



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 843, 14 September 2010**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Backers of Nuke Treaty Push for Republican Support](#)

[Ministers Consider Fewer Nuclear Patrols](#)

[West Needs New Missile Shield Against Iranian Nuclear Threat, Nato Chief Says](#)

[Now the French Want Britain to Share Nuclear Submarines](#)

[Iran Preparing to Load Fuel into Bushehr Reactor Core](#)

[Trident Replacement Could be Delayed as David Cameron Looks for Savings](#)

['West Needs to Mobilize into Coalition to Strike Iran'](#)

[Nuclear Detection Office Faces Senate Grilling](#)

[UN Nuclear Chief Chides Iran, Defends Monitors](#)

[Nunn-Lugar August 2010 Update](#)

[Arabs Push Israel N-file](#)

[U.S. Holding 324 Metric Tons of Bomb-Grade Uranium, Report Says](#)

[What Has Been Gained From Six-Party Talks](#)

[U.S. Envoy Urges N. Korea to Show Denuclearization Commitments through Action](#)

[Nuclear Program has Air Force Both Worried and Hopeful](#)

[North Korea Party Meeting 'Delayed'](#)

[Atomic Question](#)

[China Reaffirms Commitments to Nuclear Security at IAEA Meeting](#)

[Analysis / Who Should We Believe? Is Iran Building a New Nuclear Site?](#)

[Trident Missile Defence System Under Threat Again as Cuts Plans Drawn Up](#)

[Non-Proliferation is on its Last Legs](#)

---

*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.*

Boston Globe

## **Backers of Nuke Treaty Push for Republican Support**

By Desmond Butler, Associated Press Writer

September 13, 2010

WASHINGTON --A senior senator offered a plan Monday aimed at overcoming objections by his fellow Republicans to a nuclear arms control treaty with Russia.

The proposal by Indiana Sen. Richard Lugar came as Obama administration officials made a last-minute push for the New START agreement ahead of a vote Thursday in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. While the panel is expected to endorse the treaty, prospects are uncertain in the full Senate, where Democrats need at least eight Republican votes for ratification.

Administration officials were expressing confidence that the treaty, considered one of President Barack Obama's top foreign policy achievements, was gaining support from Republicans despite the rarefied political environment ahead of the November congressional election.

"There is a great deal of momentum toward ratification," said the treaty's chief U.S. negotiator, Rose Gottemoeller, at an event at Georgetown University on Monday.

Delays in negotiating the treaty and moving toward ratification have pushed consideration into the political season ahead of November's elections, when Republicans are reluctant to allow a policy victory for the Obama administration.

Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed the treaty in April. It would shrink the limit on strategic warheads to 1,550 for each country, down about a third from the current ceiling of 2,200. It also would implement changes in current procedures that allow both countries to inspect each other's arsenals and verify compliance.

Lugar, the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking Republican and a longtime advocate of arms control, was circulating an amendment to the resolution of support for the treaty offered by the committee's chairman, Democrat John Kerry of Massachusetts.

The amendment, obtained by The Associated Press, includes assurances about a host of concerns that Republicans have raised about the treaty, including whether it would limit U.S. missile defense. The amendment says it is the sense of the U.S. Senate that the treaty does not limit U.S. missile defense except for a provision that forbids converting existing offensive missile launchers into missile defense assets.

The resolution also says that a unilateral statement by Russia after the treaty was signed in April, in which Moscow made clear that it could withdraw from the treaty if it should feel threatened by a U.S. missile defense systems, "does not impose a legal obligation on the United States."

Because some Republicans have said that before ratifying the treaty they want to be sure that the Democrats will pass a big boost in money for maintaining and modernizing the U.S. nuclear stockpile, the Lugar amendment also includes provisions that would require the White House to consult with the Senate on funding levels to ensure adequate funding.

[http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2010/09/13/backers\\_of\\_nuke\\_treaty\\_push\\_for\\_republican\\_support/](http://www.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2010/09/13/backers_of_nuke_treaty_push_for_republican_support/)

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

London Sunday Telegraph – U.K.

## **West Needs New Missile Shield Against Iranian Nuclear Threat, Nato Chief Says**

*Nato's Secretary-General has urged the construction of a new missile defence system to protect Europe from the threat of Iranian nuclear attack.*

By Nick Meo in Brussels

11 September 2010

Anders Fogh Rasmussen told The Sunday Telegraph he has full American backing for a proposed €200 million (£165 million) defensive "shield", which he hopes will be agreed in November at a summit of members in Lisbon.

He was speaking after weapons inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) warned last week that Iran had passed a crucial nuclear threshold which took it nearer to being able to arm ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads.

"Based on their public statements we know that Iran already has missiles with a range sufficient to hit targets in Europe, and they don't hide the fact that they want to further develop their capability," Mr Rasmussen said.

"If Iran eventually acquires a nuclear capability that will be very dangerous, and a direct threat to the allies. That is the reason why I am now proposing a new and effective Nato missile defence system."

He claimed that the new system could be set up in cooperation with Russia, which has angrily opposed previous American attempts to set up missile shields in Europe.

Iran's longest-range ballistic missiles, such as the Shahab-3 and the Qiam-1, have ranges of around 2,500 miles and could hit targets in Turkey and Greece.

Some will see the plan for a new missile shield as a tacit admission that America has rejected the risky option of launching air attacks on Iranian nuclear and military facilities, and given up hopes of deterring Iran from building a bomb, as Western governments believe it is trying to do.

Europe's anti-missile defences at present largely consist of American-made SM-3 missiles, based on US warships, which would attempt to shoot down attacking ballistic missiles.

Speaking at his residence in a luxurious suburb of south Brussels, a day after returning from a meeting with President Barack Obama in Washington, Mr Rasmussen told *The Sunday Telegraph* that he believes that it would be relatively straightforward to set up a new defensive system. Under the plan, an anti-ballistic missile "shield" would be extended across Nato's territory, coordinated by a new command and control system that would "knit together" existing radar and other sensor systems, with new SM-3 missiles based on land.

"In a nutshell we could build an effective missile defence system to protect all our population by connecting existing systems," he said. "Even in a time of economic constraints it would cost very little – €200 million over 10 years, shared between 28 allies. For a modest cost we can protect 900 million citizens.

"If Nato decides to go ahead and develop a missile defence system it should be accompanied by an invitation to the Russians to cooperate. This would make sense from a security point of view. Realistically we would have a Nato system alongside a Russian system. We can develop cooperation mechanisms which would make the whole system more effective.

"No decisions have been taken yet. We will have consultation with Russia. We need effective protection against a real threat." Supporters of the plan believe it could fundamentally alter the troubled relationship between Nato and Russia, ushering in a new era of cooperation.

Nato officials hope a less ambitious defensive system designed to cope with only a few attacking missiles would not antagonise Russia. They have already held talks with their Russian counterparts to set up a "security roof" which would link the missile defence systems of the US, other Nato countries, and Russia.

Early in his presidency Mr Obama scrapped his predecessor's plans to site anti-ballistic missiles in Poland, with sensors to detect attacking missiles located in the Czech Republic, because of Russian anger.

Nato officials hope Iran's progress towards nuclear weapons may now help change Russian minds. Weapons inspectors announced last week that Iranian nuclear scientists had enriched enough uranium for a warhead, although miniaturising an atomic device and constructing an effective nuclear missile are highly demanding technical tasks that Iran is still some way from achieving.

Inspectors will also criticise Tehran in a report this week for repeated failure to co-operate with checks that material was held securely at Iranian plants, and the refusal of Iranian officials to answer questions about whether it was attempting to make a nuclear warhead.

In February the IAEA declared that it believed Iran was working on a nuclear warhead.

Not all missile experts are convinced Iran will pose a threat to Europe. Robert Hewson, editor of the industry publication *Jane's Air-launched Weapons*, said: "Missile defence is more about shovelling money to American contractors than protecting people in Basingstoke."

