



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 833, 10 August 2010

Articles & Other Documents:

[Russia Accuses US Of Arms Control Breaches](#)

[Russia Trained 4,000 Myanmar Nuclear Officers'](#)

[Russia Lists U.S. Violations Of START-1](#)

[US-Vietnam Nuke Deal Will Likely Allow Enrichment](#)

[Russia Accuses U.S. Of Loose Arms Control](#)

[Russia Plans Major Defense Budget Upgrade](#)

[Arab Majority Backs Nuclear Iran: Poll](#)

[Russia's Missile Forces Chief To Inspect Teikovo Division](#)

[US 'Open To Engagement' With Iran: Clinton](#)

[Fidel Castro Warns Of Nuclear Risk In 1st Speech To Cuban Parliament In 4 years](#)

[Iran Digging Graves For US Troops If They Attack](#)

[Iran Increases Uranium Enrichment – IAEA](#)

[HAFB Criticized Again Over Handling Of Nuke-Related Items](#)

[N. Korea May Conduct 3rd Nuclear Test: Defector](#)

[WHO Declares End To Swine Flu Pandemic](#)

[Kan Says He Wants To Mull Making 3 Non-Nuclear Principles Into Law](#)

[United States Is No Better](#)

[N. Korea Threatens 'Real War' As Tension Heightens At Sea](#)

[Attack On Iran Would Be "Disastrous," Blix Says](#)

[The Murky World Of Iran-North Korea Relations](#)

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.

San Francisco Chronicle

Russia Accuses US Of Arms Control Breaches

Saturday, August 7, 2010

By The Associated Press

MOSCOW (AP) -- Russia's Foreign Ministry has accused the United States of violating its obligations under bilateral nuclear arms reduction treaties and failing to properly safeguard radioactive materials.

The Foreign Ministry claimed in Saturday's statement that the U.S. has breached its duties under the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.

It said in particular that the U.S. has failed to provide assurances that some of their nuclear missile launchers and bombers converted to carry conventional weapons couldn't be retrofitted.

The ministry also claimed that the U.S. authorities have failed to prevent leaks of radioactive materials and nuclear weapons-related information. It mentioned one case in 2006 when U.S. police found confidential data from Los Alamos National Laboratory leaked to a criminal group dealing with drugs.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2010/08/07/international/i040500D07.DTL&type=business>

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

The Hindu – India

August 7, 2010

Russia Lists U.S. Violations Of START-1

By Vladimir Radyuhin

Moscow - Russia has accused the United States of “gross” violations of a number of arms-control and non-proliferation agreements in an apparent tit-a-tat for U.S. charges of Russia breaching the 1991 START-1 nuclear-arms treaty.

In a 13-page document published on Saturday on its website www.mid.ru, the Russian Foreign Ministry detailed U.S. infringements of START-1, international conventions banning chemical and biological weapons, and missile proliferation pacts.

Moscow said Washington had breached its duties under START-1 when it converted some nuclear missile launchers into interceptor missile launchers; retrofitted B1 heavy nuclear-capable bombers to carry conventional weapons; and refused to provide telemetric data on Trident-2 submarine missile launches by claiming the missiles belonged to Britain.

In glaring violation of the Missile Technology Control Regime, said the Russian report, the U.S. has been supplying missile technologies to Israel, Taiwan and some Arab countries. Among other things, the U.S. helped Israel build the Shavit three-stage solid fuel missile and has been developing jointly with Israel the Arrow-2 missile interceptor.

The U.S. also breached the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which banned missiles with ranges of between 500 and 5,500 km, the U.S. continued to build medium-range ballistic missile targets for missile-defence tests.

The Russian Foreign Ministry said the U.S. violated the Biological Weapons Convention by developing new germ agents and refusing to provide information on a network of its military bio-centres in Indonesia, Thailand, Peru, Egypt and other countries.

The U.S. authorities failed to prevent 1,500 leaks of radioactive materials and nuclear weapons-related information, including one case in 2006 when confidential data from Los Alamos National Laboratory landed in the hands of a drug dealing criminal group.

The Russian document was published 10 days after the U.S. State Department in a report on arms-control compliance said Russia had continued to violate provisions of the 1991 START-1 treaty up until the agreement expired in December.

U.S. Republicans used the report to rake up opposition to the new START nuclear arms reduction treaty the two countries signed in April and delay its ratification until after a crucial Senate elections in November.

While chief U.S. arms negotiator Rose Gottemoeller conceded that the U.S. complaints against Russia were “minor issues” which never rose to the status of alleged violations, Moscow said the facts in its report showed that Washington “has been committing numerous and often very gross breaches of ongoing agreements in the sphere of disarmament and non-proliferation”.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/article558072.ece>

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

Moscow Times – Russian Federation

Russia Accuses U.S. Of Loose Arms Control

08 August 2010

By Reuters

The Foreign Ministry accused the United States on Saturday of breaching its obligations over the nonproliferation of weapons, a sign of strained relations between the two powers.

The charge came after the New START arms control treaty between the United States and Russia suffered a setback last week when the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee delayed a ratification vote until mid-September.

The Russian military said it had successfully test-fired two ballistic missiles from the Barents Sea on Friday, Interfax reported, in another sign of muscle-flexing from Moscow.

The Foreign Ministry said on its web site that the United States had been in breach of several arms-related treaties including the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty and a treaty on conventional weapons.

"During the START I period, the United States failed to resolve Russia's concerns over how this treaty was being fulfilled," the ministry said, citing a long list of what it called irregularities, including a U.S. failure to provide information on ballistic missiles trials.

In Washington, the State Department dismissed the accusation. "We have met our obligations under START," a spokeswoman said.

The Foreign Ministry also accused the United States of preventing international supervision of its compliance with the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention.

The ministry also said secret information from the U.S. Los Alamos nuclear weapons laboratory had ended up in the hands of a drug dealing gang in 2006.

"The peculiarity of the incident was that, unlike in several other such cases when nuclear secrets were obtained by foreign intelligence services, now they were found by police with a criminal group connected to the drug trade," it said.

The ministry also said checks conducted by a U.S. government body last month revealed that several institutions dealing with viruses had failed to provide enough security measures to prevent an intruder from entering their facilities.

The Foreign Ministry also claimed that about 1,500 sources of ionizing radiation were lost in the United States between 1996 and 2001.

"In 2004, it was revealed that Pacific Gas and Electric Company lost three segments of wasted fuel rods, used at the Hamboldt Bay nuclear power station," it said in the 11-page report.

The document also castigates the United States for research into biological weapons and smallpox.

The accusations came despite warmer relations between the United States and Russia that paved the way for Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev to sign New START in April. Obama has cast the treaty, which commits the former Cold War foes to reducing deployed nuclear weapons by about 30 percent, as a first step toward his goal of a world without nuclear weapons.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/russia-accuses-us-of-loose-arms-control/411905.html>

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

Tehran Times – Iran

Saturday, August 7, 2010

Arab Majority Backs Nuclear Iran: Poll

By Staff & Agencies

According to a poll published recently by the Washington Times a vast majority of the Arab world has a positive view of a "nuclear armed Iran".

The new poll on this hypothetical situation shows that the percentage of the Arab world that thinks a nuclear-armed Iran would be good for the Middle East has doubled since last year and now makes up the majority.

Iran has repeatedly denied being in pursuit of nuclear arms. Being a member of the Non Proliferation Treaty, Iran's nuclear facilities are regularly monitored by IAEA inspectors and cameras. Most importantly the Leader of the Islamic Republic has declared development of nuclear arms as "haram" (forbidden according to sharia).

