



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 836, 20 August 2010

Articles & Other Documents:

[Iran Condemns Possible US Military Action](#)

[Gulf States Pushing For Attack On Iran](#)

[German Man Charged With Violating Iran Arms Embargo](#)

[Ayatollah Nixes Talks In Tantrum](#)

[Iran To Target Enemies' Interests Around World, If Attacked](#)

[Iran's Nuclear Threat Not Imminent, U.S. Says](#)

[Iran's Bushehr Nuclear Plant No Threat, Russia Says](#)

[Iran Broadcasts Missile Launch On State Television](#)

[China Lashes Out At Pentagon Military Report](#)

[N.Korea Smuggling Banned Materials: Reports](#)

[Korea Says Consensus With China On Nuclear Talks](#)

[US Says There are Specific Steps N. Korea Must Take to Resume 6-Party Talks](#)

[Nerpa Nuclear Submarine Sets Sail From Russia For India](#)

[US Drones Could Be Harmful For Pakistan's Nuclear Programme: Seminar](#)

[Russia's Newest Nuclear Sub Starts Sea Trials](#)

[TVA Sees Fuel In Old Warheads](#)

[CIA WMD Dept. Targets Rogue States, Terrorists](#)

[Pentagon Nears Finding On Hypersonic Glider Test Failure](#)

[Government To Overhaul Bioterror And Pandemic Flu Plans](#)

[US Conducts Antiterrorism Drill At MIT](#)

[HOLMES: Ignoring Arms-Control History Carries A Cost](#)

[Bushehr And The Bomb](#)

[Iran Has Peaceful Intentions - Rosatom Head](#)

[This Is No Way To Approve The New START Treaty](#)

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

Iran Condemns Possible US Military Action

By EDITH M. LEDERER, Associated Press Writer

Wednesday, August 18, 2010

UNITED NATIONS, (AP) -- Iran took its case against the United States to the United Nations on Wednesday and strongly condemned the top U.S. military chief for saying military action remains a possibility if the country develops nuclear weapons.

Iran's acting U.N. ambassador Eshagh Alehabib claimed in letters circulated to the secretary-general and presidents of the Security Council and General Assembly that Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other U.S. officials and lawmakers "threatened" to use military action under the "totally false" pretense that Iran is developing nuclear weapons.

Mullen said earlier this month that the U.S. military has a plan to attack Iran, although he thinks a military strike is probably a bad idea. Still, he said the risk of Iran developing a nuclear weapon is unacceptable and he reiterated that "the military option" remains on the table.

Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei warned Wednesday that Iran's response to an attack would not be limited to the region, suggesting Iran would target U.S. interests beyond the Persian Gulf.

"It's unlikely that they (U.S.) will make such a stupidity (to attack Iran) but all must know that if this threat is carried out, the field of the Iranian nation's confrontation will not be only our region," Khamenei told state TV. "The area of confrontation will be much wider."

He also said there will be no talks with the U.S. under the shadow of threats.

Khamenei, who has the final say on all state matters in Iran, apparently was referring to recent calls by the U.S. and other key powers for Iran to resume talks on its nuclear program following the U.N. Security Council's recent vote imposing a fourth set of sanctions against the country for refusing to halt uranium enrichment.

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 allegations, saying its nuclear program is geared merely toward generating electricity, not bombs.

Alehabib said the United States was using threatening language that violates international law and the U.N. Charter and goes against "global efforts to strengthen regional and international peace and security." He reiterated that Iran "would not hesitate to act in self-defense to respond to any attack."

Khamenei said negotiations would be possible if the U.S. stops making threats against Iran, and he set conditions for it.

"If the U.S. puts aside threats, sanctions and its superpower display and refuses to set goals for the talks, then there will be a possibility of talks. But under the present conditions and given the threats and pressures, no talks with be held at all," Khamenei was quoted as saying.

Khamenei also said Iran will not give up its nuclear activities.

"The U.S. and some Western countries have no logic in this issue and the Islamic Republic of Iran will never give up the cycle of nuclear fuel," state TV quoted him as saying.

The U.S. and five key powers — Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany — have been trying to revive talks with Iran on its nuclear program and have offered a package of incentives if Tehran freezes uranium enrichment and resumes negotiations.

In late July, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said nuclear talks with the six powers would start in early September, regardless of conditions he set in June, but Khamenei's comments raise questions about the timetable. Iran has also said it wants to revive separate talks involving Tehran, Washington, Paris and Moscow on a fuel swap for Tehran's research nuclear reactor.

Associated Press Writer Ali Akbar Dareini contributed to this report from Tehran, Iran.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2010/08/18/international/i101827D74.DTL>

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

Arutz Sheva – Israel
August 19, 2010

Gulf States Pushing For Attack On Iran

By Hillel Fendel

First it was the United Arab Emirates ambassador in Washington, now it's a Saudi Arabian editorial, and John Bolton says the entire Persian Gulf feels the same: an attack on Iran is the only option - if it's not too late.

An editorial in an official Saudi Arabian newspaper indicates that a military attack against Iran might be the only way of stopping it from obtaining nuclear weapons. "Tehran is moving its conflict with the international community into high gear," the *Al Madina* daily wrote this week, "and [in this case] some may consider the military option to be the best solution."

Delaying recourse to this option, the paper continues, "may lead to a point where it is impossible to implement it - if Tehran manages to produce a nuclear bomb of its own."

Former Ambassador to the United Nations John Bolton goes a bit further, saying it is the only way of stopping it - but adds that it might already be too late.

Just last month, the United Arab Emirates ambassador to Washington said at a conference, "A military attack on Iran by whomever would be a disaster, but Iran with a nuclear weapon would be a bigger disaster."

Ambassador Yousef al-Otaiba was unusually candid in his remarks, saying, "I think it's a cost-benefit analysis. I think despite the large amount of trade we do with Iran, which is close to \$12 billion... there will be consequences, there will be a backlash and there will be problems with people protesting and rioting and very unhappy that there is an outside force attacking a Muslim country; that is going to happen no matter what... Am I willing to live with that, versus living with a nuclear Iran? My answer is still the same: 'We cannot live with a nuclear Iran.' I am willing to absorb what takes place at the expense of the security of the U.A.E."

Former Ambassador Bolton feels that many states in the Persian Gulf region feel the same. He told Army Radio today (Thursday), however, that it might very well be too late to attack Iran because of the radioactivity that will emanate from the bombed reactor, harming the civilian population.

"Diplomacy and sanctions against Iran have failed," Bolton told Army Radio's Nitzan Fisher on the Ma Bo'er program, "and don't think the West took seriously enough Iran's efforts over the course of decades to get nuclear power. Frankly, I think the most likely outcome now is that indeed Iran does get nuclear weapons. I think the only possibility of stopping this is the use of military force - an extremely unattractive option, but it's even more unattractive to consider a world in which Iran has nuclear weapons."

He explained, though, that it might be too late: "With Russia beginning to supply fuel in Bushehr [two days from now], it makes the reactor essentially immune to attack, except in the most dire circumstances - because to attack it would mean, almost inevitably, the release of radioactivity into the atmosphere and possibly into the waters of the Persian Gulf."

"I don't think there's a ghost of a chance that the Obama Administration will use force against Iran's nuclear weapons program," Bolton said. "If anyone will do it, it's going to have to be Israel - and I don't know what Israel is going to do... I am very worried that Obama's fallback position is to accept an Iran with nuclear weapons. I think that can have potentially catastrophic consequences in the Middle East and beyond - but I think that's where the Obama Administration is."

Iran's Defense Minister Ahmed Wahidi said this week that Israel's existence will be endangered if it attacks the Bushehr reactor. He said such an attack would be an "international crime."

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/139207>

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

Deutsche Welle – Germany
August 19, 2010

German Man Charged With Violating Iran Arms Embargo

Prosecutors in Germany have filed charges against a German man accused of violating the Iran arms embargo by shipping equipment to Iran that could be used in making long-range missiles.

