency counterfeiting and the banned trade in conventional arms.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/04/AR2010080400440.html>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
5 August 2010

## **N. Korea Avoids U.S. List As State Sponsor Of Terrorism**

By Hwang Doo-hyong

WASHINGTON, Aug. 5 (Yonhap) -- The United States Thursday announced a new list of state sponsors of terrorism that does not include North Korea despite concerns over Pyongyang's suspected delivery of weapons to militant groups in the Middle East.

Iran, Syria, Sudan and Cuba are still listed under the annual congressionally mandated Country Reports on Terrorism 2009.

"The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) was not known to have sponsored any terrorist acts since the bombing of a Korean Airlines flight in 1987," the report said. "On October 11, 2008, the United States removed the designation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terrorism in accordance with criteria set forth in U.S. law, including a certification that the government of the DPRK had not provided any support for international terrorism during the preceding six-month period and the provision by the DPRK of assurances that it will not support acts of international terrorism in the future."

North Korea was first put on the list after the downing of the Korean Air flight over Myanmar in 1987, which killed all 115 people aboard. Its delisting came in October 2008 under the Bush administration, which saw progress in the six-party talks on ending the North's nuclear weapons programs.

The report comes amid allegations of North Korea's involvement in the provision of weapons to some Asian and Middle Eastern countries.

U.S. officials have raised concerns over North Korea's alleged nuclear and missile technology transfer to Myanmar, formerly Burma.

Israel said in May that the 35 tons of North Korean arms seized at the Bangkok airport in December were destined for the Hamas and Hizbullah militant groups via Syria.

Dennis Blair, then U.S. director of national intelligence, said only that the cargo was bound for the Middle East.

Daniel Benjamin, coordinator of the State Department's Office for Counterterrorism, told reporters that the department has been "looking into" those allegations.

"The secretary and others in the administration have been clear that if we find that Korea is, indeed, sponsoring terrorism, obviously we will revisit the issue of the listing as a state sponsor," he said. "But Korea was de-listed in accordance with U.S. law in 2008 and it was at that time certified that North Korea had not supported any terrorism in the previous six months."

Arms sales are believed to be one of the major sources of revenue for North Korea, suspected of being behind nuclear and missile proliferation in Syria, Iran, Pakistan and several other countries. For its nuclear and missile tests, Pyongyang has been under strict U.N. resolutions banning the trade of conventional arms as well as weapons of mass destruction.

The State Department, meanwhile, noted that the U.S. in May last year re-certified North Korea as "not cooperating fully" with U.S. counterterrorism efforts under the Arms Export and Control Act.

"Pursuant to this certification, defense articles and services may not be sold or licensed for export to North Korea from October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2010," the report said. "This certification will lapse unless it is renewed by the Secretary of State by May 15, 2010."

The report also said that North Korea has not yet handed over four Japanese Red Army members involved in a jet hijacking in 1970, and several Japanese citizens abducted decades ago to train North Korean agents on Japanese language and culture.

North Korea returned five abductees after the visit to Pyongyang by then-Japanese Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi in 2002 and claimed the others are dead. Japan refused to believe that, calling on North Korea to investigate further.

"The Japanese government continued to seek a full accounting of the fate of 12 Japanese nationals believed to have been abducted by DPRK state entities in the 1970s and 1980s," the report said. "The DPRK admitted to abducting eight of these individuals, but claimed that they have since died; the DPRK has denied having abducted the other four individuals."

Washington has dismissed calls by some hardliners for relisting North Korea for the torpedoing of the South Korean warship Cheonan, which killed 46 sailors in the Yellow Sea. U.S. officials say the March incident is a violation of the armistice that ended the 1950-53 Korean War, but does not merit relisting.

North Korea denies involvement. The U.N. Security Council last month condemned the attack that led the sinking, but did not directly blame the North due to China's reluctance.

Kim Jong-un, the third and youngest son of North Korean leader Kim Jong-il, is believed to be behind the incident as he is trying to win key support from the military.

The Cheonan incident is reminiscent of the Korean Air downing, allegedly masterminded by Kim Jong-il, who was trying to consolidate his status as heir apparent to his father, Kim Il-sung. Kim Jong-il took power in 1994 when Kim Il-sung died of a heart attack.