Afghanistan will be the main focus of the Lisbon Summit, and Mr Rasmussen said that he hopes to make a major announcement on progress in handing responsibility for security of provinces from Nato to Afghans— so-called transition.

"I hope to announce at Lisbon that transition is about to start," he said. "I would expect a gradual transition process to start in 2011, and it would end by 2014."

Nato had hoped to begin handing some of the less violent provinces to Afghan control before the November summit. Mr Rasmussen said the delay was not significant. "We have to make sure the process is irreversible," he said.

In the week that Taliban leader Mullah Omar predicted Taliban victory, the Secretary-General said Nato would “stay the course” in Afghanistan.

“I understand very well that people are impatient and want to see progress. So do I. Progress would be gradually handing over Afghanistan to Afghan control. We will soon see concrete results with our new strategy.”

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstoppers/politics/defence/7996581/West-needs-new-missile-shield-against-Iranian-nuclear-threat-Nato-chief-says.html>

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

Tehran Times – Iran  
Sunday, September 12, 2010

## **Iran Preparing to Load Fuel into Bushehr Reactor Core**

Tehran Times Political Desk

TEHRAN - Iran announced on Friday that nuclear fuel will be loaded into the core of the Bushehr reactor at the beginning of the Iranian calendar month of Mehr (begins on September 23).

Afterwards, the Bushehr nuclear power plant will begin operations, Atomic Energy Organization of Iran Director Ali Akbar Salehi told the Mehr News Agency.

Salehi also said the nuclear plant will be able to produce electricity in the Iranian calendar month of Azar (November 22 to December 21).

The Bushehr nuclear power plant was launched on August 21 when engineers loaded the first of 163 fuel rods into the reactor under the supervision of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Salehi and Rosatom (Russian State Nuclear Energy Corporation) Chief Executive Officer Sergei Kiriyyenko attended the opening ceremony of the plant.

The plant, which is located near the port of Bushehr on the coast of the Persian Gulf, will produce 1000 megawatts of electricity once all the fuel rods are loaded into the core of the reactor.

The Bushehr reactor may save Iran 11 million barrels of crude oil or 1.8 billion cubic meters of gas per year, the London-based World Nuclear Association said in a report.

The plant will also put Iran at least a decade ahead of more prosperous Middle Eastern neighbors such as the United Arab Emirates, which plans to build four nuclear plants by 2020.

[http://www.tehrantimes.com/index\\_View.asp?code=226422](http://www.tehrantimes.com/index_View.asp?code=226422)

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

Jerusalem Post – Israel

## **'West Needs to Mobilize into Coalition to Strike Iran'**

*Danny Yatom, former head of Mossad, says sanctions are not enough, attack is needed to stop Iranian nuclear arms race.*

By YAAKOV KATZ  
September 12, 2010

Western countries need to mobilize together into a coalition that will strike at Iran’s nuclear facilities, former head of the Mossad Danny Yatom said on Sunday.

Speaking at the International Institute of Counter-Terrorism (ICT) Conference at the Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya, Yatom, a former Labor Party MK, said that only military force will succeed in stopping Iran.

“Since the sanctions are not enough I am hopeful that the world will come to its senses and reach the conclusion that in order to stop the Iranian nuclear arms race we will have to attack some of their nuclear facilities,” Yatom said in rare comments for a former top Israeli security official regarding the use of military force against Iran.

While some of the Iranian nuclear facilities are scattered throughout the country and are built underground in fortified bunkers, if the world “mobilizes its capabilities” it would be possible to cause enough damage to delay the program.

“If the modern air forces led by the United States mobilizes its capabilities it is possible if not to completely remove the threat to delay it for years to come,” Yatom said.

While refraining from discussing specific Israeli capabilities, Yatom said that if the world failed to meet the challenge, Israel would “retain the right to self defense.”

“Figure out for yourselves what that means,” he then told the audience.

Yatom said that Israel could not live with a nuclear Iran. “I don’t want to be in a situation that I will be sitting in Israel and my fate will be in the hands of others especially when we are talking about a lunatic regime,” he said. “I don’t want to be the subject of an Iranian experiment.”

<http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Article.aspx?id=187850>

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

Charlotte Observer

## **UN Nuclear Chief Chides Iran, Defends Monitors**

By GEORGE JAHN, Associated Press Writer

Monday, September 13, 2010

VIENNA: The head of the U.N. nuclear watchdog agency warned Monday that Iran's selective cooperation with his inspectors means that he cannot confirm that all of Tehran's atomic activities are peaceful.

Yukiya Amano also chided Iran for barring some of those inspectors, warning that move hampered his agency's attempts to monitor Iran's nuclear program. And he suggested the jury is still out on allegations that Tehran conducted secret experiments meant to develop atomic arms because the Islamic Republic continues to stonewall an IAEA probe into U.S. and other intelligence agency reports purporting to contain evidence of such experiments.

Amano's blunt comments, at the start of a 35-nation IAEA board meeting, drew a strong response from Iran, which accused him of distorting facts in a report prepared for the gathering.

"We request the director general to immediately reconsider this sort of reporting ... so that it will not create political tensions," said Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's chief delegate to the IAEA.

Iran insists it is interested only in generating energy through enrichment. But since revelations of its secret enrichment program eight years ago, concerns have grown that Iran is interested in making nuclear weapons, in part through its refusal to give up enrichment and accept fuel from abroad.

The IAEA report noted that Iran continued to enrich uranium in defiance of five U.N. Security Council resolutions, and focused in greater detail on issues mentioned Monday by Amano - the lack of progress on the IAEA probe of Iran's purported arms program experiments, and Tehran's recent decision to strip two inspectors of their monitoring rights after they reported what they called undeclared nuclear experiments.

While all member states select inspectors from an official IAEA list, some Western nations on the agency's 35-nation board argue that because Iran has banned more than 40 inspectors over the past four years, a case could be made that Tehran is violating the agency's Safeguards Agreement.

The agreement is meant to ensure that the IAEA can monitor Iran's nuclear program without impediments to make sure it is solely for peaceful purposes.

In banning the two monitors, Tehran argued that they misreported what they saw - a view rejected Monday by Amano.

"I express my full confidence in the professionalism and impartiality of the inspectors concerned," he said. "Iran's repeated objection to the designation of inspectors with experience in Iran's nuclear fuel cycle and facilities hampers the inspection process."

Amano urged Iran to withdraw its 2007 ban on 38 inspectors, announced in apparent retaliation for the imposition of U.N. sanctions because of the Islamic Republic's refusal to freeze enrichment, which can produce both nuclear fuel and the fissile warhead material.

Since then, Iran refuses to accept inspectors from the five U.N. Security Council nations - the U.S., Britain, France, Russia and China, all nuclear weapons states whose experts possess the kind of knowledge on nuclear weapons research that IAEA officials say the agency cannot provide through training. Germany, which also supported the sanctions, is also not allowed to send inspectors to Iran either.

Amano, in separate comments to reporters, described the problem as "not the number of inspectors, but the quality and experience.

"I can assure you that the safeguard process is remaining effective," he said. "But if unchecked, the repeated objection to the designation of inspectors will be problematic."

The dispute has erupted at a sensitive time for the IAEA, with the departure of Olli Heinonen, the deputy director general in charge of investigating Iran. During his five years at the post, Heinonen had developed a reputation for toughness in pursuing allegations that Iran was hiding a nuclear weapons program, and Western nations had expressed concerns that any successor would not be as diligent.

Amano on Monday filled that post with Heinonen's deputy, Herman Nackaerts.

Beyond Iran, the board - and a subsequent assembly of the 151 IAEA member nations - will focus on allegations of a hidden Syrian nuclear program; something Syria denies. Israel - which is commonly considered to have nuclear arms - is also on the agenda, with Islamic nations pushing the Jewish state to open its atomic activities to IAEA perusal.