The survey was conducted by University of Maryland professor Shibley Telhami in conjunction with the polling firm Zogby International. According to the findings the percentage of respondents who positively view nuclear armed Iran doubled since last year.

The 2010 Arab Public Opinion Poll shows 57 percent of the interviewees believe that Iran's nuclear program aims to build a "bomb", but also view that goal positively. This figure nearly doubled the 29 percent polled in 2009.

The percentage of those who view an Iranian "nuclear bomb" negatively fell by more than half, from 46 percent to 21 percent.

Iran is an advocate of peace in the region and the world. In April Tehran hosted an international conference under the slogan of "nuclear energy for all, nuclear weapons for none."

According to the Washington Times report other polls conducted in the Muslim world reflected similar views. The poll also found rapidly diminishing support for U.S. President Barrack Obama in the Muslim world.

Obama's favorable ratings fell from 45 percent in 2009 to 20 percent this year, while the unfavorable rating nearly tripled, from 23 percent to 62 percent.

It was also reported that sixty-one percent of respondents cite the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as the issue with which they are most disappointed by the Obama administration, while 27 percent choose Iraq and 4 percent Afghanistan.

Telhami, who has been conducting the poll since 2003, made the study from June 19 to July 20, surveying 3,976 respondents from Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.). The large sample gives the poll a margin error of 1.6 percentage points.

http://www.tehrantimes.com/Index_view.asp?code=224312

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

US 'Open To Engagement' With Iran: Clinton

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

8 August 2010

WASHINGTON — US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said the United States remains 'open to engagement' with Iran amid tensions over its nuclear aims, according to an interview transcript released Sunday.

'We remain open to engagement. But they do know what they have to do. They have to reassure the international community by words and actions as to what their nuclear program is intended for,' she said in an interview with The New York Times.

'And so whether it would take six months, a year, or five years, it's that deep concern about Iran acquiring nuclear weapons that is the preoccupation of our friends and partners,' she said.

But Washington, she added, would pursue the sanctions path 'regardless of any issue of timing, because we think it's got the best potential for changing Iranian behavior.'

Clinton's comments were released by the State Department Sunday, a day after brief quotes from her 20-minute Times interview appeared in the newspaper.

Earlier this week, President Barack Obama cautiously welcomed the effects of new sanctions on Iran but said he remained willing to talk with Teheran about its nuclear program, in a meeting with a small group of journalists at the White House.

'It is very important to put before the Iranians a clear set of steps that we would consider sufficient to show that they are not pursuing nuclear weapons,' Obama said, according to The Washington Post.

'They should know what they can say 'yes' to.'

Reports said Obama left open the possibility that the United States would accept a deal allowing Iran to maintain its civilian nuclear program, so long as Teheran provides 'confidence-building measures' to verify that it is not building a bomb.

Clinton did not specifically address such a deal, but said Teheran had been provided a 'pathway' in order to 'demonstrate that they are not attempting to obtain nuclear weapons.'

The top US diplomat also said the sanctions packages 'surprised Iran by the scope and reach of what the international community was prepared to do on the pressure front,' and that the economic effects of the sanctions were 'beginning to bite.'

'We are hearing from many different sources around the world that this is having an impact on Iran's thinking, and they've undertaken dramatic diplomatic and commercial maneuvers to try to prevent the sanctions from being levied on them... and are falling short.'

The US-Iran nuclear showdown has proven to be one of the most intractable problems facing Obama in his 18 months in office, and top aides including Defense Secretary Robert Gates have consistently refused to rule out a possible US military strike on Iran.

But Clinton sought to downplay suggestions that the Obama administration may be drawing a line under the latest efforts to get Teheran to curtail its nuclear ambitions.

'The president's been very clear that Iran should understand that he is leaving all options on the table and that they should take him at his word, but I don't think it benefits our efforts to go much further than that.'

Earlier in the week, White House spokesman Robert Gibbs rebuffed a proposal from Iran's hardline President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad for face-to-face summit talks with Obama.

Ahmadinejad meanwhile urged Obama on Wednesday to join talks on a nuclear fuel swap deal, saying Teheran was ready to begin discussions.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/international/2010/August/international_August393.xml§ion=international

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

Denver Post

Iran Digging Graves For US Troops If They Attack

By ALI AKBAR DAREINI, Associated Press Writer

Tuesday, August 10, 2010

TEHRAN, Iran - Iran has dug mass graves in which to bury U.S. troops in case of any American attack on the country, a former commander of the elite Revolutionary Guard said.

The digging of the graves appears to be a show of bravado after the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Mike Mullen, said last week that the U.S. military has a contingency plan to attack Iran, although he thinks a military strike is probably a bad idea.

The U.S. and some of its allies accuse Iran of using its civilian nuclear program as a cover to build nuclear weapons. Iran has denied the charges, saying its nuclear program is geared merely toward generating electricity, not bomb.

Gen. Hossein Kan'ani Moghadam, who was the Guard's deputy commander during the 1980s, said graves have been dug in Iran's southwestern Khuzestan province, where Iran buried Iraqi soldiers killed during the ruinous 1980-88 war between the Islamic republic and Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein's regime.

"The mass graves that used to be for burying Saddam's soldiers have now been prepared again for U.S. soldiers, and this is the reason for digging this big number of graves," Moghadam told The Associated Press Television News late Monday. He did not say how many were prepared.

Footage obtained by APTN showed a large number of empty, freshly dug graves in a desert region of Khuzestan. The digging of the graves was first reported earlier this week by Iran's semiofficial news agency Fars.

Moghadam repeated warnings that Iran will retaliate against U.S. bases in the Gulf if there is an attack on Iran. The U.S. Navy's 5th Fleet headquarters is based just across the Gulf from Iran in Bahrain.

If U.S. forces attack, "Iran will have no choice but to strike the American bases in the region," he said. "The heavy costs of such a war will not be just on the Islamic Republic of Iran. America and other countries should accept that this would be the start of an extensive war in the region."

The war of words has intensified between Iran and the United States after the U.N. Security Council imposed a fourth round of tougher sanctions in June in response to Iran's refusal to halt uranium enrichment, a technology that can be used to produce nuclear fuel or material for an atomic bomb.

The U.S. and Israel have said military force could be used if diplomacy fails to stop what they suspect is an Iranian nuclear weapons program.

http://www.denverpost.com/rawnews/ci_15728798

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

BBC News – U.K.

August 10, 2010

Iran Increases Uranium Enrichment – IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Agency has said Iran has activated more equipment to enrich uranium more efficiently, violating UN resolutions.

The UN watchdog said a second set, or "cascade", of centrifuges was operating at the Natanz pilot fuel enrichment plant when inspectors visited in July.

The move to enrich uranium to 20% purity means Iran could quickly advance to making weapons-grade material.

The West believes Iran is seeking to build a nuclear bomb. Iran denies this.

The UN Security Council, the US and EU have each imposed sanctions on the Iranian authorities to force them to halt enrichment activities.

Power station

Iran has been producing low-enriched uranium (LEU) of about 3.5% purity for some time, and announced in February that it had begun enriching uranium to 20% to make fuel for its Tehran research reactor, which produces medical isotopes. A bomb would require at least 90%.

"The IAEA can confirm that on 17 July, when agency inspectors were at [Natanz], Iran was feeding nuclear material to the two interconnected 164-machine centrifuge cascades," spokeswoman Gill Tudor said.

Ms Tudor said the move was "contrary to UN Security Council resolutions affirming that Iran should suspend all enrichment-related activities".