By Matt Zuvella

Federal prosecutors in Germany on Thursday opened a case against two men thought to have shipped equipment to Iran that could be used for making long-range missiles carrying nuclear warheads. This would be in violation of the Iran arms embargo.

The two men, Mohsen A., a 52-year-old Iranian, and Heinz Ulrich K. a 65 year-old German, are accused of buying and shipping a vacuum sinter furnace to Iran, which was purchased in Germany. The furnace is used to make warheads and missile guidance systems heat-resistant.

The purchase and shipment of the furnace was done without the knowledge of German authorities, and German law forbids unlicensed exports of goods that could be used for military purposes in conflict zones.

Mohsen A. had already previously been charged in connection with the shipment of the furnace, but prosecutors say their case against him has been expanded.

The two men are thought to have purchased the furnace in July 2007 for 850,000 euros (\$1.1 million).

Editor: Rob Turner

<http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,5925054,00.html>

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

New York Post
August 19, 2010

Ayatollah Nixes Talks In Tantrum

Reuters, with Associated Press

TEHRAN, Iran -- Iran's supreme leader said yesterday that his regime would not conduct nuclear talks with the United States unless sanctions and military threats were lifted.

"What they say, our president and others are saying, that we will negotiate -- yes, we will, but not with America because America is not negotiating honestly and like a normal negotiator," Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said in a televised speech.

"Put away the threats and put away the sanctions."

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has said that Iran is willing to resume negotiations with a group of six global powers in the coming weeks.

It was not entirely clear if Khamenei was ruling out resuming talks with the six, which include the United States, or saying there would be no bilateral talks with Washington.

The mullahs' regime also took its case against the United States to the United Nations yesterday and condemned the top US military chief for saying military action remains a possibility if the country develops nuclear weapons.

Iran's acting UN ambassador, Eshagh Alehabib, claimed that Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, and other US officials "threatened" to use military action under the "totally false" pretense that Iran is developing nukes.

Mullen said earlier this month that the US military has a plan to attack Iran, although he thinks a military strike is probably a bad idea. Still, he said the risk of Iran developing a nuclear weapon is unacceptable and he reiterated that "the military option" remains on the table.

Khamenei warned yesterday that Iran's response to an attack would not be limited to the region, suggesting Iran would target US interests beyond the Persian Gulf.

"It's unlikely that they [United States] will make such a stupidity [to attack Iran] but all must know that if this threat is carried out, the field of the Iranian nation's confrontation will not be only our region," Khamenei said. "The area of confrontation will be much wider."

http://www.nypost.com/p/news/international/ayatollah_nixes_talks_in_tantrum_h8VKPBweVGmH4LvoTUMT5J

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

People's Daily – China

Iran To Target Enemies' Interests Around World, If Attacked

August 19, 2010

Iran's Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC) announced on Thursday that in case the country is attacked, the IRGC will target the interests of the enemies in any part of the world.

IRGC has gained capabilities and strength enough to target the interests of the enemies in face of attacks, said the announcement posted on IRGC's website.

"IRGC is in full readiness to encounter firmly with the stupidity of the U.S. and the Zionist regime (of Israel)," Public Relations of IRGC was quoted as saying.

Earlier this month, the U.S. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Mike Mullen said the United States has a plan in place to attack Iran, if it is necessary.

"Military actions have been on the table and remain on the table" for curbing Iran's nuclear ambition, Mullen, the highest ranking U.S. military officer, told NBC's "Meet the Press".

"In a decisive battle, IRGC will impose a definite defeat to the enemies," said the announcement.

Muslim Iranians have proved that, despite the economic pressures, military threats and psychological war, they will push forward with their inalienable objectives, according to the announcement.

Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, said Wednesday that if the military threats of the enemies come true, Iranians will extend the battlefield to beyond the region.

On Wednesday, Iran's deputy ambassador to the United Nations, Eshaq Alehabib, complained to UN about U.S. military threats against the country over its nuclear program.

In a letter addressed to the UN Security Council (UNSC), Alehabib criticized the U.S. for the military threats.

Source: Xinhua

<http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90777/90854/7110317.html>

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

Globe and Mail - Canada

Iran's Nuclear Threat Not Imminent, U.S. Says

Obama administration officials believe assessment has dimmed prospect of pre-emptive strike by Israel

By Mark Mazzetti and David E. Sanger

Friday, August 20, 2010

Washington — The Obama administration, citing evidence of continued troubles inside Iran's nuclear program, has persuaded Israel that it would take roughly a year — and perhaps longer — for Iran to complete what one senior official called a "dash" for a nuclear weapon, according to U.S. officials.

Administration officials said they believe the assessment has dimmed the prospect that Israel would pre-emptively strike against the country's nuclear facilities within the next year, as Israeli officials have suggested in thinly veiled threats.

For years, Israeli and U.S. officials have debated whether Iran is on an inexorable drive toward a nuclear bomb and, if so, how long it would take to produce one. A critical question has been the time it would take Tehran to convert existing stocks of low-enriched uranium into weapons-grade material, a process commonly known as "breakout."

Israeli intelligence officials had argued that Iran could complete such a race for the bomb in months, while U.S. intelligence agencies have come to believe in the past year that the timeline is longer.

"We think that they have roughly a year dash time," said Gary Samore, President Barack Obama's top adviser on nuclear issues, referring to how long it would take the Iranians to convert nuclear material into a working weapon. "A year is a very long period of time."

Mr. Samore said the United States believed international inspectors would detect an Iranian move toward breakout within weeks, leaving a considerable amount of time for the United States and Israel to consider military strikes.

The U.S. assessments are based on intelligence collected over the past year, as well as reports from international inspectors.

Now, U.S. and Israeli officials believe breakout is unlikely anytime soon. For one thing, Iran, which claims it is interested in enriching uranium only for peaceful purposes, would be forced to build nuclear bombs from a limited supply of nuclear material, currently enough for two weapons. Second, such a decision would require kicking out international weapons inspectors, eliminating any ambiguity about Iran's nuclear plans.

Even if Iran were to choose this path, U.S. officials said it would probably take Iran some time to reconfigure its nuclear facilities to produce weapons-grade uranium and ramp up work on designing a nuclear warhead.

Israeli officials have indicated that if they saw a race for the bomb under way, they would probably take military action and encourage the United States to join the effort. A spokesman for the Israeli Embassy in Washington

declined to comment for this article. In interviews, Israeli officials said their assessments were coming into line with the American view, but they remain suspicious that Iran has a secret enrichment site yet to be discovered.

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/africa-mideast/irans-nuclear-threat-not-imminent-us-says/article1679399/>

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

People's Daily – China
20 August 2010

Iran's Bushehr Nuclear Plant No Threat, Russia Says

Strict controls on the operation of Iran's new Bushehr nuclear plant would ensure no fuel was siphoned off for other uses, Russia's Foreign Ministry said Friday.

Russian-supported construction of the Bushehr nuclear plant was close to completion, and the physical launch of the plant was planned for Saturday with fuel being loaded into the tank, it said in a statement.

"The Bushehr project is unique in terms of providing a strict abidance of the nuclear non-proliferation regime. Fuel for the plant will be supplied by Russia on condition of its return," the statement said.

All the plant's operation, including fuel supply and return, would be under full control of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), it said.

"The Bushehr project has been a visible example of how Iran could benefit from cooperation with the international community if it would undertake the practical steps to prove its nuclear program is fully peaceful," the statement said.

Construction of the plant started in 1975 by several German companies. However, work halted when the United States imposed an embargo on hi-tech supplies to Iran after the 1979 revolution. Russia signed a contract with Iran to complete the construction in 1998.

Western powers suspect Iran of seeking to build nuclear weapons despite Tehran's claims its nuclear program is intended only for generation of civilian energy.

