



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

---

---

Issue No. 650, 9 September 2008

**Articles & Other Documents:**

[India Jubilant Over Nuclear Trade Waiver](#)

[White House Set To Put Aside U.S.-Russia Nuclear Agreement](#)

[China, Iran Discuss Nuclear Issue](#)

[Rice: U.S. Has Aided In Nuclear Regulation](#)

[U.S. To Withdraw Proposed Nuclear Pact With Russia](#)

[Bush To Press Nuclear Deal With India](#)

[International Envoys Discuss North Korea Nuclear Complex](#)

[Vladimir Putin Set To Bait US With Nuclear Aid For Tehran](#)

[China, Russia Military Expansion Threats Hit](#)

[What's Missing From The Iran Debate](#)

[U.S. Ties Protocol To Terror Delisting](#)

[China Calls For Peaceful Resolution Of Nuclear Standoff](#)

[Averting a Nonproliferation Disaster](#)

[Terror Groups Developing 'Dirty Bomb', Say Security Chiefs](#)

[Australia Reconsiders Nuclear Deal With Russia](#)

---

*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 nuclear, biological and chemical threats and attacks. 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.*

Newsmax.com

(Associated Press)

Sunday, September 7, 2008 9:30 AM

**India Jubilant Over Nuclear Trade Waiver**

NEW DELHI -- India's government and business groups were jubilant Sunday over a hard-won endorsement from nations that supply nuclear material and technology, a decision that paves the way for a landmark civil nuclear energy accord between India and the United States.

India has been subject to a nuclear trade ban since it first tested an atomic weapon in 1974. The country conducted its most recent test blast in 1998 and has refused to sign nonproliferation agreements.

The 45-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group, which governs the legal world trade in nuclear components and know-how, agreed to lift the ban on civilian nuclear trade with India on Saturday after three days of contentious talks in Vienna and some concessions to countries fearful it could set a dangerous precedent.

India described the agreement as "a forward-looking and momentous decision." "It marks the end of India's decades-long isolation from the nuclear mainstream," Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh said late Saturday. "The opening of full civil nuclear cooperation between India and the international community will be good for India and for the world."

The Confederation of Indian Industry, the country's top business group, said the decision would open up enormous business opportunities for India as well as help meet its energy requirements. Chandrajit Banerjee, the confederation's director general, called the development a "major confidence-building move" for India's high-technology sector.

U.S. officials have said that selling peaceful nuclear technology to India would bring the country's atomic program under closer scrutiny and boost — not undermine — international nonproliferation efforts. The civil nuclear agreement, which still requires U.S. congressional approval, will overturn more than three decades of U.S. anti-proliferation policy by allowing America to send nuclear fuel and technology to India, even though New Delhi has refused to sign nonproliferation treaties and tested nuclear weapons.

India, in exchange, would allow international inspections of its civilian nuclear reactors. The Indian media's reaction was also effusive. "Nuclear Dawn," said a headline in the Hindustan Times newspaper. "Pariah to power, India joins the big league," it added.

But the Nuclear Suppliers Group's waiver and the nuclear energy accord between India and the U.S. have come under criticism both in India and abroad. In India, the right-wing opposition Bharatiya Janata Party has said the deal could undermine the country's cherished nuclear weapons program. Communist parties have slammed the India-U.S. deal, saying they don't want closer ties with the United States.

The Communist Party of India (Marxist) said the waiver represented another step toward a surrender of nuclear independence by India's ruling coalition. "The struggle to reverse the agreement is not over," party chief Prakash Karat told reporters. The International Atomic Energy Agency signed off on the deal last month. The Bush administration will have to rush to get approval from Congress in the few weeks remaining before lawmakers adjourn for the rest of the year.

© 2008 Associated Press. All Rights Reserved.

[http://www.newsmax.com/international/india\\_us\\_nuclear\\_deal/2008/09/07/128453.html](http://www.newsmax.com/international/india_us_nuclear_deal/2008/09/07/128453.html)

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

Newsmax.com

Associated Press

Saturday, September 6, 2008 9:15 AM

## **China, Iran Discuss Nuclear Issue**

BEIJING -- Chinese President Hu Jintao urged flexibility and a peaceful resolution of Iran's nuclear ambitions in a meeting with his Iranian counterpart on Saturday, days after Tehran announced it has increased its number of operating centrifuges. In talks with President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who was in Beijing for the opening ceremony of the Paralympic Games, Hu said China respects Iran's right to peaceful energy and is pushing for the problem to be solved through negotiations.

"At present, the Iran nuclear issue is faced with a rare opportunity for the resumption of talks, and we hope all parties concerned could seize the opportunity and show flexibility, to push for a peaceful settlement of the issue," Hu was quoted as saying by the official Xinhua News Agency.

State television showed the two men warmly shaking hands and smiling for the cameras at the Great Hall of the People, where Hu had earlier welcomed world leaders to the Paralympics. The meeting came a little over a week after Iran's Aug. 29 announcement that it had increased the number of operating centrifuges at its uranium enrichment plant to 4,000.

The number was up from the 3,000 centrifuges that Iran announced in November that it was operating at its plant in the central city of Natanz, but still well below the 6,000 it said last year it would operate by summer 2008. The United Nations has already imposed three rounds of sanctions on Tehran for its refusal to freeze its enrichment program, which can be used to produce either fuel for nuclear reactors or the material needed for nuclear warheads. The United States and its allies are likely to press the U.N. later this year for a new round of sanctions but could face strong resistance from Russia after last month's crisis in Georgia deeply damaged ties between Washington and Moscow. China, another U.N. Security Council member with veto power, has in the past sided with Russia in opposing truly onerous sanctions against Iran. On Saturday, Hu stressed the two sides had a "deep friendship," while Ahmadinejad spoke of "good cooperation in various fields like exchange of people and communication."

© 2008 Associated Press. All Rights Reserved.