Kim Jong-il reportedly plotted the flight downing to disrupt the upcoming presidential election in South Korea and the 1988 Olympics in Seoul.

Neither Kim Jong-il nor Jong-un has any military background, unlike Kim Il-sung, the founding father of the North who served as a guerrilla leader against Japanese colonialists.

U.S. officials have expressed concerns about further provocations from North Korea due to uncertainties surrounding the third generation dynastic power transition.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2010/08/06/78/0301000000AEN20100806000600315F.HTML>

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

Japan Times – Japan  
Friday, August 6, 2010

## **Hiroshima Urges End Of Nuclear Umbrella**

*Roos, Ban among 55,000 at 65th anniversary of bombing*

By ERIC JOHNSTON, Staff writer

HIROSHIMA — At a memorial ceremony attended for the first time ever by a U.N. secretary general and a U.S. representative, Hiroshima on Friday marked the 65th anniversary of its atomic bombing by calling on Japan to withdraw from the U.S. nuclear umbrella and accelerate the progress made over the past 18 months to eliminate nuclear arms.

On a sweltering morning, Prime Minister Naoto Kan, U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon, U.S. Ambassador John Roos, as well as representatives of nuclear states Great Britain and France were on hand for the ceremony. Some 55,000 people took part in the memorial, according to city officials.

This year's ceremony took place three months after the Nuclear Nonproliferation Review Conference in New York, which followed an April meeting hosted by the U.S. on nuclear disarmament.

Hiroshima Mayor Tadatoshi Akiba said in his message to the ceremony that Japan needs to do more to assure the world it is serious about remaining a nonnuclear state.

"The time is ripe for the Japanese government to take decisive action. It should begin to take the lead in the pursuit of the elimination of nuclear weapons by legislating the three nonnuclear principles, abandoning the U.S. nuclear umbrella, and implementing passionate, caring assistance measures for all of the aging hibakusha anywhere in the world," Akiba said.

Earlier this week, Akiba said it is ridiculous for Japan to think about national security policies while still being dependent on America's nuclear umbrella.

Akiba's call to turn Japan's long-standing three nonnuclear principles into law is something antinuclear groups have long desired.

The three nonnuclear principles of not possessing, manufacturing, or introducing nuclear weapons were introduced as a Diet resolution in the late 1960s and adopted in 1971, but have yet to be codified into law.

The mayor also urged Kan to speak to nuclear weapons states directly and push them to disarm completely by 2020.

Kan, who was once an activist, gave credit to the hibakusha, their next of kin, and citizens' groups worldwide for their efforts to rid the world of nuclear weapons, and for the recent political progress toward that goal.

"Last May, at the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conference in New York, nearly 100 hibakusha spoke about their experiences. Over 4,000 cities worldwide, including Hiroshima and Nagasaki, belong to the Mayors for Peace Conference, which is calling for the elimination of nuclear weapons. It is the activities of citizens and NGOs that have played a critical role in arms reduction," he said.

U.S. Ambassador Roos laid a memorial wreath at the cenotaph, but did not address the ceremony.

Kan, Ban and Akiba all welcomed his attendance to the annual event, as well as the ambassadors from Great Britain and France.

Roos, who visited the A-bomb Dome and the memorial museum in Hiroshima last October shortly after assuming his post, said he was "deeply moved."

His visit was generally received favorably by the Japanese government and the public.

But this time, the ambassador stayed at the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park, the site of the memorial service, for one hour without talking to any survivors.

In Tokyo, the U.S. Embassy released a press release after the memorial saying that Roos attended the ceremony "to express respect for all the victims of World War II."

"For the sake of future generations, we must continue to work together to realize a world without nuclear weapons," Roos was quoted as saying in the release.

Ban's attendance at the annual ceremony, the first ever by a U.N. secretary general, was even more anticipated and drew the lion's share of the attention.

Recalling the destruction he saw during the Korean War as a youth, Ban said his experience of marching along a muddy country road while his home village burned led him to devote his life to peace, and also brought him to Hiroshima.

Paying his respects to the hibakusha and their families, Ban said the efforts made since the atomic bombing on Aug. 6, 1945, by Hiroshima citizens to convey the horrors of the atomic bomb have made city the epicenter of peace.

"Together, we are on a journey from ground zero to ground zero, a world free of weapons of mass destruction," Ban said.

