



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 835, 17 August 2010

Articles & Other Documents:

[The New START's Categories Of Data Pertaining To Strategic Offensive Arms](#)

[START Expiration Ends U.S. Inspection Of Russian Nuclear Bases](#)

[Russia To Load Fuel For Iranian Reactor](#)

['Iran Opts To Proceed With Enrichment'](#)

[Nuclear Inspection Of Israel Sought](#)

[Iran To Begin Work On New Uranium Plant In 2011](#)

[Iranian Gov't Obligated To Push Ahead With 20 Pct Uranium Enrichment](#)

[France Voices Concern Over Iran's Uranium Enrichment Facility Plans](#)

[Attack Is 'International Crime'](#)

['Obama Won't Hit Iranian Reactor'](#)

[Committee To Urge President Lee To Switch To 'Active Deterrence'](#)

[China's Nuclear Arsenal Limited To Lowest Levels: Top General](#)

[China Strengthens Strategic Capability, Report Says](#)

[China Deploys New CSS-5 Missiles On Border With India](#)

[Former Military Chiefs Call On Treasury To Fund Trident Replacement](#)

[Nick Clegg: Troops Should Take Priority Over Trident](#)

[Air Force Seeks New Nuclear Command-and-Control Terminals](#)

[Airborne Laser Set For Second Antimissile Test Tonight](#)

[Obama Points To "Pathway" For Iran](#)

[Iran's N-Plant](#)

[Stop The Sino-Pak Nuclear Pact](#)

[John Kerry: Approving The New START Treaty Keeps America Safe](#)

[Jim DeMint: The New START Treaty Weakens U.S. National Security](#)

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.

The New START's Categories Of Data Pertaining To Strategic Offensive Arms

BUREAU OF VERIFICATION, COMPLIANCE, AND IMPLEMENTATION

Fact Sheet

August 13, 2010

Key Point: The New START obligates the Parties to exchange a large amount and variety of data on their respective strategic nuclear forces. This extensive database, which will be comprehensively updated every six months throughout the life of the Treaty, will give each side substantial insight into what is going on with the other's strategic forces.

- Part Two of the Protocol to the New START sets out the categories of data that each Party will be obligated to provide pertaining to its strategic offensive arms.
 - The database will be initially populated with data no later than 45 days after the Treaty enters into force and will be updated via periodic data declarations every six months thereafter.
 - Until the Treaty is ratified and enters into force, we will not receive any new data. The last time we received data on the Russian strategic forces was under the START in July 2009.
- Examples of the specific information required to be provided includes data on:
 - Numbers, locations, and unique identifiers for deployed and non-deployed ICBMs, deployed and non-deployed SLBMs, and deployed and non-deployed heavy bombers;
 - Numbers of warheads, aggregated by operating base, emplaced on deployed ICBMs and on deployed SLBMs, and nuclear warheads counted for deployed heavy bombers;
 - Numbers and locations of deployed and non-deployed launchers of ICBMs, and deployed and non-deployed launchers of SLBMs;
 - Operating bases; production, storage, repair, elimination, and space launch facilities; and test ranges where strategic offensive arms may be located; and
 - Categories for technical characteristics for ballistic missiles systems as well as categories for distinguishing features for heavy bombers.
- The semiannual data declarations will contain certain information that was not provided under START. Specifically, the Parties will be obligated to provide the total number of warheads emplaced on deployed ICBMs and SLBMs based at each ICBM base and submarine base, respectively, as well as the total number of nuclear warheads counted for deployed heavy bombers at each air base.
- The Parties must also notify the change in status between deployed and non-deployed status for ICBMs and SLBMs (when missiles are placed in or removed from launchers) and nuclear-capable heavy bombers as well as the specific location or geographic region for heavy bombers away from their bases inside or outside national territory, respectively.
- An important innovation is the inclusion for each ICBM, SLBM, and heavy bomber of an alpha-numeric unique identifier (UID) in the applicable notifications, periodic data declarations, and briefings presented prior to inspections.
 - Inspectors will have the right to confirm UIDs during inspections.
 - Under the previous START, only mobile ICBMs had such UIDs.
- Due to the presence of UIDs on each ICBM, SLBM, and heavy bomber, data declarations, and on-site inspections, combined with the New START's extensive notifications regime of 43 notifications that are exchanged electronically through each Party's Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers, the United States will have a "cradle to grave" track of the location and status of Russian strategic offensive arms. The life cycles include when they arrive at their operating base, movement between facilities, changes in deployment status, maintenance or storage, and eventual conversion or elimination.

- For example, 48 hours in advance of a solid-fueled ICBM leaving its production facility, the United States will receive a notification of the planned movement, including the missile's UID. Such a notification was not required under the START. We will also receive a notification of the date of arrival and location of the missile within five days of its arrival at a declared facility. Any subsequent movements, e.g., to a storage, repair, or elimination facility, will require similar notifications.
- The Treaty also requires each Party to exchange information about facilities, known as site diagrams. These site diagrams were exchanged in May 2010, as required by the Treaty. The list of inspectable and non-inspectable facilities will be provided as part of the initial data exchange after the Treaty enters into force.
- Information provided through the periodic data exchanges and notifications will be validated not only by on-site inspections but also by U.S. national technical means, such as observation satellites, and other means of verification.
- Under the New START, an ICBM or SLBM is considered deployed only if it is placed in or on a launcher. If it is removed from its launcher, it becomes non-deployed.

<http://www.state.gov/t/vci/rls/145975.htm>

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

Washington Post

START Expiration Ends U.S. Inspection Of Russian Nuclear Bases

By Mary Beth Sheridan, Washington Post Staff Writer

Tuesday, August 17, 2010

Page - A01

For the first time in 15 years, U.S. officials have lost their ability to inspect Russian long-range nuclear bases, where they had become accustomed to peering into missile silos, counting warheads and whipping out tape measures to size up rockets.

The inspections had occurred every few weeks under the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty. But when START expired in December, the checks stopped.

Meanwhile, in an obscure, fluorescent-lighted State Department office staffed round-the-clock, a stream of messages from Russia about routine movements of its nuclear missiles and bombers has slowed to a trickle.

The Obama administration hopes the inspections and messages will soon resume under the New START agreement, which was signed by the two countries in April. But the pact is on hold in the Senate. If it faces long delays, or is voted down, the U.S. government will lose critical insight into Russia's nuclear forces, officials say.

"The problem of the breakdown of our verification, which lapsed December 5, is very serious and impacts our national security," Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.), one of the chamber's top nuclear experts, said in a recent hearing.

In months of debate over New START, there has been little focus on the implications of the lapse in nuclear checks. Instead, hearings have centered on such issues as whether the pact would inhibit U.S. missile defense.

"I thought we were just going to continue doing business as usual" as the replacement treaty was debated, Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) said when a reporter noted the inspection cutoff.

The Obama administration has emphasized that New START will require the United States and Russia to reduce their nuclear arsenals. But many experts say the verification measures matter even more.

That's not because they think a nuclear attack is imminent. But even two decades after the end of the Cold War, Russia has about 2,500 deployed nukes capable of hitting the United States. U.S. officials like to keep an eye on them.

"Without the [new] treaty and its verification measures, the United States would have much less insight into Russian strategic forces, thereby requiring our military to plan based on worst-case assumptions," Jim Miller, a senior nuclear policy official in the Pentagon, testified last month. "This would be an expensive and potentially destabilizing approach."

Kyl and other Republicans say that before voting on a pact that reduces the nation's stockpiles, they want to ensure there is enough money to modernize the nuclear complex. They say they should not rush the treaty because the monitoring measures have expired.