<http://www.charlotteobserver.com/2010/09/13/1689676/chief-un-nuke-inspector-chides.html>

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

Arab Times – Kuwait  
September 14, 2010

## **Arabs Push Israel N-file**

IAEA OPENS TALKS

VIENNA, Sept 13, (Agencies): International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Board of Governors kicked off meetings here Monday amidst "severe" split over Middle East nuclear proliferation, especially in Iran, Israel and Syria.

Head of the Mission of the Arab League in Vienna Dr Mikhail Wehbe told KUNA prior to the meetings that "heated" discussions are expected to take place over the Israeli nuclear capabilities, especially with the lack of international monitoring on them.

Determination of NAM (Non-Aligned Movement) states and the Arab group to discuss the Israeli nuclear dossier in the meetings is based primarily on last week's report by IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano for inspecting Israeli nuclear sites, Wehbe said.

Israel still refuses to join the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

Terming Yukiya's report "disappointing", Wehbe stressed that the Arab group refuses the West's approach of shifting focus from the Israeli file to the ones of Syria and Iran.

The IAEA chief had written to all IAEA member states to give their views on the watchdog's general congress resolutions last year, urging Israel to join the NPT and to allow international inspectors to check its nuclear sites.

IAEA reports to be discussed in the meetings said Iran is moving forward with its nuclear activities and is ignoring all international sanctions imposed.

It also said that "secrecy" adopted by Syria is thwarting the probe on the 2007 Israeli raid on Dir al-Zour nuclear facility; an allegation rejected by Damascus.

The head of the UN atomic watchdog said on Monday Iran's barring of experienced nuclear inspectors was hampering the agency's work in the Islamic state, but Tehran flatly rejected the accusation.

Signalling a desire for continuity at the IAEA at a time of strained ties with Tehran, Amano named a senior Iran expert and IAEA insider as its new top investigator, diplomats said.

Herman Nackaerts, who now oversees inspections in Iran and elsewhere in the Middle East as well as South Asia and Africa, will succeed former boss Olli Heinonen as head of the IAEA division which verifies that nuclear work in member states worldwide is not being diverted for military use.

"There was no dissent," a diplomat said on the sidelines of a closed-door meeting of the IAEA's 35-nation governing board, where Amano earlier criticised Iran over the barred inspectors.

Heinonen, a Finn, resigned as deputy director-general in charge of global nuclear safeguards in July for personal reasons after nearly 30 years at the Vienna-based body.

Nackaerts, 59, from Belgium, will take up the top inspection job in the midst of a public row over Iran's refusal to admit some inspectors.

The dispute has compounded international concern about Iran's nuclear programme, which Western powers suspect is aimed at developing atomic bombs. Iran denies this, saying it is enriching uranium only for generating electricity.

In June Iran barred two inspectors who had worked in the country, telling them they could not return. Their nationalities have not been disclosed. Tehran also cancelled access for a high-ranking Middle East inspector in 2006 and objected to a number of other inspector designations in the past.

"I learned with great regret about Iran's decision to object to the designation of two inspectors who recently conducted inspections in Iran," Amano said in a speech to the board.

Iran has accused the two of distributing "false" information about its nuclear activities. But Amano told the board he had full confidence in their "professionalism and impartiality".

"Iran has not provided the necessary cooperation to permit the Agency to confirm that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities," the veteran Japanese diplomat said, according to a copy of his speech made behind closed doors.

Meanwhile, Iran's internal battles over the handling of American detainee Sarah Shourd flared again Monday as the mouthpiece of the powerful Revolutionary Guard led the backlash against a decision to free her on \$500,000 bail.

The criticism by Guard-linked Fars news agency and others — including one lawmaker calling it a "bonus for Quran burners" in the United States — show the judiciary's offer to release Shourd on health grounds had failed to quiet the political tempest among Iran's conservative factions.

The political sniping also shows the country's simmering political rivalries and the various groups vying for greater slices of power since last year's disputed re-election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

Ahmadinejad, who first tried to shepherd the release of Shourd last week, was rebuked by the courts who insisted that any release had to be on their terms.

Now Ahmadinejad's supporters, led by the Revolutionary Guard, are firing back against the judiciary's decision. Also in the mix are some conservative lawmakers objecting to any plans at freeing Shourd, who was detained along the Iraqi border in July 2009 along with two American friends.

Iranian authorities say they have issued indictments on spy-related charges. That could mean trials for the two American men and proceedings in absentia for Shourd if she is freed.

Her attorney, Masoud Shafiei, told The Associated Press that he had no update on Monday on the status of efforts to pay the bail.

He said he has been in contact with Shourd's family and the Swiss Embassy, which handles US affairs in Iran because there are no diplomatic relations between Washington and Tehran. On Sunday, he said he hoped she could be freed in "two or three" days.

<http://www.arabtimesonline.com/NewsDetails/tabid/96/smld/414/ArticleID/159499/t/Arabs-push-Israel-N-file/Default.aspx>

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

Airang News – South Korea  
September 11, 2010

## **What Has Been Gained From Six-Party Talks**

By Kim Na-ri, Airang News

China is pushing to restart the stalled six-party talks however the United States is skeptical about the idea. Beijing's nuclear envoy Wu Dawei recently visited Washington to tout the six-party talks that were begun to bring an end to North Korea's nuclear program.

US analysts are doubting about the usefulness of the multilateral negotiations calling them a playground for North Korean leader Kim Jong-il to make promises he subsequently ignores.

The six-party nuclear talks with members Russia, Japan, South Korea, the United States, China and North Korea were first held in 2003 aimed at resolving the North Korean nuclear issue.

Two years later in 2005 the discussions succeeded in reaching the September 19 Joint Statement which is assessed as the best result the dialogue has achieved so far.

But North Korea restarted its nuclear program soon after and the talks have remained dormant since 2008. With the talks not making any inroads for seven years the Obama administration is believed to be seeking more effective alternatives to its pressure-and-punishment stance toward North Korea.

Many US analysts believe that their country must consult closely with South Korea to explore a possible new framework for dealing with the communist regime.

There are different opinions on the matter however as some European and Southeast Asian nations feel that the talks are the best way to maintain security and the status quo on the Korean peninsula.

[http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News\\_View.asp?nseq=106835&code=Ne2&category=2](http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News_View.asp?nseq=106835&code=Ne2&category=2)

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

September 13, 2010

## **U.S. Envoy Urges N. Korea to Show Denuclearization Commitments through Action**

By Chang Jae-soon and Yoo Jee-ho

SEOUL, Sept. 13 (Yonhap) -- A senior U.S. envoy on North Korea urged the communist nation Monday to take concrete steps to back its rhetoric of denuclearization commitment, saying Washington is looking for indications that substantial progress could be made if the international nuclear talks reopen.

"The U.S. is not interested in talking just for the sake of talking with the North Koreans," envoy Stephen Bosworth said. "We want negotiations that produce a meaningful result. So we will be looking for indication that North Korea shares that desire and that determination."

"We look for North Korea's attitude to be expressed through its actions, not simply through its rhetoric," Bosworth told reporters after talks with South Korea's chief nuclear envoy, Wi Sung-lac.

Bosworth also said that the U.S. looks "forward to a process of bilateral contacts and eventually multilateral contacts that would hopefully result in a resumption of the six-party process," but he added that there is much work to do before such a process occurs.

The remark was similar to China's three-step proposal for resuming the stalled negotiations. That offer calls for the U.S. and the North to hold bilateral talks before all six-party members hold unofficial talks and then reopen formal nuclear talks.