[http://www.newsmax.com/international/china\\_iran/2008/09/06/128300.html](http://www.newsmax.com/international/china_iran/2008/09/06/128300.html)

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

International Herald Tribune  
September 6, 2008

## **U.S. To Withdraw Proposed Nuclear Pact With Russia**

By Susan Cornwell, Reuters

WASHINGTON--The Bush administration will withdraw a civilian nuclear pact with Russia soon as a penalty for its invasion of Georgia last month, a State Department official said Friday. "The administration will not be moving forward with the agreement. It will be pulling it back from Congress," said the official, speaking on condition of anonymity.

While the U.S. government has announced plans to give the U.S. ally Georgia more than \$1 billion in reconstruction aid, it has yet to hit Moscow with any tangible sanctions for its military incursion deep into Georgian territory last month. But the Bush administration is preparing to scuttle the civilian nuclear deal, intended to lift Cold War restrictions on trade and open up the U.S. nuclear market and Russia's uranium fields to companies from both countries.

"We made very clear that Russia's behavior has to be condemned and there have to be consequences that flow from what it's done in Georgia," the State Department official said. "This will be an example of that." He did not know the exact timing, but said "It's probably going to happen next week."

The nuclear cooperation agreement was signed by the two countries in May and sent by President George W. Bush to Congress, which can still disapprove of the pact. Bush or his successor, who takes office in January, could later decide to resubmit the deal to Congress. Key U.S. lawmakers have said the accord is probably dead anyway in the wake of Russia's short war last month with Georgia over the breakaway enclave of South Ossetia.

Russia has left troops in Georgia despite the internationally negotiated cease-fire requiring them to pull back to positions held before the conflict started. Moscow further angered the West by recognizing the "independence" of South Ossetia and another pro-Russian separatist enclave, Abkhazia. "We want to work with Russia on a wide range of issues," the State Department official said.

"But Russia has to show that it's interested in working with the international community. And the fact that there is a cease-fire agreement that they are not adhering to is troubling to all of us," the official added. "That's why our relationship right now is being reviewed across the board." The nuclear pact would have gone into force if Congress

did not pass a joint resolution of disapproval or adjourn for the year before lawmakers had 90 legislative days to review it.

Some lawmakers were already troubled by the nuclear pact even before Russia and Georgia went to war last month. They said they did not trust Russia enough to expand nuclear cooperation because it supplied fuel to Iran's Bushehr nuclear power plant. Washington believes Iran harbors ambitions to build a nuclear bomb.

The Bush administration had argued the pact would clear the way for Washington and U.S. companies to cooperate with Russia in setting up an international nuclear fuel bank that would supply countries like Iran, in a bid to discourage them from developing their own nuclear fuel cycle facilities.

<http://www.iht.com/articles/2008/09/05/europe/05nuke.php>

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

New York Times  
September 6, 2008

## **International Envoys Discuss North Korea Nuclear Complex**

By Choe Sang-hun and Graham Bowley

SEOUL, South Korea -- International envoys from four nations started meetings in Beijing on Friday, seeking clarification on whether North Korea has begun reassembling its main nuclear complex, its only known source of bomb-making plutonium.

The United States' top nuclear envoy, Assistant Secretary of State Christopher R. Hill said late Friday night after meetings in Beijing that the United States was willing to sit down again with representatives from the five other countries involved in the disarmament talks, according to the Associated Press.

"What we need to do is verify their nuclear declaration and we have put together a protocol that's based on international standards," the AP quoted Mr. Hill as saying after he met with representatives of South Korea and Japan. "I think there's a lot of support within the six party process for getting this done."

The North announced last week that it had stopped disabling its nuclear facilities at Yongbyon, about 60 miles north of Pyongyang, and this week was said to have started rebuilding them. Mr. Hill was expected to press China, the North's key Communist ally, to persuade North Korea to refrain from rebuilding facilities at the complex. American and South Korean officials, however, have warned against reading too much into the developments and American officials have cast doubt on the seriousness of the North's efforts.

Korea has taken the action because it was angry that it had not yet been removed from the United States' list of state sponsors of terrorism. The United States maintains that the North has not fulfilled the requirements for being removed from the list.

Mr. Hill was scheduled to leave Beijing on Sunday after his series of meetings, including one with the Chinese foreign minister, Wu Dawei.. North Korean representatives were not expected to attend the meetings with Mr. Hill.

Before leaving for Beijing, Kim Sook, Mr. Hill's South Korean counterpart was quoted as telling reporters: "This is a critical moment, and we should try to break this deadlock as soon as possible so that North Korea can promptly restart nuclear disarmament and come back to the six-party talks."

In a briefing with reporters in Washington on Thursday, a State Department spokesman, Robert Wood, said that United States monitors at the Yongbyon complex had ascertained "that some equipment that had been moved to a storage site as part of the disablement process apparently was returned to its previous location. But none of that equipment is operational."

In a briefing that Mr. Kim held with the South Korean media on Thursday, local reporters quoted a government official as saying that North Korea was gathering the debris from the reactor's cooling tower, toppled in June as part of the disablement process, Reuters reported.

However despite the apparent rebuilding efforts at the complex, officials have said that so much of the essential equipment had been removed to warehouses that it would take at least a year to reassemble the old Soviet-era reactor and its auxiliary facilities. In Washington on Wednesday, the State Department spokesman, Sean McCormack, said that the North Koreans seemed simply to be taking equipment out of storage and moving it around.

As part of an aid-for-disarmament deal, North Korea submitted a nuclear declaration in June and the United States wants to ascertain that the North did not leave out any vital data. It has long suspected the North of pursuing uranium enrichment as an alternative method of making bombs, as well as exporting its nuclear know-how to countries like Syria.

*Choe Sang-hun reported from Seoul, South Korea, and Graham Bowley from New York.*

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/06/world/asia/06korea.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

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

Japan Times  
September 6, 2008

## **China, Russia Military Expansion Threats Hit**

By Kyodo News

Japan remains vigilant of China's growing military power, including its development of an antisatellite laser, but is less apprehensive than last year about Beijing's stand against Taiwan, according to an annual defense review released Friday.