The centrifuges spin uranium hexafluoride (UF₆) gas at high speeds to separate the fissile U-235 atoms from the denser U-238 atoms.

Experts say that using two interconnected cascades increases efficiency by allowing leftover LEU to be re-fed into the machines.

The IAEA said in a report in February that Iran had achieved enrichment levels of up to 19.8%, which added to its concerns about the "possible military dimensions" of its nuclear programme.

Experts say the technical leap required to get to 90% purity from 20% is relatively straightforward, because it becomes easier at higher levels. Going from the natural state of 0.7% purity to 20% takes 90% of the total energy required, they add.

Iran insists its nuclear programme is for entirely peaceful purposes.

Meanwhile, the head of the country's atomic energy organisation announced on Monday that its first nuclear power station at Bushehr would come on stream by September, after years of delays.

"The plant is undergoing the final sets of experiments for detection of any possible failure," Ali Akbar Salehi said. "The preliminary phase will be completed in less than two weeks and the plant will be ready to launch."

NUCLEAR FUEL CYCLE

- Mined uranium ore is purified and reconstituted into solid form known as yellowcake
- Yellowcake is chemically processed and converted into Uranium Hexafluoride gas
- Gas is fed through centrifuges, where its isotopes separate and process is repeated until uranium is enriched
- Low-level enriched uranium is used for nuclear fuel
- Highly enriched uranium can be used in nuclear weapons

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-10925381>

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

Korea Herald – South Korea

N. Korea May Conduct 3rd Nuclear Test: Defector

August 8, 2010

North Korea will not give up on its nuclear ambitions despite international sanctions, and may conduct its third nuclear test in the near future, a former senior North Korean official said in an interview Saturday.

"North Korea believes nuclear arms are its most important defensive tool, and the country will not abandon its nuclear ambitions," Hwang Jang-yop was quoted by local broadcaster KBS as saying.

Hwang is a former secretary of the ruling Workers' Party and the highest-ranking North Korean official to defect to South Korea.

The 87-year-old man is the author of North Korea's "juche" or self-reliance ideology that forms the backbone of the country's regime.

Hwang also said the communist state may conduct a nuclear test in defiance of international sanctions.

Earlier this week, the United States said it will carry out fresh sanctions on North Korea "in the next several weeks" that could lead to cutting companies or individuals involved in Pyongyang's illicit activities off the international financial system.

<http://www.koreaherald.com/national/Detail.jsp?newsMLId=20100808000002>

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

Mainichi Daily News – Japan

August 9, 2010

Kan Says He Wants To Mull Making 3 Non-Nuclear Principles Into Law

NAGASAKI (Kyodo) -- Prime Minister Naoto Kan said Monday in Nagasaki he wants to consider enshrining into law Japan's three non-nuclear principles of not possessing, producing or introducing nuclear weapons in the country's territory, which is currently a national policy.

"I would like to consider enshrining the principles into law," Kan, who was visiting Nagasaki to attend the memorial service for the 65th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of the city during World War II, told a news conference after the ceremony.

It is not clear whether Kan will have his way given significant opposition to the idea. Foreign Minister Katsuya Okada, for example, expressed earlier this year skepticism about making the three principles legally binding indefinitely.

About his view on nuclear deterrence, which he said is necessary in Hiroshima last Friday, when he visited the city for a memorial service marking the U.S. atomic bombing there in 1945, the prime minister said, "Regrettably we can not afford not to rely on nuclear deterrence because North Korea's nuclear development program is still under way," while adding, "I continue to feel strongly about nuclear disarmament."

Katsuki Masabayashi, head of a Nagasaki group of bereaved families of A-bomb victims, responded when he met with Kan the same day, saying "the prime minister's remark (about nuclear deterrence) sounds as though you affirmed the legitimacy of nuclear arms and they broke the hearts of the members" of his group, Masabayashi said.

In response, Kan said, "I'm thinking about how we can abolish the nuclear weapons human beings have already created. I believe that we have to change the world so that it no longer needs nuclear deterrence."

At the news conference, Kan also commented on Japan's planned civilian nuclear cooperation pact with India and said, "We will pay sufficient attention to the issue of nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation and step up our efforts to get India to sign the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty."

(Mainichi Japan)

<http://mdn.mainichi.jp/mdnnews/news/20100809p2g00m0dm047000c.html>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea
10 August 2010

N. Korea Threatens 'Real War' As Tension Heightens At Sea

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, Aug. 10 (Yonhap) -- Just a day after North Korea fired artillery shells into its waters near the border with South Korea, the communist state threatened Tuesday to use its nuclear deterrent to show "what a real war is like" if such action is necessary.

The Rodong Sinmun, the newspaper of the North's ruling Workers' Party, however, stressed in an editorial that the only way to defuse military tensions between Pyongyang and Seoul is to "create a peaceful atmosphere."

North Korea "will clearly show to those buoyed by war fever what a real war is like any time it deems necessary through a war of retaliation of its own style based on its nuclear deterrent," the paper said.

"The most urgent issue on the Korean Peninsula, where a touch-and-go situation prevails, is to create a peaceful atmosphere," it said in the editorial carried by the official Korean Central News Agency.

North Korea has threatened "powerful physical retaliation" against South Korea's large-scale anti-submarine exercises that ended Monday near their western sea border. Forty-six South Korean sailors died in the area in March when their corvette sank in what Seoul says was a torpedo attack by a North Korean submarine.

The two Koreas remain technically at war after their 1950-53 Korean War ended in a truce rather than a peace treaty. Further complicating their relations that have soured in recent years, a North Korean patrol boat on Sunday towed a South Korean fishing boat into a port on the east coast, prompting Seoul to urge the prompt release of the crew.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2010/08/10/54/0301000000AEN20100810005800315F.HTML>

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

Hindustan Times – Pakistan

'Russia Trained 4,000 Myanmar Nuclear Officers'

By Deutsche Presse-Agentur (DPA)
Friday, August 6, 2010

Russia has trained 4,185 Myanmar military officers in nuclear sciences over the past decade but only a "sprinkling" of scholars have pursued the positive uses of the energy source, a Myanmar academic said on Friday. Myanmar's nuclear ambitions have been a subject of concern in recent years after allegations by defectors that the pariah regime is keen to develop nuclear weapons in cooperation with North Korea.

Myanmar's ruling junta, however, claims that its nuclear ambitions are purely medical in nature.

Maung Zarni, a research fellow at the London School of Economics and Political Science, pointed out that only a handful of the Myanmar graduates who have studied nuclear-related technologies in Moscow had medical backgrounds, raising questions about the regime's claims of pursuing nuclear energy for medicinal reasons.

"Between 400 to 600 graduates are sent to Russia every year and out of those graduates only a sprinkling of officers have medical backgrounds," he told a seminar at Bangkok's Chulalongkorn University.

Zarni estimated that only five to 20 of the military graduates attending nuclear-related courses in Moscow since 2001 had medical backgrounds. He had compiled the list of 4,185 based on interviews with former graduates, he said.

"And if the nuclear programme is for medical purposes why isn't there any involvement by the Ministry of Health," Zarni noted.

He acknowledged that it was still difficult to prove whether Myanmar's military junta had acquired or developed nuclear weapons, but argued their intent to do so was pretty clear.

At this stage the junta might be more interested in using the threat of a potential nuclear arsenal as a "big stick" in diplomacy, he speculated.

"The fact that the US and other powers have not done anything substantive to rein in North Korea is because they have the bomb, so that's a role model for a lot of rogue states," Zarni said.

Myanmar has been under military rule since 1962.