Source: Xinhua

<http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90777/90853/7112498.html>

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

Iran Broadcasts Missile Launch On State Television

Iran has test fired a surface-to-surface missile, according to the country's defence minister.

20 August 2010

Ahmad Vahidi's announcement comes a day before Iran is scheduled to launch its Russian-built first nuclear power plant in the southern port city of Bushehr.

Television images showed the sand coloured Qiam (Rising) blasting into the air from a desert terrain, amid chants of "Allahu Akbar" (God is greatest).

The words "Ya Mahdi" were written on the side of the missile, referring to Imam Mahdi, one of the 12 imams of Shiite Islam, who disappeared as a boy and whom the faithful believe will return one day to bring redemption to mankind.

Mr Vahidi, who was speaking during Friday prayers in Tehran, did not say when the launch took place nor did he disclose the precise range of the missile.

"The missile has new technical aspects and has a unique tactical capacity," he said on state television, adding that the device was of a "new class."

"Since the surface-to-surface missile has no wings, it has lot of tactical power, which also reduces the chances of it being intercepted," he said.

On Tuesday, Mr Vahidi had said that Qiam was to be test fired during the annual government week, the period when Tehran touts its achievements in various fields. This year government week begins on Monday.

The third generation Fateh 110 (Conqueror) missile was also to be test fired during this period. Iran has previously paraded a version of Fateh 110 which has a travel range of 150 to 200 kilometres (90 to 125 miles).

Also during government week, the production lines of two missile-carrying speedboats, Seraj (Lamp) and Zolfaqar (named after Shiite Imam Ali's sword) are due to be inaugurated, while a long-range drone, Karar, is expected to be unveiled.

The firing of Qiam comes days after a top commander from the Revolutionary Guards said Iran will mass produce replicas of the Bladerunner 51, often described as the world's fastest boat, and equip them with weapons to be deployed in the Gulf.

On August 8, Iran took delivery of four new mini-submarines of the home-produced Ghadir class. Weighing 120 tonnes, the "stealth" submarines are aimed at operations in shallow waters, notably in the Gulf.

Iranian officials regularly boast about the Islamic republic's military capabilities and the latest missile launch comes at a time when local officials have been warning against any attack on the Islamic republic.

On Saturday, Iran is launching its Russian-built first nuclear power plant which eventually aims to generate electricity.

The plant is scheduled to go online after more than three decades of delays.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/7955996/Iran-broadcasts-missile-launch-on-state-television.html>

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

Montreal Gazette – Canada

China Lashes Out At Pentagon Military Report

By Marianne Barriaux, Postmedia News

August 18, 2010

BEIJING - China hit out Wednesday at a Pentagon report on its expanding military capabilities as other Asian nations said they would be keeping a wary eye on their giant neighbour's growing might.

Beijing said the U.S. Defence Department report was "not beneficial" for military ties between the two major powers, while state media branded the dossier "aggressive" and said it exaggerated the power of China's armed forces.

Geng Yansheng, spokesman for China's defence ministry, insisted the country was on a "path of peaceful development".

"Issuing this report is not beneficial for the improvement and development of Sino-U.S. military ties," he said in a statement.

The Pentagon report to the U.S. Congress said China's military strategists were looking to extend their reach to be able to hit targets as far away as mainland Japan, the Philippines and the U.S. territory of Guam.

Beijing was ramping up investment in a range of areas including nuclear weapons, long-range missiles, submarines, aircraft carriers and cyber warfare, according to the report published Monday.

Taiwan responded on Tuesday by renewing its call for the United States to sell it advanced weaponry, and joined Japan in vowing to keep a close eye on China's rising military strength.

But China demanded that Washington stop issuing such reports.

"China . . . firmly abides by a defensive national defence policy, does not take part in military confrontation and does not pose a military threat to any country," Geng said.

"We ask the United States . . . to stop remarks and behaviour that are not beneficial for mutual trust between the two militaries and Sino-U.S. relations."

China's state-run media carried a barrage of comments from experts on the issue, blasting what they called an "aggressive" Pentagon report.

Meng Xiangqing, a professor at the National Defence University, told the Global Times: "The interfering nature of the report remains unchanged. It will surely draw discontent from China over its exaggeration of its military power."

China's military expansion comes alongside its surging economic growth, which saw it overtake Japan as the world's second largest economy in the second quarter and the international community has been pushing China to take a more active role in addressing issues such as climate change and trade imbalances.

The Pentagon said China's military build-up in the Taiwan Strait had "continued unabated", despite better ties with the China-friendly government in Taipei which has been in power since 2008.

Taiwan on Tuesday repeated its call for the United States to sell it advanced F16 jet fighters and diesel submarines in the face of China's much stronger military.

Earlier this year, Beijing reacted angrily to an arms deal between Washington and Taiwan, saying it would cut military and security contacts with the United States.

"China has not given up the use of force against Taiwan and we are closely monitoring China's military developments. We ask the public to rest assured," Taiwan defence ministry spokesman Yu Sy-tue said.

Beijing considers Taiwan, where the mainland's defeated nationalists fled in 1949 at the end of a bloody civil war, to be part of its territory awaiting reunification, by force if necessary.

Following the report, Tokyo said it would "keep paying attention to China's military trend".

"It will have a significant impact on security in the region, including Japan, and on the international community," a Japanese defence ministry spokeswoman said.

Japan and Vietnam, which both have historic tensions with China, have reported incidents with China's military in recent months and the Pentagon predicted Beijing may step up patrols in the South China Sea.

Against this backdrop, the United States and Vietnam — former foes who only normalize diplomatic ties 15 years ago — held their first high-level defence dialogue on Tuesday.

Hanoi and Beijing are involved in a territorial dispute over islands in the South China Sea.

Last month China reacted angrily after U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said resolution of those territorial rows — which also involve other nations — was "pivotal" to regional stability.

<http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/China+lashes+Pentagon+military+report/3411667/story.html>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

N.Korea Smuggling Banned Materials: Reports

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

19 August 2010

SEOUL - North Korea has been smuggling banned materials which could be used for rocket and missile launches, often using forged documents to disguise their destination, local media reported Thursday.

South Korea has secured evidence that materials related to the weapons of mass destruction were exported to the North through China and other countries, Munhwa Ilbo newspaper reported, quoting unnamed government officials.

“North Korea has smuggled commodities related to weapons of mass destruction banned by the international community and luxury goods through detour routes such as China, Japan, Mongolia and Russia,” it said.

Illegal methods used by the cash-strapped communist country to evade sanctions have become more creative than before, the newspaper said.

South Korean officials refused to confirm the report.

UN resolutions adopted after the North's missile and nuclear tests last year ban transactions linked to its nuclear and atomic activities and the supply of luxury goods to Pyongyang.

The United States has announced new sanctions on the North to punish it for the sinking of a South Korean warship in March with the loss of 46 lives, and to push it to scrap its nuclear weapons programme.

Seoul found that a Chinese company had fabricated documents to export measuring equipment to the North in April, Munhwa Ilbo said, adding such equipment could be used for long-range rocket or missile launches.

The South's Yonhap news agency carried a similar report and said Seoul and Washington have been watching closely as the North used US measuring equipment to launch a long-range rocket last year.

South Korean officials believe the measuring equipment smuggled this year could be used to launch missiles, it said.

Munwha Ilbo added that two Japanese traders were caught by police in June attempting to export second-hand digging equipment, which could be used as a missile launch pad, to North Korea.

South Korea has collected information about North Korean officials using diplomatic pouches to smuggle whisky, cigars and drugs, the newspaper said.

Pyongyang now favours Mongolia and Russia to smuggle banned goods because of tightened regulations in China, it said.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?col=§ion=international&xfile=data/international/2010/August/international_August1009.xml

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

The Star - Malaysia
Friday, August 20, 2010

Korea Says Consensus With China On Nuclear Talks

By Jeremy Laurence

SEOUL (Reuters) - North Korea said it has reached a consensus with China concerning the resumption of international talks on ending its nuclear arms programme, the North's official news agency reported.