The Defense of Japan 2008, endorsed Friday by the Cabinet, also expresses caution about Russia's military activities around Japan and refers to the possibility of North Korea developing downsized nuclear warheads in a short time span. In the wake of scandals involving the Defense Ministry and the Self-Defense Forces since last year, the 425-page report devotes 22 pages to describing reform measures.

On China, the report repeats a call for more transparency on the country's military spending. China's published defense expenditures have marked double-digit year-to-year growth for 20 years in a row, with the fiscal 2008 budget totaling around 409.9 billion yuan (about \$60 billion). The growth during this period translates into "a pace that nearly doubles every five years," the report says.

It argues that the priority in China's military modernization is to acquire the capability to deter Taiwan, which it regards as a renegade province, from seeking independence, and also to deter "foreign military forces" from providing support to Taiwan. The report, however, waters down the rhetoric on these reiterated points compared with the 2007 report.

The 2008 review offers for the first time detailed references to China's growing military capabilities in space, including the reported development of a laser aimed at disabling satellites. It also mentions reported Chinese drills against cyber attacks.

<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20080906a7.html>

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

Washington Times  
September 7, 2008  
Pg. 6

## **U.S. Ties Protocol To Terror Delisting**

*Rules to end nuclear impasse*

By Audra Ang, Associated Press

BEIJING--The United States will move quickly to take North Korea off its list of state sponsors of terrorism if nuclear negotiators can cobble together rules to verify the regime's nuclear programs, the top U.S. nuclear envoy

said Saturday. Assistant Secretary of State Christopher Hill said the established protocol would be the only way to break the deadlock that has stalled the disarmament process.

"We're not looking to verify their declaration now. We're looking to come up with rules on how we will verify it in the future," Mr. Hill told reporters after two days of meetings with representatives from South Korea, Japan, Russia and China. No talks were scheduled with North Korea.

"If we can get there, we can take them off the terrorism list," he said. "We're prepared to move very quickly on that - really, instantaneously - provided we get what we need in terms of the verification." The North conducted an underground nuclear test blast in October 2006. It later agreed to disable the Yongbyon plant - its main nuclear facility - in exchange for aid and diplomatic concessions. Work began in November.

The impasse stems from North Korea's contention that the United States has not held up its end of the disarmament deal - a promise to remove the regime from its list of state sponsors of terrorism. Washington says it will take the North off the list - a coveted goal of cash-strapped Pyongyang - only after it complies fully with the disarmament requirements. "The declaration without a protocol is really like just having one chopstick," Mr. Hill said. "You need two chopsticks if you are to pick up anything."

The Japan-based Choson Sinbo newspaper, considered one of North Korea's overseas propaganda outlets, reported from Pyongyang on Saturday that the standoff arose because the United States made a "brigandish demand" over nuclear verification.

The paper said on its Web site that Washington's demand amounts to a violation of the North's independent sovereignty because it calls for "ransacking anywhere" in North Korea - a charge that Mr. Hill said was "simply not an accurate characterization."

The meetings came as Pyongyang began moving disassembled parts of its main nuclear reactor back to the plutonium-producing facility this week, steps that indicate it may be reversing its promised disarmament. Citing unidentified U.S. officials, Fox News Channel said Saturday that the North had repeatedly broken seals the United Nations' nuclear watchdog placed in areas around Yongbyon in its efforts to reassemble.

Mr. Hill said he could not confirm the report but underscored Washington's earlier position that Pyongyang just moved some equipment out of storage and that it has not yet started to reintegrate the equipment back into the facility. "Actually reconstituting Yongbyon is not an easy piece of work," Mr. Hill said. "It doesn't happen in a matter of weeks or even months. It would really take more than a year."

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2008/sep/07/us-ties-protocol-to-terror-delisting/>

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

New York Times  
September 6, 2008, Pg. 12

## **China Calls For Peaceful Resolution Of Nuclear Standoff**

By Edward Wong

BEIJING — President Hu Jintao of China urged other nations on Saturday to negotiate a resolution to Iran's nuclear issue during a meeting with Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, making clear again that China disapproves of any move by Western countries to attack Iran with military force.

Mr. Hu met with Mr. Ahmadinejad on Saturday in the Great Hall of the People here after Mr. Ahmadinejad flew into Beijing to attend the opening ceremony of the Paralympic Games, which began in the evening. "At present, the Iran nuclear issue is faced with a rare opportunity for the resumption of talks, and we hope all parties concerned could seize the opportunity and show flexibility to push for a peaceful settlement of the issue," Mr. Hu said in the meeting, Xinhua, the state news agency, reported.

The agency said in its own words that Mr. Hu had said that that China "respects Iran's right to the peaceful use of nuclear energy" and "adheres to the peaceful settlement of the Iran nuclear issue through dialogues and

negotiations.” According to Xinhua, Mr. Hu also said that “both China and Iran are big developing nations, and have strong economic complementarity and great potential of cooperation.”

At issue is Iran’s refusal to halt its uranium enrichment program, a central step in burning uranium into nuclear fuel — or, at greater concentrations, into bombs. Senior American officials contend that Iran is trying to build a nuclear warhead, while Iran has repeatedly said that its program is for peaceful purposes.

Mr. Hu spoke more than a week after Iran announced that it had increased the number of operating centrifuges at its uranium enrichment plant. On Aug. 29, Iran said it had 4,000 operating centrifuges at the plant, in the city of Natanz, which was an increase of 1,000 from the number it gave last November.

As members of the United Nations Security Council, China and Russia, each of which have veto power, have long opposed plans by the United States and other Western countries to impose strict sanctions on Iran.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2008/09/07/world/asia/07china.html?partner=rssnyt&emc=rss>

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

London Daily Telegraph

September 8, 2008

## **Terror Groups Developing 'Dirty Bomb', Say Security Chiefs**

By Con Coughlin

Islamist terrorists have stepped up their efforts to develop a 'dirty' bomb for use against Western targets, senior Western security sources have told The Daily Telegraph. They are exploiting the political chaos in Pakistan in a bid to acquire nuclear material for a 'spectacular' attack. At least one plot has been uncovered involving Pakistani-based terrorists planning to use nuclear material against a major European target.