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/Russia-trained-4-000-Myanmar-nuclear-officers/Article1-583149.aspx>

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

Charlotte Observer

US-Vietnam Nuke Deal Will Likely Allow Enrichment

By FOSTER KLUG, The Associated Press

Saturday, August 7, 2010

WASHINGTON -- The Obama administration has told U.S. lawmakers that a nuclear cooperation deal with Vietnam is unlikely to include a coveted promise by the Hanoi government not to enrich uranium, congressional aides say.

The United States had sought a no-enrichment pledge, which the State Department promotes as the "gold standard" for civilian nuclear cooperation accords.

It would have been modeled on a deal last year in which the United Arab Emirates pledged, in return for U.S. nuclear equipment and reactors, not to enrich uranium or extract plutonium from used reactor fuel - procedures that would provide material that could be used in a nuclear weapon.

The Obama administration has been eager to send a strong nonproliferation message, especially to Iran, which the United States and others accuse of covertly seeking nuclear weapons. Iran says its nuclear program is only for peaceful purposes, but it has resisted international pressure to stop enriching uranium.

A UAE-style deal with Vietnam could have been used by the United States to push other countries for similar commitments not to enrich uranium or reprocess spent fuel. Many countries, however, balk at what they consider an infringement on sovereignty. Countries that have signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty have the right to enrich uranium for civilian use on their own soil under safeguards.

Two congressional aides familiar with the discussions said the Obama administration has concluded that it is unlikely to persuade Vietnam to agree to a UAE-style no-enrichment pledge. The aides spoke on condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the negotiations. Another congressional aide, briefed by the administration, said the talks with Vietnam are in their final stages.

The Vietnam development was reported first by The Wall Street Journal.

State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley would not talk about specifics of the deal with Vietnam. He called the UAE nuclear accord the "gold standard" and noted that the UAE had decided "that it would forgo the right of enrichment that every country in the world has."

"We certainly want to see other countries make that same kind of decision," Crowley said.

Asked if the United States would agree to a deal that would allow Hanoi to keep its right to enrich, Crowley said: "If a country decides to pursue nuclear energy, and a country decides that it chooses to enrich on its own soil, then we would prospectively work with that country" to make sure its program would meet all international safeguards and work with the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Vuong Huu Tan, director of Vietnam Atomic Energy Institute, said that "Vietnam does not plan to enrich uranium, which is a very sensitive issue."

The United States and Vietnam signed an agreement in March meant to pave the way for U.S. companies to help build nuclear power plants. The countries are now negotiating a broader deal that would allow U.S. companies to enter Vietnam's nuclear power sector.

Vietnamese officials say they also have signed nuclear energy cooperation agreements with Russia, China, France, South Korea, India and Argentina.

Henry Sokolski, executive director of the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center think tank and a former Pentagon official, urged the White House to "step back and ask, 'Does it make sense to be peddling nuclear cooperation as a way to make and influence friends there?'"

"This deal gives double standards a bad name. They need to slow down," he said. "If you're going to do it, then don't lower your standards. What does that buy you? Nothing but trouble."

Associated Press writers Desmond Butler in Washington and Tran Van Minh in Hanoi contributed to this report.

<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2010/08/07/1607844/us-vietnam-nuke-deal-likely-to.html>

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

SpaceWar.com

Russia Plans Major Defense Budget Upgrade

By Staff Writers

August 6, 2010

Moscow (UPI) -- While Russia's 2011-2013 defense budget contains increases, Gen. Oleg Frolov has warned that these will be insufficient for the period up to 2020.

Frolov, who is acting head of armaments for the Russian Federation Ministry of Defense, made his observations in the Duma, Voenno-Promyshlennii Kurier reported on Thursday.

Frolov told the Duma that while the 2011-2020 state arms program, the most expensive in recent Russian history, will reach expenditures of \$436.4 billion, the Ministry of Defense believes that to fulfill its missions the actual amount need for the period is actually \$940 billion to \$1.2 trillion over the next decade.

According to Frolov, the Ministry of Defense's highest priorities during the next decade will be upgrading Russia's strategic triad together with the Air Force and Air Defense Forces. Accordingly, the army and navy during the next 10 years will have a lower priority, with ground and naval forces maintaining existing equipment in combat-ready condition while receiving with minimal deliveries of new equipment.

Under the Ministry of Defense priorities, Russia's Strategic Nuclear Forces will be re-equipped, with Strategic Missile Troops receiving the Topol-M and Yars complexes along with the possible addition of a new silo-based heavy missile whose development was announced last year. The aerial component of the nuclear triad will continue to deploy Tu-95MS and Tu-160 bombers as development continues on the Advanced Aviation Complex for Frontline Aviation. Over the course of the next decade the Naval Strategic Nuclear Forces are to be supplemented with eight Project 955 strategic SLBM submarines as further tests of the Bulava missile upgrade for them continue.

The Ministry of Defense's budget also includes funding for the period 2011-2020 to purchase 350 new combat aircraft for the Russian Air Force between 2011 and 2020 along with 400 new or upgraded helicopters by 2015, with the transport aviation fleet also being upgraded.

Under the proposed budget the Russian air force's Air Defense Troops will continue to receive Pantsir S-400 short range air defense missile systems while following final development S-500 and Vityaz will also be transferred to Air Defense Troops.

If the proposed budget is implemented then the Russian Navy over the next decade without an increase in appropriations will receive at most 12-15 corvette-frigate class surface ships, six-eight multirole nuclear and diesel submarines and an indeterminate number of combat vessels of other classes along with the possibility of four universal Mistral-type amphibious assault ships.

Mirroring trends worldwide, the reduction of Russian ground forces is a given in the new budget as few officers believe that Russia can expect a large-scale ground war on its borders.

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Russia_plans_major_defense_budget_upgrade_999.html

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia's Missile Forces Chief To Inspect Teikovo Division

10 August 2010

New commander of the Russian Strategic Missile Forces (SMF) will inspect on August 10-12 the rearmament of a missile division in central Russia with new mobile missile systems.

During his first inspection as Russia's missile forces chief, Lt. Gen. Sergei Karakayev will visit the 54th Strategic Missile Division in the town of Teikovo about 150 miles (240 km) northeast of Moscow.

The division, which had Topol (SS-25 Sickle) mobile ballistic missile systems on combat duty since 1988, has been recently rearmed with 18 Topol-M (SS-27 Stalin) mobile systems and at least three RS-24 mobile systems.

According to SMF, Topol-M and RS-24 missiles will be the mainstay of the ground-based component of Russia's nuclear triad and account for not less than 80% of the SMF's arsenal by 2016.

As of June 2010, the SMF operated at least 50 silo-based and 18 road-mobile Topol-M missile systems. The RS-24 was commissioned in 2010 after successful testing.

The Topol-M missile, with a range of about 7,000 miles (11,000 km), is said to be immune to any current and future U.S. ABM defense. It is capable of making evasive maneuvers to avoid a kill using terminal phase interceptors, and carries targeting countermeasures and decoys.

It is also shielded against radiation, electromagnetic pulse, nuclear blasts, and is designed to survive a hit from any form of laser technology.

The RS-24 is heavier than Topol-M, and was created in response to the missile shield that the United States was planning to deploy in Europe.

The missile, equipped with a multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle (MIRV) warhead, is expected to replace the older SS-18 and SS-19 missiles by 2050 and greatly strengthen the SMF's strike capability.