<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20100806x1.html>

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

The West Australian – Australia

## **N.Korean Leader's Son To Join Party Leadership**

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

August 6, 2010

TOKYO (AFP) - The youngest son of North Korean leader Kim Jong-Il is expected to join the communist party leadership at an upcoming meeting, paving the way for his eventual succession, a report said Friday.

Japan's Kyodo news agency said Kim Jong-Un is expected to be elected as a member of the ruling party's central committee at a meeting of key party delegates next month.

The agency, in a report from Beijing and Pyongyang, said Kim junior is also expected to become a member of the party's political bureau presidium at a central committee general meeting to be held soon after the delegates meet.

Kyodo, quoting informed sources, said the party is expected to convene a congress in 2012 at which Jong-Un would be officially appointed as successor.

The 68-year-old leader, who suffered a stroke in August 2008, is widely reported to be grooming Jong-Un, his third son, to take over eventually.

Kim Jong-Il, who among his other titles is party general secretary, is currently the only member of its political bureau presidium.

North Korea in June announced plans for the delegates' meeting, which will be only the third since the communist state was founded in 1948.

It is seen as the most important party event since 1980, when a convention of all party members made public Kim Jong-Il's status as Kim Il-Sung's eventual successor.

Analysts have previously said the September meeting, for which no date has been announced, will probably designate Jong-Un as next leader.

South Korea's spy chief said in June that the leader's poor health was driving him to speed up preparations for a handover.

He said Jong-Un, believed to be 27, was taking a greater role in policymaking and often accompanied his father on inspection tours.

<http://au.news.yahoo.com/thewest/a/-/world/7723277/nkorean-leaders-son-to-join-party-leadership/>

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

Montreal Gazette – Canada

## **Obama Thinks It Appropriate To Recognize Hiroshima: Clinton**

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

August 6, 2010

WASHINGTON - Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said Thursday that U.S. President Barack Obama "thought it appropriate" to recognize Japan's atomic bomb anniversary as he wants to rid the world of nuclear arms.

The United States, 65 years after a mushroom cloud rose over Hiroshima, will for the first time send an envoy this Friday to commemorate the bombing that rang in the nuclear age.

"President Obama is very committed to working toward a world without nuclear weapons," even if he sees it as a "long-term goal," Clinton told reporters when asked for comment on the anniversary.

"I think that the Obama administration and President Obama himself believe that it would be appropriate for us to recognize this anniversary and has proceeded to do so," she said.

The U.S. ambassador to Japan, John Roos, is due to attend and lay a wreath "to express respect for all of the victims of World War II," the State Department said.

The United States has not apologized for the atomic bombs it dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki which, surveys show, most Americans believe were necessary to bring a quick end to the war and avoid a land invasion that could have been more costly.

<http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/Obama+thinks+appropriate+recognize+Hiroshima+Clinton/3366817/story.html>

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

Deccan Herald – India

## **US Still Concerned About A.Q. Khan Network**

Washington, August 4, 2010

By Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)

Possible revival of the A.Q. Khan run nuclear-smuggling network is an area of ongoing concern for Washington even as Islamabad claims the notorious Pakistani scientist is out of business.



"Obviously, the A.Q. Khan network has - or is responsible for some of the most serious cases of proliferation in recent decades," State Department spokesman Philip Crowley told reporters Tuesday when asked to comment on an article in the Washington Times. "We have worked intensively with Pakistan and other countries to shut down that network," he said.

"And while A.Q. Khan himself is out of business, according to the government of Pakistan, we watch his network very closely for signs that others within his realm are still in business."

"It is something - it's an ongoing focus of ours, and because we - this is a part of our broad international effort to try to stem sources of proliferation around the world. So it is an area of ongoing concern," Crowley said.

The Times reported last week that scientists, engineers and financiers involved in the A.Q. Khan nuclear-smuggling network are being contacted by several governments in an effort to lure these specialists out of retirement.

The development is raising concerns among US intelligence agencies about the revival of the proliferation network that was thought to have been shut down years ago, it said.

<http://www.deccanherald.com/content/85978/us-still-concerned-aq-khan.html>

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

Global Security Newswire

## India Pursues Laser-Based Missile Defenses

Wednesday, August 4, 2010

India is working on a number of devices intended to destroy enemy ballistic missiles with concentrated energy beams, the Xinhua News Agency reported yesterday (see *GSN*, July 26).