Osama bin Laden's al-Qa'eda terror group, whose terrorist infrastructure is based in the province of Waziristan in northwest Pakistan, is known to be trying to acquire nuclear technology to use in terror attacks against the West. Other militant Islamist groups in Pakistan, such as the newly formed Pakistani Taliban, have also shown an interest in developing weapons with a nuclear capability, according to Western security officials.

Security chiefs fear the mounting political instability in Pakistan will make it easier for militant Islamist groups to develop a primitive nuclear device. Pakistan is the world's only Muslim country with a nuclear weapons arsenal, which was developed during the 1990s by the rogue Pakistani nuclear scientist Dr Abdul Qadir (AQ) Khan.

Dr Khan was placed under house arrest after he was accused of selling the blueprint for Pakistan's atom bomb to rogue states such as Libya, North Korea and Iran. But the restrictions on Dr Khan's detention have been eased since President Pervez Musharraf was forced from power.

Pakistan's nuclear arsenal is subject to stringent security safeguards put in place with the help of the American military when Mr Musharraf was in office. But there is mounting concern within Western security circles that Islamic terror groups will gain access to Pakistan's expertise in developing terrorist weapons containing nuclear material.

"Islamist militant groups want to carry out terror attacks on a massive scale, and there is no better way for them to achieve that objective than to develop some form of primitive nuclear device," said a senior U.S. security official. The most likely terror device using nuclear material is a "dirty bomb", where conventional explosives are fitted with radioactive material. Security experts believe the detonation of such a device in a city like London would provoke widespread panic and chaos, even though the area of contamination would be relatively small.

Western security officials say they have uncovered evidence that a Pakistani based group was planning to attack a European target with such a device, although details of the planned attack have not been made public.

The sweeping victory of Asif Ali Zardari, the widower of murdered Pakistani leader Benazir Bhutto, in the presidential election at the weekend, has done little to reassure Western diplomats that the security situation in

Pakistan is about to improve. Mr Zardari was jailed for nine years on corruption charges, and Western diplomats have little confidence in his ability to provide strong leadership.

"Pakistan is in danger of becoming a failed state, and Mr Zardari's election victory is unlikely to improve the situation," said a Western diplomat. Tensions grew last week when American special forces staged a cross-border incursion from Afghanistan into Pakistan's lawless tribal regions. They were targeting suspected al-Qaeda operatives, signalling a possible intensification of US efforts to disrupt militant safe havens in Pakistan.

Despite fury in Pakistan, US defence officials have said that the number of cross-border missions might grow in coming months in response to the growing militancy. But there are fears this could but this could provoke an Islamist backlash throughout Pakistan that could play into the terrorists' hands. Most of the recent Islamist terror plots against Britain – including the July 7 attacks in London in 2005 – had links with Pakistan, and British security officials say groups based in Pakistan continue to pose the greatest terrorist threat to Britain.

British security officials recently confirmed that they were investigating at least 30 terror plots that originated in Pakistan. "In the past many of the plots have been fairly primitive, but we are seeing a growing level of sophistication. We fear it is only a question of time before the groups based in Pakistan develop some form of nuclear capability."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/newstopics/politics/lawandorder/2700195/Terror-groups-developing-dirty-bomb-say-security-chiefs.html>

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

Washington Post  
September 8, 2008, Pg. 12

## **White House Set To Put Aside U.S.-Russia Nuclear Agreement**

By Michael Abramowitz, Washington Post Staff Writer

The White House plans to formally pull from congressional consideration an agreement with Russia for civilian nuclear cooperation, perhaps as soon as today, Bush administration sources said over the weekend. The move would be the latest effort by the administration to convey its displeasure with Russia over its military actions in Georgia in the past month. Last week, the White House proposed a \$1 billion package of humanitarian and economic assistance to help Georgia recover from its war with Russia over the breakaway region of South Ossetia.

Days later, Vice President Cheney traveled to Tbilisi, Georgia's capital, to pledge U.S. support and, at a conference in Italy on Saturday, blasted Moscow over its invasion of Georgian territory, saying, "Russia's actions are an affront to civilized standards and are completely unacceptable." Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice hinted at coming action on the nuclear accord while traveling in North Africa. "The time isn't right for the Russia agreement," she told reporters Saturday. "We'll be making an announcement about that later."

The civil nuclear agreement was signed in Moscow four months ago, after two years of negotiations. Among other things, the deal would facilitate joint ventures between the Russian and U.S. nuclear industries, and would clear the way for Russia to import thousands of tons of spent nuclear fuel, a business potentially worth billions of dollars.

But the accord must be approved by Congress, a step widely seen as impossible after the Georgia-Russia war, according to administration officials and experts on Russia. Withdrawing the agreement from Congress avoids a rejection of the pact, allowing the White House to save the deal for the next administration, should relations with Russia improve, some experts said.

Stephen Sestanovich, a Columbia University professor who handled Russian affairs in the Clinton administration, yesterday said the agreement is "dead in this Congress, but a new administration will have a look." "Even if this is only a de facto sanction, the Russians have to ask themselves, is this a part of a negative reaction to what they have done that is only going to get bigger if they don't retreat," Sestanovich said. "So far the European Union has actually been a little stiffer and more angry than the Russians truly expected."



Robert J. Einhorn, a specialist on nuclear nonproliferation at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, expressed doubt that withdrawing the nuclear accord would provide much leverage with Moscow, noting that the deal is as much in Washington's interest as Russia's. He said the deal would make it easier for the countries to cooperate in fighting nuclear proliferation and in keeping nuclear material out of the hands of terrorists, both top priorities for the Bush administration.