China, the North's sole key ally, has urged regional powers to put the March sinking of a South Korean warship behind them and return to the negotiating table to end a cycle of confrontation that has raised tension to new heights.

Seoul and Washington say a North Korean submarine torpedoed the Cheonan corvette, killing 46 sailors. Pyongyang denies any role.

Six-way nuclear talks involving the two Koreas, the United States, Japan, Russia and China have been in limbo since 2008.

Chinese state media said a delegation led by Beijing's chief nuclear envoy Wu Dawei visited Pyongyang earlier this week for talks on security issues and the six-party talks process.

The North's official KCNA news agency said the two sides had held "in-depth discussions on the regional situation and the bilateral relations of friendship and matters of mutual concern including the resumption of the six-party talks and the denuclearization of the whole Korean Peninsula".

"They reached a full consensus of views on all the matters discussed," it reported late on Thursday.

China, which had been the host of the six-way talks that began in 2003, has urged regional powers to "flip the page of the Cheonan incident" and quickly resume negotiations.

Last month, after the U.N. Security Council statement did not directly blame it for the sinking of a South Korean warship, apparently in deference to Beijing, Pyongyang said it was willing to return to the talks.

South Korea and the United States have said the North must first admit responsibility for the Cheonan incident before they would consider the resumption of the six-way forum.

North Korea has consistently sought talks with Washington, claiming the status of a legitimate nuclear power, and has also demanded new negotiations to replace the armistice ending the 1950-53 Korean War with a permanent peace treaty.

South Korea and the United States have rejected the idea of peace talks, saying the dismantling of the North's nuclear programme in an irreversible manner must come first.

Editing by Jonathan Thatcher

http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/8/20/worldupdates/2010-08-20T073004Z_01_NOOTR_RTRMDNC_0_-509563-1&sec=Worldupdates

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

Arirang News – South Korea

US Says There are Specific Steps N. Korea Must Take to Resume 6-Party Talks

August 20, 2010

By Han Da-eun, Arirang News

Washington announced that there are measures that need to be taken by North Korea to ensure an appropriate environment for the resumption of the six-party talks aimed at the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula.

However according to US State Department Spokesman Philip Crowley at a daily press briefing while there is still much left for Pyongyang to do to create a productive environment for talks the communist state has undertaken some specific obligations.

Crowley failed to explain what they were in detail but did express concerns over provocations made by the North both recently and over the last several months.

He called on the regime to change its behavior which would indicate that Pyongyang is ready to resolve the tension over the Cheonan incident by restarting the negotiations involving the two Koreas, China, the US, Japan and Russia.

He also mentioned the upcoming UN General Assembly next month saying it would provide an opportunity for direct talks with all concerning parties.

However he added that the US will continue to make it clear to North Korea that there are steps the isolated regime has to take to create the right environment for progress.

On Thursday China's Foreign Ministry said that its chief nuclear envoy Wu Dawei visited North Korea from Monday to Wednesday and met with high-ranking Pyongyang officials to hold discussions on the regional situation and mutual concerns including the resumption of the six-party talks and the denuclearization of the reclusive regime.

Wu's three-day trip came ahead of a new round of joint military drills between South Korea and the US slated to be staged in the West Sea early next month.

China has denounced these exercises citing the possibility of increasing the already-heightened tensions between the two Koreas.

http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News_View.asp?nseq=106111&code=Ne2&category=2

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

Brahmand Defence & Aerospace News - India

Nerpa Nuclear Submarine Sets Sail From Russia For India

August 20, 2010

By Press Trust of India

MOSCOW (PTI): Russia has handed over a new nuclear powered submarine armed with torpedos and cruise missiles to India and the vessel has set sail for home with a mixed crew of Indian and Russian sailors.

The Akula class nuclear attack submarine on a ten year lease to the Indian Navy left its base on the Pacific coast earlier this week, bound for India, RIA Novosti and Interfax news agencies reported.

With the expected induction of Nerpa by year-end, it will be after 19 years that the Indian Navy would have a nuclear submarine in its fleet.

India's indigenous nuclear submarine INS Arihant is presently undergoing sea test trials.

However, an official of the shipyard said that the submarine was still undergoing final sea trials. The Russian Navy's Pacific Command refused to comment.

Reports said that the Nerpa submarine which has been re-christened INS Chakra leased at a cost of USD 650 million is accompanied by Russian instructors, who will help Indian naval crew to bring it to the new port of deployment.

"The Nerpa has not been yet handed over to the Indian Navy," an official of the Amur Shipyard in Russia's far eastern Khabarovsk region said over phone.

"Presently the joint Indian-Russian naval crew is completing the combat training on the high seas," the shipyard official added.

But experts here do not rule out that the Russian Navy wants to formally hand over Nerpa to the Indian Navy on the Indian coast and the so-called training mission could be a cover for security reasons.

The submarine has been handed over two years after an accident onboard during testing killed 20 people. The Amur shipyard, the builders of the sub said the vessel was now completely retrofitted after the November 2008 accident.

Russia's Akula-II class submarine is considered to be the quietest nuclear submarine and during its trials by the Russian Navy since January its acoustic noises have been further reduced by the Amur Shipyard, which was initially to deliver the submarine in 2007.

<http://www.brahmand.com/news/Nerpa-nuclear-submarine-sets-sail-from-Russia-for-India/4746/3/13.html>

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

Daily Times – Pakistan
Friday, August 20, 2010

US Drones Could Be Harmful For Pakistan's Nuclear Programme: Seminar

Staff Report

LAHORE: Nuclear issues expert and the director of the Ali Institute of Education, Dr AH Nayyar has expressed fear that US drone attacks could prove harmful for Pakistan's nuclear programme and its nuclear installations placed at undisclosed locations.

Addressing a seminar titled "What is so unclear about nuclear; a brief history of Pakistan's nuclear programme" organised by the Ali Institute of Education in its Mustafa Hall on Thursday, when the director was asked if the CIA could take away Pakistan's nuclear weapons and whether the country's nuclear weapons were safe against thefts and proliferations, Dr Nayyar told the audience that the country's nuclear weapons were fully safe, as the state of Pakistan had taken strict measures according to modern standards that were similar to international countries to avoid any mishap. "But, due to US drone attacks, Pakistani nuclear weapons could be targeted if these weapons were kept in the same areas of the country where US forces were chasing terrorists and bombing their hideouts," he added.

The nuclear expert said that Pakistan held around 125 nuclear weapons, which were not placed together at any single location in the country, and no other country including the US could trace or take away these weapons from Pakistan and hence the programme was totally safe.

Regarding the threat from the Taliban or other religious element interested in acquiring nuclear weapons to enhance their powers for pressuring the US, he said that generally, it was a most dangerous situation for the nuclear weapons holder countries if they were dealing with terrorist activities in their territories and unfortunately, Pakistan was one of them, so such threats did exist but the security given to these installations was more than adequate.

http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2010%5C08%5C20%5Cstory_20-8-2010_pg13_9

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia's Newest Nuclear Sub Starts Sea Trials

19 August 2010

Russia's newest strategic nuclear-powered submarine, the Borey-class Yury Dolgoruky, started a series of sea trials in the White Sea, the Sevmash shipyard said on Thursday.

The trials are part of the manufacturer's test program and depending on their outcome, official state testing will begin, a Sevmash spokesman said.

The submarine, a 23-billion ruble (\$755 million) project, is expected to be armed with the troubled Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM).

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) has officially suffered seven failures in 12 tests. Some analysts suggest that in reality the number of failures is considerably larger. Some observers claim only one of the 12 launches has been an outright success.

The future development of the Bulava has been questioned by several lawmakers and defense industry officials, who suggest that all efforts should be focused on the existing Sineva SLBM.