India's Defense Ministry in a planning document placed the development of antimissile "directed energy weapons" among its highest priorities for the next 15 years (see *GSN*, May 25). Trials of the defenses are expected within several years if work on the technology proceeds as planned (Xinhua News Agency, Aug. 3).

"Lasers are weapons of the future. We can, for instance, use laser beams to shoot down an enemy missile in its boost or terminal phase," the *Times of India* quoted Anil Kumar Maini, who heads the Indian Defense Research and Development Organization's Laser Science and Technology Center, as saying (Rajat Pandit, *Times of India*, Aug. 3).

One device under development would fire a 25-kilowatt laser at a ballistic missile to destroy the weapon as its fell toward its target, Maini said. The system would render a missile harmless by rapidly heating it to between roughly 400 and 600 degrees Fahrenheit, the official was quoted as saying.

Another defensive weapon would rely on a road-mobile, gas-dynamic laser.

India might ultimately deploy such laser weapons by air and sea, according to the Defense Ministry "Technology Perspective and Capability Road Map" (Xinhua News Agency).

Laser-based weapons would comprise one component of a wider India missile defense network now under development, the *Times of India* reported. The newspaper noted, though, that the Defense Research and Development Organization is known to make claims regarding technology that it cannot ultimately produce (Pandit, *Times of India*).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100804\\_8058.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100804_8058.php)

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

Denver Post

## UN Chief In Nagasaki Calls For Nuclear Disarmament

July 5, 2010

By The Associated Press

NAGASAKI, Japan—U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called for the abolishment of nuclear weapons Thursday during a visit to Nagasaki, one of two Japanese cities devastated by U.S. atomic bombs in the closing days of World War II.

Ban toured the Atomic Bomb Museum and met with six survivors during his visit, the first by a U.N. chief to Nagasaki. More than 70,000 people were killed when the U.S. bombed the southern Japanese city on Aug. 9, 1945.

"My visit here has strengthened my conviction that these weapons must be outlawed, either by a nuclear weapons convention or by a framework of separate mutually reinforcing instruments," Ban said in a speech at Nagasaki's Urakami Cathedral.

The cathedral, just 2,000 feet (600 meters) from the bomb's hypocenter, was completely destroyed and was rebuilt along with much of the city after the war.

Ban said nations must work together to create a world free from nuclear weapons.

"The only way to ensure that such weapons will never again be used is to eliminate them all," he said. "There must be no place in our world for such indiscriminate weapons."

Ban is to visit Hiroshima on Friday to attend the 65th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of that city on Aug. 6, 1945. About 140,000 people were killed or died within months in Hiroshima. Japan surrendered on Aug. 15, ending World War II.

U.S. Ambassador John Roos will also attend the ceremony in Hiroshima, becoming the first representative sent by Washington to the annual commemoration.

Nuclear powers France and Britain will also send representatives to the Hiroshima ceremony for the first time.

Former President Jimmy Carter visited Hiroshima's Peace Museum in 1984, after he was out of office. The highest-ranking American to visit while in office is House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, who went in 2008.

[http://www.denverpost.com/nationworld/ci\\_15680301](http://www.denverpost.com/nationworld/ci_15680301)

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

USA TODAY

## **Report Urges Genetic IDs For Bioterror Germs**

August 4, 2010

By Steve Sternberg, USA TODAY

The nation's leading scientific advisory group said Tuesday that it is possible, and may be wise, to classify bioterror germs by their gene sequences in addition to their scientific names.

The National Academy of Sciences' proposal also suggests adopting a "yellow flag" plan to alert authorities when terrorists attempt to buy gene sequences taken from deadly bacteria or viruses and turn them into bioweapons.

"That capability exists today or will in the not-too-distant future," says James Leduc, chairman of the committee that wrote the report and director of the Galveston National Laboratory at the University of Texas Medical Branch there.

Many companies worldwide now sell synthetic DNA for scientific research. Researchers hope to harness custom-made microbes to make drugs, fuels and other materials. In May, researchers led by Craig Venter of J. Venter Genome Research Institute created the first living, replicating bacteria controlled by man-made genes. But researchers worry that synthetic biology may also be exploited by terrorists.