"The Russians would like this agreement, but they are not dying to get it," Einhorn said yesterday. "They are prepared to live without it. The benefits fall just about equally to both sides. This is not a big favor we have done for the Russians, and so this is not a great punishment to deny it to them."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/07/AR2008090702424.html>

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

Washington Post  
September 8, 2008, Pg. 13

## **Rice: U.S. Has Aided In Nuclear Regulation**

*Efforts to Halt Spread Of Weapons Are Cited*

By Glenn Kessler, Washington Post Staff Writer

RABAT, Morocco, Sept. 7 -- Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice on Sunday defended the Bush administration's record on restraining the spread of nuclear weapons, asserting that the record shows "we have left this situation or this issue in far better shape than we found it."

Rice's remarks came a day after the administration succeeded in persuading a 45-nation group that regulates trade in nuclear equipment and materials to grant an exemption that allows civilian nuclear trade with India. The deal has been heavily criticized by nuclear experts because India is one of the few countries that has refused to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Rice, speaking to reporters after she wrapped up a tour of North Africa with meetings with Moroccan officials, said that the agreement will "expand the reach" of the International Atomic Energy Agency because it will be able to monitor civilian reactors that India has agreed to place under international scrutiny. Reactors involved in India's weapons program, however, will remain off-limits.

Congress must still approve the India deal, but the international imprimatur is a significant personal victory for Rice. She set the agreement in motion just weeks after becoming the top U.S. diplomat in 2005, pushing for a dramatic change in policy that took even the Indian government by surprise.

In lengthy remarks, Rice also pointed to the breakup of a Pakistani nuclear smuggling ring, the creation of a proliferation monitoring group, and the administration's diplomacy on North Korean, Iranian and Libyan weapons programs as other successes.

"I think this is a very strong record," Rice said. "These problems took a long time to emerge. They are not going to be resolved overnight. They won't be resolved by any single administration. But this nonproliferation-counterproliferation problem is in a very much better and a very different place than when we came."

Libya in 2003 agreed to give up its biological, chemical and nuclear weapons programs, a decision Rice called "a major breakthrough" and one that sparked a restoration in relations with the United States. Rice on Friday flew to Tripoli and met with Libyan leader Moammar Gaddafi, becoming the first secretary of state in 55 years to visit the country.

But the North Korean and Iranian efforts have achieved less success, many experts say. North Korea's nuclear program was frozen under an agreement struck in 1994 with the Clinton administration, but that deal collapsed in 2002 after the Bush administration accused Pyongyang of clandestine nuclear work. North Korea then restarted its nuclear reactor and produced enough plutonium for half a dozen weapons.

Last year, the United States, working with China, Japan, South Korea and Russia, succeeded in persuading North Korea to halt the reactor and to begin to disable it. But in recent weeks, North Korea has backtracked, saying it would reassemble it because Washington has not lived up to its promises.

"Yes, this process has its ups and downs, but we do have a way forward," Rice said. The multilateral diplomacy established by the Bush administration, she said, "means that management of the North Korea problem is in the hands of those who have the right sets of incentives and disincentives to get to the proper outcome."

Iran has made great strides in a nuclear program that it insists is civilian but that the administration has said is weapons-related. But Rice pointed to three U.N. Security Council resolutions imposing sanctions on Tehran for not halting its uranium enrichment.

Rice did not mention Iraq, which the United States invaded in 2003 on the grounds that it possessed vast stocks of weapons of mass destruction, in defiance of U.N. resolutions. No such weapons were ever found.

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/07/AR2008090702490.html?nav=rss\\_world](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/07/AR2008090702490.html?nav=rss_world)

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

Wall Street Journal  
September 8, 2008, Pg. 12

## **Bush To Press Nuclear Deal With India**

By Jay Solomon and Niraj Sheth

The Bush administration, seeking to secure a landmark nuclear-cooperation deal with India before its term expires, will push Congress to pass the required legislation by the end of the month. The State Department will likely begin as early as this week to submit to congressional committees the comprehensive legislation, known as the "Hyde Package," U.S. officials said. The goal is to force an up-or-down vote by Sept. 26, the end of the current Congress's term.

"If we have any hope at all, we need to get this done before the adjournment," said a senior U.S. official working on the India legislation. "We still have a lot of hurdles in front of us." The deal would pave the way for the U.S. to supply India with nuclear fuel and technology for civilian use. It could also open up more opportunities for American civilian and military-technology companies, like Boeing Co. and Lockheed Martin Corp., to do business in the world's second-most-populous nation.

India's Congress Party, which leads the country's coalition government, has put a priority on improving India's access to nuclear power through this deal. Although the country's economy is slowing, it is still growing fast, and the nation needs to increase power generation. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said on Saturday during a trip to Algeria that she has already been in contact with congressional committee chairmen to see if they can expedite the India legislation before Congress breaks.

Administration officials identified two congressional players, both Democrats, as central to determining the legislation's fate: California's Howard Berman, chairman of the House of Representatives Committee on Foreign Affairs; and Joe Biden of Delaware, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Democratic vice-presidential nominee.

Sen. Biden has been a key administration ally in supporting the India deal and had vowed earlier this year to "work like the devil" to secure its passage. Rep. Berman has been more circumspect, demanding from the Bush administration greater assurances that any U.S. nuclear assistance to India wouldn't be utilized for military purposes.

"Senator Biden welcomes this positive development and urges the Administration to submit the agreement to Congress quickly," a Biden spokeswoman said in an email. In a statement, Rep. Berman on Sunday expressed support for cooperation on civilian nuclear energy with India. But he said before it votes, Congress needs to study a decision made on Saturday by the Nuclear Suppliers Group, an international body that regulates trade in nuclear materials, to lift a three-decade-old ban on doing such trade with India.

"The burden of proof is on the Bush administration so that Congress can be assured that what we're being asked to approve conforms with U.S. law," he said. Ms. Rice has acknowledged in recent days that time is running out on one of her administration's principal foreign-policy initiatives. But she said on Saturday that even if the India deal isn't approved this year, Mr. Bush will "leave behind a good package" for the next administration to take up.