However, that would require major changes to the Borey-class submarines. The Russian military has insisted that there is no alternative to the Bulava and pledged to continue testing the missile until it is ready to be put into service.

MOSCOW, August 19 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20100819/160261783.html>

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

The Tennessean

TVA Sees Fuel In Old Warheads

Plan to reuse plutonium has unresolved issues

August 18, 2010

When it comes to nuclear power, there is no such thing as an easy answer.

The latest example of this is the proposal by the U.S. Department of Energy to use surplus material from nuclear warheads to help power Tennessee Valley Authority nuclear power plants.

For DOE, it represents a chance to get rid of weapons that the government no longer wants, as the nation's nuclear arsenal undergoes modernization and reduction.

That reduction is an admirable goal. But in suggesting that the weapons-grade plutonium be reprocessed for power plants, the federal government may only be shifting the environmental and security threats from one place to another.

Here's what DOE proposes: It wants to convert 13 metric tons of plutonium produced in making nuclear warheads into a mixed-oxide fuel, or MOX, at a fuel-fabrication plant under construction at the federal Savannah River, S.C., nuclear complex. This would begin after the plant is finished in 2016.

The plutonium-enriched MOX would then be shipped over roads from South Carolina to TVA's Sequoyah nuclear plant in Soddy-Daisy, Tenn., or to its Browns Ferry plant near Athens, Ala., by 2018.

DOE and TVA both know this is a tricky sell, and have held public meetings in Chattanooga and Tanner, Ala., not far from Browns Ferry. But there are good reasons for the public to be skeptical. According to a number of scientists and environmental groups, the transportation of the fuel is highly vulnerable to theft for terrorist uses.

The Union of Concerned Scientists has called the MOX fuel "dirty, dangerous and expensive," and the organization has warned that reprocessing plutonium to a less-volatile state makes it easier to be stolen, either by people who work for the operation or by those who would hijack the shipment. The material can be processed again for use in nuclear weapons.

It's easy to see why citizens of East Tennessee and North Alabama would be worried. Also, it should be a matter of concern for residents of Texas and other Western states, because the plutonium will first be shipped from weapons facilities there to Savannah River.

DOE and TVA assurances that specially licensed shippers will be able to handle these materials without incident are, frankly, insufficient, as is TVA's argument that this process is not very different from the reprocessing of weapons-grade uranium that is already being done.

TVA saves nearly 25 percent on its nuclear fuel costs by recycling weapons uranium, and that's why the agency is so keen on this project.

There simply are too many questions. For example, tests for making MOX were being conducted at Duke Power's Catawba Nuclear Plant in North Carolina, but the plant canceled the arrangement at the end of 2008, according to a recent report by *The Chattanooga Times Free Press*. TVA officials say the problem there was over manufacture of guide tubes, not the fuel.

Before that, fuel assemblies for the MOX fuel were manufactured in France, but the assemblies could only be used twice because they expanded unexpectedly during tests.

These are not developments that should be taken lightly, and TVA ratepayers and state and local officials in Tennessee and Alabama should send a strong message that they want answers on what happened to the guide tubes and fuel assemblies before these practices begin.

Don't try to solve the problem of the nation's aging nuclear arsenal by sending the problem to the Southeast.

<http://www.tennessean.com/article/20100818/COLUMNIST0111/8180345/TVA-sees-fuel-in-old-warheads->

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

Homeland Security Today

CIA WMD Dept. Targets Rogue States, Terrorists

By Anthony L. Kimery

Thursday, 19 August 2010

'... our nation continues to confront the threat of weapons of mass destruction'

As Al Qaeda and its associated movements (AQAM) continue to aggressively pursue a variety of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs), especially biological and nuclear, senior counterterrorism intelligence officials said, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) announced this week that it is putting the final touches on a new counterproliferation (CP) office.

CIA Director Leon Panetta said the new counter-WMD group will "confront the threat of weapons of mass destruction - nuclear, chemical and biological."

The new office also will have strong tasking to monitor – and, disrupt, if necessary – any pariah state's covert WMD programs. Iran comes to mind.

According to sources and reports, the new CP office will provide improved coordination and intelligence dot sharing between WMD analysts and traditional field CIA agents involved in operations that either are directly targeting WMD activities, or which because of their missions reasonably could cause them to come across bad guys involved in trying to sell, acquire or otherwise manufacture these sorts of weapons.

The CIA said "the new organization will incorporate the current Counterproliferation Division of the National Clandestine Service (NCS) and elements of the Weapons Intelligence, Nonproliferation & Arms Control Center (WINPAC), which is part of the Directorate of Intelligence (DI)."

The Counterproliferation Center will be led by an undercover NCS officer, with deputies for operations and analysis, according to a CIA statement. Panetta explained that CPC would take shape over the next several weeks.

"More important than the movement of people or desks, though, are the results we seek: the strongest, most effective counterproliferation operations and analysis in our Agency's history," Panetta said.

Continuing, Panetta said, "as our nation continues to confront the threat of weapons of mass destruction—nuclear, chemical, and biological - we must constantly strive for new ways to work across directorates, combining a diversity of expertise with a range of powerful capabilities to keep our nation safe. Our greatest achievements as an agency are the product of close collaboration among operations officers, analysts, targeters, technical specialists, and support officers."

The National Counterterrorism Center already has a specific unit that's tasked with hunting terrorists trying to obtain WMDs – presumably this office, too, will be working closely with the new WMD counterproliferation agency the CIA is cobbling together.

The Director of National Intelligence's (DNI) National Counterproliferation Center is supposed to be the authority over Intelligence Community-wide counter WMD activities. How it will interface with the CIA's new CP department – or how both will be integrated with the NCTC's counter-WMD unit – hasn't been made clear.

The DNI's CP center's mission is "the primary organization within the Intelligence Community" for coordinating US efforts against the spread of biological, chemical and nuclear weapons."

CIA officials said the new CP office will formalize the working relationship between its WMD analysts and covert operatives. CIA spokesman George Little said the relationship has already led to unspecified intelligence successes.

Homeland Security Today reported in the January report, "*The WMD Connection*," that the terrorist WMD threat continues to be real and growing. But with Iran and other Islamist nations working or thinking of launching their own covert nuclear programs, intelligence officials worry that materials needed for a bomb will be more easily available to jihadist terrorist organizations, especially Al Qaeda or one of its allied terror groups.

<http://www.hstoday.us/content/view/14409/149/>

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

Global Security Newswire

Pentagon Nears Finding On Hypersonic Glider Test Failure

Thursday, August 19, 2010

By Elaine M. Grossman

WASHINGTON -- The U.S. Defense Department is close to determining what caused a hypersonic glide vehicle to fail during an April flight test, a senior official said today (see *GSN*, March 15).

The event was expected to demonstrate technology usable in a conventional "prompt global strike" weapon capable of striking targets anywhere around the world within one hour.

A Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency review board "is in the last phases of its internal review" of the Hypersonic Test Vehicle-2's maiden flight test and should report out in "the next month or so," Zachary Lemnios said at a breakfast session with reporters this morning. "When that review board finishes their work, we'll come out with a statement on exactly what's happened."

Using the HTV-2 technology, a joint DARPA-Air Force effort is aimed at developing a Conventional Strike Missile capable of achieving Mach 20 speeds.

Lemnios, who directs the Pentagon's Defense Research and Engineering office, said a significant amount of data was gathered during the April 22 test. Launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., the test vehicle reportedly achieved successful separation from its Minotaur 4 boosters high in the atmosphere.

However, nine minutes into the flight, the dart-shaped glider lost communication and never made it to its notional target, which had been set in the Pacific Ocean north of Kwajalein Atoll.

Initial DARPA analysis was that the loss of the vehicle might have resulted from its self-destruct apparatus, which could automatically terminate flight if it sensed any divergence from its programmed route, according to one defense consultant. Alternatively, any number of other operating failures might have led to the crash, according to officials.