The United States now regulates and limits access to 82 bacteria, viruses and toxins that pose a biosecurity threat. Identifying them and related microbes by their genetic sequences offers a "brighter line" for distinguishing which ones represent trouble, the 197-page report says.

The proposed database of yellow-flagged sequences would alert commercial DNA firms anytime a buyer requested a sequence that represents a potential threat so they could do a quick check to make sure the buyer is reputable, Leduc says.

But Gigi Kwik Gronvall of the UPMC Center for Biosecurity in Baltimore said identifying germs by name is simpler and more reliable. The new approach, she says, would "put the onus on DNA synthesis companies to follow up if someone orders a sequence that might be dangerous." The trouble is, no one can say for sure which sequences are dangerous, so confusion may reign, Gronvall says.

[http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/2010-08-04-bioweapon04\\_ST\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/2010-08-04-bioweapon04_ST_N.htm)

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

New York Daily News

## **Federal Agencies Still Unprepared For Weapons Of Mass Destruction, 9 Years After 9/11: Justice Dept**

BY Richard Sisk  
DAILY NEWS WASHINGTON BUREAU  
Wednesday, August 4th 2010

WASHINGTON - Except for the FBI, no federal law enforcement agency is ready to respond to an attack on the U.S. with weapons of mass destruction, Justice Department officials said Wednesday.

Nearly nine years after 9/11, the FBI has taken "appropriate steps" to prepare. The other agencies under the Justice umbrella were untrained and "as a whole did not have adequate policies or plans for responding to a WMD attack," said Glenn Fine, the Justice Department's inspector general.

"Quite frankly, it's rather disturbing," said Sen. Ben Cardin (D-Md.), "to see that nine years after the 9/11 attack we still do not have in place the proper functioning plans in the event of a successful attack."

Fine singled out the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, which would have responsibility to help uphold public safety if state and local law enforcement were overwhelmed by an incident.

"Right now, being totally effective would never happen. Everybody would be winging it," Fine told a hearing of the Senate terrorism and homeland security subcommittee.

The ATF, the Drug Enforcement Administration and the U.S. Marshals Service also were clueless on the FBI's master response plan for an attack on Washington, Fine said.

James Baker, an associate deputy attorney general, admitted the shortcomings outlined by Fine and agreed, "We should improve the readiness of the department.

"The American people are entitled to expect nothing less," Baker said.

"There has been a sense of complacency that has developed," Fine said, in law enforcement and in the general public since 9/11 that must be addressed.

The committee also questioned whether the Justice Department itself has fulfilled its role to protect the nation in one nuclear attack scenario.

Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) focused on the possibility that terrorists would acquire a missile to detonate a nuclear device in the atmosphere over the U.S., releasing an electromagnetic pulse that would wipe out power grids and electronic devices.

"A relatively crude nuclear weapon mounted on a Scud missile, for example, could be launched from a ship in U.S. waters and inflict massive damage," Kyl said.

Low Earth-orbit satellites would be disabled, along with ground systems, by an [electromagnetic pulse] burst, and "recovery could take on the order of months to even years," said Michael Frankel, executive director of a federal commission to assess the EMP threat.

[http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/2010/08/04/2010-08-04\\_agencies\\_unready\\_for\\_wmd\\_hit\\_feds.html](http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/2010/08/04/2010-08-04_agencies_unready_for_wmd_hit_feds.html)

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

National Public Radio (NPR)

OPINION

## **Foreign Policy: Rethinking The "Nuclear Revolution"**

By Stephen M. Walt

August 4, 2010

*Stephen M. Walt is the Robert and Renée Belfer professor of international relations at Harvard University. He serves on the editorial boards of Foreign Policy, Security Studies, International Relations, and Journal of Cold War Studies.*

Ever since graduate school, I've been a firm believer in the "nuclear revolution." The term refers to the belief that the invention of nuclear weapons constituted a fundamental shift in the nature of warfare, and conceivably in international relations itself. As Bernard Brodie put it in *The Absolute Weapon* (1946): "Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on its chief purpose must be to avert them." (Hmmm. Given that we've fought at least five significant wars since World War II, and a host of minor conflicts, we don't seem to be following Brodie's advice).