The board of governors of the United Nations' atomic watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency, has unanimously approved an inspections agreement with India -- a precondition for completing the deal. The deal could also boost Indian spending on U.S. military technology outside of nuclear energy. American businesses have backed the nuclear pact, which would ease restrictions on civilian and military technology exports to India.

U.S. companies like Boeing and Lockheed Martin have used the momentum created by the nuclear deal to bid to provide 126 fighter jets to the Indian government, in a deal valued at between \$8 billion and \$10 billion. But India could also turn to French or Russian companies, which have indicated interest in selling technology to India.

Indian Defense Minister A. K. Antony arrived Sunday for a four-day visit to Washington, where he is expected to meet with Defense Secretary Robert Gates to discuss potential deals to buy U.S. military technology, among other issues.

--*Christopher Conkey contributed to this article.*

[http://www.wsj.com/article/SB122083577266508761.html?mod=todays\\_europe\\_nonsub\\_economy\\_and\\_politics](http://www.wsj.com/article/SB122083577266508761.html?mod=todays_europe_nonsub_economy_and_politics)

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

London Sunday Times  
September 7, 2008

## **Vladimir Putin Set To Bait US With Nuclear Aid For Tehran**

By Mark Franchetti, in Moscow

Russia is considering increasing its assistance to Iran's nuclear programme in response to America's calls for Nato expansion eastwards and the presence of US Navy vessels in the Black Sea delivering aid to Georgia. The Kremlin is discussing sending teams of Russian nuclear experts to Tehran and inviting Iranian nuclear scientists to Moscow for training, according to sources close to the Russian military.

Moscow has been angered by Washington's promise to give Georgia £564m in aid following the Russian invasion of parts of the country last month after Tbilisi's military offensive. Kremlin officials suspect the US is planning to rearm the former Soviet republic and is furious at renewed support for attempts by Georgia and Ukraine to join Nato.

Last week a third US Navy ship entered the Black Sea with aid bound for Georgia. Moscow has accused the Americans of using the vessels to deliver weapons but has failed to provide any evidence. Vladimir Putin, the prime minister of Russia, who has been the driving force during the crisis, has declared he will take unspecified action in response.

"Everything has changed since the war in Georgia," said one source. "What seemed impossible before, is more than possible now when our friends become our enemies and our enemies our friends. What are American ships doing off our coast? Do you see Russian warships off the coast of America? "Russia will respond. A number of possibilities are being considered, including hitting America there where it hurts most – Iran."

Increasing nuclear assistance to Iran would sharply escalate tensions between Moscow and Washington. Over the past 10 years Russia has helped Iran build its first nuclear power station in Bushehr. Iran claims the plant is for civilian purposes. Officially at least, Moscow accepts that. The West has little doubt the aim is to build a nuclear bomb.

But diplomats say that despite its help with the Bushehr plant, Moscow has so far played a constructive role as a mediator between the regime in Tehran and the West and by backing United Nations sanctions. Earlier this year, in one of his last actions as president, Putin added Russia's stamp of approval to a UN security council resolution imposing fresh sanctions against Iran.

The document bans, with the exception of the Bushehr project, dual-technology exports that could be used for civil nuclear purposes and missile production. "After the war in Georgia it's difficult to imagine relations between Russia and America getting worse," said a western diplomat. "Russia giving greater nuclear assistance to the Iranians would do the trick – that's for sure."

Last month Russia agreed to sell missiles to Syria. "The mood among the hawks is very bullish indeed," said one source who did not rule out a resumption of Russian military action in Georgia to take the port of Batumi, where American vessels are delivering aid.

Hardliners were infuriated last week by the visit to Georgia of Dick Cheney, the American vice-president. "Georgia will be in our alliance," Cheney said. He also visited Ukraine, whose Nato aspirations could make it the next flashpoint between Russia and America.

However in Kiev, the Ukrainian capital, events appeared to be moving Moscow's way. Viktor Yushchenko, the pro-western president, is fighting to stay in power in a crisis that could see him impeached. "I'm amused by claims in the West that Russia is the loser in this crisis," said a former Putin aide. "What would Washington do if we were arming Cuba the way it armed Georgia? The post Soviet days when we could be pushed around are over."

<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/world/europe/article4692237.ece>

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

Washington Post  
September 8, 2008  
Pg. 17

## **What's Missing From The Iran Debate**

*Building a Security Framework for a Nuclear Tehran*

By David Kay

It would be impossible and foolish to predict what lies immediately ahead for Iran. Inflation runs rampant and domestic unrest is growing, but the leadership is banding together in support of the country's nuclear program. Threat assessment and war planning are (or should be) about best-guessing capabilities and intentions. When it comes to Iran, these calculations are difficult, but there are things we can -- and must -- figure out. Given what we know and what we can best-guess, it looks as if Iran is 80 percent of the way to a functioning nuclear weapon.

Every nuclear program needs raw materials, a way to refine them and, in the final stage, weaponization. Getting and enriching the materials is the hardest part; without this, a nuclear reaction is impossible. How does Iran's nuclear program measure up?

The situation is a bit murky, but we know, basically, that Tehran has a handle on the fissionable material. Iran imported significant amounts of raw uranium from China in 1991. It has also attempted to produce weapons-grade material, conducting secret enrichment efforts and acquiring designs, materials and samples of gas centrifuges for uranium enrichment from the A.Q. Khan network. Plus, over the past 18 years, the Iranians have developed and tested state-of-the-art centrifuges and enrichment techniques. If Iran's 6,000 forthcoming new-design centrifuges were working for a year, the program could produce about five weapons. My best guess is that they are about two to four years away from accomplishing this.

Next comes weaponization. The fissionable material must be converted into metal and packaged. Here again, Iran has made substantial progress. What remains is to produce these elements in adequate numbers and amounts; combine them in an engineering design that ensures that they work and that fits on a missile; and gain confidence that the resulting weapons will get the job done.