"It's not an argument for voting before you know all the facts," said Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.).

For the Cold Warriors who plodded through arms-control talks back in the 1980s, getting inspectors onto the other guy's bases was a major breakthrough.

"It was the holy grail to get on-site inspections, boots on the ground in the Soviet Union," said Franklin Miller, who worked in arms control for more than two decades, ending up as special assistant to President George W. Bush.

Even without those inspections, the U.S. and Russian governments can still check on each other's forces by using reconnaissance satellites and radar. But those methods are not perfect.

For example, a satellite cannot peer into a Russian underground silo and see whether the missile inside is carrying one nuclear bomb or 10, officials say.

"One of our dirty little secrets is, when the [Berlin] Wall went down, the United States reoriented a lot of intelligence capacity away from the Soviet Union and Russia. To some fair degree . . . the IC [intelligence community] was relying on U.S. inspectors to be on the ground," Miller said.

The "boots on the ground" include people such as Phil Smith, a former Air Force crew chief for nuclear-tipped missiles. He has made about 20 inspection visits to Russian nuclear facilities.

"We have 15 years of experience under START, understanding where everything is. We've been through these sites multiple times," he said in an interview.

The U.S. teams typically arrive at Russian bases with only about a day's notice. Many of the inspectors' methods are surprisingly low-tech: They stretch tape measures along missiles and poke flashlights into trailers. The inspections allow each side to count nuclear weapons on a sampling of missiles, bombers or submarine launch tubes and look around one another's maintenance facilities and test ranges.

"If something is atypical . . . I will not be bashful about saying, 'Okay, we need to take a closer look at this one.' That's the kind of dynamic you have on the ground that you wouldn't have with a satellite," Smith said.

Inspectors check what they see against a database compiled by both sides with the numbers, characteristics and locations of their long-range nuclear weapons.

Until December, both sides updated that database constantly. Russia sent about 1,500 notifications a year to a special computer at the State Department's Nuclear Risk Reduction Center, where a "ding-dong" would signal an incoming message. ("It sounds like Avon calling," explained one technician.)

The messages, which the center distributed to U.S. security agencies, included information on upcoming inspections, the destruction of nuclear launchers and movement of nuclear-capable missiles and bombers.

"Now we don't get any of that information. We have less and less visibility into their status of forces," said Ned Williams, the director of the center. (Notifications of missile test launches have continued, to ensure that neither side mistakenly thinks a nuclear attack is underway.)

Few experts dispute the value of having inspections. But some critics have argued that New START is not as good as its predecessor.

The Obama administration "agreed to gut the monitoring and verification measures and limitations necessary to render it effectively verifiable," said Paula DeSutter, the assistant secretary of state for verification in the George W. Bush administration.

For example, she said, the Obama administration acquiesced to a Russian demand to exchange less telemetry -- the flight data from ballistic missile tests. That information helps U.S. officials understand the number of warheads the Russians will load onto their missiles. Under New START, the Russians are required to provide the data from only five tests, instead of all 10 or 12 they do annually.

U.S. officials say the change is not significant because, under the new treaty, they will be counting the number of warheads on missiles and not using estimates, as was the case before. They contend that the new treaty will help each side get a more accurate count by assigning an ID number to each warhead and launcher.

Although U.S. nuclear inspectors are not traveling to Russia these days, they are busy training, sometimes with mock "Russian" inspectors.

The idea, Smith said, is "to make sure when we're called upon to do this, we're ready to go."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/16/AR2010081605422.html>

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

Washington Post

Russia To Load Fuel For Iranian Reactor

By Vladimir Isachenkov, *Associated Press*

Saturday, August 14, 2010

Page - A06

MOSCOW -- Russia will load fuel into Iran's first nuclear power plant next week despite U.S. demands that Iran be prevented from obtaining nuclear energy until it proves it is not pursuing a weapons capacity, Russian and Iranian officials said Friday.

Uranium fuel shipped by Russia will be loaded into the Bushehr reactor Aug. 21, beginning a start-up process that will last about a month and end with the reactor sending electricity to Iranian cities, officials said.

"From that moment, the Bushehr plant will be officially considered a nuclear-energy installation," said Sergei Novikov, a spokesman for Russia's nuclear agency.

Russia signed a \$1 billion contract in 1995 to build the Bushehr plant but has been slow to finish the project. It has cited technical reasons for the delays, but analysts say it has used the project to press Iran to ease its defiance over its nuclear program.

Russian officials say, however, that U.N. sanctions against Iran, including a new, more stringent set approved in June, do not directly prevent Moscow from going ahead with the Bushehr project. They have argued that the Bushehr project is essential for persuading Iran to cooperate with the U.N. nuclear watchdog and fulfill its obligations under international nuclear nonproliferation agreements.

Russian officials did not say why they had decided to move ahead with loading fuel into the Bushehr plant now.

The uranium fuel used at the Bushehr plant is enriched to a level too low to be used in a nuclear weapon. Iran is already producing uranium enriched to that level -- about 3.5 percent -- and has started a pilot program of enriching uranium to 20 percent. It says it needs the 20 percent-enriched uranium to produce fuel for a medical research reactor, but the move has further heightened concerns about its nuclear program.

Uranium must be enriched more than 90 percent for use in a nuclear warhead.

Iran's semiofficial ISNA news agency quoted Vice President Ali Akbar Salehi, who also heads the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran, as saying that the country had invited International Atomic Energy Agency experts to watch the transfer of fuel, which was shipped about two years ago, into the Bushehr reactor.

"Fuel complexes are sealed (and being monitored by IAEA). Naturally, IAEA inspectors will be there to watch the unsealing," ISNA quoted Salehi as saying.

Russia has said that the Bushehr project has been closely supervised by the U.N. nuclear watchdog, which declined comment Friday. It also says Iran has signed a pledge to ship all the spent uranium fuel from Bushehr back to Russia for reprocessing, meaning none of it could be used to make nuclear weapons.

Russia is one of the six powers leading international efforts to ensure that Iran does not develop an atomic bomb. It has backed U.N. sanctions but strongly criticized the United States and the European Union for following up with separate, stronger sanctions.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/13/AR2010081305819.html>

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

Press TV – Iran

'Iran Opts To Proceed With Enrichment'

Sunday, 15 August 2010

A senior Iranian lawmaker slams the US and its allies for failing to fulfill formal agreements with Iran, saying Tehran has no option but to continue enriching uranium.

"We have to go ahead with uranium enrichment activities because we have no confidence in Western countries," IRNA quoted Head of Iran's Parliament (Majlis) National Security and Foreign Policy Commission, Alaeddin Boroujerdi, as saying on Sunday.

The US, Germany and France which have breached official agreements with Iran showed they are not reliable, he went on to say.

The Iranian official also pointed to the issue of providing fuel needed to launch Iran's long-delayed first nuclear power plant in the southern city of Bushehr and said the plant will come on stream soon.

"Fuel needed for the Bushehr plant was brought to Iran more than one year ago. The fuel will be transferred to the plant next week which means it is becoming operational," the lawmaker said.

Boroujerdi said the Iranian government is duty-bound to generate 20,000 megawatts of electricity to meet domestic demands based on a parliamentary approval dated four years ago.

Iran will finish Bushehr under any circumstances, whether Russia participates in supplying fuel or not. If Russia refuses to supply the needed fuel, Iran will do it by itself, Boroujerdi noted.

On Friday, a spokesman for the Russian atomic agency Rosatom, Sergei Novikov, said Iran's first nuclear power plant will come online next week.

"The fuel will be charged in the reactor on August 21. From this moment, Bushehr will be considered a nuclear installation," he further explained.