Bosworth's trip here came amid signs of a thaw in relations between Seoul and Pyongyang that have frayed badly after the North's alleged deadly sinking of a South Korean warship. It also came as China pushes to jump-start the six-nation nuclear talks, whose prospects have been overshadowed by the ship sinking.

Bosworth is considered one of the advocates for dialogue with the North, and his trip to the region, which will also take him to Japan and China later this week, has spurred speculation that Washington may be trying to lay the groundwork for resuming the nuclear talks.

In recent months, North Korea has been signaling its willingness to return to the nuclear negotiations that have been stalled since the last session in late 2008. The talks bring together the two Koreas, China, Japan, Russia and the United States.

But South Korea and the U.S. have demanded that the North prove through action it is serious about abandoning its nuclear programs and show a responsible attitude over the ship sinking if the communist nation wants to reopen the nuclear talks.

That position reflects deep skepticism about North Korea, which has used its participation in the nuclear talks as a negotiating card. It has been a standard pattern of Pyongyang's behavior to raise tensions with provocations and then return to the dialogue table to get the concessions it wants before backtracking on agreements and quitting the talks again.

Officials in Seoul and Washington have said that the current impasse is of North Korea's making, and therefore, it is up to the communist nation to break the stalemate by ceasing belligerent behavior and engaging its partners in a more constructive manner.

Apparently mindful of the demand, North Korea has been stepping up conciliatory gestures. It has released a detained American citizen and a South Korean fishing boat, and proposed reunions of families separated by the 1950-53 Korean War.



South Korea has responded to the overtures positively, offering to provide the North with flood aid. The North accepted the offer and specified what aid it wants from Seoul, such as rice, cement and construction equipment.

On Monday, South Korea announced via the Red Cross that it will send the North 5,000 tons of rice aid and 10,000 tons of cement, and proposed that working-level officials of the two sides hold a meeting Friday to discuss details for the proposed family reunions.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2010/09/13/14/0301000000AEN20100913007800315F.HTML>

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

Al Jazeera – U.A.E.

## **North Korea Party Meeting 'Delayed'**

*First conference of ruling Workers' Party in 30 years postponed, with leader Kim apparently "ill".*

13 September 2010

North Korea's ruling party has delayed the start of a rare conference of the ruling Workers' Party (WPK) due to the health of Kim Jong-il, the country's leader, but his condition is not serious enough to cancel the meeting, according to South Korean television.

The Workers' Party conference, the first formal gathering of the state's secretive ruling elite in 30 years, was called to pick new leadership and possibly to anoint an heir, as the current leader's health deteriorates.

Kim, 68, has apparently faced worsening health since his five-day trip to China last month, but his condition was not bad enough to warrant a cancellation of the meeting, South Korea's YTN reported on Monday.

The South's National Intelligence Service said it could not confirm the YTN report and state media in North Korea has not mentioned delays facing the conference.

### **'Gruelling chore'**

The Korean Central News Agency reported in June that the WPK would meet in early September to elect the party's "highest leading body" and North Korea analysts thought Kim would use the opportunity to pass the reigns of power to his youngest son, Kim Jong-un.

"The party congress is likely to be a gruelling chore for Kim, who as party secretary will be expected to sit bolt upright in front of thousands of deputies and TV cameras at least for five hours a day and probably stand up while delivering one of the interminable speeches beloved of dictators everywhere," South Korea's *Chosun Ilbo* newspaper reported.

North and South Korea are still technically at war, having only signed an armistice in 1953 and regional powers are anxious to know what changes are afoot and who will command the nearly 1.2 million troops and another 7.7 million in the reserves.

Tensions on the peninsula, however, are showing signs of easing, with Seoul and Pyongyang making more conciliatory gestures towards each other.

The South announced on Monday its biggest aid package to its impoverished neighbour in more than two years.

The two agreed to meet in the North Korean border town of Kaesung on Friday to discuss a resumption of reunions of families separated by war.

The apparent thaw has prompted the start of shuttle diplomacy between regional nuclear envoys, fuelling speculation of a resumption in aid-for-disarmament talks.

Tensions rose to their highest level in years in March with the sinking of a South Korean warship, which Seoul and Washington blame on the North. Pyongyang denies any role.

Source: Agencies

<http://english.aljazeera.net/news/asia-pacific/2010/09/201091313234045275.html>

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

People's Daily – China

## **China Reaffirms Commitments to Nuclear Security at IAEA Meeting**

September 14, 2010

China remains committed to strengthening international cooperation against nuclear terrorism and promoting nuclear safety, a Chinese diplomat told the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) directors meeting here Tuesday.

Hu Xiaodi, China's permanent representative and ambassador to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Vienna, said that the Chinese government always pays great attention to security issues on nuclear materials and facilities and positively participate in various activities on nuclear security led by the IAEA.

At the Nuclear Security Summit in April, Chinese President Hu Jintao raised five points of proposals on stepping up international cooperation on meeting nuclear security challenges, he said.

In August, China Atomic Energy Authority (CAEA) and the IAEA signed a practical arrangement in the field of nuclear security in Beijing, which played a significant role in effectively achieving China's commitments to nuclear security and strengthening cooperation with the agency on nuclear security, the diplomat added.

He said China has joined the agency's Illicit Trafficking Database (ITDB) program and constantly improved the management and access control of its domestic radioactive source in the light of the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources.

He also pointed out that the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its amendment is an important international instrument to promote international nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear security.

China submitted the ratification of the Amendment to the convention in September last year, becoming the second country with nuclear weapons to ratify the convention following Russia, the diplomat went on.

China also called for more countries to take positive action to ratify the convention so that it enters into force as soon as possible, he added.

The diplomat also noted that this year is the first year for the implementation of the IAEA's Nuclear Security Plan for 2010-2013 and the IAEA has done a great deal of work in the aspects of promoting the implementation of international legal documents, helping the member states to establish and improve their nuclear security regulations system, infrastructure and capability-building.

In addition, he said China appreciated the help offered the agency to the member states in strengthening border controls, the return of highly enriched uranium used for nuclear reactors, as well as the recycling of radioactive materials.

Source: Xinhua

<http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90776/90882/7140201.html>

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

London Sunday Telegraph – U.K.

## **Trident Missile Defence System Under Threat Again as Cuts Plans Drawn Up**

*The future of Britain's Trident nuclear missile system is once again under threat as ministers draw up detailed plans for swingeing spending cuts, it can be revealed.*

By Patrick Hennessy and Sean Rayment

11 September 2010

The National Security Council will discuss plans for a £20 billion Trident replacement on Friday – with the debate said to include whether the replacement system should go ahead at all, not just how it is funded.

Senior defence chiefs are understood to be split over whether Britain should retain a submarine-based strategic nuclear deterrent or opt for a cheaper alternative.

The NSC will also discuss options for a whole series of future defence projects and will decide what needs to be axed to make Britain's armed forces more flexible, relevant and less expensive to run.

General Sir David Richards, the incoming chief of the defence staff, is understood to favour retaining Trident but will support calls for the replacement programme to be delayed by up to five years.

Liam Fox, the defence secretary, also supports retaining a strategic nuclear deterrent but is said to be "open to alternative options", which would lessen the burden on the defence budget.

The options include reducing the numbers of submarines to three or even two boats.

While other senior chiefs are proposing that Britain retains its nuclear capability based around cruise missiles which offer flexibility as well as deterrence.

The government is under increasing pressure to reach a consensus over the Trident replacement programme where research and development costing £1 million a day.

Scrapping Trident in favour of a cheaper alternative system would spark outrage among right-leaning Tory MPs and would be a massive political gamble for David Cameron.

It would also represent a big win for Nick Clegg and the Liberal Democrats, who opposed renewing Trident in their general election manifesto.

Up until now it had been assumed that a similar version of Trident to the current system, which features four submarines armed with nuclear warheads, would get the go-ahead.