MOSCOW, August 10 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100810/160135352.html

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

Washington Post

Fidel Castro Warns Of Nuclear Risk In 1st Speech To Cuban Parliament In 4 years

By Will Weissert, Associated Press

Sunday, August 8, 2010

Page - A10

HAVANA -- A lively and healthy-looking Fidel Castro appealed to President Obama to stave off global nuclear war in an emphatic address to the Cuban parliament Saturday that marked his first official government appearance since emergency surgery four years ago.

Castro, who turns 84 in a week, arrived on the arm of a subordinate who steadied him as he walked. The nearly 600 lawmakers present sprang to their feet and applauded as he took the podium, grinning broadly and waving. "Long live Fidel!" they chanted.

Castro has been warning in opinion columns for months that the United States and Israel will launch a nuclear attack on Iran and that Washington could also target North Korea -- predicting Armageddon-like devastation.

"Eight weeks ago, I thought that the imminent danger of war didn't have a possible solution. So dramatic was the problem that I didn't see another way out," Castro told the National Assembly. "I am sure that it won't be like that and, instead . . . one man will make the decision alone, the president of the United States."

His address, along with a spate of recent appearances after a four-year absence from public view, is likely to raise more questions about how much of a leadership role he is ready to reassume.

The speech lasted barely 11 minutes -- possibly a record for the man who became famous for his hours-long discourses during his 49 years in power.

He took a seat after his speech and was briefly approached by his wife, Delia Soto del Valle. In the past, the couple rarely appeared in public together, but Soto has been seen with Castro more frequently of late.

It was Castro's first appearance in parliament or at a government act since shortly before a health crisis in July 2006 that forced him to cede power to his younger brother Raúl -- first temporarily and then permanently.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/07/AR2010080702549.html>

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

Desert News -- Salt Lake City

HAFB Criticized Again Over Handling Of Nuke-Related Items

Inspectors say base failed to account for more than 100 nuclear-related parts

Saturday, August 7, 2010

By Lee Davidson

CLEARFIELD — Hill Air Force Base is again facing criticism for the way it handles — or mishandles — materials used to arm, launch or release nuclear weapons.

This time, inspectors say the base failed to account for more than 100 nuclear-related parts in recent inventories — which could lead to undetected theft. The Air Force censored which items had been missed, but the unit involved handles nuclear missile maintenance.

Inspectors also said that when Hill officials found discrepancies in inventory data, they simply changed codes on forms without verifying actual conditions.

And the inspectors said some nuclear-weapons related items were stored in containers marked with codes for other parts, which could lead to shipping the wrong item.

That is according to Air Force Audit Agency reports written in January but just recently obtained by the Deseret News through a Freedom of Information Act request.

The problems come after an infamous mistake in 2008 when Hill sent nuclear missile parts (some warhead fuses) to Taiwan instead of the helicopter batteries that were ordered. The high-profile blunder cost the Air Force secretary and chief of staff their jobs, and 17 other generals and colonels were disciplined — including the commander at the time of Hill's Ogden Air Logistics Center.

That mistake, and other similar blunders, also led the Air Force to order a worldwide inventory of all such nuclear-weapons related materials in 2009 to resolve any problems and questions with inventories.

The Pentagon ordered auditors last year to review how well Hill's 526th Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Sustainment Group performed its part of that worldwide audit and how it is now overseeing "nuclear weapons related materials" stored or shipped through the base.

The Air Force Audit Agency wrote that the Hill unit "did not inventory all on-hand assets," "did not ensure inventory teams were properly appointed," "did not always validate inventory balances," and "assets were stored in reusable containers stenciled with outdated data that did not match the stored asset."

The report said that when Hill did its part of the 2009 worldwide inventory, it missed 107 "assets valued in excess of \$2.6 million." The report was partially censored and did not list exactly what type of nuclear weapons assets were involved. The Air Force said release of that data could harm national security.

It said the parts were missed because they were "undergoing aging and surveillance testing," and such items were not included in any inventory management system. It added that identifying and recording such assets would help the Air Force track them, "thus preventing loss or theft."

Auditors also wrote that the group commander "did not ensure inventory teams were properly appointed." None of the members were appointed in writing as required, and two-thirds did not have required rank or seniority. Also, none of the "verifying officers" met criteria for being "disinterested individuals" without conflicts of interest with their regular jobs.

Amid that, auditors said teams did not always validate inventories properly. For example, "One team member physically counted assets at five locations while the second team member validated the inventory balances without performing a physical count."

Also, the report said that when teams questioned data, such as a specific serial number, "the verifying officer directed count teams to change condition code data without properly validating the asset condition."

Even after Hill had been involved in the infamous shipping of missile parts instead of helicopter batteries, auditors found that some of the missile assets were stored in reusable containers marked with outdated data that did not match the item inside.

Auditors said local officers blamed the problems on confusing and insufficient guidance and training on how to conduct the inventory.

Auditors made several recommendations, all of which Hill agreed to accept.

Corrective steps included hiring a "positive inventory control facility manager" to help prevent future problems with inventory teams by improving training; rewriting procedures; rearranging warehousing to segregate the nuclear weapons related material by condition code; and instructing workers to be more vigilant in handling and tracking materials.

After looking at the unit's responses, auditors said the "actions planned and taken should correct the problem(s)."

Auditors also looked at how the 75th Air Base Wing at Hill handled similar materials and found fewer problems.

But auditors wrote that it also failed to properly appoint inventory teams. It also said that it failed to mark items to show inventory completion to ensure that multiple teams did not count the same item.

When contacted for comment, Hill issued the following statement: "Team Hill leadership is aware of the AFAA audit reports, have followed up with appropriate officials and are continuing to track the quality with which the base performs its nuclear sustainment mission. As with any thorough, knowledgeable inspection, the AFAA audits revealed areas that need improvement.

"Now that we know what those areas are, we are concentrating on improving them. Although none of the findings show compromises in safety, security and reliability of nuclear weapons sustainment, we continue to hone our training, processes and procedures to ensure we provide the best possible support. We are committed to meeting the highest standards of safety, security and reliability all the time."

Contributing: Jamshid Ghazi Askar

<http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700054456/HAFB-criticized-again-over-handling-of-nuke-related-items.html>

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

Vancouver Sun – Canada

WHO Declares End To Swine Flu Pandemic

By Sharon Kirkey, Postmedia News

August 10, 2010

The World Health Organization has declared an end to the swine flu pandemic.

The planet is no longer in Phase Six of pandemic epidemic alert, World Health Organization officials said Tuesday morning following a meeting of the International Health Regulations Emergency Committee meeting in Hong Kong.

WHO director-general Margaret Chan said the new H1N1 virus "has largely run its course."

"As we enter the post-pandemic period this does not mean H1N1 has gone away," she said.

Based on experience with past pandemics, the H1N1 human swine flu virus will behave like garden-variety flu, and will continue to circulate for some years to come, Chan said.

Canada and other countries began ratcheting down their H1N1 efforts in January but WHO held back on downgrading H1N1 until now.

Chan said WHO had a duty to monitor the global situation.

"All in all, now we are seeing clear signals and evidence pointing to the fact that the world . . . is now transitioning out of the pandemic into the post-pandemic period.

"There is no longer a dominance of the H1N1 virus that we saw last year."

Chan said the pandemic turned out to be far less than what was feared a little over a year ago. "This time around we have been aided by pure good luck," she said. "The virus did not mutate during the pandemic to a more lethal form. Widespread resistance to oseltamivir (Tamiflu) did not develop and the vaccine proved to be a good match with circulating viruses and showed an excellent safety profile."

The first cases of human swine flu were reported in Canada on April 26, 2009. Since then 426 H1N1 deaths have been reported in Canada, and nearly 9,000 hospitalizations.