All of this is public knowledge, but the answers to most of the important questions relating to intent and progress on crucial elements of weaponization are unknown. It's the only partially understood and suspected activities of Iran that are most alarming. Signs of these activities include detection by International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors of samples of highly enriched, weapons-grade uranium; more extensive plutonium separation than Iran has admitted; weapons design work; construction of a heavy-water reactor and its associated heavy-water production facility;

design work on missile reentry vehicles that seem to be for a nuclear weapon; and reports of yet-undiscovered programs and facilities.

If all of these activities are real, it would mean that Iran is moving faster and is closer to obtaining a nuclear-weapons capability than the hard facts suggest. Obtaining that last 20 percent of the elements needed to make a nuclear weapon would take perhaps one to two years, instead of the four to seven years needed if they were not.

While we know a lot more about Iran than we did about Iraq (before the Persian Gulf and Iraq wars), we still lack answers to the most important questions, including:

\*If Iran has decided or decides to acquire nuclear weapons, how long will it take to do so and how many could it produce per year?

\*How much foreign assistance has Iran received, and from whom did it receive it?

\*Does Iran have unknown clandestine nuclear facilities and, if so, how many? Doing what?

\*What are the real capabilities of Iran's various weapons-delivery options, particularly its missiles?

\*What are the command-and-control arrangements for Iran's nuclear program? Where is President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in this mix?

This dirty-laundry list is one reason efforts to provide net assessments about where the program is have proved so contentious. The last U.S. attempt to produce a National Intelligence Estimate on Iran, in December, led to a comedy remarkable even by Washington standards. Yet we are talking about a country with known nuclear ambitions and a track record of violating international obligations in pursuit of that goal.

Despite the unanswered questions, we have some pretty frightening knowledge about Iran's nuclear capabilities. Less clear are its intentions. Tehran often claims to want only to pursue a civilian nuclear program. But it also says it wants to wipe Israel off the map. And Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, along with Ahmadinejad, sees nuclear "power" as a symbol of national pride. It's difficult to know what to believe.

What truly raises tensions, though, is Iran's worldview. Iranians have learned to fear the power of others and to believe that they must ultimately organize their world in a way that lessens the power of the states that pose the greatest threat to them. And Iran's essential national security threat has never been Israel. It is the United States.

My humble best guess is that Iran is pushing toward a nuclear-weapons capability as rapidly as it can. But if Tehran were to believe that American -- not Israeli -- military action is imminent, it might slow work on the elements of its program that it thinks the world can observe. Yet such temporizing would only be tactical. Its strategic goal is to acquire nuclear weapons to counter what it views as a real U.S. threat. Iran appears to believe that the United States is not willing to accept the validity and survival of the Iranian revolutionary state.

Of course, Iran does not exist in a vacuum. How Israel and the United States perceive the threat, based on their own historical memories and strategic priorities, figures significantly in just how messy this may get.

The context within which these national strategies and decisions are interacting is being reshaped by two factors. First, oil prices have exploded, greatly enriching Iran and making clear to the West the economic and political pain and destruction that could come from a serious disruption in the flow of oil. Second is Iran's belief that it has gained a strategic advantage against the United States as a result of its being tied down in Iraq, and against Israel, because of the tactical blunting, if not defeat, of its military in Lebanon.

The United States must figure out and articulate its strategic objectives regarding Iran's nuclear program. At present, its actions and rhetoric are often as conflicted as those of the Islamic Republic.

And while not all would agree with Sen. John McCain's assessment that the only thing worse than a U.S. or Israeli military attack on Iran would be Iran acquiring nuclear weapons, few in the mainstream of American politics seem ready to go on the record with a plan for "the day after" that does not involve military action.

Two concerns seem to be most absent from discussion of Iran's "nuclear future," whatever it is: First, what policies would limit any advantage, political or military, that Iran might gain from such weapons? Second, how do we begin to craft, with all the states of the region -- including Israel and Iran -- political, economic and security arrangements that recognize their varied interests and concerns and their often very different perspectives on what these are? In the end, we need to decide how we can perform damage control and create arrangements that take into account states' varied interests.

Figuring this out is not rocket science. But we must begin the process of discussion, consultation, planning and acting that will lay the groundwork for a future far different from either the conflicts of the past or the current path toward a regional conflagration that may well involve nuclear weapons.

The United States, along with all of the states in the Middle East, has to create security policies that guarantee that acts of aggression will not be allowed to threaten any state's survival while also beginning to build the economic institutions and policies that can create a future where war seems impossible. While Iran's economy suffers, engagement is more feasible.

What is hard is the actual act of stepping off the (probably sinking) ship we stand on to construct a very different vessel. This is one of those times in history when will is more important than brilliance and when determination to shape a different future is more vital than experience in rituals of the past.

*The writer led the U.N. inspections after the Persian Gulf War that uncovered the Iraqi nuclear program. He later led the CIA's Iraq Survey Group, which determined there were no Iraqi weapons of mass destruction at the time of the 2003 invasion. A longer version of this article appears in the September/October issue of the National Interest.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2008/09/07/AR2008090701953.html>

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

Published on Arms Control Association (<http://www.armscontrol.org>)

## **Averting a Nonproliferation Disaster**

Daryl G. Kimball

September 2008

Decision time has arrived on the controversial proposal to roll back three decades of nuclear trade restrictions on India, which violated peaceful nuclear cooperation agreements by detonating its first nuclear bomb in 1974.

As early as Sept. 4-5, the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) will reconvene to consider a revised U.S. proposal to permit nuclear trade with India. At a special meeting of the 45-member group last month, the Bush administration proposed an India-specific exemption from NSG guidelines, which currently require full-scope IAEA safeguards as a condition of supply. Bowing to Indian demands, the Bush team called for a "clean" and "unconditional" waiver that would have allowed unrestricted nuclear trade with India at the discretion of each NSG member state.

To their credit, more than 20 states essentially said "no thanks" and proposed more than 50 amendments and modifications that would establish some basic but vitally important restrictions and conditions on nuclear trade with India. Many of these amendments track with the restrictions and conditions established in 2006 U.S. legislation regulating U.S. nuclear trade with India, which include the termination of nuclear trade if India resumes testing and a ban on the transfer of uranium-enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing technology.