The Hypersonic Test Vehicle-2 reportedly lacks a device that might have signaled activation of the self-destruct sequence, somewhat complicating the DARPA analysis.

"There does not appear to be a mechanism in there that would tell you whether it was self-destruction or not," said the consultant, who requested anonymity because of the sensitivity of the ongoing failure review.

Eric Mazzacone, a DARPA spokesman, said the engineering-review board has been meeting since the end of May to scour "millions" of data points gathered during the flight test.

"Following senior-level [Pentagon] review of those findings, key observations may be released, subject to classification and export-control restrictions," he told *Global Security Newswire* today.

U.S. Strategic Command chief Gen. Kevin Chilton has said he wants to see the first Conventional Strike Missile fielded at Vandenberg by 2015 (see *GSN*, July 1, 2009). It would remain on alert, backed up by two spares, for potentially hitting a time-urgent target such as top terrorist leaders spotted at a hideout or a North Korean nuclear missile being readied for launch, according to defense officials.

The HTV-2 has a carbon-fiber aero shell that allows it thermal protection as the delta-wing vehicle glides on the edge of space towards its target. During the test, the vehicle was expected to fly roughly 5,700 kilometers in less than half an hour.

Lemnios would not say today whether the April disappointment is expected to delay the prompt-strike missile's deployment or to hike flight-test costs, which were projected last spring to reach or even surpass \$500 million. He also declined to speculate whether plans for the next such HTV-2 flight, slated for March 2011, would be affected.

"I'm not going to make that determination until I see exactly what came out of the review board," said Lemnios, who is responsible for overseeing DARPA efforts.

Pentagon budget officials -- assembling their request for fiscal 2012 funding -- recently examined the possibility of splitting off the futuristic HTV-2 technology development effort from the Air Force-led Conventional Strike Missile program, according to defense sources. The White House is expected to submit the new budget to Congress next February.

If implemented, the idea would have been to allow the Air Force-led missile program to be fielded more quickly by pairing it with a less futuristic payload-delivery vehicle, available in the nearer term.

However, defense officials opted to defer a decision on the matter until after next year's flight test, these sources said.

Though Lemnios would not discuss program or budget specifics, he did describe the general thinking behind the HTV-2 effort.

"The risk that we put into those programs -- the risk level that we're willing to put into those investments -- is enormously high," he told reporters at the Defense Writers Group event. "The impact is also high."

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100819_3364.php

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

Los Angeles Times

Government To Overhaul Bioterror And Pandemic Flu Plans

Federal officials will use H1N1 funding to speed the process of discovering and developing drugs and vaccines in case of emergency.

By Andrew Zajac, Tribune Washington Bureau
August 20, 2010

Reporting from Washington — Acknowledging that the development of medical countermeasures against bioterrorism threats and pandemic flu is lagging, federal authorities Thursday announced a \$1.9-billion makeover of the system for identifying and manufacturing drugs and vaccines for public health emergencies.

The overhaul includes refinements to manufacturing aimed at shaving weeks off the time it takes to produce pandemic flu vaccine, and a series of steps aimed at more quickly spotting promising scientific discoveries and getting them to market.

We aren't generating enough new products," said Health and Human Services Secretary Kathleen Sebelius, citing "leaks, chokepoints and dead ends" in the medical development pipeline.

Money for the changes comes from funds initially allocated for the H1N1 flu pandemic.

Among other things, the effort would provide \$822 million for upgrades to speed up production of pandemic flu vaccine. Another large block, \$678 million, would be used to set up at least one private facility that would work under government contract with small companies to manufacture new products, develop new manufacturing processes and help produce vaccines during periods of peak demand.

The reforms were detailed in a Health and Human Services Department report commissioned in late 2009 and released Thursday along with a separate report by the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology.

Both reports were spurred by months-long delays in production of the H1N1 vaccine last year. The pandemic flu turned out to be relatively mild, but health authorities said the delay exposed flaws in response that could cost thousands of lives in future outbreaks if uncorrected.

The changes, particularly the additional money for drug development and improvement of the FDA's regulatory process, are important steps in the right direction, said Dr. Brad Spellberg of the Infectious Diseases Society of America.

"This is a sign that the federal government is starting to get it," said Spellberg, author of "Rising Plague," which describes that emergence of antibiotic-resistant "superbugs."

Although Sebelius did not address it directly, the changes are an implicit acknowledgement that Project BioShield, a \$5.6-billion fund set up in 2004, has not led to the quick development of a stream of vaccines, drugs and equipment for the bioterrorism medicine chest.

Key congressional lawmakers last month proposed cutting \$2 billion from BioShield.

White House spokesman Nick Shapiro said that BioShield and Health and Human Service's Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority, which manages it, remained important players in bioterrorism defense, but that "we are now finally creating conditions that will enable their success."

<http://www.latimes.com/health/la-na-vaccines-20100820,0,4445809.story>

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

Boston Globe

US Conducts Antiterrorism Drill At MIT

Theft of radioactive material is feared

By Bryan Bender, Globe Staff
August 20, 2010

WASHINGTON — US counterterrorism officials held an exercise at MIT yesterday to better prepare local authorities to respond to the potential theft of radioactive material, part of a series of security enhancements federal officials are putting in place at facilities across the region that are considered vulnerable to terrorists seeking weapons of mass destruction.

Led by the Department of Energy and the FBI, the exercise involved a fictitious scenario in which terrorists tried to steal cobalt, a highly radioactive substance that is used in hospitals to irradiate blood, but could also be used to make

a so-called dirty bomb to spread deadly radiation. The exercise included officials from MIT's police force, the medical community, Cambridge police, Massachusetts State Police, and fire officials.

The exercise was not announced publicly. Officials would not say whether they encountered specific problems.

It was the latest in a series of efforts by the US Department of Energy to improve security at a number of facilities in the Boston area that rely on radioactive substances such as cobalt or cesium for medical treatments and research activities.

"Boston has a concentration of major research universities," said Steven Aoki, deputy undersecretary of energy for counterterrorism, who participated in the daylong session. "We are trying to make sure in a very complicated area that everyone has some awareness of what the relationships and roles and responsibilities are" of different members of the community in case of an event, he said.

David E. Moncton, director of MIT's nuclear research reactor, said "exercises of this type are valuable tools for enhancing coordination among the various organizations involved in response management."

In addition to MIT, which has a nuclear reactor and several blood irradiation centers, security improvements are also being implemented at five other facilities in the Boston area, according to officials involved in the effort. They declined to name the facilities for security reasons.

The facilities are among more than 2,100 buildings across the country that house radioactive materials that the federal government considers vulnerable to theft. The effort to beef up security at such facilities has a long way to go. By July, the federal government had completed security enhancements at 131. The government does not expect to finish upgrading security at the remainder of the sites until 2019.

The security enhancements, which are voluntary, include installing biometric scanners to control access to the materials; closed-circuit television cameras to monitor supplies; motion detectors; and special kits that can alert authorities if the radioactive materials are obtained by unauthorized persons.

The steps are funded by the Department of Energy's Global Threat Reduction Initiative, established to help secure vulnerable nuclear materials around the world. The program places new emphasis on protecting radioactive materials in the United States; the Obama administration is proposing to increase the budget for domestic efforts 10-fold next year to more than \$300 million.

Yesterday's training exercise at MIT was part of a series called Silent Thunder. It is designed to examine federal, state, and local authorities' ability to respond to terrorist incidents involving weapons of mass destruction.

The security of nuclear materials at MIT has long been a concern for some specialists. Its research reactor is one of a few left in the United States that uses highly enriched uranium, the most radioactive form that can be used to make a nuclear weapon. While the university has in place a series of security measures, it has agreed to demands from federal authorities to convert its reactor in the coming years so it uses low-enriched uranium fuel, which cannot be used to make a bomb.