Western corporations began the construction of the Bushehr facility in the 1970s. However, following the 1979 Islamic Revolution in Iran, the Western companies reneged on their commitments and pulled out of the project due to political pressure from Washington.

Iran then turned to Russia to complete the project. In 1992, Tehran and Moscow signed a deal to complete the construction of the nuclear power plant.

The Bushehr plant was originally scheduled to be completed in 1999, but its start-up has been repeatedly delayed.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail.aspx?id=138771§ionid=351020104>

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

Al Jazeera – Qatar
Sunday, August 15, 2010

Nuclear Inspection Of Israel Sought

Arab nations have urged Washington and several other nuclear powers to push for inspections of Israel's nuclear programme, diplomats have told the Associated Press news agency.

In a letter sent ahead of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) meeting scheduled for September, the Arab League also sought support for a resolution that calls on Israel to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The letter sent on August 8 was signed by Amr Moussa, the Arab League chief.

Besides Hillary Clinton, the US secretary of state, the letter was also sent to foreign ministers of Russia, China, Britain and France - the four other permanent UN Security Council members.

Obama warning

The letter comes one month after Barack Obama, the US president, warned the Arab world not to use the 150-nation IAEA forum to single out Israel.

Obama and Binyamin Netanyahu, the Israeli prime minister, agreed to work together to oppose efforts to single out Israel at the upcoming IAEA conference.

At the time, Obama suggested that such a move would undermine the possibility of breakthrough talks on a Middle East nuclear-free zone, as proposed by the NPT conference three months ago.

But the Arab League letter says they were not attempting to single out Israel.

"Singling out a state assumes that there are a number of states in the same position and only one state was singled out," the letter says.

Referring to the NPT, the letter says: "The fact is that all the states in the region have acceded to the NPT except Israel."

Israel is commonly assumed to have nuclear weapons but refuses to discuss the issue.

Islamic nations have long called for Israel to open its programme for inspectors.

The Arab League's attempt to pressure Israel into unveiling its nuclear programme might deflect attention from Iran, which the United States and its allies accuse of covertly seeking to build an atomic bomb.

Tehran denies the charge and insists its programme is for peaceful civilian purposes.

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/middleeast/2010/08/201081516228402597.html>

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

Brisbane Times – Australia

Iran To Begin Work On New Uranium Plant In 2011

By Jay Deshmukh, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

August 16, 2010

Iran will begin building its third uranium enrichment plant in early 2011, a top official said, defying world powers who have imposed new sanctions on Tehran for pursuing the sensitive nuclear work.

Iran's atomic chief Ali Akbar Salehi was cited on state television's website late Sunday as saying the search for locations for 10 new enrichment facilities has ended and "the construction of one of these facilities will begin by the end of the (current Iranian) year (to March 2011) or the start of next year."

Iran is already enriching uranium at its main plant in the central city of Natanz and is building a second enrichment facility inside a mountain at Fordo, southwest of Tehran.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad had announced the planned construction of 10 new enrichment plants late last year after Tehran was censured by the UN atomic watchdog over building the Fordo facility.

Salehi, who is also one of 12 vice presidents of Iran, has previously said that any new uranium plants the Islamic republic builds would be located at sites which cannot be targeted by air strikes.

He did not specify where the third plant would be located.

Iran's arch-foes the United States and Israel have never ruled out military strikes against Tehran to halt its nuclear programme which they suspect is aimed at making weapons.

Tehran denies the charge, saying its atomic programme has purely peaceful goals.

Iran's uranium enrichment programme is at the heart of its nuclear controversy and the key reason for the Islamic republic to be imposed with the fourth round of UN sanctions on June 9.

Enriched uranium can be used as fuel to power nuclear reactors as well as to make the fissile core of an atom bomb.

The UN sanctions have been followed by unilateral punitive measures by the United States, the European Union, Australia and Canada.

The Western powers have been particularly infuriated with Iran for defiantly enriching uranium to the 20 percent level, which theoretically brings it closer to the 90 percent level required to make an atom bomb.

Iran says it is enriching uranium to 20 percent level to produce fuel for a research reactor in Tehran and as a potential deal with some of the world powers to supply the fuel is still embroiled in a deadlock.

On July 11, Salehi said that Iran has produced more than 20 kilogrammes of this high grade uranium, but added a few days later that it has no intention of "stockpiling" the sensitive material.

According to the May report of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Iran has produced around 2,500 kilogrammes of low-enriched uranium at its Natanz facility.

Ahmadinejad ordered in February the refining of uranium to 20 percent after a swap deal, aimed at providing nuclear fuel for the Tehran reactor and drafted by the IAEA in October last year, hit a deadlock.

Brazil and Turkey brokered a counter proposal in Tehran on May 17 under which Iran would send its low-enriched uranium to Turkey in return for research reactor fuel to be supplied later.

But the world powers initially cold-shouldered that proposal and voted through a fourth set of sanctions, which had the effect of further tightening financial and military restrictions on Tehran.

They later raised questions about the counter proposal as they issued calls for discussing Iran's overall nuclear programme.

Iran says it has responded to their questions over the counter proposal, known now as the Tehran Declaration, and is waiting for an official date for a meeting with the Vienna group to discuss the details of the plan.

"The other sides have announced their readiness (to discuss) in the media, but we have not received any official or written response," Salehi said.

The IAEA, the United States, France and Russia, known as the Vienna group, are involved in thrashing out the issue of fuel supply to the Tehran reactor.

<http://news.brisbanetimes.com.au/breaking-news-world/iran-to-begin-work-on-new-uranium-plant-in-2011-20100816-126qe.html>

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

People's Daily – China

Iranian Gov't Obligated To Push Ahead With 20 Pct Uranium Enrichment

August 16, 2010

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad announced a law on Monday instructing the government to push ahead with 20-percent uranium enrichment, the local satellite Press TV reported.

According to the law, which has already been approved by the Majlis (Parliament) and by the Guardian Council, as the top legislating body of the country, the government is obliged to press ahead with 20 percent uranium enrichment work to supply and deliver the fuel needed by the Tehran medical research reactor, the report said.

Under the instructions of the law, the government will invest on different dimensions of the nuclear technology to bring the nation to "full nuclear independence," according to the report.

Also, as with the law requirements, Iran's government will cooperate with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) only within the framework of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and is banned from fulfilling demands which go beyond the NPT requirements, said Press TV.

Currently, Iran, as a signatory to NPT, is enriching uranium to a level of 20 percent in Natanz enrichment facilities in central Iran which is criticized by the West.

Head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) Ali Akbar Salehi said late Sunday that Tehran will begin constructing another uranium enrichment plant by early 2011.

Source: Xinhua

<http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90777/90854/7106299.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

France Voices Concern Over Iran's Uranium Enrichment Facility Plans

16 August 2010

France is concerned about Iran's plans to construct a new uranium enrichment facility in 2011, a spokeswoman for the French Foreign Ministry said on Monday.

Earlier on Monday Iranian nuclear chief Ali Akbar Salehi told ISNA news agency that the Islamic Republic would begin building an enrichment center by next March.

Iran plans to build a total of ten such centers.

France, along with other western powers, suspects Iran of seeking to build nuclear weapons under the guise of its nuclear program, which Tehran says is aimed at the peaceful generation of civilian energy.

"The uranium enrichment program has no obvious civil purpose since the fuel for the country's only nuclear reactor [Bushehr] that will run in the near future is supplied from Russia," Christine Fages said.

Fages said that if the construction of the new nuclear facility is confirmed, it will be "a new violation of Iran's commitments to six UN Security Council resolutions".

"We are waiting for Iran to choose to cooperate and to finally begin real negotiations with the Six group of international mediators," Fages said.