The idea of the "nuclear revolution" goes further than that, however. As refined by scholars like Brodie, Thomas Schelling, Glenn Snyder, Robert Jervis, Kenneth Waltz, and Stephen Van Evera, nuclear weapons are said to

provide states with the ability to protect their sovereignty and independence not via direct defense but rather through deterrence. Instead of defending one's borders or vital interests with conventional military forces, states could deter enemy attack by threatening to inflict unacceptable damage on an aggressor. As long as they possessed a secure second-strike retaliatory force, in short, they could deter attack by threatening to make an aggressor's losses outweigh its gains. As Winston Churchill famously put it, peace had become "the sturdy child of terror, and survival the twin brother of annihilation."

Finally, as Jervis argued in several important works, the nuclear revolution dampened (and maybe eliminated) the security dilemma between states. As long as a state possessed a secure second-strike capability (SSC), its security wasn't affected if an possible adversary had a much larger arsenal. In the world of mutual assured destruction, in short, "nuclear superiority" was a meaningless concept. Even if an enemy had a lot more warheads, it couldn't attack a state with a secure SSC without risking devastating retaliation. And it didn't take a genius to figure out that even a minor nuclear exchange would ruin your whole day.

According to the logic of the "nuclear revolution," therefore, states with second-strike capabilities were secure against attack and didn't need to worry very much about their sovereignty or independence. The "security dilemma" was muted, and cooperation between states would be greatly facilitated. (Other theorists took this argument even further, and suggested that the technological change embodied in the nuclear revolution heralded the end of the nation-state and the emergence of a global republic).

I've long accepted the core tenets of this basic argument, and I've taught it to my students for years. But lately I've started wondering about just how far-reaching this "revolution" really was. Although I still accept the core logic, the existence of nuclear weapons doesn't seem to have had the far-reaching political effects that Jervis and others anticipated.

Consider: the United States has a very large and sophisticated nuclear arsenal, and a very secure "second-strike" capacity. It could easily devastate any country foolish enough to attack us. Yet the United States also maintains a large and expensive Navy, a sizeable and expensive air force, and significant ground and amphibious too. And the justification for this is not the need to defend human rights, or even spread democracy (though both claims get invoked from time to time); rather, we maintain these forces because we think they are essential to our *national security*.

Yet if nuclear weapons were somehow disinvented, it is not obvious that this event would have any discernible effect on our conventional military posture, especially given the absence of a true "peer competitor." And if China continues to grow and expands its own military capabilities, will the existence of our robust nuclear arsenal make us indifferent to this development? I rather doubt it.

And it's not just the United States that seems to have so little confidence in its own deterrent. Israel has by most accounts a sizeable nuclear arsenal of its own, and a clear "second-strike capability" against any possible foe. Yet Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu recently warned about future threats along Israel's "Eastern front," a position linked to the demand that a future Palestinian state be demilitarized and that Israel retain control of the Jordan River Valley. Israel developed nuclear weapons to enhance its security (a perfectly understandable decision), but having the bomb hasn't made it feel any safer or reduced its perceived security "requirements," even against *conventional* military forces.

One can go further. Russia has the second-largest nuclear arsenal in the world, but that hardly precludes it from maintaining large conventional forces and from striving for regional influence around its borders. Nobody could invade Russia today without risking devastating retaliation, yet the "security dilemma" seems to be alive and well in the minds of Russian leaders. One could say much the same for both India and Pakistan — each tested nuclear weapons in order to enhance their security, yet the security competition between the two states has not declined by as much as the "nuclear revolution" thesis suggests.

In short, although a number of countries have acquired nuclear arsenals, and several have large and redundant nuclear forces, the security dilemma has not disappeared and national leaders don't seem to be reducing their defense requirements because they have great confidence in the deterrent power of these awesome weapons.

Don't get me wrong: I'm not suggesting that nuclear weapons have no effects whatsoever, and I'm not a sudden convert to the idea of general and complete disarmament. Unlike John Mueller, for example, I believe the presence of nuclear weapons was one of the factors that kept the Cold War from heating up. If nothing else, having a nuclear arsenal helps ensure that other nuclear (or WMD)-armed states don't attack you directly, and it may even provide a "nuclear umbrella" over close allies. But nobody in power seems to think that a nuclear deterrent is sufficient to protect the country, or even to significantly reduce other defense or security requirements.

