



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 584, 29 August 2007

Articles & Other Documents:

[Tehran Agrees To Answer Nuclear Questions](#)

[India: Nuclear pact causes deep rift](#)

[U.S. sees limits, manipulation in Iran deal with IAEA](#)

[Russia Warns Czechs To Wait On U.S. Radar](#)

[17 POUNDS OF WEAPONS-GRADE URANIUM
DISAPPEAR IN CHINA](#)

[Iran May Have Reined In Nuclear Program](#)

[Dissent Threatens U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Deal](#)

[Lugar, Nunn Push Arms Security Program](#)

[French Leader Raises Possibility Of Force In Iran](#)

[Iran agrees to reveal nuclear info](#)

[Bush Cites Nuclear Risk Of Leaving Iraq](#)

[Plan Released By Iran And U.N. Atomic Agency Is
Faulted](#)

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. Please direct any questions or comments on CPC Outreach Journal to Jo Ann Eddy, CPC Outreach Editor, at (334) 953-7538 or DSN 493-7538. To subscribe, change e-mail address, or unsubscribe to this journal or to request inclusion on the mailing list for CPC publications, please contact Mrs. Eddy, joann.eddy.ctr@maxwell.af.mil.

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

Los Angeles Times
August 22, 2007

Tehran Agrees To Answer Nuclear Questions

Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency have agreed on a timetable for Tehran to respond to questions about its nuclear activities, both sides said Tuesday.

The agreement was announced at the end of two days of talks in Tehran.

There was no elaboration on the time frame. But the agreement was expected to provide for easier inspection of facilities as well as to urge Tehran to provide detailed answers on remaining questions about its activities.

The two sides did not say what the lingering questions were, but it is believed that they include questions about Iran's past experiments with small amounts of plutonium.

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-nukes22aug22.1,4114167.story?coll=la-headlines-world>

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

Christian Science Monitor
August 22, 2007

India: Nuclear pact causes deep rift

India's Prime Minister is digging in this week to face political challenges over a high-stakes nuclear deal with the US that could destroy his fragile government.

By Mian Ridge | Correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor

New Delhi, India

Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh is steadfastly refusing to renege on a historic nuclear deal with the United States, even though the row threatens to bring down his government.

This weekend, communist allies to India's United Progressive Alliance (UPA), the coalition headed by Mr. Singh's Congress party, made a thinly veiled threat that they would withdraw from the government if it did not cease negotiations with the US over a nuclear-energy pact.

The pact, agreed to this month after two years of discussions, has attracted international criticism because it allows India to buy civil nuclear technology from the US, despite the fact that India has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and has tested nuclear weapons. In return, India would open its civil nuclear reactors to inspectors.

The deal is regarded as the most important act between the world's two biggest democracies since India's independence 60 years ago, laying the foundation for a new strategic alliance between them – and a major foreign-policy triumph for Singh.

But critics in India argue it would give the US too much influence over their country's foreign policy and threaten India's weapons program. Even if the dispute does not result in early elections, analysts say, it has exposed a serious gulf between the government and its communist allies, raising doubts about whether Singh will succeed in establishing closer ties with the US – or manage to pass a number of urgently needed economic reforms.

Singh, however, reiterated on Monday that he was committed to developing nuclear energy. With both sides refusing to back down, the impasse constitutes the most serious crisis of the government's three years in power.

"I would say this is the beginning of a big comedown for the government," says Mahesh Rangarajan, an independent political analyst. "Even if the collapse doesn't happen immediately, I would bet on early elections before they are scheduled in 2009."

Singh expected to hang tough

Though not part of the ruling coalition, India's four communist parties – united around the Communist Party of India (Marxist) – have 60 members of parliament in the 545-member lower house. If they withdraw support, Singh's government will either collapse or be reduced to a feeble minority.

Hamstrung by his leftist allies since he came to power in 2004, Singh, who, as finance minister in the 1990s was the architect of India's economist reforms, has failed to pass any significant reforms as prime minister.

On this occasion, however, the famously gentle Singh is expected to hang tough for what may turn out to be his legacy.

For his government, the nuclear-energy deal with the US is simply too important to go back on. Not only does it constitute a major stride forward in Indo-US relations, it also addresses the critical need to find new sources of the energy upon which India's economic growth depends.