International pressure on Iran increased in early February when Tehran announced it had begun enriching uranium to 20% in lieu of an agreement on an exchange that would provide it with fuel for a research reactor.

Turkey, Brazil and Iran signed an agreement on May 17, dubbed the Tehran Declaration, in which Iran committed itself to giving 1,200 kg of its 3.5%-enriched uranium to Turkey in exchange for 20%-enriched uranium it would receive from Western countries to be used as fuel in the nuclear research reactor near Tehran.

The trilateral deal did not stop the UN Security Council from passing on June 9 a resolution imposing a fourth set of sanctions on Iran over its nuclear program.

PARIS, August 16 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100816/160224029.html>

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

Straits Times – Singapore

August 17, 2010

Attack Is 'International Crime'

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

TEHERAN - IRAN warned on Tuesday that an attack on its first nuclear power plant would amount to an 'international crime,' as the countdown started for the launch of the Russian-built facility.

'Attacking an international plant is an international crime as the consequences will not be limited to the hosting country but will have a global aftermath,' Iran's nuclear chief Ali Akbar Salehi told the state IRNA news agency.

Iran's first and much-delayed nuclear power plant near the southern port city of Bushehr will go online on August 21 to eventually generate electricity, at a time of mounting international pressure on Tehran over its atomic programme.

The United States and Israel, which accuse the Islamic republic of seeking nuclear weapons, have never ruled out a military strike to curb Iran's atomic drive. Iran insists the programme is solely aimed at peaceful ends. Former US envoy to the United Nations John Bolton said on Monday that Israel has 'eight days' to launch a military strike against Iran's Bushehr nuclear facility to stop Teheran from acquiring a functioning atomic plant.

Iran's foreign ministry spokesman dismissed a possible Israeli attack on the Bushehr plant. 'These threats had become repetitive and lost their meaning,' Ramin Mehmanparast told reporters on Tuesday. 'According to international law, installations which have real fuel cannot be attacked because of the humanitarian consequences,' he said.

Meanwhile on Tuesday, an Iranian air force jet reportedly crashed in Bushehr province but the pilot survived. Officials say Teheran has stepped up defensive measures at the plant to protect it from possible attacks.

http://www.straitstimes.com/BreakingNews/World/Story/STIStory_567513.html

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

Jerusalem Post – Israel

'Obama Won't Hit Iranian Reactor'

By DOV PREMINGER

August 17, 2010

Former US ambassador to the UN John Bolton said he didn't see "any signs whatsoever that President Obama would make the necessary decision" to strike Iran's nuclear reactor, speaking in an interview with Israel Radio Tuesday.

Bolton claimed Israel has only three days to strike before Russia "begins the fueling process for the Bushehr reactor this Friday," after which any attack would cause radioactive fallout that could reach as far as the waters of the Persian Gulf.

In an interview with Fox Business Network earlier Tuesday Bolton had said the deadline was eight days, but he revised it to three in the Israel Radio interview, saying Iran and Russia had announced they would begin fueling on Friday.

"It has always been optimal that military force is used before the fuel rods are inserted," Bolton explained. "That's what Israel did in Osirak in 1991, and when they attacked the North Korean reactor built in Syria." Israel bombed the Osirak nuclear reactor in Iraq in 1981, and a Syrian reactor in 2007.

However Bolton didn't see any indication that an Israeli strike was going to happen. "Obviously if Israel were going to do something it wouldn't exactly be advertising it. But time is short."

Bolton said that it would be "a much more dangerous world" if Iran were to gain nuclear capability. "That's why I think it's so critical. It won't stop with Iran. Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, perhaps other states as well."

Iranian nuclear chief Ali Akbar Salehi said earlier Tuesday that an attack on Iranian nuclear facilities would be an "international crime."

In an interview with IRNA, Salehi said that the impact of such a strike would be global. "This is stipulated in the resolutions passed by the IAEA and the UN Security Council as well as in the resolution adopted at the close of the NPT Review Conference," he stressed.

Russia, who is supplying the uranium fuel for the plant, announced last week that they will begin loading the Bushehr reactor on August 21.

In an initial interview earlier today with Fox Business Network earlier Tuesday, Bolton warned that once the Bushehr facility is operational it will be too late for a military air strike against Iran because such an attack would spread radiation and harm Iranian civilians.

"Once that uranium, once those fuel rods are very close to the reactor, certainly once they're in the reactor, attacking it means a release of radiation, no question about it," Bolton said.

"Iran will achieve something that no other opponent of Israel, no other enemy of the United States in the Middle East really has and that is a functioning nuclear reactor."

Bolton was critical of Russia for aiding Iran in the fueling of the nuclear reactor.

"The Russians are, as they often do, playing both sides against the middle. The idea of being able to stick a thumb in America's eye always figures prominently in Moscow," Bolton concluded.

<http://www.jpost.com/IranianThreat/News/Article.aspx?id=185060>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea
15 August 2010

Committee To Urge President Lee To Switch To 'Active Deterrence'

SEOUL, Aug. 15 (Yonhap) -- A presidential committee on military reforms plans to propose to President Lee Myung-bak that the military adopt an operational plan that allows its forces to preemptively strike North Korean bases if they see a sign of impending aggression, officials said Sunday.

The concept of "active deterrence" is key to preventing such provocations by North Korea as the deadly March sinking of a South Korean warship, and will require the South to secure an elevated capability to monitor the North, members of the committee said.

"This is a concept that allows for attacks if North Korea shows signs of preparing nuclear and missile attacks," one member said, citing a committee meeting he attended. The official declined to be named.

Another member of the 14-person committee, headed by former professor Rhee Sang-woo and joined by Defense Minister Kim Tae-young, said the Cheonan sinking has transformed Seoul's view on national defense.

"The existing concept of deterrence was an approach based on the idea that the North would not attack, as long as we built up our forces, but the Cheonan case showed this concept to be unsuitable," he said, also declining to be identified.

The officials said that the attacks, if carried out, would only target North Korean bases considered to pose the greatest threat to the South, including those with missiles and nuclear devices.

Forty-six sailors died when the Cheonan warship went down near the Koreas' Yellow Sea border. Citing the findings of a multinational investigation, South Korea has demanded an apology from the North and held a series of naval exercises to protest the sinking while the North has denied any role in the tragedy.

The presidential committee opened in June under President Lee's initiative and as part of the government's efforts to learn from the sinking and reform the military accordingly.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/08/15/77/0401000000AEN20100815002900315F.HTML>

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

Daily News & Analysis

China's Nuclear Arsenal Limited To Lowest Levels: Top General

Saturday, August 14, 2010

By Press Trust of India (PTI)

China has limited its nuclear weapons capacity to the lowest levels as it refrains from an arms race and strictly pursues a no first use policy, a top general of the People's Liberation Army, has claimed.

"If no power presses for nuclear war with China, the Second Artillery Force will always keep silent," Gen Jing Zhiyuan, commander of PLA's Second Artillery Force that controls China's nuclear weapons stockpile wrote in an article published in the latest issue of China Armed Forces.

China's development of a nuclear arms capacity is limited to that of the lowest level necessary to safeguard national security, Jing insisted.

"We will firmly pursue a defensive nuclear strategy and resolutely implement the 'no first use' policy," he said.

"We, the Second Artillery Force, will always stick to the principle of limited development of nuclear weapons and we will not engage in a nuclear arms race," Jing wrote.

Numbers of China's nuclear weapons have been a matter of speculation as there is no definite official information about them.

According to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, China may be having around 130 nuclear warheads deployed in missiles and aircraft with 70 more in storage.