The fall wave of the first flu pandemic in 41 years began in the first week of September, peaked in early November and tapered off by late January.

WHO urged continued vigilance during the post-pandemic period.

<http://www.vancouversun.com/news/declares+swine+pandemic/3380595/story.html>

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

What the Russian Papers Say – RIA Novosti

Vedomosti

OPINION

United States Is No Better

9 August 2010

Russia has accused the United States of violating START I treaty and blamed it for the 2008 armed conflict in South Ossetia.

On Saturday, the Russian Foreign Ministry made public a list of breaches committed by the United States in the non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, including violations of the 1990 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I). The publication follows the release on July 28 of a report by the U.S. State Department in which Russia is accused of violating START I and other agreements. The report has no basis in fact, the Ministry says.

When START I was in force, the United States neither informed nor relayed telemetric information to the Russian side on the flight tests of Trident-II submarine-launched ballistic missiles. The United States said the missiles belonged to the United Kingdom, which was under no treaty obligations; therefore, the basic parameters could not be monitored. The United States re-equipped five silo ICBM launchers into interceptor missile launchers without authorization and failed to supply proof that B-1 bombers converted to non-nuclear weapons could not be converted back.

The U.S. report criticized Russia for the unlawful presence of Russian troops in Moldova and Georgia. But the Foreign Ministry said that the United States sold 18,400 rifles and carbines to Georgia in 2008, as well as 40 heavy machine guns, in violation of the OSCE Document on Small Arms and Light Weapons. Therefore, it says, the United States "shares the responsibility" for the conflict.

Russia and the United States exchanged these mutual accusations on the non-fulfillment of START I as the New START Treaty signed in April was being prepared for ratification. The international committee of the upper house of Russia's parliament recommended the treaty be adopted in July. The relevant committee of the U.S. Senate postponed the vote until September.

The Foreign Ministry's move is a response to the State Department's report, whose publication is connected with the battle of the titans waged by Barack Obama administration for the ratification of the treaty, says analyst Fyodor Lukyanov. In their comments on the report, U.S. officials emphasized that the treaty violations were not critical, the analyst said, while discrepancies in the interpretation of treaties always occur.

The opponents of the New START Treaty in the U.S. Congress seek to present it as a document that is difficult to check and execute, and in this sense the Foreign Ministry's publication did not help the Obama administration, which wants it ratified. Instead it gives additional ammunition to the treaty's opponents, says Nikolai Zlobin, director of Russian and Asian programs at the Global Security Institute in Washington. The analyst believes the ratification procedure may be drawn out indefinitely.

<http://en.rian.ru/papers/20100809/160128299.html>

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

Global Security Newswire
OPINION/ANALYSIS

Attack On Iran Would Be “Disastrous,” Blix Says

Monday, August 9, 2010

By Lee Michael Katz

Special to *Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- If Iran continues its uranium enrichment activities it is “only a question of time” before the longtime U.S. antagonist has enough material for nuclear weapons, according to former International Atomic Energy Agency chief Hans Blix (see *GSN*, Aug. 5).

However, Blix warned that the aftermath of any Israeli or U.S. attack on suspected Iranian nuclear weapons program facilities “could be absolutely disastrous.”

Blix has long been one of the best known names in the international field of disarmament and nonproliferation. The former Swedish diplomat has held top worldwide posts in dealing with weapons of mass destruction for the past 30 years.

He led the U.N. nuclear watchdog from 1981 to 1997. Later, Blix served as executive chairman of the U.N. Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission (UNMOVIC) that looked into whether Saddam Hussein’s regime in Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (see *GSN*, July 27).

Blix subsequently headed the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission in Stockholm, an international body established by the Swedish government “to present realistic proposals aimed at the greatest possible reduction of the dangers of weapons of mass destruction.”

In the lengthy interview with *Global Security Newswire*, Blix talked about today’s critical nuclear issues, including when Iran could have nuclear weapons and the state of North Korea’s own arms program. In the edited

excerpts below, Blix also offered his insights on how the world sees Obama administration nuclear policies, potential nuclear weapons programs from Syria to Burma, the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, the proliferation of nuclear power programs and the future of disarmament.

Q: CIA Director Leon Panetta recently said Iran could have nuclear weapons within two years and already has enough low-enriched uranium to make two nuclear weapons (see *GSN*, June 28). Do you agree with that?

Blix: We know they are developing an industrial-scale enrichment capability and within some time, whether it's two or three or four [years], they would be able to have enough high-enriched uranium to make several bombs. Once the centrifuges spin, well, then it's a question of time.

It maybe changes the urgency, but it doesn't change the basic question: Can the world induce Iran to go away from a weapons option? Or even from industrial-scale enrichment?

Q: So far, those efforts have not gone well. Realistically, do you expect Iran will abandon its suspected nuclear weapons program? Or do you think it will eventually become like North Korea, now regarded in some circles as a nuclear power?

Blix: I was head of the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission, which as an international one, discussed what to do with proliferation in general. We agreed you must look to what are the motivations of states that may be going for a weapon? And then try to see if you can meet the interests they seek through weapons in another way.

The U.S. is the only country in connection with Iran that has not diplomatic relations, but has rather, especially during the Bush administration, kept a very haughty attitude and says, "We will talk to you when you behave."

Q: Do you think the Obama administration would establish diplomatic relations with Iran?

Blix: Yes. The Obama administration has two chips here that could be used in further negotiations. One being assuring Iran about security and the other assuring them that, yes, they will be part of the diplomatic community through U.S. diplomatic relations. The third element is a question of assurance of supply of fuel for their reactor program.

Q: The U.N. Security Council recently issued new sanctions against Iran. The United States and Western allies also imposed their own sanctions. Do you think sanctions, a major part of U.S. strategy, will work?

Blix: There are many chips on the table, incentives and disincentives. Security guarantees would be an incentive. If you talk about sanctions, well, these are disincentives for them to continue on their present course. And they may contribute. I don't think in themselves, they will lead to the results. Sanctions, sometimes in history, have had big effect, as in Iraq in 2001. Maybe in Libya they had some effects as well. [Libyan leader Muammar Qadhafi] went along with negotiations with the U.K. and the U.S. in abandoning the nuclear program. And the long period of sanctions against Libya had an effect on him (see *GSN*, April 27).

Q: What do you see as the prospects and consequences of an attack on suspected Iranian nuclear weapons production facilities by the United States or, seemingly more likely, Israel?

Blix: Like most people, including [Chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff Adm. Michael] Mullen, I think that if Iran were not determined before to go for nuclear weapons, any attack from the outside would lead them to such a determination. And so, the effect could be a temporary one.

They certainly have the drawings. They have a lot of accumulated know-how. So, there could be a postponement, a time delay, but nothing else. And that's on the gain side.

On the other side, I think the consequences of a military action could be absolutely disastrous in many respects.

In the Middle East, Iran is not going to just sit and take it, but they're going to take countermeasures, and they could be very disastrous.

Q: There have long been calls in the U.N. and Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty review conferences for a nuclear weapon-free zone in the Middle East. What does the U.S. agreement this year in going along with the review conference consensus and not blocking the issue mean? (see *GSN*, June 10)

Blix: Well, it says the U.S. is not trying to block preparations for a conference in 2012, but there's no guarantee that the conference will come about. They are not putting any obstacles in its way. But it's for 2012, and many things can happen before that. The Israelis might change their mind. The Americans might change their mind. Or it may be blocked.