Oil and gas imports currently fuel two-thirds of India's energy supply, placing – in the words of Singh – an "unbearable burden" on Asia's fourth-largest economy.

The communists do not buy this argument. Their objection is ideological, born of a fear that the deal will allow the US to dominate India.

"They don't even want India to have a strategic relationship with the US," says Mr. Rangarajan.

In particular – and perhaps with an eye on India's sizable Muslim vote – the communists say they are concerned that the US may come to control India's relationship with countries such as Iraq and Iran.

A marriage of political convenience

Meanwhile, the opposition Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which is normally the communists' bitter rival, is using concerns about India's nuclear security to unite with the left against Singh's government. This is despite the fact that the BJP supported an alliance with the US before it lost power in 2004.

The BJP argues that the deal will compromise India's nuclear-weapons program. Though the Indian government has said it has not given up the right to conduct nuclear tests and the new deal leaves some studied ambiguity on this question, under US law, the deal could be annulled if India does so. In the event of a test, the US will also be able to demand that India return all nuclear technology and fuel.

The irony is that American critics of the deal see it as excessively soft on India, potentially allowing it to continue building its nuclear-weapons program while refusing to sign the NPT.

"India has always stood against the NPT, and now the US is changing the NPT architecture solely and exclusively for the benefit of India – if that's not a gain for India, what is?" asks B.G. Verghese, a political analyst at New Delhi's Centre for Policy Research.

Mr. Verghese says that for the government to either delay or withdraw from the deal would constitute a major international embarrassment.

"If India backs down, who is ever going to take it seriously again?" he says. "Asking the prime minister to delay on this is like asking him to commit suicide so that he can talk afterwards."

Analysts believe that one way out of the standoff may be for the government and its communist allies to set up a panel of experts to scrutinize the deal in the hope that it would resolve their differences.

Neither side, after all, wants this row to end in elections. For the communists, the 2004 election in which Singh came to power gave them their best performance ever. They do not want a weakened Congress party to lose votes to the BJP. And neither side wants to send India to the polls on an issue that, as Rangarajan says, "is not an issue for most Indians."

The pact: What critics say

The India-US nuclear deal aims to end American sanctions on nuclear trade with India and give it access to nuclear fuel and equipment.

- Many in the international community say the pact would subvert existing nonproliferation treaties that don't recognize India as a member of the nuclear club.

- Right-wing Indian critics say the deal will hurt India's nuclear security by limiting nuclear trade and prohibiting further weapons testing.

- India's communists are critical of India's friendship with Washington. They say the deal will give the US influence over Indian foreign policy, particularly toward the Middle East.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0822/p06s01-wosc.html>

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

Reuters

U.S. sees limits, manipulation in Iran deal with IAEA

Wed Aug 22, 2007 2:38PM EDT

By Mark Heinrich

VIENNA (Reuters) - A nuclear cooperation pact Iran struck with the International Atomic Energy Agency has "real limitations" and Tehran should stop trying to manipulate the IAEA to dodge harsher U.N. sanctions, a senior U.S. envoy said.

Washington was not impressed by Iran's transparency promise -- hailed as a "milestone" by the IAEA on Tuesday -- to allay suspicions it is secretly seeking atomic bombs, and would still pursue talks on more U.N. sanctions against Tehran, the U.S. envoy to the U.N. nuclear watchdog, Gregory Schulte, said.

The IAEA declined comment on Schulte's criticism. A diplomat close to the Vienna-based agency said Schulte's remarks "shows a deliberate campaign to derail this process."

Schulte said Washington welcomed any progress in resolving troubling questions about Iran's nuclear activities. "But we understand there are real limitations with the plan, including Iran's continued refusal to implement the IAEA's Additional Protocol," he told reporters by conference call.

He was citing a measure allowing inspectors to conduct spot checks at sites not declared to be nuclear but regarded as important to resolving four-year-old IAEA investigations into the nature and scope of Iran's atomic program.

The deal is meant to answer IAEA questions about indications of illicit military involvement in Iran's declared drive for peaceful nuclear energy and to improve access for U.N. inspectors to its underground uranium enrichment plant. The IAEA's top negotiator said the plan had a timetable and steps to carry it out would start shortly. Neither side disclosed what precisely Iran would do and by when. Details should emerge in a report to the IAEA board by early next month.