China has also developed inter-continental ballistic missiles with a range of 15000km.

China began building its own nuclear arsenal after the country exploded its first atomic bomb in the deserts of north western China in 1964.

In 1971, the country became the fifth country in the world to launch a nuclear submarine.

China successfully tested a carrier rocket in 1980, shooting it from northwest China to the South Pacific to showcase its intercontinental strike capabilities.

It also conducted an underwater missile launch in 1982.

In 1996, China declared it would suspend nuclear testing to promote nuclear disarmament.

http://www.dnaindia.com/world/report_china-s-nuclear-arsenal-limited-to-lowest-levels-top-general_1423337

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

Global Security Newswire

China Strengthens Strategic Capability, Report Says

Tuesday, August 17, 2010

The U.S. Defense Department said in a report issued yesterday that China continues to strengthen its strategic capability through updates to its nuclear and missile systems, the Associated Press reported (see *GSN*, June 3; Anne Flaherty, Associated Press/Yahoo!News, Aug. 16).

"China has the most active land-based ballistic and cruise missile program in the world. It is developing and testing several new classes and variants of offensive missiles, forming additional missile units, qualitatively upgrading certain missile systems, and developing methods to counter ballistic missile defenses," according to the Pentagon report, "Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2010."

Beijing is pursuing "more survivable delivery systems" in order to update its nuclear deterrent, the report says. The nation in the last few years has fielded "road-mobile," solid-propellant versions of its Dongfeng ICBM. The Dongfeng 31A is believed to have a range of nearly 7,000 miles, enabling it to reach much of the continental United States.

Also possibly in development is a mobile ICBM that could be loaded with multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles, according to the report.

Meanwhile, China is "acquiring large numbers of highly accurate cruise missiles" and deploying them on land and at sea, the report says.

The nation has fielded from 1,050 to 1,150 short-range ballistic missiles opposite the island of Taiwan, which has an independent government but is still held by Beijing to be Chinese territory (see *GSN*, July 19).

A ballistic missile intended to be used against enemy ships is also in development, the Pentagon said.

"The missile has a range in excess of 1,500 kilometer, is armed with a maneuverable warhead, and when integrated with appropriate command and control systems, is intended to provide the [People's Liberation Army] the capability to attack ships, including aircraft carriers, in the western Pacific Ocean," the report says.

The Defense Department determined that China has in excess of 60 submarines and has nearly finished building a naval installation on Hainan Island in the South China Sea that could be used for docking ballistic missile submarines and other vessels (see *GSN*, May 6, 2008).

Work on the nation's latest nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine is continuing, the report says. One of the Jin-class vessels is already operational and another four such vessels could be put to sea (U.S. Defense Department report, Aug. 16).

Beijing's aggressive spending on its effort to become a top military force has been recognized for some time, AP reported. China has rejected U.S. concerns about its defense program. Frustrated by Washington's military support for Taiwan, it has halted U.S.-Chinese military contact that could address the issue.

"The limited transparency in China's military and security affairs enhances uncertainty and increases the potential for misunderstanding and miscalculation," the report says (Flaherty, Associated Press).

U.S. Senator John Cornyn (R-Texas) said the Pentagon document "paints an alarming picture, despite its 'glass half full' perspective," the *Washington Times* reported.

"It is clear that China is aggressively expanding its military capabilities, which appear to be aimed at limiting American strategic options in the Pacific," he said. "This troubling reality is inconsistent with China's supposed interest in fostering a peaceful, stable region" (Bill Gertz, *Washington Times*, Aug. 16).

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100817_9071.php

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

Times of India – India

China Deploys New CSS-5 Missiles On Border With India

By Press Trust of India (PTI)

August 17, 2010

WASHINGTON: China has moved new advanced longer range CSS-5 missiles close to the borders with India and developed contingency plans to shift airborne forces at short notice to the region, according to Pentagon.

Despite increased political and economic relationship between India and China, the Pentagon in a report to the US Congress said, tensions remain along the Sino-India borders with rising instances of border violation and aggressive border patrolling by Chinese soldiers.

However, a senior Defense Department official told reporters that the US has not observed any anomalous increase in military capabilities along the Sino-India border.

Noting that China continues to maintain its position on what its territorial claim is, the official said, the two capitals - Beijing and New Delhi - have been able to manage this dispute, in a way, using confidence-building measures and diplomatic mechanisms to be able to maintain relative stability in that border area.

"But it's something that China continues to watch; but I wouldn't say that there's anything in this report that demonstrates a spike or an anomalous increase in military capabilities along the border.

"It's something that China's paying very careful attention to. It's obviously something that India is paying careful attention to as well," the Senior Defense Department official said.

In its annual report, the US Defence department said, to improve regional deterrence, the PLA has replaced older liquid-fueled, nuclear capable CCS-3 intermediate range missiles with more advanced and survivable fueled CSS-5 MRBMs.

"China is currently engaged in massive road and rail infrastructure development along the Sino-India border primarily to facilitate economic development in western China: improved roads also support PLA operations," the Pentagon said.

The report presented to the Congress said despite increased political and economic relations over the years between China and India, tensions remain along their shared 4,057 km border, most notably over Arunachal Pradesh, which China asserts as part of Tibet and therefore of China, and over the Aksai Chin region at the western end of the Tibetan Plateau.

"Both countries, in 2009, stepped up efforts to assert their claims. China tried to block a USD 2.9 billion loan to India from the Asian Development Bank, claiming part of the loan would have been used for water projects in Arunachal Pradesh. This represented the first time China sought to influence this dispute through a multilateral institution," the Pentagon said.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/China-deploys-new-CSS-5-missiles-on-border-with-India/articleshow/6324105.cms>

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

Former Military Chiefs Call On Treasury To Fund Trident Replacement

A group of distinguished defence experts today demand that the full cost of replacing Britain's strategic nuclear deterrent is met by the Treasury and not extracted from the dwindling defence budget.

By Sean Rayment, Defence Correspondent

15 August 2010

In a letter to *The Sunday Telegraph* they describe the Armed Forces as "chronically overstretched and seriously under-resourced", adding that the defence budget would not be able to stand further reductions to fund the Trident replacement programme.

The nine signatories, include Admiral of the Fleet Sir Julian Oswald, Air Chief Marshal Sir Michael Graydon, a former Minister of State for Defence, Dr The Lord Gilbert and Admiral Sir John Treacher, a former Commander-in-chief Fleet.

In the letter, they state that Britain's submarine-based nuclear deterrent, which was first provided by Polaris and subsequently by Trident, has proved "successful" for more than 40 years.

The letter adds that for a deterrent force to be effective it must be reliable, secure and available at all times for deployment and use.

The signatories argue that to decide against replacing Trident, or to compromise by opting for a "less certain, less reliable alternative", would present "real risks to our nation in an increasingly dangerous world".

Chancellor George Osborne provoked a Cabinet row last month when he revealed that the £20 billion cost of replacing Trident would have to come from defence budget. Traditionally, the cost of Britain's nuclear deterrent has always come from the Government's reserve fund.

But Liam Fox, the defence secretary, has complained that funding the Trident replacement programme would have a serious impact on Britain's fighting capability.

Speaking on Friday, Dr Fox insisted that the battle over who will pay for Trident was an ongoing discussion. He said: "Ultimately, all our defence capabilities have to be paid for. Which bits are paid, over what timescale, is part of the discussions we are having and I'm not going to entertain them in public. I have enough time entertaining them in private."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newsttopics/politics/defence/7945764/Former-military-chiefs-call-on-Treasury-to-fund-Trident-replacement.html>

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

London Guardian – U.K.