The main debate was whether it would be funded from within the Ministry of Defence's £35 billion-a-year budget – as the Treasury is currently demanding – or whether its costs would be ring-fenced as they are currently.

However, it now appears that there is no certainty that a submarine-based system, which provides the ultimate form of independent deterrence, will be approved at all.

A cheaper alternative, possibly based on shorter range cruise missiles or similar weapons, would see nuclear strikes capable of being launched from submarines, surface ships or aircraft.

Supporters of the current system, however, say this would abandon the key "stealth" ability of Trident to strike without being detected.

Nick Clegg, the Liberal Democrat leader and Deputy Prime Minister, raised eyebrows last month by saying that the "huge" cost of replacing Trident was hard to justify at a time of retrenchment across the board.

A source close to the replacement programme told *The Sunday Telegraph*: "The mood music has definitely shifted from having to show savings from within the Trident replacement plan to having to justify it happening at all."

Patrick Mercer, the Conservative MP said: "Colleagues from all sides of the party need to get real. This is about defending ourselves properly, not posturing with Cold war kit.

"Trident has never been used and it is fabulously expensive. The savings would be better spent on an alternative, cheaper system."

Labour would be likely to oppose any plans not to replace Trident in the House of Commons, leaving Mr Cameron vulnerable to a possible damaging defeat if up to 40 Tory MPs were to vote against the government.

This week sees the coalition's "star chamber" – where the major decisions on spending cuts ahead of October's Comprehensive Spending review will take place – begin regular meetings.

George Osborne, the Chancellor, has ordered most Whitehall departments to prepare blueprints for budget cuts of 25 per cent and 40 per cent.

The figures for education and defence, however, are 10 and 20 per cent while health and international developments have had their budgets ring-fenced.

*The Sunday Telegraph* also understands that serious consideration is now being given to axing the Royal Navy's £5bn carrier programme, with small cheaper alternatives being proposed.

If the carriers are axed sources have revealed that the £9bn programme to buy the Joint Strike Fighter will either be cut in its entirety or see the numbers of aircraft bought severely reduced.

In an extract from his autobiography his published in *The Sunday Telegraph* this weekend, General Sir Richard Dannatt, the former chief of the general staff, suggests that the decision to procure two aircraft carriers was, in part, politically motivated.

He adds: "The new Coalition Government has indeed got to address the aircraft carrier issue. There is no doubt that these ships are highly desirable; but the jury is still out on whether they are both essential or affordable."

The RAF will lose the final tranche of Eurofighters as well as the Tornado fleet. Army chiefs have been warned that an armoured brigade will be lost and all troops serving in Germany will return to the UK within five years.

Other changes will include major changes to the Permanent Joint Headquarters, greater funding of Unmanned air vehicles research and development and advances to counter cyber warfare.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/politics/defence/7996647/Trident-missile-defence-system-under-threat-again-as-cuts-plans-drawn-up.html>

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

Financial Times – U.K.

## **Ministers Consider Fewer Nuclear Patrols**

By Alex Barker and James Blitz

September 12, 2010

Ministers are considering downgrading the policy that keeps a nuclear-armed submarine maintained at sea at all times, in the biggest overhaul of the country's nuclear posture since the 1960s.

A fierce squeeze on the defence budget means the national security council is assessing amendments to the "continuous at-sea deterrence" (CASD) principle adopted after President John F. Kennedy sold Britain the Polaris missile.

Accepting the risk that there might be a gap in patrols – during which Britain would have no nuclear-armed submarines at sea – would ease financial pressures on the £20bn Trident nuclear deterrent replacement programme. The programme could be delayed by five years or the four submarines in the fleet reduced to as few as two.

David Cameron was to chair a meeting on the issue last week, but the prime minister was unable to attend because of the death of his father.

In spite of Liberal Democrat misgivings, the coalition has committed itself to maintaining a credible deterrent while looking for ways to reduce costs.

The proposals – included in a value for money study – have sparked an intense debate within the defence and security establishment, as well as aggravating tensions between the Treasury and Liam Fox, defence secretary.

Mr Fox is a strong supporter of a permanent nuclear-armed submarine presence at sea and argues that the technology does not exist to reliably maintain a presence with fewer than four submarines.

Other critics say chipping away at the CASD principle is foolhardy and undermines the power of a deterrent. They also fear the timing of Trident submarine deployments could send an aggressive message that would risk escalating any diplomatic stand-off that had arisen.

"Continuous at-sea deterrence is a binary matter – you either have it or you don't," said one defence insider. "The difference financially is not all that significant. But strategically there's a very big difference indeed."

Underlying the debate is the battle between the Ministry of Defence and the Treasury over who pays for the replacement of the deterrent.

George Osborne, the chancellor, is insisting that the MoD pays for replacing Trident, which places heavy strain on the core budget beyond 2016.

No agreement has been reached on whether the MoD's budget settlement reflects the additional costs of replacing Trident, which rises from 5 per cent to more than 8 per cent of its entire budget once the new submarines are being built. To better understand the issues, Mr Osborne paid a secret visit last month to the Faslane naval base.

One senior Whitehall figure said that "a vigorous discussion is taking place that looks at what the implications of entertaining a risk to CASD might be and what kind of savings we might get from it".

There was "no doubt that there are going to be some savings made", he added.

Other ways of reducing costs include limiting the number of missiles or cutting the capital costs of infrastructure.

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/929aa924-be97-11df-a755-00144feab49a.html?ftcamp=rss>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.

## **Now the French Want Britain to Share Nuclear Submarines**

By Peter Allen

13th September 2010

Britain and France may start sharing their nuclear submarines, it was announced today.

Despite firm denials that a 'joint' navy was a practical idea, the chairman of the National Assembly defence committee in Paris said there might be co-operation underwater.

The announcement follows news of the proposal on September 1 that Britain and France would share aircraft carriers as part of a huge cost cutting exercise by David Cameron.

Guy Teissier of the ruling UMP party told Le Figaro newspaper: 'We can envisage co-operation between our nuclear submarines.'

Two submarines – HMS Vanguard and Le Triomphant – collided deep beneath the Atlantic last February, causing up to £50 million of damage.

At the time hugely embarrassed naval commanders on both sides of the Channel blamed the crash on a freak accident, while anti-nuclear groups said it could have ended in disaster.

Mr Teissier suggested that his plan would help the submarines to keep track of each other during peacetime, while going their separate ways in time of war.

He said cooperation 'could only happen in a period of relative peace, like today' because 'in a crisis each should take care of its own deterrent because nuclear fire cannot be shared.'

Highlighting the fact that cooperation would enable the two countries to 'avoid redundancies' in their respective navies, Mr Teissier said: 'You can imagine each country investing in its own deterrent, without lowering their guards, and then making practical savings through cooperation.'

Last Friday Liam Fox and Herve Morin, British and France's respective defence ministers, said plans to share aircraft carriers were 'unrealistic', but did not rule out projects in other fields.

Mr Teissier said sharing carriers was 'a project that was difficult to achieve as the aircraft carriers carried atomic weapons' but cooperating on submarines would 'lower costs.'

In March, the then British prime minister Gordon Brown said Anglo-French cooperation on nuclear defence would be a good idea, and that an official report had recommended joint submarine patrols.

Mr Brown said he had reached an agreement with French President Nicolas Sarkozy on nuclear cooperation.

'UK and French cooperation is at its highest level,' said Mr Brown. 'We've agreed a degree of co-operation that is, I think, greater than we have had previously but we will retain, as will France, our independent nuclear deterrent.'

But critics say the plan could jeopardise the UK's military independence and place the security of the nation in the hands of France.

Both Britain and France have a permanent underwater nuclear deterrent, with at least one nuclear-armed submarine circling the world at any given time.

The system is viewed by critics as a relic of the Cold War system, and completely outdated.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/worldnews/article-1311602/More-military-cost-cutting-Britain-share-submarines-France-say-ministers.html?ITO=1490#>

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

London Guardian – U.K.