Western diplomats believe Iran is making a display of cooperation to split key world powers over the need for stiffer sanctions -- Russia and China are reluctant -- and wants to buy time so it can master enrichment capability.

Schulte said Iran's suggestion it would not implement the transparency plan unless the U.N. Security Council shelved steps to intensify the mild sanctions imposed on the Islamic Republic over its refusal to stop enrichment was unacceptable.

"If Iran's leaders truly want the world's trust, they would stop trying to manipulate the IAEA, start to cooperate fully and unconditionally and suspend activities of (world) concern.

"Iran is clearly trying to take attention from its continued development of bomb-making capability. I don't think the Security Council will be distracted (by this deal)," he said.

U.S.-IAEA TENSIONS

The diplomat close to the IAEA told Reuters that Schulte's comments were "very unhelpful" ... Such immediate downplaying of this development is disingenuous."

"To expect Iran now to comply on the whole package of demands by the Security Council, all at once, when they remain under sanctions, is unrealistic," the diplomat said.

Tehran said it was "serious" about implementing the plan.

Western powers suspect Iran's declared goal to refine uranium for electricity so it can export more of its oil is really a cover for perfecting the means to make nuclear bombs.

France said Iran could not restore international confidence just by a pledge to open its books to IAEA sleuths.

"Iran must accept a suspension of its sensitive activities, failing which the international community will have no option but to maintain its attitude of firmness, including by passing a third sanctions resolution....," French Foreign Ministry spokesman Denis Simonneau said at an on-line news conference.

European diplomats said only Iranian actions would matter. A similar timetable for transparency, in 2004, came to nothing.

Gary Samore at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York said Iran retained an edge in its standoff with the West.

"The U.S. is bogged down in Iraq, other big powers are loath to impose significant economic penalties on Iran. But Iran will have to do enough so this process doesn't look like a charade, and make it hard for Russia to argue it should be given time."

(Additional reporting by Francois Murphy in Paris, Louis Charbonneau in Berlin, Sophie Walker in London)

<http://www.reuters.com/article/worldNews/idUSL2215792420070822?sp=true>

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

San Diego Union-Tribune

August 22, 2007

Russia Warns Czechs To Wait On U.S. Radar

By Combined Dispatches

MOSCOW – Russia's military chief told the Czech Republic yesterday that hosting a U.S. missile defense shield would be a "big mistake" and urged Prague to delay a decision until a new U.S. president was elected.

The Czech Republic is considering whether to accept a radar station that would form part of a U.S. missile shield – a system designed to intercept and destroy missiles from so-called rogue states but which Moscow sees as a threat to its security.

"We say it will be a big mistake by the Czech government to put this radar site on Czech territory," Yuri Baluyevsky, the Russian military chief of staff, told reporters after meeting Czech Deputy Defense Minister Martin Bartak.

In a counterproposal to the missile shield, Russia has offered the U.S. military joint use of a radar station it leases in the former Soviet republic of Azerbaijan. It said that would remove the need for the missile shield in Europe.

Baluyevsky met the Czech delegation on the 39th anniversary of the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia to crush the Prague Spring, when Soviet tanks ended a bid to promote liberal reforms.

The Russian general said the Czech Republic should hold off making a decision until after next year's U.S. presidential election.

Asked by a reporter to clarify, he said: "I do not exclude that a new administration in the United States will re-evaluate the current administration's decisions on missile defense."

Also yesterday, the British military detailed action taken last week against a Russian aircraft.

Two Royal Air Force jets shadowed a Russian strategic bomber that approached British air space, the Ministry of Defense said.

The incident occurred Friday, the same day Russian President Vladimir Putin flexed his military's muscle by placing strategic bombers back on long-range patrol for the first time since the breakup of the Soviet Union.

Britain's defense ministry issued two photographs on its Web site showing one of the two RAF Typhoon F2s flying near the Russian Tu-95 strategic bomber over the North Atlantic ocean.

Last month, two Russian bombers briefly entered British air space but turned back after British fighter jets intercepted them.

In Russia on Friday, Putin announced that 20 strategic bombers had been sent far over the Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic oceans – showing off Moscow's forceful new posture.

Eleven Russian military planes, including strategic bombers and fighter jets, carried out maneuvers west of NATO member Norway on Friday, a military official said.