Nick Clegg: Troops Should Take Priority Over Trident

Deputy prime minister reveals tensions within coalition government over the nuclear weapons system

By Press Association

Monday, 16 August 2010

Nick Clegg, the deputy prime minister, today exposed tensions within the coalition over the £20bn replacement of the Trident nuclear weapons system.

He said at a time of "huge pressure" on the defence budget money should be directed towards troops on the frontline in Afghanistan.

The Liberal Democrat leader, who has become the public face of the government while David Cameron is on holiday, claimed the public would find it hard to understand why money was being spent on a full replacement of the Trident system at a time of belt-tightening in Whitehall.

Clegg went into the general election opposing a like-for-like replacement of the missile system that uses four submarines to maintain a permanent capability.

Speaking at a Q&A event at the London headquarters of Microsoft, Clegg said: "My views on Trident are well known. I can't try to hide them now that I've got into a coalition government.

"I think there is huge pressure on the defence budget, I think that much is obvious, as there is on all budgets.

"It's going to be an extraordinarily difficult thing for all the armed services to get this right because of the massive amounts that are involved and the huge procurement contracts that invariably seem to go over time and over budget.

"I think the priority within the defence budget should be absolutely to make sure that our brave troops, our brave servicemen and servicewomen, particularly now on the frontline in Afghanistan, have what they need.

"I think we need to constantly ask ourselves what kind of challenges are we going to face? What kind of wars are we going to face? What kind of conflicts are we going to have to confront in the future?

"My own view is that the kind of technology and hardware that we acquired as a country in the past, in an era of cold war conflict ... the role has changed and it's changing very fast and that needs to be reflected in the kinds of things that we spend money on.

"Not to mention that fact that, of course, it's going to be difficult for someone who is going to receive less housing benefit because of the changes we are introducing to understand why, at the same time, we should spend huge, huge amounts of money in a hurry on replacing Trident in full.

"But all these things are still being discussed, all will become clear in the comprehensive spending round in October."

The coalition agreement thrashed out between his party and Cameron's Conservatives committed the government to renewing Trident, but agreed that it should be scrutinised to ensure it offers value for money.

The deal allows the Lib Dems to "continue to make the case for alternatives".

The problem of funding Trident has become more acute since the chancellor, George Osborne, indicated the cost would be covered by the defence budget rather than out of the Treasury's.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2010/aug/16/nick-clegg-troops-trident>

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

nextgov.com

Air Force Seeks New Nuclear Command-and-Control Terminals

By Bob Brewin
August 16, 2010

After more than a decade of delays, the Air Force launched an advanced satellite on Aug. 14 to provide jam-proof communications for nuclear forces, but the service is rethinking its strategy to develop terminals for bombers and ground stations to avoid further extensions.

The Air Force plans to acquire six Advanced Extremely High-Frequency satellites for a project that has stretched over more than a decade, starting in 1999 at a cost of \$3.2 billion to develop and put in orbit the first satellite. The Air Force estimates it will spend another \$4 billion for five more satellites.

The AEHF satellites, developed by Lockheed Martin Corp., operate at data rates ranging from a little faster than a 1990s dial-up modem (75 bits per second) to about the same as a home cable modem or telephone high-speed Internet connection (8 megabits per second).

Gary Payton, deputy undersecretary of the Air Force for space programs, told the House Armed Services Committee in April that the AEHF satellites will increase the throughput for the jam-proof communications needed for overseeing nuclear forces from kilobytes per second to a megabyte per second.

The Air Force awarded Boeing Co. a contract currently valued at \$2.7 billion to design and build 216 terminals for use in B-2 and B-52 nuclear bombers, for aerial command posts for the president and top defense commanders, and fixed terminals to be used in ground command centers.

But the Government Accountability Office reported in March Boeing had missed its February target to begin production of the terminals.

In an October 2009 report, GAO estimated the Air Force will have deployed only 2 percent of the AEHF terminals by 2011 and will not field all terminals until 2019.

Faced with the delay, the Air Force Electronic Systems Center at Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass., invited contractors to a meeting in July to discuss "the potential for an alternate source for development and production" of the AEHF terminals.

At the briefing, officials said they wanted to install terminals on nuclear-strike aircraft and air-and-ground command posts in 2015, with 23 terminals for RC-135 reconnaissance aircraft slated for delivery in 2016.

The Air Force emphasized it needed to conduct market research and feasibility studies, and obtain high-level acquisition approval before it proceeds with an alternative to the AEHF terminal strategy. Official plan to present its new plan to the Defense Acquisition Board in August or September.

Thirty companies, including Boeing, General Dynamics Inc., Lockheed and Northrop Grumman Corp. responded to the Air Force's request for information.

http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20100816_8329.php

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

Global Security Newswire

Airborne Laser Set For Second Antimissile Test Tonight

Tuesday, August 17, 2010

By Martin Matishak

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Missile Defense Agency tonight plans to conduct a second test of its Airborne Laser system's ability to destroy an enemy ballistic missile, the agency's chief said today (see *GSN*, July 28).

The test of the experimental technology is scheduled to occur around 10 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time off the coast of California, Lt. Gen. Patrick O'Reilly said this morning at a Defense Writers Group breakfast. The entire event is expected to last about 50 seconds.

The system, housed in a converted Boeing 747, while in flight would shoot a directed energy laser beam at a target resembling an enemy short-range ballistic missile. The platform successfully destroyed its first simulated short-range target in February, the MDA chief said.

The latest exercise was originally slated for two weeks ago, but the agency experienced difficulties with the stand that holds up the target, O'Reilly told reporters. The test was rescheduled to take place Sunday, but had to be postponed again after a software module that operates some of the target's tracking systems had to be rebooted.

"Whenever we operate a test like that, safety is No. 1 and we have to ensure we have clearances from the [Federal Aviation Administration] and so forth ... and we were running out of time in our window," the three-star general said.

The objective for tonight's test will be to shoot down the target at twice the range as the February drill, according to O'Reilly.

"There was a lot of debate about a year ago whether or not we could shoot it down at all," he noted, saying that since the first test the agency has worked out many "theoretical calculations" on how far the laser can transmit through the atmosphere.

The laser system's range is classified but the scope of February test was more than 50 miles, O'Reilly said. "So [tonight's test is] twice beyond that," he added.

"We learned so much from that first test that our conclusion was we can operate at twice the range we thought," the MDA chief told reporters. "We actually had another instrumented test in June that indicated we may be off again and it may even have a greater range."

O'Reilly said he enjoys tests with directed energy because "if you fail, you can turn around and shoot again."

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100817_8021.php

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency
OPINION & ANALYSIS

Obama Points To "Pathway" For Iran

13 August 2010

Iran has responded to President Barack Obama in a familiar manner, flouting a U.N. Security Council resolution by bringing two interconnected 164-machine centrifuge cascades on line to better enrich uranium.

In reality, Iran's actions only seem like a response to Obama's unexpected address at the meeting with reporters in the White House last Wednesday. The cause and effect are actually the other way around. The reports of the latest development in Iran's nuclear program came from the July 17 inspection by the IAEA, while Obama spoke with reporters August 4. Obama was, in fact, responding to Tehran.

It was an unusual encounter with the press. A small group of journalists were invited to the White House for a meeting. The purpose of the meeting was not disclosed, nor did the reporters know that the president would be in attendance. At the meeting, Obama reiterated his support for the U.N. Security Council sanctions against Iran imposed on June 10 in light of its refusal to halt uranium enrichment as well as the much tougher coordinated sanctions imposed by the U.S. and European Union soon after. He discussed how the United States and Europe are cautioning China and Japan not to use the situation as an opportunity to step up investment in Iran. By the way, Russia had warned against "two-tier" sanctions, which mean actions in circumvention of the UN... And yet, Obama said he was still offering Iran a "pathway" to a peaceful settlement of the nuclear issue.