When I was at the IAEA, the concept of a nuclear-free zone was discussed. Of course, Iran may have a full-scale enrichment and not any bombs. But the concerns are ... possible proliferation effects that others in the region would also go for enrichment, like Egypt, who is the most advanced of them. So, a zone in the Middle East, including Iran and Israel, would have to aim not only at the elimination and absence of weapons, but also of facilities to enrich uranium and to reprocess uranium to make plutonium.

Of course, that is not an idea that will fly in today's political climate. But I don't think you can have peace without a zone. There is nothing absurd about discussing the elements of such a zone as you discuss the peace process.

Q: What sort of job do you think new director general, Yukiya Amano, is doing at the IAEA?

Blix: I think he is continuing the course that has been traditional for the agency of a professional watchdog. And I trust he is also watching the independence of the organization, which is vital. The inspectors are watchdogs. They are not police dogs. They cannot stop someone from doing something. They can bark, but not bite.

They can bark and thereby alert the masters, and the masters are the Board of Governors and the member states. And for barking, they need to have a good sniffing ability. That has improved over the years, very much with help from the U.S. The whole technique of environmental sampling was developed in the United States and came to be used during the inspections in Iraq in the 1990s. And the U.S. has been very, very helpful in developing the safeguard program.

At the same time, it is very important that the U.S. and other great powers respect the independence of the IAEA. Because if states that are inspected feel that the inspectors are sort of a prolonged arm of the CIA or anyone else, they will not be as cooperative. So, this independent position is a very valuable one. ... In my relations with the U.S. in 2000 to 2003 [while Blix led UNMOVIC], I don't think they questioned our independence that much. They were disappointed or even angry that we didn't find anything [in Iraq]. But I didn't feel sort of intimidated at any time.

Q: Does the IAEA need to be more aggressive in Syria, which has blocked inspections of a suspected nuclear reactor site bombed by Israel? (see *GSN*, Aug. 4)

Blix: They have said ... that they would want to have more explanations from Syria. And they have not been given that so far, I guess. I'd assume that they've maintained the pressure on Syria. It would be [desirable] that everybody contributes to the knowledge of it, including Israel and the United States.

Q: What is the feeling in general on the prospects for global nuclear disarmament right now?

Blix: I feel a lot more optimistic today than I did in 2008. It has very much to do with Obama's visions and his ambitions. At the end of the Bush administration, we were heading into a new cold war with Russia. The atmosphere was really very bad. And Obama has succeeded in getting an opening towards détente and disarmament. ...

You have the [New] START agreement. And it didn't come about in eight of these [Bush administration] years. It had a result, which is modest, but nevertheless the springboard for things that are more difficult (see *GSN*, Aug. 5). Then the Obama administration also took steps to defreeze the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva.

The conference on security that Obama arranged this spring dealt with a fairly limited but nevertheless significant point: namely ... that fissionable material everywhere be under good control, that there be no longer traffic in it. It maybe was good to get the attention at the highest level everywhere for that. And there was the NPT conference that is also modest progress in substance. ...

Then you had the Nuclear Posture Review, in which the U.S. declared that they would not make any new nuclear weapons. ... They also moved a little forward on the security guarantees to non-nuclear weapons states. You had the national security doctrine that came in recently and also indicated intention to seek less reliance on nuclear weapons.

Q: There's been some talk of withdrawing U.S. nuclear weapons from Europe. Do you think that could happen? (see *GSN*, May 21)

Blix: They should withdraw them. From what I read, they really have no military significance. There was some memorandum in Washington that showed that it would take, what, two months to get an agreement on any use of them, rather than 20 minutes. But I think generally they have no military use any longer.

Q: Is there still tension between nuclear weapons states and those that don't have nuclear weapons? A feeling the Obama administration still hasn't done enough?

Blix: Yes, of course there is. There is a feeling the non-nuclear weapons states have refrained from making nuclear weapons, with the famous exceptions of Iraq and North Korea. And they feel that although the number of nuclear weapons has gone down from some 55,000 during the Cold War to something like 25,000 now, this is mainly for economic reasons. They'd expect the nuclear weapons states to go much further and much more quickly.

Sure, there remains an impatience, but now there's a favorable view of the U.S. and the expectation that the nuclear weapons states will actually move, which did not exist in 2005.

Q: It seems that the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty is not coming to a vote in the very near future... (see *GSN*, May 26).

Blix: The obstacles lie mainly very much inside the U.S. Congress. Obama cannot today get the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It's ratified by Russia, by France, by the U.K. But the U.S. Congress is, I think, more cautious and holding back and saying "the world is dangerous, we have to have an effective deterrent."

Q: What would it mean if the U.S. did ratify CTBT?

Blix: In the first place, we could expect that China would ratify it, and there would also be good opportunities, chances to get Pakistan and India to come along. And ... Israel, Iran. The only case I would wonder about would be the North Koreans. They are not party to that, and they would probably exact some price for it, or else some way would be found around it if North Korea refuses to ratify it.

So, the gain for the U.S.: much less likelihood that anyone would test a weapon in the future.

Q: You testified in the United Kingdom about the war in Iraq. Do you think the Blair administration ignored your comments on weapons of mass destruction in Iraq?

Blix: We never said that there was nothing in Iraq. We said that we had carried out 700 inspections in 500 different sites and we had not found anything. But there were many, many question marks, many open issues which we listed. And the U.S. and the U.K. preferred to rely on their own intelligence, which was defective and faulty.

Q: Why is it important to talk about this now?

Blix: Well, it's important because the IAEA inspections are paid by the world community. Why in the hell do they invest in them ... if they will almost automatically believe in their own intelligence, rather than in the inspection?

Q: Do you think North Korea is going to grow into a real nuclear weapons power like China? (see *GSN*, Aug. 5)

Blix: They have presumably a limited quantity of plutonium available at the present time. ... The more bombs they test and explode, they would consume part of the plutonium supply they have. But yes, it's a problem. North Korea is an urgent problem.

Q: In Burma, or Myanmar, there have been mysterious hints of a nuclear weapons program. And they're like North Korea in terms of international pariahs. Are you concerned about Burma's nuclear plans? (see *GSN*, July 22)

Blix: There are conflicting reports about Burma. And to my knowledge, Burma has a very rudimentary nuclear program for medical purposes and nonpower purposes. I'm not aware that they're planning for any nuclear power plant at the moment. So, they are at a very early stage. It may well be that there's been connections with North Korea. As you said, both are regarded as pariah states -- and there may be first contact there. It's quite plausible to me. But they are in any case very, very far away from the military applications.

We're all concerned about the country of Myanmar, the regime they have, and the way that they treat their own people. So, it's certainly a country where you want to keep your eyes on it.

Q: Are you worried about the explosion, if you will, of civilian nuclear power programs around the world?

Blix: No. I think it is desirable to have this expansion. The bigger part of the expansion is going to take place in big countries that already have nuclear weapons. China has a very fast expansion. In India there is another fast expansion; [also the] U.S., U.K., Russia.

Iran and other countries in the Middle East, for them, I think that it would be desirable to come to a zonal agreement that would exclude both reprocessing and enrichment. Because this is a volatile area and going into fuel cycle activities would raise concerns.

The commercial market probably will for most countries exclude the interest in enrichment. But in the Middle East and on the Korean Peninsula, I think it would be desirable to have zonal agreements that exclude it.

Q: What made you decide this year to chair the international advisory board of the United Arab Emirates' nuclear program? Are you concerned people will perceive your name is being used in the Abu Dhabi capital to give it an imprimatur, to deflect any criticism?