Norway sent F-16 fighter jets to observe and photograph the Russian planes, which rounded the northern tip of Norway and flew south over the Norwegian Sea toward the Faeroe Islands before turning back, said Brig. Gen. Ole Asak, chief of the Norwegian Joint Air Operations Center.

--AP, Reuters

http://www.signonsandiego.com/uniontrib/20070822/news_1n22russia.html

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

FOXNews.com

Friday, August 24, 2007

17 POUNDS OF WEAPONS-GRADE URANIUM DISAPPEAR IN CHINA

Associated Press

BEIJING — Authorities said that 17 pounds of **weapons-grade uranium** disappeared and that a verdict in the trial of four men accused of trying to sell the radioactive material will be delayed until it is found, state media reported Friday.

The report was the first public word that uranium was missing.

The defendants said they did not know where the uranium was because it had been moved around so much between potential buyers, the China Daily newspaper reported.

The uranium was types **U-235** and **U-238**, both of which can be used to make nuclear weapons. Prolonged exposure to the radioactive material can cause cancer.

Defendant Zhang Sangang said he met a uranium mine owner in April 2005 and offered to be a middleman. The owner said he wanted \$26,400 per kilogram, and that Zhang could keep the difference if he found someone willing to pay a higher price, the report said.

The three other defendants joined Zhang in his plan, and one of them met a businessman in the city of Guangzhou who said he knew someone willing to pay \$210,000 for a kilogram of the uranium, the newspaper said, citing testimony in Guangzhou's Tianhe District Court.

But the businessman reported defendant Li Zi'an to police because he knew it was illegal to sell uranium.

The uranium mine owner was being tried separately.

<http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,294398,00.html>

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

Miami Herald

August 26, 2007

Iran May Have Reined In Nuclear Program

Some experts think sanctions have convinced Iran to slow its nuclear program, an encouraging sign for the tense standoff with the West.

By Matthew Schofield, McClatchy News Service

VIENNA--Iran appears not to have significantly expanded its uranium enrichment program this summer, a development that has many experts wondering whether the threat of sanctions finally has had an impact on the Iranian government.

Experts won't know for sure if Iran has paused its program until a report this week from a team of International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors, who were in Iran last week for the third round of inspections this summer. A public debate on the report is scheduled for the IAEA's Sept. 10 meeting.

But after five years of frustration at a lack of Iranian cooperation, those who closely follow Iran's nuclear program believe that Iran's resumption of IAEA inspections coupled with the apparent halt in expansion may signal that the Islamic republic is willing to compromise.

Centrifuge count

At the center of speculation about the Iranian nuclear program is how many centrifuges -- the devices that spin uranium ore into ever-purer concentrations -- Iran is operating.

Some experts had expected that over the summer Iran would begin operating 18 cascades, or sets, of centrifuges, numbering 164 centrifuges each. That number, 2,952 centrifuges in all, would allow Iran to enrich enough uranium in one year for a nuclear weapon, if the centrifuges were operating at full capacity. Experts also note that the IAEA believed early this summer that Iran would have 8,000 working centrifuges by year's end.

Some authorities say indications are that Iran has frozen the program at about 2,000, the same number it was operating in June when IAEA Director General Mohamed El Baradei declared himself deeply worried about Iran's program and the increasingly bellicose Western reaction to it.

That number, El Baradei said then, was "more than adequate" for research and development, one of the goals Iran has said it has in maintaining an enrichment program in the face of Western objections. He worried that the expansion would lead to a military confrontation unless diplomatic efforts were able to resolve the standoff. Jacqueline Shire, a senior analyst for Institute for Science and International Security, a Washington D.C.-based think tank, called Iran's apparent pause in its expansion a positive development, especially since before June Iran had added hundreds of centrifuges to its enrichment program this year.

But she said that even 2,000 centrifuges is an unacceptable number. "The world is not a better place with an Iranian nuclear weapons program," she said. "There are a lot of people arguing that it's too late to force Iran to shut down all enrichment activity, that horse has already left the barn. Our argument would be that maybe it's time to put that horse back in the barn."

Europeans are hopeful, however, that the slowdown in the program signals that the crisis can be resolved without military action.

Sanctions' effects

One European diplomat close to the negotiations said it's becoming clear that the Iranians are "feeling the effects" not only of existing sanctions, which include prohibitions on the sale of nuclear technology to Iran and travel restrictions on officials affiliated with the program, but the possibility of stricter future sanctions.