In fact, Obama arranged this meeting to preempt any talk that his policy was heading toward a dead end - Obama got his sanctions but to little effect. He also reminded his audience of U.S.-Iranian talks on issues unrelated to Iran's nuclear program, for example, Afghanistan. Iran is Afghanistan's neighbor, making it a key player in the region. Now the U.S. wants to resume the talks with Iran.

So what's really going on here? Is Obama merely seeking a clear conscience, knowing that Tehran will go its own way no matter what? Or are there other reasons? Analysts at The Washington Post put forward their own explanation: Obama knows that now would be a good time for Tehran to make a deal, because the sanctions are beginning to weigh heavily on Iran's economy and also because Iran is beginning to run up against technical difficulties in its efforts to enrich uranium to weapons-grade level, which is the reason for the sanctions.

Analysts estimate that it will take the country another two years to actually build a nuclear bomb, if this is really its aim. The Obama administration believes that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad will have to deal with serious economic problems in two years due to the effects of the sanctions. There are signs that the Iranians will be willing to talk, which is why Obama has re-extended the offer, albeit indirectly, in his meeting with journalists.

There are two other ideas floating around; one has to do with Israel, the other with Vietnam, oddly enough.

The situation with Israel is more or less predictable. Middle East experts recently gathered in Moscow, where they agreed, despite their differences, that tensions between Israel and Iran could boil over into an armed conflict as early as this fall. The details are not that important: it could manifest itself in fighting between intermediaries, or something else.

It's still dangerous to say such things openly in the United States. Legendary film director Oliver Stone is probably the only one who can get away with it. But Americans are truly tired of defending Israel, whose policies are becoming increasingly radical, upending America's entire Middle East policy.

Obama clearly doesn't want the United States to be drawn into any more wars in the region, and he will need all the partners he can get to continue safely withdrawing troops from Iraq and to pull out of Afghanistan further down the line. Obama will continue his attempts to persuade Iran. If he succeeds, Israel will surely moderate its position.

As for Vietnam, the U.S.-Vietnamese nuclear deal currently in the works is extremely important for America's East Asia policy. Obama cannot afford to have the public and especially Congress turn against this initiative because of its close resemblance to the Iran situation.

In short, Vietnam is being offered the same deal as Iran but with one major proviso: Vietnam can purchase fuel and equipment from the United States for its nuclear power plants, which will help revive the U.S. nuclear industry. However, Vietnam is reluctant to pledge not to enrich uranium on its own, just like Iran. Negotiations have lasted over a decade. There are related political issues as well, such as the U.S. attempts to create a counterweight to Chinese influence to its south. The Iranian problem could put that plan in jeopardy.

All this might also have repercussions for U.S.-Russian relations, which are complicated enough as they are. Moscow warned Washington that if it wants Russia to sign on to UN sanctions against Iran, it must refrain from imposing additional U.S. and EU sanctions, as this would make Russia (as well as China and some others) look bad. It would also create problems for Russia with its own companies, which fully intend to work with Iran in compliance with the UN resolution.

After ignoring Moscow's warning, Washington cannot expect further cooperation on sanctions.

Yet, Obama's attempts to bring Tehran back to the negotiating table are an important sign. The Obama administration is clearly different from the Bush administration. Although their policies might seem similar - continuing to ratchet up pressure until complete capitulation and regime change - Obama is more inclined toward diplomacy than to military action. This should certainly be taken into account; Obama's policies are worthy of cooperation in certain cases.

Dmitry Kosyrev, RIA Novosti political commentator

The opinions expressed in this article are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of RIA Novosti.

<http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20100813/160179534.html>

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

Pakistan Nation – Pakistan

OPINION/EDITORIAL

Iran's N-Plant

August 15, 2010

Finally, Iran with the help of Russia will be ready to operate its Bushehr nuclear power station next week. The plant will be producing electricity, thus giving credibility to Iranian assurance that their nuclear programme is geared only for peaceful purposes. The Obama Administration had been trying every foul method, including sanctions and threats of war, to bully the Iranians, yet its sabre-rattling only strengthened Tehran's resolve to carry on with the programme.

Though the sanctions imposed last month have come as a big challenge to Iran's economy, especially its energy sector, yet the Iranians have boldly stood their ground not even showing the slightest sign of weakness. The Russian support in the face of stiff US opposition shows that the Americans have also failed to isolate Iran the way they had planned. Russia of course must be mindful of the fact that American hatred of Iran is merely based on rank prejudice and hegemonic designs. President Obama, for all his rhetoric and oratory, just could not help but follow in the footsteps of President Bush sticking to his point of view that Iran was among the axis of evil. The US and UK had lied about Iraq's weapons of mass destruction and there is no doubt that they have been lying about Iran also.

While it is shameful and outrageous that even though Iran's nuclear programme is well within the NPT framework, it is targeted while countries like Israel and India, evading the non-proliferation regime, are freely given technological help to amass as many nukes as they wish. Ironically, the US continues to be the biggest source of nuclear proliferation. Besides, if the assumption that the nuclear arsenal of these countries is not a threat to global security, then one had better recall the Hiroshima and Nagasaki holocaust brought about by the world's so-called conscientious and democratic state - the USA. Many Americans do not remember the event with a pang of guilt but with a shameful sense of pride, as so far no US administration has offered any apology for the nuclear strikes.

<http://www.nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Opinions/Editorials/15-Aug-2010/Irans-Nplant>

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

August 16, 2010

Stop The Sino-Pak Nuclear Pact

The Obama administration should make clear its objections to the deal.

By ASHLEY J. TELLIS

China's plans to sell Pakistan two new civilian reactors are progressing apace, adding another chapter to the long and troubled history of nuclear trade between the two countries. Alarm is rightly on the rise in foreign capitals, especially given Pakistan's fragile political leadership. The United States must take the lead in urging China to rethink its plans.

Some claim that Washington's ability to discourage Beijing from moving forward is compromised by America's 2008 civilian-nuclear cooperation agreement with India. Like Pakistan, India has not signed the Nonproliferation Treaty, and treating India differently, many observers feel, weakens Washington's hand in opposing China's efforts. It has even been argued that if the U.S.-India agreement never went through, China's current proposal to sell nuclear reactors would likely not have occurred.

These claims, however, do not stand up. The U.S.-India nuclear initiative, which I helped to negotiate when I was a State Department official, is different from the Sino-Pakistani deal. While leaders in the U.S. and India publicly debated the terms of their agreement before signing it, authorities in China have been silent about the conditions of its sale. China joined the Nuclear Suppliers Group—the international body that oversees nuclear trade—in 2004, but during the most recent meeting Chinese officials declined to answer essential questions about whether a contract with Pakistan was in place, when the agreement was finalized and its exact terms.

Beijing also risks renegeing on its NSG obligations, which say China cannot sell nuclear reactors to a non-nuclear-weapon state that does not have full scope safeguards. China privately claims that the prospective sale to Pakistan is covered by a bilateral nuclear collaboration deal agreed to before China joined the NSG—even though Beijing failed to mention the possibility of the additional reactors when it joined the group.

And finally, China has not sought an exemption from the NSG for its nuclear trade with Pakistan. While the Bush administration spent four years reaching out to NSG members to secure their support, China has made no such effort. Beijing appears willing to sidestep the NSG and go it alone. It is also hard to argue that the U.S.-India agreement led directly to the Sino-Pakistani sale when Beijing has been looking to sell nuclear material to Pakistan for more than a decade—long before the U.S.-India agreement was even conceived.