The lesson I draw from this is that nuclear weapons have very limited value. A handful of survivable weapons makes it very unlikely that another state will attack you directly or try to invade and take over your country. That's

about it. And states certainly don't need thousands of warheads in order to obtain these effects. In short, if we're going to keep spending a lot of money on conventional forces and conducting geopolitics much as we did before 1945, we might as well save some money and move to a "minimum deterrence" posture, like this. And by acknowledging that nuclear weapons are neither the be-all and end-all of international security or a potent talisman of great power status, we might make it easier for potential entrants into the nuclear club to decide that it's not worth the trouble or the cost.

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=128974264>

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

Japan Times – Japan

OPINION

Friday, August 6, 2010

EDITORIAL

## **Accelerate Nuclear Disarmament**

This year Hiroshima and Nagasaki hold their peace memorial services to mark the 65th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombings of them as the world feels the "global momentum toward a nuclear weapons-free world," as U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki Moon observes. It is important that every nation and citizens the world over do their best to accelerate this momentum so that people can live free from the fear of nuclear weapons.

U.S. President Barack Obama's April 2009 speech in Prague, in which he made clear the U.S. commitment "to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons," has clearly contributed to building this momentum. In his speech, he also said that "as a nuclear power, as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act" toward building a world without nuclear weapons.

In September 2009, the United Nations Security Council, attended by the five permanent UNSC member states, which are nuclear-weapons states — the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China — and the nonpermanent member states, including Japan, adopted a resolution to "seek a safer world for all and create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons."

In April of this year, the U.S. and Russia, which together hold nearly 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, signed a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which caps the two countries' deployed warheads at 1,550 — 30 percent below the levels agreed in the 2002 Moscow Treaty, although it does not require actual destruction of the shelved warheads.

Later the same month, the U.S. announced its Nuclear Posture Review, which said that nuclear weapons should play a diminished role in U.S. military strategy and that the U.S. "will not develop new nuclear weapons." The U.S. refrained from adopting a "no first use" policy but pledged not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against states that are signatories to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and are in compliance with all obligations under the treaty.

April also saw 47 countries adopt, at a nuclear security summit, a 12-point communique to strengthen nuclear security, reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism and secure all vulnerable nuclear material within four years. The next month, 189 countries at the U.N.'s NPT Review Conference reconfirmed their commitment to the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and agreed to hold a regional conference in 2012 that would eliminate weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

The peace memorial service in Hiroshima carries the imprint of the momentum created by those events. Mr. Ban is the first U.N. secretary general to attend it and to meet with "hibakusha" or A-bomb survivors. All the countries, especially those possessing nuclear weapons, should heed his call that they "act within a time frame so that at least some hibakusha will live to see the end of all nuclear weapons."

Government representatives from the U.S., Britain and France, including U.S. Ambassador to Japan John Roos, also will attend the annual ceremony for the first time. The purpose of the ambassador's attendance is not so much to pray for the souls of individual atomic-bomb victims as to "express respect for all of the victims of World War II." Still his presence is significant. It represents the U.S. desire to play a leading role in global efforts toward the eventual abolition of nuclear weapons.

Despite the momentum for a nuclear weapons-free world, the situation concerning nuclear nonproliferation in East Asia is difficult. North Korea has not shown any sign of returning to the six-party talks to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula. Japan, the U.S. and South Korea should persevere in working to get the North to return to the talks and to change the attitude of China, which chairs the talks and maintains close ties with Pyongyang. In the long run,

countries around the North should endeavor to create an environment in which it does not feel threatened and does not see the need to possess nuclear weapons.

Japan should also be careful about its talks with India over a pact to allow India to import civilian nuclear technology and equipment from Japan. Japan should have the courage to end the talks if India fails to commit itself to nonproliferation efforts such as ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty and stopping production of fissile material for nuclear weapons. Japan also should try to get India and Pakistan, both of which possess nuclear arms, to join the NPT.

Although Japan advocates a nuclear weapons-free world, its continued reliance on the U.S. nuclear umbrella could impede its efforts to help create such a world. At the very least, it should uphold steadfastly its three-point nonnuclear principle of not "producing" and not "possessing" nuclear weapons and not allowing them to be "brought in." This pronounced nonnuclear principle is the strongest lever in trying to get the nuclear weapons states to reduce their arsenals.

<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/ed20100806a1.html>

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