Blix: I am convinced by the arguments Abu Dhabi has for going for nuclear. They feel that rather than using their oil to generate electricity, they will generate by nuclear power and sell the oil. In fact, the same argument as Iran has and I think it is a valid one. Other oil states will do the same thing. No one criticizes Mexico for going for nuclear, although they, too, have lots of oil. And Russia [was] also not criticized for going for nuclear and selling their oil. I think Abu Dhabi has also taken a great many steps to convince the region and the world that they have first-class nonproliferation credentials.

Q: Are you worried about proliferation? Your own WMD commission said measures must be taken to ensure the expected expansion of nuclear power does not increase the risk of fissile material being diverted to weapons.

Blix: Well, acceptance of [the IAEA] Additional Protocol is an important means to give assurance that there is no diversion of fissionable material. Under the Additional Protocol, they can go to places. They can ask for many more pieces of information, and therefore, it is much stronger as a confidence-building measure. But in terms of nonproliferation, a safeguard does not, per se, prevent a proliferator.

...In a big country like Iran or Iraq, you cannot guarantee that there are not hidden prototypes and centrifuges or installations hidden in some caves somewhere.

And prevention comes from other factors. The most important one being foreign policy and security to give assurance to countries that they do not need nuclear weapons.

The Russians developed nuclear weapons because the U.S. had. And the Chinese developed them because the Russians and the U.S. had. India developed because the Chinese had them, and Pakistan, et cetera, and Israel because of the fear of the Arabs. And if you pursue a policy of détente in the world, as we had the chance to do after the collapse of the Soviet empire, this is the most important thing you can do to prevent proliferation.

Q: President Obama said that he could envision a world without nuclear weapons, but perhaps might not see it in his own lifetime. What would you like to see done in your lifetime?

Blix: I'm not going to ridicule the target of doing away with nuclear weapons in the world. Look, between 1910 and 1950, we had two world wars and one collapsed world organization.

Now, don't you think that a lot of things can happen between 2010 and 2050? There's a long period ahead, and I don't despair. Who will say it's ridiculous to think that we couldn't do away with nuclear weapons? However, that to me is not the big issue today. Which are the next steps we take? That's where the political discussion and the differences are.

What do I expect within my lifetime? I am 82 now (laughs). So, it's the next few years. I would like to see START ratified. It would be terrible if they did not ratify it. I would like to see the Comprehensive Test Ban ratified by the U.S. and China and by the others. I would like to see a cutoff agreement on the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

I would like to see the general acceptance of IAEA Additional Protocols. A New START agreement follow-up that reduces nuclear weapons. And I would like to see the other nuclear weapons states also joining in the process at some stage. India will not do away with their weapons before you see very strong measures to reduce them in the other nuclear weapons states. But I think they will come along.

[Also] that a U.S.-Russia agreement on nuclear cooperation comes about. It's not going to be an easy process. I'm not saying that. But the world was heading toward a new cold war, and it is no longer ...A clear contrast to the Bush administration's attitude when they ridiculed any idea of asking the Security Council for a "permission slip."

There is an element of optimism that the world can steer a different course under Obama.

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100806_8704.php

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

Daily NK – South Korea
ANALYSIS

The Murky World Of Iran-North Korea Relations

BY KIM YONG HUN
AUGUST 10, 2010

Suspicious about the scale and nature of connections between the North Korean and Iranian nuclear programs are growing again.

Washington sees the two nuclear issues as connected, believing there is a high probability that Iran and North Korea are sharing not only missile technology but also Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) technology as well, and has requested that the South Korean government participate in future Iran sanctions.

If Iran's uranium enrichment technology were to succeed and be transferred to North Korea, the U.S. would be facing a worst case scenario of having to deal with North Korean plutonium and uranium-based nuclear weapons. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) already announced back in May that it believes Iran has produced a minimum of 5.7kg of highly enriched uranium.

U.S. Deputy Assistant Treasury Secretary Daniel Glaser, visiting South Korea on August 2nd to discuss both Iran and North Korea, commented that "the two are bound to be linked."

Similarly, a ranking source within the South Korean government recently stated, "When North Korea exported missile technology to Iran, it is possible that Iran might have exported uranium enrichment technology to North Korea." On the same note, Kim Young Sun, a spokesperson for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade added on August 7th, "We are watching with concern the possibility that North Korea and Iran might be cooperating on WMD."

North Korea claims to be making progress with its HEU program, and North Korea experts believe there is a high possibility of Pyongyang having a HEU program since centrifugal separators, which are used to enrich uranium, are small, making them easy to conceal, and also since enrichment facilities can be widely dispersed.

Kim Tae Young, South Korean Minister of National Defense, stated in March that North Korea has acquired 30~40 kg of plutonium and is proceeding with its HEU program.

There are several nations which have uranium enrichment technology, however, only Pakistan and Iran are likely to transfer or share the technology with the Kim Jong Il regime. Especially, Iran and North Korea already actively cooperate militarily in the missile development field, having concluded an agreement for the development of ballistic missiles in 1983, meaning there is a high possibility of both nations sharing technology related to nuclear weapons as well.

Since the 1970s, North Korea has been improving the Scud missiles it originally imported from the Soviet Union, including the Rodong-2, a product similar to which is produced in Iran, while North Korea's 'Yeono' class submarine, which was probably used in the Cheonan sinking, is of the same design as Iran's 'Ghadir' class.

In addition, while North Korea allegedly imported 20 centrifugal separators for uranium enrichment from Pakistan in the 1990s, in order to enrich uranium to weapons grade, thousands of centrifugal separators are required. Therefore, there is a good chance that North Korea has been cooperating with Iran to advance its nuclear program.

Sankei Shimbun of Japan reported in 2004 that North Korea and Iran were planning to construct a joint centrifugal separator production facility in North Korea to develop enriched uranium nuclear weapons, though this has not been verified.

For its part, Iran still denies the nuclear connection with North Korea. Mohamed Reza Bakhitiri, the Iranian Ambassador to South Korea, told Yonhap News on August 9th, "We are conducting our own nuclear activities, without sharing them with anyone. There is a normal bilateral relationship between Iran and North Korea; however, there is no special cooperation related to either nuclear or missile issues."

However, experts see a high possibility of North Korea's HEU technology having reached a certain level and then, in the absence of appropriate enrichment facilities, their having cooperated with Iran to successfully go forward.

Cha Du Hyun, a researcher with Korea Institute for Defense Analysis commented during an interview with The Daily NK, "The origin of Iran's uranium enrichment technology is Pakistan, and since North Korea has imported centrifugal separators from them, we can see that the Iran-Pakistan-North Korea link already exists. Iran is working with the uranium enrichment method, and since North Korea has also announced that it is running a uranium enrichment program, there is a good possibility of a North Korea-Iran nuclear connection."

Additionally, he added, "Western countries are unwilling to transfer uranium enrichment technology to North Korea, so there is a good probability of North Korea and Iran having a mutual support relationship for the purpose of sharing those technologies the other lacks."

Especially, he pointed out, "Since North Korea has a certain level of technology related to centrifugal separators for uranium enrichment, there is a possibility that North Korea might have been the one which transferred the technology to Iran, and that North Korea imports the raw material for the centrifugal separators from Iran."

Song Dae Sung, President of the Sejong Institute, agreed that the possibility is real, saying, "Before UN Security Council Resolution 1718 and 1874, the surveillance system surrounding North Korea was imperfect, and therefore

there is a fair possibility of North Korea and Iran having cooperated on uranium enrichment technology in addition to the missile trade."

<http://www.dailynk.com/english/read.php?cataId=nk00400&num=6675>

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