## **Trident Replacement Could be Delayed as David Cameron Looks for Savings**

*Government hopes to maintain Britain's continuous nuclear deterrent while ensuring 'value for money'*

By Nicholas Watt, chief political correspondent

Monday, 13 September 2010

David Cameron is examining plans to delay the replacement of Britain's Trident nuclear deterrent to reduce the pressure on the public finances during the toughest spending round since the second world war, according to government sources.

Amid a row between the Treasury and the Ministry of Defence, the prime minister is looking at ways of maintaining Britain's continuous nuclear deterrent while introducing savings in the estimated £20bn costs of Trident's replacement.

The Tories and Liberal Democrats, who argued in the general election campaign against a like-for-like replacement of Trident, reached a compromise on the issue in their coalition agreement.

The two parties agreed that Britain should maintain a nuclear deterrent but that the "renewal of Trident should be scrutinised to ensure value for money". The Lib Dems also secured the right to "make the case for alternatives".

Since the election the greatest rows have taken place among Tories in the Treasury and the Ministry of Defence.

George Osborne, the chancellor, is pressing for major savings while Liam Fox, the defence secretary, has gone public by saying that it is wrong that his department should foot the bill for the Trident replacement.

Fox has also said that it would be impossible to maintain the cornerstone of Britain's "continuous at sea deterrent" – that a strike can be launched against any target at any time – unless Britain maintains four submarines equipped with ballistic nuclear missiles. The first of the current Vanguard submarines is due to be taken out of service in 2022, with the second to be taken out in 2024.

Government sources believe that savings can be made in two main ways Firstly, delaying the introduction of the replacements for the current four Vanguard submarines. Ministers are looking carefully at a paper drawn up by Malcolm Chalmers, a professorial fellow at the Royal United Services Institute, which said it might be possible to delay the start of the successor submarine by five years.

Delaying the introduction of the new generation of submarines would ease the burden on the public finances at a sensitive time. Chalmers estimates that the "peak spending" would not need to take place until 2019 – four years after Osborne plans to eliminate the fiscal deficit.

The second possible way to make savings the government is looking at would be to examine whether Britain needs four submarines to maintain its so called "continuous at sea deterrent". Labour said in a white paper in December 2006 that the deterrent would no longer be continuous under current technology if the number of submarines were cut below four, a view supported by the current defence secretary. But the white paper indicated that technological developments could allow a continuous deterrent to be provided by three submarines in the future.

It is understood the prime minister also believes that savings could be made by changing the way in which submarines and nuclear warheads are serviced. At the moment one submarine is always at sea and a second is always ready to be launched. The prime minister's spokesman said: "We will retain a nuclear deterrent and we will look at value for money of that deterrent. The position is set out in the coalition agreement."

The prime minister made clear earlier in the summer that he supports having at least three submarines to ensure the deterrent is current. "If it wasn't continuous at sea it wouldn't be a proper deterrent," he said.

Fox made clear his support yesterday for a continuous deterrent. Bob Ainsworth, the shadow defence secretary, asked him whether he stood by his statement on 26 May in which he said: "There is no lack of clarity in the government's policy: we believe in a continuous, at-sea, minimum, credible, nuclear deterrent, based on the Trident missile system. I hope that that is explicit enough."

Fox said: "Well, I am not sure that I need to repeat it. Put simply, I agree with it."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/sep/13/trident-nuclear-replacement-david-cameron>

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Nuclear Detection Office Faces Senate Grilling**

Monday, September 13, 2010

A U.S. Homeland Security Department office is expected Wednesday to address criticism from senators over its work to prevent illicit transfers into the United States of material that could be used in a nuclear attack, *Congressional Quarterly* reported yesterday (see *GSN*, July 1).

The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee has scheduled a follow-up to a June hearing in which lawmakers and expert witnesses nearly unanimously expressed disapproval of the Domestic Nuclear Detection Office's efforts. Participants in that meeting questioned why the office had long emphasized work on a new generation of radiation detectors, dubbed Advanced Spectroscopic Portal monitors, over establishment of plans to counter nuclear smuggling with available sensors.

"Five years into its existence, based on its record, it's just inescapable to conclude that DNDO requires retooling, and quickly," said panel Chairman Joseph Lieberman (I-Conn.). "It's made too little progress on its major mission, which is the development of the global nuclear detection architecture."

Obstacles consistently arose in testing the ASP monitors, prompting Homeland Security officials to relegate the devices to second-line assignments (see *GSN*, March 2). As problems with the machines persisted, the office failed

to address various nuclear smuggling vulnerabilities, including inadequate scanning of small seagoing vessels and vehicles at border crossings, said officials with the Congressional Research Service, Government Accountability Office and National Research Council.

"They took their eye off the ball on what they were supposed to do," GAO official Gene Aloise said, noting his office had "issued numerous reports before Congress and this committee warning them that they were falling into that trap and they fell into that trap."

In June, the United States had no system for spotting illicit nuclear material in train shipments from Canada and no strategy for screening U.S.-bound commercial cargo on aircraft, Aloise said.

The nuclear office has sought \$13 million in the next budget cycle for preparing a new nuclear detection blueprint in coming years. Committee spokeswoman Leslie Phillips, though, last week noted the office has already had five years and \$2 billion to refine its funding and action approaches.

"Unfortunately, DNDO and its partners at DHS have no strategic investment plan, no certain plans or solutions ready to close security gaps outside of established ports of entry, and their best avenues for moving forward in the near-term are blocked by the unintended consequences of DNDO's program failures," Phillips said.

Extremist entities including al-Qaeda have continued seeking materials for a radiological "dirty bomb" attack on the United States, Lieberman said. The International Atomic Energy Agency's Illicit Trafficking Database has recorded 1,340 verified illicit transfers of potential dirty bomb ingredients since 2007; 18 of the incidents included plutonium or weapon-grade uranium capable of fueling a nuclear bomb.

"I ask seriously if DNDO has been on the right track and has been moving rapidly enough to achieve its critical mission," he said (Rob Margetta, *Congressional Quarterly*, Sept. 12).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100913\\_3682.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100913_3682.php)

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

Press Release of Senator Lugar

## **Nunn-Lugar August 2010 Update**

Monday, September 13, 2010

U.S. Sen. Dick Lugar announced the following progress in the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program last month.

- 2 Intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) destroyed,
- 3 nuclear weapons transport train shipments secured and
- 56.6 metric tons of chemical weapons agent neutralized.

In November 1991, Lugar (R-IN) and Sen. Sam Nunn (D-GA) authored the Nunn-Lugar Act, which established the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. This program has provided U.S. funding and expertise to help the former Soviet Union safeguard and dismantle its enormous stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, related materials, and delivery systems. In 2003, Congress adopted the Nunn-Lugar Expansion Act, which authorized the Nunn-Lugar program to operate outside the former Soviet Union to address proliferation threats. In 2004, Nunn-Lugar funds were committed for the first time outside of the former Soviet Union to destroy chemical weapons in Albania, under a Lugar-led expansion of the program. In 2007, Lugar announced the complete destruction of Albania's chemical weapons.

The Nunn-Lugar scorecard now totals 7,551 strategic nuclear warheads deactivated, 787 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) destroyed, 498 ICBM silos eliminated, 180 ICBM mobile launchers destroyed, 651 submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) eliminated, 476 SLBM launchers eliminated, 32 nuclear submarines capable of launching ballistic missiles destroyed, 155 bomber eliminated, 906 nuclear air-to-surface missiles (ASMs) destroyed, 194 nuclear test tunnels eliminated, 490 nuclear weapons transport train shipments secured, upgraded security at 24 nuclear weapons storage sites, built and equipped 20 biological monitoring stations, and neutralized 1500 metric tons of Russian and Albanian chemical weapons agent. Perhaps most importantly, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus are nuclear weapons free as a result of cooperative efforts under the Nunn-Lugar program. Those countries were the third, fourth and eighth largest nuclear weapons powers in the world.