Yesterday's exercise in Cambridge had two parts. The first focused on ways to detect and deter a terrorist from obtaining radioactive materials and the second forced officials to think about how they would respond in the event of an attack using radioactive materials or another weapon of mass destruction.

"The purpose of these exercises is to get all the key players together around a table to practice going through the kind of crisis management and emergency response scenarios that could come up in a real world emergency, to make sure we get the kinks worked out in advance," said Damien LaVera, a spokesman for the National Nuclear Security Administration, an arm of the Department of Energy. "It helps communities think through all the contingencies they would need to be prepared for, in the event of a real attack."

He insisted that the intent was not to grade the facilities on their security, which he said is considered adequate. But he acknowledged that more work needs to be done to ensure that such facilities are fully secure.

The agency believes that the threat is not just from terrorists, but also the possibility that someone who is authorized to gain access to the material could remove it and transfer it to others.

"It is important to not focus solely on attacks from outside terrorists attempting to penetrate and steal material," Kenneth Sheely, an Energy Department official, told Congress last year. "The possibility and probability of a passive insider, [such as] one who simply arranges access to the facility for the adversary, or an active insider, one who participates in the theft, diversion, or sabotage of radiological material, is greater, given the open environment of a university campus or city hospital in which many radiological devices are used."

http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2010/08/20/us_conducts_antiterrorism_drill_at_mit/

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

Washington Times
OPINION

HOLMES: Ignoring Arms-Control History Carries A Cost

By Kim R. Holmes - The Washington Times
Wednesday, August 18, 2010

Those following the debate over the New START treaty inked by Presidents Obama and Medvedev in April know that both governments dispute what it means. Russia says it'll impose real restrictions on U.S. missile defenses. U.S. officials brush off those claims.

The dispute centers on language in the preamble linking strategic offensive and defensive weapons and claiming such linkage "will become more important as strategic nuclear arms are reduced."

Treaty supporters in the U.S. say this language is merely rhetorical; it won't restrict our ability to defend against missiles from Iran, North Korea or elsewhere. It's stunning how easily they dismiss Russia's interpretation. They should review a little history. The Russians may know something they don't.

For example, under the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with the Soviet Union, the U.S. consistently placed limitations on "theater" (shorter-range) air and missile defense systems the treaty did not officially cover. Why? Because Pentagon attorneys feared controversy with the Soviets. Their guidance led the U.S. to "dumb down" the Patriot missile so that it could intercept only "slow and low" missiles, though nothing in the ABM Treaty required such design and testing limits. As a result, former Strategic Defense Initiative Director Henry F. Cooper confirmed later, "In the 1970s, no ballistic missile defense capability was given to [the developmental] SAM-D, now called Patriot."

So what's wrong with shaving a little capability?

It ultimately costs lives. Take the Gulf War. Between August 1990 and the war's outbreak in January 1991, the U.S. rushed to build new Patriot models to counter Iraq's Scud missiles. But they were far less capable than they could have been. More capable interceptors could have prevented an Iraqi missile from killing 28 American soldiers in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, that February. Lives were lost because overzealous U.S. attorneys, wary of offending the Soviets, went far beyond the "letter of the law" of the ABM Treaty.

Democratic and Republican administrations also bent over backward to avoid violating ABM Treaty limits on testing systems "based on other physical principles." This provision was mistakenly applied to any new technology - particularly to anything for outer space, since that was what most rankled the Russians. The Pentagon intentionally slowed development of space-based defenses. We remain far behind what the technology will allow in space because of the years of dithering caused by the ABM Treaty.

A third example occurred after the Soviet Union collapsed. The U.S. negotiated so-called "demarcation agreements" with Belarus, Kazakhstan, Russia and Ukraine - states the Clinton administration sought to make our new ABM Treaty partners. Mr. Clinton wanted to maintain "the viability, integrity and effectiveness of the treaty" by theoretically giving free rein to U.S. theater missile defense systems, which everyone agreed we needed. But that didn't happen. By including some of the ABM Treaty's definitional language, the demarcation agreements ended up constraining theater defenses, most particularly the sea-based system the U.S. was developing.

Then Russia got into the act. It insisted the demarcation agreements be brought into force before it would ratify START II. But because the U.S. Senate was so opposed to the succession and demarcation agreements, Mr. Clinton submitted none of them for ratification. START II and the demarcation agreements died because the Senate wisely refused to let Russia hold our missile defense capabilities hostage to the promise of a strategic arms reduction treaty.

Granted, New START doesn't have the kinds of detailed restrictions on developing, testing and deploying defenses in the ABM Treaty and demarcation agreements. However, it does re-establish the linkage between offensive and defensive strategic forces that Russia went to the mat over in the 1990s.

Here is where history matters: As they did with START II and the demarcation agreements, Russians are vigorously pushing the Senate today to choose between U.S. offensive reductions and robust missile defenses.

And the Obama administration is playing this Russian game. It sacrificed the "third site" of U.S. missile defenses in Europe to counter missiles from Iran, mainly to mollify Russia. It scaled back the ground-based interceptors in Alaska and California from 44 to 30, mainly to convince China that our defenses pose no significant capability against their missiles.

As the threat of missiles launched from Iran, North Korea, or a rogue state grows, so does the need for more robust defenses. At some point, our need to defend against longer-range Iranian and North Korean missiles will run right up against the promise implied in New START that our systems won't have any capability against Russian missiles.

When that happens, someone in Congress will undoubtedly say this or that upgrade to our missile defenses violates New START. Or worse, a Pentagon attorney will say it, and nobody but a few vigilant experts will know better or care.

As the saying goes, those who ignore history are destined to repeat it. We've been down this road before, and it cost the country dearly.

Kim R. Holmes, a former assistant secretary of state, is a vice president at the Heritage Foundation.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/aug/18/holmes-ignoring-arms-control-history-carries-a-cos/>

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

Forbes

OPINION

Present Dangers

Bushehr And The Bomb

By Ilan Berman

August 20, 2010

If the Kremlin stays true to its word, Russia on Saturday will begin loading nuclear fuel into Iran's Bushehr reactor. Once it does, it will usher in a new stage in the deepening crisis over Iran's nuclear program.

The 1,000-megawatt plutonium reactor, located near the southern Iranian port city of the same name, has been the public face of the Iranian regime's nuclear program since Tehran and Moscow concluded the agreement to build it, despite American objections, in early 1995. Construction was completed in 2004, but Bushehr has laid dormant for years, ostensibly because of disputes over financing between Russia and Iran, but really because of Moscow's recognition of Washington's worries about Iran's nuclear program.

Until now. On Aug. 13, Rosatom, Russia's state nuclear agency, announced that it will begin packing fuel rods into the reactor, after which "the plant can be certified as a nuclear power installation."

The news has set off alarm bells in Washington, and for good reason. Once it is up and running over the next six months, fuel from the plant could be diverted to expand Iran's existing stockpile of weapons-usable fissile material. Bushehr, once online, could also serve as a critical training ground for Iranian scientists and technicians, significantly expanding the knowledge base (and consequently the pace) of Iran's nuclear program.

But while Bushehr may be Iran's most prominent nuclear facility, it isn't the most important one. While Iran had pursued both uranium and plutonium tracks in its nuclear program since the mid-1980s, the lion's share of resources and attention in recent years have been devoted to the former. The decision is logical; uranium enrichment provides Iran with a quicker, simpler way to generate the fissile material necessary for an atomic bomb, if the Iranian regime makes the strategic decision to do so.

Additionally, Bushehr is far too high-profile a facility for effective nuclear weapons work. With an estimated 900-person workforce, one-third or more of which is foreign (primarily from the former Soviet Union), the plutonium plant is well and truly an international affair. For these reasons, and others, experts say Bushehr is unlikely to figure prominently on the target list for any conceivable military action on the part of Israel.