Incredibly, U.S. officials are resisting even these most basic measures. As the Department of State's Richard Boucher said in an Aug. 19 interview, "[S]ome would like to see all the provisions of the Hyde Act legislated in some international fashion. We don't think that is the right way."

Although acknowledging India's legitimate interest in diversifying its energy options, like-minded countries, including Austria, Ireland, Japan, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, and Switzerland, correctly recognize that the Bush approach is deeply flawed and would effectively end the NSG as a meaningful entity. It is vital that these and other responsible states stand their ground.

Why? Any India-specific exemption from NSG guidelines would erode the credibility of NSG efforts to ensure that access to peaceful nuclear trade and technology is available only to those states that meet global nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament standards.

Contrary to the Orwellian claims of its proponents, the deal would not bring India into the nonproliferation mainstream. Unlike 179 other countries, India has not signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. It continues to

produce fissile material and expand its nuclear arsenal. As one of only three states never to have signed the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), it has not made a legally binding commitment to achieve nuclear disarmament.

In order to maintain its option to resume nuclear testing, India is seeking bilateral nuclear cooperation agreements that help provide it with strategic fuel reserves and lifetime fuel guarantees. This flatly contradicts a provision in U.S. law championed by Sen. Barack Obama (D-Ill.) that stipulates that fuel supplies be limited to reasonable reactor operating requirements.

Given India's demands, the revised U.S. proposal will likely only pay lip service to the other NSG states' concerns. Any such proposal should be flatly rejected as unsound and irresponsible. To be effective, NSG guidelines must establish clear and unambiguous terms and conditions for the initiation of nuclear trade and possible termination of nuclear trade.

If NSG states agree under pressure from an outgoing U.S. administration to blow a hole in NSG guidelines in order to allow a few states to profit from nuclear trade with India, they should at a minimum:

- establish a policy that if India resumes nuclear testing or violates its safeguards agreements, trade involving nuclear items with India shall be terminated and unused fuel supplies returned;
- expressly prohibit any transfer of reprocessing, enrichment, or heavy-water production items or technology, which can be used to make bomb material;
- regularly review India's compliance with its nonproliferation obligations and commitments; and
- call on India to join with four of the five original nuclear-weapon states in declaring that it has stopped fissile material production and call on India to transform its nuclear test moratorium pledge into a legally binding commitment.
- Some Indian officials have threatened they may walk away from the deal if the NSG establishes even these most basic requirements. If that occurs, so be it.

The Indian nuclear deal would be a nonproliferation disaster, especially now. The current U.S. proposal threatens to further undermine the NPT, the nuclear safeguards system, and efforts to prevent the proliferation of sensitive fuel-cycle technologies. Absent curbs on Indian nuclear testing and fissile material production, it would also indirectly contribute to the expansion of India's nuclear arsenal with adverse consequences for the nuclear arms race in Asia.

For those world leaders who are serious about advancing nuclear disarmament, holding all states to their international commitments, and strengthening the NPT, it is time to stand up and be counted.

Source URL: [http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2008\\_09/Focus](http://www.armscontrol.org/act/2008_09/Focus)

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

AFP

September 1, 2008

## **Australia Reconsiders Nuclear Deal With Russia**

CANBERRA (AFP) — Australia is reconsidering a pact to sell uranium to Russia following its military push into Georgia, Foreign Minister Stephen Smith warned on Monday. He spoke as the head of a parliamentary committee examining the deal that would allow sales of uranium for use in Russia's civil nuclear power industry, expanding on the terms of a 1990 agreement, raised fears the yellowcake could be diverted for nuclear weapons use.

Smith told parliament that Australia would take into account Russia's actions in Georgia and the current state of Moscow's ties with Canberra when deciding whether to ratify the pact signed by the two countries last year.

"When considering ratification, the government will take into account not just the merits of the agreement but recent and ongoing events in Georgia and the state of Australia's bilateral relationship with the Russian Federation," Smith said. Smith said he made Australia's views clear to Russia's ambassador when he summoned the envoy last week to call on Moscow to pull its troops in Georgia back to the positions they held before the conflict began on August 8.

He also criticised Russia's decision to recognise the independence of the Georgian rebel regions of South Ossetia and Abkhazia as unhelpful. Kelvin Thompson, who chairs the parliamentary treaties committee, meanwhile said he had concerns over whether Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin would honour the terms of the civilian nuclear agreement.

"I think that we could supply uranium to him and if he changed his mind about the uses to which he was going to put it, I don't think we'd have any effective comeback at all. "Recently he's taken South Ossetia and another province off Georgia and there's no real comeback over that," he added.

Russia has been fiercely criticised by a range of Western countries since its tanks and troops burst into Georgia last month to push back a Georgian offensive to retake South Ossetia, which broke away from Tbilisi in the early 1990s with Moscow's backing.

Russian troops still hold positions in western Georgia, serving in what Moscow describes as a peacekeeping mission. Tbilisi calls them an occupation force. Given the current situation in Georgia, Thompson said, Australia should at least consider delaying ratifying the 2007 agreement until after a review of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, scheduled for 2010.

He said another concern was that his parliamentary treaties committee heard Monday that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) had not carried out any inspections in Russia since 2001. "There has been a nuclear smuggling problem in the past and Russia and states of the former USSR are involved in the large majority of documented incidents. There needs to be a proper regime of inspections," he said.

The committee must submit a report on the agreement to the government which Smith said Canberra would take into account before making a final decision on ratification of the pact. However Australian Safeguards and Non-Proliferation Office director general John Carlson said it was unlikely Russia would use Australian uranium for the production of nuclear weapons. "Australian uranium won't be used for weapons because Russia has such an enormous surplus there's no reason why it would even think of doing so," he said.

Copyright © 2008 AFP. All rights reserved.

<http://afp.google.com/article/ALeqM5jn4B6Qn-RuxcTEbIpvDBaUMexj9g>

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