Lugar makes annual oversight trips to Nunn-Lugar sites around the world.

<http://lugar.senate.gov/news/record.cfm?id=327580&&>

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

Los Angeles Times

## **U.S. Holding 324 Metric Tons of Bomb-Grade Uranium, Report Says**

*The Obama administration, which is urging other nations to reduce their stores of the material, should declare part of the U.S. inventory surplus, a watchdog group says.*

By Ralph Vartabedian  
September 14, 2010

The Energy Department is holding 324 metric tons of bomb-grade uranium at the same time the Obama administration is urging nations to reduce or eliminate their stores of the material, according to a report to be released Tuesday by the nuclear watchdog group Project on Government Oversight.

The Washington-based group wants the administration to declare a portion of the U.S. inventory of highly enriched uranium as surplus and increase the amount that is blended down each year into commercial reactor fuel.

The inventory began to swell years ago after the U.S. agreed to a series of nuclear arms accords resulting in the decommissioning of thousands of nuclear warheads. The U.S. stopped making highly enriched uranium after the end of the Cold War.

The Energy Department's National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, defended the rate at which it is blending the uranium into commercial fuel, noting the difficulty and cost of the process. It did not comment on the size of the surplus, which is classified.

The NNSA also said that it was not sending out a contradictory message by maintaining the surplus. It said that its facilities are secure from terrorists and that the agency provides technical assistance to other nations when they give up their bomb materials.

But the issue is drawing fresh scrutiny from nuclear nonproliferation groups and Congress.

"The U.S. would be on higher moral ground if we clearly articulated that we are working to minimize our use of highly enriched uranium," said Joan Rohlfing, president of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a nonpartisan group. "It should be the norm that every country with these materials publishes their status."

Staff from the House Armed Services Committee is preparing to go to a new \$500-million Tennessee facility where the uranium is stored. A spokesman for the Republican staff said they wanted to ask why existing highly enriched uranium surpluses were being "downblended" at a slower than expected rate.

Frank N. von Hippel, a Princeton University nuclear weapons expert and co-chairman of the International Panel on Fissile Materials, said, "We are awash in surplus" highly enriched uranium. But von Hippel makes a more conservative estimate of the surplus, putting it at about 60 metric tons.

The Navy uses highly enriched uranium to power its submarines and aircraft carriers. Under an earlier declaration, 160 metric tons of the material was set aside for future Navy needs, enough for 25 to 50 years of operation.

Small amounts of the material are also used by research reactors to produce medical isotopes and by NASA to power deep-space probes.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-uranium-20100914,0,7187215.story>

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

Government Executive

## **Nuclear Program has Air Force Both Worried and Hopeful**

By Otto Kreisher, *Congress Daily*  
September 14, 2010

The commander of the U.S. Strategic Command expressed concern on Monday over several aspects of nuclear deterrent capabilities but praised the Nuclear Posture Review and the administration's fiscal 2011 budget that requested a substantial funding increase to upgrade nuclear weapons facilities and modernize and sustain the weapons stockpile.

Air Force Gen. Kevin Chilton also gave a strong endorsement of the New START arms control treaty, calling it a "strategy-based approach" to which his command contributed.

Earlier in the day at the Air Force Association's conference at the National Harbor convention center in Maryland, a number of senior Air Force officers in nuclear deterrent commands noted the improvements made in the last two



years to re-establish high standards of security and performance and to start improvements in the aged nuclear weapons arsenal.

In addressing the challenges to nuclear deterrence, Chilton warned that the critical capability to warn of a possible nuclear attack is eroding because of the continued failure of the Space Based Infrared missile launch warning system.

He noted that he protested the lack of the SBIRS network of satellites in 2008 and 2009 and was assured both times that launch of the first satellites was imminent. But the program remains trapped in technical problems and threatened by massive cost overruns.

"It is past time to eliminate this critical gap in our strategic missile warning system," he said.

Chilton also protested the badly deteriorated condition of the nuclear weapons production facilities at Oak Ridge, Tenn., which he noted, were built during the Manhattan Project in the 1940s.

But he praised the steps taken by the administration "to reverse the 15-year neglect" of the nuclear infrastructure, including refurbishment and upgrades to the nuclear warheads.

Chilton expressed concern that there was no plan to replace the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles, but noted that the Navy has started work on replacing the Ohio-class strategic missile submarines. He suggested it also should begin planning a replacement for the D-5 Trident missiles the subs carry.

He also worried about the future of the solid rocket industrial base that would be needed to produce replacements for the Minuteman and the D-5.

On the positive side, Chilton cited the NPR, which confirmed the need for a strong nuclear deterrent force and continuation of the nuclear Triad of land- and sea-based missiles and bombers, and the New START treaty.

Asked about his previous comments that even if Russia cheated on the treaty's limits it would not be a problem, Chilton said the verification system would prevent a militarily significant violation. And even if the Russians violated the pact, they could not gain enough of an edge to consider a nuclear attack.

Ratification of the treaty in the Senate has been delayed by Republican concern about the arms reduction and verification.

Earlier, officials noted that the Air Force has spent \$8.5 billion in rebuilding its nuclear deterrent capabilities and created the new Global Strike Command to establish a single authority over both the missile and bombers.

<http://www.govexec.com/dailyfed/0910/091410cdam1.htm>

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

Financial Times – U.K.  
OPINION/EDITORIAL

## **Atomic Question**

September 12, 2010

David Cameron's government is this month taking final decisions on Britain's Strategic Defence and Security Review, reconfiguring the armed forces for an era of tighter budgets. One big question it must decide is what the future of Britain's nuclear deterrent should be. The country is planning to spend £20bn over the next decade building four new submarines that can launch the Trident missile. It is the largest single equipment programme in the Ministry of Defence budget. As spending gets slashed on conventional armed forces, politicians and generals are insisting that a cut in nuclear weapons must also be made.

Ahead of this decision, some things are clear. First, Britain must not unilaterally scrap its nuclear arsenal. It must do so only in a multilateral negotiation with other powers. Moreover, Britain must stick to a sea-launched deterrent. Analysts believe the creation of an aircraft-launched system would be more expensive than one based on submarines. A land-launched deterrent, while cheaper than any other variant, could be obliterated in a sudden nuclear strike on a state the size of the UK.

So the question Mr Cameron and his colleagues must answer is how the UK can save money on the new submarine building programme. Here, debate among officials has focused on whether the UK needs to retain what is called "continuous at sea deterrence" – in other words, maintaining submarine patrols 24 hours a day, seven days a week. During the cold war, when there was permanent threat of a sudden Soviet attack on Europe, Britain needed a round-the-clock deterrent. Today, such a threat does not exist. The question therefore arises whether Britain can risk having short periods when there might be no submarine at sea.

Mr Cameron should make this compromise. By doing so, he can extend the life of the current submarine fleet, which will not have to patrol on the current punishing timetable. This would mean capital spending on the replacement fleet could be pushed further into the future. Compromising on round-the-clock deterrence would also allow the UK to reduce the number of submarines it builds from four to three.

Savings would not be huge. But Britain's defence review cannot leave spending on the nuclear arsenal untouched. The UK needs a credible deterrent. But when billions are being wiped off welfare spending, ministers cannot insist that there should be no compromise whatsoever on Trident.