"They are worried about international investment drying up," said the diplomat, who asked that she not be further identified because of the sensitive nature of the topic. She said negotiators are on a tightrope. "They have to be firm: If Iran is playing us for time, we can't play that game. But we can't be so firm as to give them an excuse to end this discussion," she said.

Oliver Thraenert, an expert on Iran and nuclear proliferation at the German Institute for International and Security Affairs in Berlin, urged a tough stance on the Iranian program.

"If we want to avoid both Iranian nuclear weapons and military action against Iran, now is the time for stronger sanctions and strong diplomacy," he said.

<http://www.miamiherald.com/news/world/story/215492.html>

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

Washington Post

August 26, 2007

Pg. 14

Dissent Threatens U.S.-India Nuclear Cooperation Deal

Delhi Parties Say Pact Limits Sovereignty

By Emily Wax and Rama Lakshmi, Washington Post Foreign Service

NEW DELHI -- After two years of painstaking negotiations, a historic nuclear cooperation agreement between the United States and India appears to be unraveling as a broad spectrum of political parties calls on the government of Prime Minister Manmohan Singh to scrap the deal, saying it limits the country's sovereignty in energy and foreign policy matters.

The landmark accord that just weeks ago looked like a major foreign policy triumph for this energy-starved subcontinent has become a political liability for India's fragile ruling coalition.

The brouhaha over the deal has surprised some nuclear analysts in Washington, partly because the Bush administration was widely perceived as having caved in to key Indian demands. The administration had assured the government here that it could receive uninterrupted nuclear supplies from the United States and maintain the right to reprocess spent nuclear fuel -- a potentially dangerous prospect because reprocessing technology can also be used to make weapons-grade plutonium. To many Western observers, India already had the upper hand in the deal, a testament to its growing international influence.

"The Indian negotiators were as tough or tougher than anyone that the U.S. has encountered in recent years," said Philip D. Zelikow, former counselor to Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and a key player in the accord. "India won a great deal."

In return, the Bush administration firmed up a strategic alliance with a country that in many ways is expected to shape the future of Asia. India's nuclear program serves as a check on Pakistan's, as well as a counterbalance to China's nuclear prowess.

But in the latest twist of the saga, an alliance of Indian communist parties has called on Singh's government to scrap the deal. The parties say India's sovereignty was compromised by the agreement because it includes a condition that all but requires the government's cooperation in U.S. foreign policy matters.

Partly at issue for India is whether it can conduct further nuclear tests without violating the terms of its agreement with the United States. The right to do so is fiercely protected by politicians in India, whose lingering mistrust of Western powers dates back to British colonial rule.

"We have the right to test. They have the right to protest," the embattled Singh said when asked by Indian reporters what would happen if India tested another nuclear bomb, as it did in 1998.

All week, breaking news about the "government in crisis" has been splashed across the newspapers and broadcast on television, with anxious reports about the looming demise of the U.S.-India nuclear deal and, along with it, Singh's coalition government.

"The deal is frozen. It is stuck," a senior Indian government official said on condition of anonymity. "Now only a miracle can retrieve the deal."

The push for India to renege on the nuclear pact has vexed U.S. officials, who are facing their own domestic criticism for reaching an agreement with a country that has refused to sign the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Nuclear experts say the Bush administration was too lenient with India.

In India, some analysts say India is already in a good position.

"We have sufficient weapons-grade plutonium for maintaining the minimum credible arsenal," said K. Santhanam, a defense expert in New Delhi, adding that the deal would not affect India's nuclear weapons program. "We are and can remain a regional power and should be able to vacate all nuclear threats."

Some analysts say the communist parties are using anti-Americanism surrounding the nuclear issue to court Muslim votes in a country with the world's second-largest Muslim population. The conservative Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party, or BJP, also wants to help sink the nuclear deal, saying it objects to it not on the basis of anti-American sentiments but because outsiders should not have control over India's foreign policy or its right to test weapons.

The U.S.-India agreement was made possible by the so-called Hyde Act, which was approved by the U.S. Congress last December and which created an exception to the U.S. policy of not cooperating on nuclear issues with countries that have not signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Critics say the act is vague. It will create "a minefield of future misunderstanding between India and the U.S.," said Yashwant Sinha, a BJP leader and former foreign minister. "The U.S. and India have interpreted the agreement in two different ways. Unless you have a common understanding of what you are doing, you will run into problems." But from the U.S. point of view, such statements are ironic.