Whether China ultimately proceeds with the transaction will greatly depend on Washington's reaction to the prospective sale. For all of Beijing's supposed nonchalance, its leaders have been responsive in the past to both American and international pressure on proliferation issues.

In the past, U.S. administrations have successfully protested the sale. During the Bush administration, for example, Washington both demarched China formally and questioned it informally, warning Beijing about its concerns and cautioning China not to violate NSG rules. Washington also pressed Islamabad simultaneously. In each instance, no Chinese reactor sale to Pakistan occurred.

While the U.S. initially hesitated to press China on the issue—reportedly the administration did not want to displease either China or Pakistan given their strategic importance on critical issues—the Obama administration is becoming more resolute.

The administration must become even more adamant. Determined U.S. opposition to China's planned sale would not only make Beijing more cautious in pushing ahead with the sale, but also strengthen resistance from other NSG members, most of whom are already apprehensive about Beijing's efforts to circumvent the existing guidelines. China's expanding civilian nuclear power program increasingly depends on international cooperation for its success and this will make Beijing more cautious with proceeding as it will fear losing access to imported fuel and new technology.

By sending clear and tough messages to China, encouraging U.S. nonproliferation partners to do the same—both bilaterally and multilaterally—and reserving the implicit threat to withhold the forms of cooperation that China desires, Washington can convince Beijing to reconsider its planned sale of reactors to Pakistan.

Mr. Tellis is a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704868604575432941374803392.html?mod=WSJ_Opinion_LEFT_TopBucket

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

U.S. News & World Report
OPINION

John Kerry: Approving The New START Treaty Keeps America Safe

The treaty is a key tool to protect the United States against nuclear threats

By JOHN KERRY

August 16, 2010

John Kerry is a Democratic senator from Massachusetts and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Ratifying the New START treaty is a common-sense step that will make America safer. Since the Reagan administration, the Senate has approved every U.S.-Russian strategic arms control agreement with broad bipartisan support. In negotiating and signing this treaty, President Obama has followed a tradition pursued by every president for the last 40 years—Republican and Democrat—to reduce nuclear dangers by shrinking the U.S. and Russian arsenals and instituting vigorous verification procedures that will give us a clearer picture of Russia's nuclear capabilities. This treaty will improve our relationship with Moscow, while strengthening the global nonproliferation regime to help us stop rogue states and terrorists trying to acquire nuclear weapons.

For all these reasons, the treaty will be a key tool in our efforts to protect the United States against nuclear threats. But the Senate must approve the agreement before it can take effect, and its advice and consent is not a rubber stamp. That is why the Foreign Relations Committee led a thorough review of this treaty. Since April, my colleagues and I have conducted 12 hearings, with over 20 witnesses from across the political spectrum. We questioned the secretary of state, the secretary of defense, and the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We heard from the treaty's negotiators, the senior military officers who oversee our nuclear deterrence and missile defense efforts, representatives of our intelligence community, and the directors of the nation's three nuclear weapons laboratories. In our effort to consider a wide range of views, we heard from officials who served Presidents Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, Bush 41, Clinton, and Bush 43. These witnesses overwhelmingly supported timely ratification of the New START treaty.

Opponents of the treaty have yet to convincingly explain why their judgment differs so significantly from that of our current and former military and diplomatic leaders—a long and distinguished list that includes six former secretaries of state, five former secretaries of defense, three former national security advisers, and seven former commanders of our nuclear forces. Some have argued that the treaty will undercut our nuclear deterrent, even though the general currently responsible for commanding it argues precisely the opposite. Others have claimed that the treaty will restrict our missile defenses, even though the man in charge of the Missile Defense Agency, Lt. Gen. Patrick O'Reilly, testified, "I do not see any limitation on my ability to develop missile defenses." Some have complained that, if we ratify this treaty, we might not build a Star Wars-type missile defense against Russia, even though Secretary of Defense Robert Gates explained that our goal for over 20 years has been to protect against a limited attack, not a massive strike.

Why is this treaty less deserving of approval than, say, the original START treaty, whose reductions were significantly more dramatic and which was signed in 1991, at a time of great international upheaval? Why, nearly 20 years later, when relations with Moscow are far better, would we not agree to modest reductions in our nuclear arsenals? Why, when the fight against proliferation is ever more crucial, would we not approve a treaty that will encourage international cooperation in the fight against the spread of nuclear weapons to rogue states like Iran?

The opponents of New START cannot provide good answers to these questions. All they can do is stand in the way of common sense—and of our nation's security.

<http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/08/16/john-kerry-approving-the-new-start-treaty-keeps-america-safe.html>

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

U.S. News & World Report

OPINION

Jim DeMint: The New START Treaty Weakens U.S. National Security

The treaty makes America and her allies vulnerable to rogue nations

By JIM DEMINT

August 16, 2010

Jim DeMint is a Republican senator from South Carolina and member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The concessions President Obama made to Russia to get the New START signed are precisely why the Senate should not ratify it.

New START is another Obama giveaway at the expense of U.S. citizens. The treaty mandates strategic nuclear weapons parity with the progeny of an old Cold War foe, yet allows the Russians to maintain a 10-to-1 tactical nuclear-weapons advantage. Whether in warhead and launcher limits, verification, or missile defense, America loses. The treaty dampens the U.S. ability to defend against missile attacks and makes America and her allies vulnerable to rogue nations while receiving nothing for our concessions.

The Obama administration champions the fact that the treaty would limit both countries to 1,550 deployed strategic nuclear warheads each. But Russia could maintain its huge stockpile of roughly 4,000 tactical nuclear weapons, thousands more than the United States has, because the treaty doesn't restrict those types, which can also be affixed to rockets, submarines, and attack aircraft.

The treaty's delivery vehicle limit is also troubling. While U.S. land-based missiles only have one warhead each, the Russians use multiple independent re-entry vehicles per missile. Though this is more unstable, it means the Russians can hit more targets with fewer launchers. To add insult to injury, launchers carrying nonnuclear, conventional weapons that have the capability to carry a nuclear weapon would count toward this limit as well. This is another win for the Russians: We depend on our conventional weapons arsenal for nonnuclear deterrence and now some of those weapons would count under the treaty's limits. Another concern about the treaty is that the Russians are modernizing their arsenal and manufacturing new weapons. We are the only nuclear superpower that is neither modernizing nor capable of producing new nuclear weapons.

Either Obama was out-negotiated or he was so intent on getting the treaty signed to secure a diplomatic "win" that he didn't mind giving Russia a clear advantage.

Worse, the New START was crafted without a serious review of past treaty violations. A recent compliance report shows that Russia continually violated the original START. But the administration has turned a blind eye and is permitting even more lax procedures.

The Russians' intentions have been clear. Before Obama signed the treaty, they expressed a desire to make the United States more vulnerable to future attacks. While discussions about the treaty were underway, Prime Minister Vladimir Putin commented on American missile defenses last December, "By building such an umbrella over themselves, [the United States] could feel themselves fully secure and will do whatever they want." And Putin got what he wanted. After Obama signed the treaty, the Russian government issued a statement that the treaty "can operate and be viable only if the United States refrains from developing its missile defense capabilities quantitatively or qualitatively."

Russia should not be permitted to dictate whether we can develop our missile defense capabilities. No negotiations should require a sacrifice of sovereignty. The United States has a constitutional duty to protect its citizens and a moral obligation to protect its allies.

To secure his first major diplomatic victory, Obama used U.S. missile defense systems as a negotiating tool. But national security is not something to be given away.

<http://politics.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2010/08/16/jim-demint-the-new-start-treaty-weakens-us-national-security.html>

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