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/0838d5aa-be9a-11df-a755-00144feab49a.html>

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

Daily Ha'aretz – Israel  
OPINION/ANALYSIS  
September 12, 2010

## **Analysis / Who Should We Believe? Is Iran Building a New Nuclear Site?**

*Mujahedin-e-Khalq, the opposition group that leaked evidence of a 'third' enrichment, clearly has a vested interest.*  
By Yossi Melman

Should we believe the National Council of Resistance of Iran's "discovery" of a third uranium enrichment facility in the Islamic Republic? On one hand, the council is essentially a front for Mujahedin-e-Khalq, which began in the 1970s as an organization that combined leftist ideology with Islam and whose targets included American diplomats, as part of its plan to bring down the Shah. All of this earning it a place on the U.S. blacklist of terror groups.

On the other hand, at a 2002 press conference similar to the one it held in Washington on Friday, the council did expose the enrichment facility in Natanz, as well as construction on a 40-megawatt heavy-water research reactor in Arak. That information was handed over to the International Atomic Energy Agency, forcing its head at the time, Mohamed ElBaradei, to launch an investigation.

Mujahedin-e-Khalq has some pretty good sources in Iran, but it has been accused of serving as a pipeline for information from the Israeli and U.S. intelligence communities. It has also made more than a few dramatic announcements about the discovery of facilities connected to Iran's nuclear program, and even to biological and chemical weapons programs, that turned out to be unfounded.

The organization clearly has a vested interest in getting the goods on Iran, on which complements the American and Israeli desires to impose more and more sanctions on Iran in the hope of getting Tehran to halt its military nuclear program. Iran has announced in the past several months that it intends to build 10 new enrichment facilities, but as it has already passed the "technological threshold" of enriching uranium, these are not entirely necessary.

<http://www.haaretz.com/print-edition/news/analysis-who-should-we-believe-is-iran-building-a-new-nuclear-site-1.313291>

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

Daily Star – Lebanon

## **Non-Proliferation is on its Last Legs**

By Harsh V. Pant  
Tuesday, September 14, 2010

Two years ago when former US President George W. Bush helped end India's status as a nuclear pariah, opening the country for civilian nuclear technology sale, the long-term implications were obscure.

With Japan, a long-time critic of India's weapon bid, lining up for deals with India, and China proposing to offer similar technology to Pakistan, the geopolitical import of the 2008 Indo-US agreement is becoming clear: Japan, concerned by China's rise, wants to strengthen India while China counters the US-India partnership by helping India's nemesis Pakistan. In the process, protecting the nuclear non-proliferation regime has become more complex.

Since the signing of the Indo-US agreement and special dispensation granted to India by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), India has signed civilian nuclear-energy pacts with states as diverse as the United Kingdom, France, Russia, Canada Argentina, Kazakhstan, Namibia and Mongolia. The start of negotiations with Japan is the latest such agreement. China announced its own civil nuclear pact with Pakistan

this year though it has yet to receive a waiver from the NSG for selling technology to a non-member of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

Behind seemingly innocuous agreements of civilian nuclear cooperation, India, Japan, China and Pakistan engage in a strategic balancing game that could draw in other states, complicate the global non-proliferation agenda and raise serious security concerns about Pakistan as a Wal-Mart of illicit nuclear technology.

The US-India nuclear pact virtually rewrote the rules of the global nuclear regime by underlining India's credentials as a responsible nuclear state that should be integrated into the global nuclear order, with the Bush administration deciding to "dehyphenate" American relations with India and Pakistan. The pact creates a major exception to the US prohibition of nuclear assistance to any country that does not accept international monitoring of all its nuclear facilities. The unspoken context of the deal was US concern about China's rapid ascendance in the Asia-Pacific. Both India and the US realized that, to prevent China from dominating the region, a close partnership between the world's two largest democracies was essential. The nuclear deal became the most potent symbol of US-India rapprochement.

But the deal was not merely between India and the US. Successful approval by the NSG allowed India to engage other nuclear powers in civilian nuclear trade and provided new market opportunities to major nuclear powers. Even Japan, a strong critic of India's nuclear policy, decided to fast-track negotiations for a civilian nuclear deal, planning to sign the accord during the Indian prime minister's visit to Tokyo by year-end – the first such agreement between Japan and a country that isn't a signatory to the NPT.

Though Indian-Japanese ties have blossomed in recent years on a range of issues, the nuclear issue has been a major irritant. The new understanding between the two nations underscores Tokyo's attempts to come to terms with India's nuclear status. Japanese nuclear companies are eager for a share of the Indian market. Given involvement of Toshiba, Hitachi and Mitsubishi in US and French nuclear industries, an Indo-Japanese pact is essential for US and French civilian nuclear cooperation with India.

Beyond the commercial dimensions of the deal, political symbolism is even more critical. Such a deal would underline Japan's determination to put Indo-Japanese ties in high gear. The rise of China is a major factor in the evolution of Indo-Japanese ties as is the US attempt to build India into a major balancer in the region. Both India and Japan chafe at China's not-so-subtle attempts at preventing their rise. An Indian-Japanese civil nuclear pact would signal an Asian partnership to bring stability to the region at a time when China goes all out to dispense civilian nuclear reactors to Pakistan, putting the entire non-proliferation regime in jeopardy.

The Sino-Pakistan nuclear relationship has been the major factor wrecking the foundations of the NPT regime. China's nuclear test in 1964 propelled India's nuclear weaponization culminating in India's "peaceful nuclear explosion" in 1974. Sino-Pakistan nuclear cooperation – involving the sharing of weapon design and missile technology in the 1990s – forced India to go overtly nuclear in 1998.

When Washington announced its civilian nuclear energy cooperation pact with India in 2005, China indicated displeasure by asking India to sign the NPT and dismantle its nuclear weapons. Beijing promptly made that concern pointless by declaring its intention to sell nuclear reactors to Pakistan.

The not-so-subtle message was, if Washington decided to play favorites, China would do the same, confirming that China continues to view Pakistan as an asset in countering India.

The Chinese authorities confirmed earlier this year that the China National Nuclear Cooperation signed an agreement with Pakistan for two new nuclear reactors at the Chashma site – Chashma III and Chashma IV – in addition to the two already under development in Pakistan. This action is in clear violation of NSG guidelines that forbid nuclear transfers to countries not signatories to the NPT or not adhering to comprehensive international nuclear safeguards.

With or without the NSG approval, nuclear cooperation between China and Pakistan will intensify in the coming years as China becomes more assertive. China is concerned about deepening Indo-US relations and India's attempts to cultivate ties with states in China's periphery. The resulting priority of the Sino-Pakistani relationship is evident in Chinese policies toward South Asia.

Moreover, there's a sense in Beijing that the Obama administration would be reluctant to challenge the deal as it needs China's help on issues ranging from Iran and North Korea to the global economy. The US no longer seems to have the willingness and clout to enforce the rules requiring credible safeguards before civilian nuclear technology can be exported.

China is not only active in Pakistan. Iran has emerged as the second-largest customer of China's defense industry after Pakistan, receiving critical technology, including some that violate stated Chinese policy of adhering to the norms of the non-proliferation regime.

As China becomes more assured of its rising global profile, it will challenge American foreign-policy priorities, and the non-proliferation regime will fast become the first casualty of emerging great power politics.

It's safe to conclude that notwithstanding the hype surrounding the NPT Review Conference held in May, the non-proliferation regime as we have known it is on its last legs. The reason is simple: the changing balance of power, most dramatically in Asia. It's there that the epitaph of the non-proliferation regime is being written. The non-proliferation regime is out of sync with the distribution of global power at the moment. No surprise that its credibility is eroding.

*Harsh V. Pant teaches at King's College, London. This article is reprinted with permission from Yale Global Online (www.yaleglobal.yale.edu). Copyright © 2010, Yale Center for the Study of Globalization, Yale University.*

[http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition\\_id=1&categ\\_id=5&article\\_id=119244#axzz0zWj3WmAi](http://www.dailystar.com.lb/article.asp?edition_id=1&categ_id=5&article_id=119244#axzz0zWj3WmAi)

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