"If they back out, they are looking a gift horse in the mouth," Zelikow said of the groups opposed to the nuclear agreement. "There has never been a hidden agenda to try and control India's foreign policy. Any problems with this deal are domestic and political posturing for a future election. Maybe this is something that India's democracy and civil society has to work through."

Relations between the United States and India historically have been antagonistic, a carry-over from the Cold War era, when India appeared to warm to the Soviet Union while the United States fostered ties with India's nemesis, Pakistan.

The relationship has improved in the past decade, because the two nations today share both people and politics. With 2 million Americans of Indian origin living in the United States, India receives the largest number of U.S. visas, second only to Mexico, according to the U.S. Embassy in New Delhi. Trade between the two countries has also intensified, spurred largely by India's growing information technology industry.

Still, problems in the relationship remain. In May, Congress expressed "grave concerns" about India's friendly relationship with Iran, which has its own nuclear program. Indian officials are discussing with Iran the prospect of partnering in the construction of a natural gas pipeline.

A vote on Capitol Hill is expected on the nuclear deal in coming months. Meanwhile, India still needs to reach separate agreements concerning additional nuclear safeguards with global regulating agencies, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Nuclear Suppliers Group.

Even if India goes ahead with its plans, nuclear power will satisfy only about 8 percent of the country's current energy needs, nuclear analysts said.

"To make India's foreign policy and strategic autonomy hostage to the potential benefits of nuclear energy does not make any sense, except for the American imperative to bind India to its strategic designs in Asia," Prakash Karat, head of the country's Communist Party, wrote in the Hindu, an English-language daily newspaper.

Other analysts say that India should now have the economic and political confidence to solve its domestic political woes and go forward on the deal, lest the government appear immature on the world stage.

"This is extremely important for India's growth. It opens up avenues to power which we have not had access to in the past," said R.K. Pachauri, head of the Tata Energy Research Institute in New Delhi. "You can't expect the world to deliver us a blank check."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/25/AR2007082501192.html>

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

Washington Post
August 28, 2007
Pg. 9

Lugar, Nunn Push Arms Security Program

By David E. Hoffman, Washington Post Foreign Service

MOSCOW, Aug. 27 -- Sen. Richard G. Lugar (R-Ind.) and former senator Sam Nunn (D-Ga.) launched a new effort Monday to expand the reach and strength of their program to secure nuclear, chemical and biological weapons at a time of deepening tensions between the United States and Russia.

Lugar and Nunn, the architects of legislation approved by Congress to destroy weapons as the Soviet Union collapsed, warned that it would be a mistake to allow recent disagreements with Russia to become a lasting crisis. Lugar, the ranking Republican on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, cautioned against allowing the relationship to "drift toward conflict."

Nunn, a former chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee and now co-chairman of the nonprofit Nuclear Threat Initiative, expressed concern about the recent dispute over U.S. plans to station a missile defense system in Europe. Russia and the United States need to "pause" and "take a deep breath," Nunn said. "We could stumble to the precipice of strategic danger if we and our Russian friends play a foolish zero-sum game with missile defense." At the outset of a trip this week to examine the past and future of the program, Lugar and Nunn delivered remarks at a ceremony marking the 200th anniversary of U.S.-Russian relations, held at Spaso House, the residence of the U.S. ambassador. Their speeches were notable in urging the audience -- which included prominent foreign policy specialists -- to think about building partnerships with the United States rather than plunging deeper into rancor. "In our modern age," Nunn said, "considering the explosion of technology, know-how and terrorism, any plan for global peace and security that does not feature the Russians and Americans working together is not likely to be successful for either of us or the world."

Lugar proposed that Russia and the United States jointly apply Nunn-Lugar methods to the situation in North Korea if agreement is reached on dismantling weapons there. He noted that the legislation has already been used outside the former Soviet Union in the cleanup of 16 tons of chemical weapons discovered in Albania in 2002.

Nunn also called for removing nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert and deepening cuts in the arsenals. The former senator met Russian President Vladimir Putin in July with a group that included former secretaries of state Henry Kissinger and George P. Shultz, among others. The meeting was at Putin's request.