Or of the United States, for that matter. Up until Bushehr was finished in 2004, the Bush administration opposed Russia's construction of the plutonium plant, seeing it as a potential source for Iranian proliferation. Once it was built, Washington lobbied heavily--and, for the most part, successfully--for Moscow to defer delivery of fuel to the facility, hoping to keep it under wraps.

The Obama administration, by contrast, appears to have given its blessing to Bushehr. The State Department has already emphasized that, in its view, Bushehr "does not represent a proliferation risk," and has spoken approvingly of Russia's provision of nuclear fuel to Iran, holding it out as a viable alternative to Iran's indigenous enrichment efforts.

All of which tracks closely with Russia's interests. Moscow, after all, has been one of Iran's principal nuclear enablers since at least the early 1990s. And while the Kremlin of late has grudgingly gone along with U.N. sanctions against Iran, it shows little sign that it is willing to truly disengage from the Islamic Republic. To the contrary, Moscow has made clear that it hopes to build additional nuclear facilities for Iran once Bushehr comes online. But

first, Russian technicians will need to get the Bushehr plant up and running--something that would constitute an "irreversible step" in Iran's nuclear development, in the words of Rosatom spokesman Sergei Novikov.

That's certainly what Iran's leaders hope. Over the past half-decade they have lobbied feverishly for their country to be accepted internationally as a nuclear power. The activation of Bushehr makes their claims a reality--and the West's mission to roll back Iran's nuclear advances that much more difficult.

The Islamic Republic clearly believes that, with enough time and progress on its part, the West will acquiesce to its nuclear will to power. With Bushehr online, Iran has more reason than ever for believing that it ultimately will. For that, we have our Russian "partners" to thank.

Ilan Berman is vice president of the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington, D.C. His column, Present Dangers, appears monthly.

<http://www.forbes.com/2010/08/20/iran-russia-nuclear-opinions-columnists-ilan-berman.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

OPINION/ANALYSIS

What the Russian papers say

20 August 2010

Rossiiskaya Gazeta

Iran Has Peaceful Intentions - Rosatom Head

On August 21, the Bushehr nuclear power plant will go into operation in Iran. Sergei Kiriyyenko, head of the Russian Federal Atomic Energy Agency, Rosatom, told Prime Minister Vladimir Putin that the Iranian leadership had peaceful intentions.

He said this Saturday will see the physical launch of the plant: it will turn from a facility under construction into an operating unit. This will be done under the supervision of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors. They will unseal containers of fuel Rosatom delivered over a year ago, and the fuel will be taken to the reactor room.

It is not only that Iran will use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes that is important, but also that Russia has proven it always fulfils its obligations. Russia's position is that any country in the world has the right to use nuclear power peacefully under IAEA supervision. "It is also important that this is a large international project. Of course, most of the work has been carried out by Russia, but deliveries have come from over 10 other countries, including many in the European Union and in the Asia-Pacific Region. Therefore this global project demonstrates once again that if Iran develops peaceful nuclear energy under IAEA supervision and complies with the standards of international legislation, this is a possibility for Iran as it is for any other country," the Rosatom head said.

However, the corporation's international plans are not confined to Iran. In September, Rosatom is planning to wrap up an inter-governmental agreement with Vietnam on the construction of the first nuclear plant there. Next week Moscow is expecting a delegation from Bangladesh to inspect Russian nuclear plants and decide whether Bangladesh needs similar ones.

Overall, Kiriyyenko only had good news for Putin. Even the situation in Sarov, where the nuclear facilities were under threat from approaching wildfires, did not appear too difficult to manage. "Fire attacked three times. At first, it came from the west. Then it crept up from the south. The last blaze encroached from a nature preserve to the east," Kiriyyenko said, adding that more than 3,000 men and 300 pieces of equipment had been gathered together to fight the fires. He asked for the staff of the Emergencies Ministry, Interior Troops and Federal Penitentiary Service to be given awards in recognition of their efforts.

<http://en.rian.ru/papers/20100820/160274773.html>

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

Washington Post

This Is No Way To Approve The New START Treaty

By Stephen G. Rademaker

Friday, August 20, 2010

Page - A21

It appears increasingly likely that the Senate will not approve the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty this year. Ironically, if the treaty is not approved, its supporters will bear most of the blame.

From the outset, proponents of New START have framed the issue as one on which senators must vote either yes or no. And those not in favor of "yes" are acting, as Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry said of former governor Mitt Romney, on the basis of "narrow, uninformed political objections."

This narrative grossly oversimplifies the way complex treaties typically are addressed in the Senate. In addition to voting yes or no, senators ordinarily are afforded the option of voting "yes, provided . . ." -- with that "provided" consisting of declarations and conditions in the Senate resolution of approval that are designed to remedy concerns about particular aspects of a treaty.

Overzealous supporters of treaties sometimes try to deny senators this third option, calculating that they have enough votes to ram a treaty through irrespective of some lawmakers' reservations. This strategy can work brilliantly to streamline the approval process -- but it can also fail spectacularly, as with the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1999.

In that case, Sen. Byron Dorgan (D-N.D.) threatened to obstruct all work in the Senate unless the Republican leadership agreed to schedule a yes-or-no vote. The Republican leadership acquiesced. With senators forced to choose between just two options, 48 voted yes -- while 51 voted no.

Many arms-control supporters realized afterward that they had made a huge mistake. They came to compare their approach on the test-ban treaty unfavorably to the tack they had taken two years earlier on the Chemical Weapons Convention.

When that convention was under consideration, they recognized from the outset that many senators had reservations. So supporters engaged in a formal process with potential opponents over a period of months, identifying their individual concerns and negotiating language to address those concerns in the resolution of approval. The convention was approved 74 to 26.

Today, these lessons appear to have been forgotten. Senate critics of New START have largely been cut out of the process. All but two Republicans on the Foreign Relations Committee formally asked the administration to share with them the negotiating record of the treaty. They were told no, even though there is precedent for accommodating such requests.

All but one of the committee Republicans wrote to Kerry in May, asking him to invite nine witnesses to testify on the treaty. Over the course of 11 hearings featuring more than 20 witnesses, only one of the nine was invited to appear.

Given that these letters were signed by the senators whose votes are needed to reach the two-thirds majority necessary for ratification, this is a strange way to go about attracting their support.

And if treaty critics aren't going to be accommodated on questions of process, they almost certainly aren't going to be accommodated on substance. This is regrettable, because while the critics have raised serious substantive concerns, most of those concerns could be addressed in a properly crafted resolution of approval.

For example, many worry that a consultative group established under the treaty is empowered to modify its own mandate and therefore could adopt binding restrictions on the United States that would evade Senate review. This could be fixed by imposing limits on that group in the Senate resolution.

Similarly, many are concerned that, unlike previous agreements, New START appears not to limit certain types of Russian missiles. The Obama administration insists that both sides intend for such missiles to be covered by the treaty. Accordingly, the resolution could condition ratification on Russia's confirmation that it agrees with the Obama administration's assertion.

Frequently expressed concerns that the treaty may limit missile defense and long-range conventional weapons could be addressed through interpretive declarations in the resolution.

Working with the critics to address their concerns could pave the way for a strong bipartisan vote in favor of New START, as happened with the Chemical Weapons Convention. This would, however, require a level of patience and respect for dissenting views that has not been in evidence.

Instead, the process more closely resembles the one that surrounded the test-ban treaty. If current trends continue, the likely outcome will be a near party-line vote in the committee next month, probably foreclosing prospects for Senate approval this year.

Should this happen, it will be unfair to simply blame those who voted no. Rather, it will be important to ask whether supporters could have done more to help them find a way to vote "yes, provided . . ."

The writer, senior counsel at the lobbying firm BGR Government Affairs, was an assistant secretary of state from 2002 to 2006.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/19/AR2010081905214.html>

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