Nunn said he asked Putin: "Why is it in the interests of the United States for the president of Russia to have only a very few precious minutes to decide whether to launch his missiles, or lose them?" Nunn said a large number of U.S. and Russian weapons could be taken off alert relatively quickly.

Lugar and Nunn expressed concern that the Bush administration might allow a 1991 strategic arms treaty to lapse when it expires in 2009. Russia has called for a new treaty, but the Bush administration has indicated that it does not think one is necessary. Lugar said he is "inclined to feel we probably do" need to keep the treaty. Nunn said it is "absolutely essential."

Nunn said joint action is needed by both countries to deal with two thorny problems left over from the Cold War: what to do about tactical or short-range nuclear weapons, which have never been covered by any treaty, and the lack of transparency on research into biological weapons. The United States abandoned biological weapons in 1969. Both the United States and the Soviet Union signed a treaty outlawing them in 1972, but the Soviets built a large and secret bioweapons program. While Western efforts to sponsor new, civilian work in some of Russia's biological research laboratories have succeeded, other facilities have never opened their doors. Nunn said Russia and the United States need to "eliminate the suspicions" over biological programs and make the 1972 treaty verifiable. Nunn and Lugar plan to examine a chemical weapons destruction facility, visit a modern warehouse for storing fissile material and observe a demonstration of rocket fuel destruction, as well as discuss nuclear energy and arms control.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/08/27/AR2007082701395.html>

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

New York Times
August 28, 2007

French Leader Raises Possibility Of Force In Iran

By Elaine Sciolino

PARIS, Aug. 27 — In his first major foreign policy speech as president, Nicolas Sarkozy of France said Monday that Iran could be attacked militarily if it did not live up to its international obligations to curb its nuclear program. Addressing France's ambassadorial corps, Mr. Sarkozy stressed that such an outcome would be a disaster. He did not say France would ever participate in military action against Iran or even tacitly support such an approach. But the mere fact that he raised the specter of the use of force is likely to be perceived both by Iran as a warning of the consequences if it continues its course of action, and by the Bush administration as acceptance of its line that no option, including the use of force, can be excluded.

Mr. Sarkozy praised the current diplomatic initiative by the world's powers, a two-pronged approach that threatens tougher United Nations-mandated sanctions if Iran does not stop enriching uranium for possible use in a nuclear weapon, but holds out the possibility of incentives if Iran complies.

That approach, he said, "is the only one that can enable us to avoid being faced with an alternative that I call catastrophic: an Iranian bomb or the bombing of Iran."

Calling the crisis over Iran's nuclear program "the most serious weighing on the international order today," Mr. Sarkozy also reiterated his position that a nuclear-armed Iran was "unacceptable" for France.

Although Mr. Sarkozy's aides said French policy had not changed, some foreign policy experts were stunned by his blunt, if brief, remarks.

"This came out of the blue," said François Heisbourg, special adviser to the Foundation for Strategic Research in Paris and author of a coming book on Iran's nuclear program. "To actually say that if diplomacy fails the choice will be to accept a nuclear Iran or bomb Iran, this is a diplomatic blockbuster."

Mr. Sarkozy's speech, an annual ritual outlining France's foreign policy goals, came as a new poll indicated that he had extraordinarily high approval ratings more than three months into his presidency.

According to a TNS-Sofres telephone poll of 1,000 people published Monday in *Le Figaro*, 71 percent say they are satisfied with Mr. Sarkozy's performance. A number of other polls put his approval rating higher than 60 percent. But his debut before his ambassadors was marred by a diplomatic imbroglio involving his foreign minister, Bernard Kouchner, who was forced to apologize to Prime Minister Nuri Kamal al-Maliki of Iraq for calling for his resignation.

Mr. Maliki had demanded the apology from Mr. Kouchner, who was quoted on Newsweek's Web site as saying that the Iraqi government was "not functioning" and that he told Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice by phone, "He's got to be replaced."

Mr. Sarkozy made no mention of the diplomatic gaffe. Instead, he went out of his way to repeatedly praise Mr. Kouchner, an outspoken humanitarian activist and former United Nations administrator of Kosovo who left the Socialist Party to join Mr. Sarkozy's conservative government.

In a subsequent speech to the 180 visiting ambassadors, Mr. Kouchner veered from his prepared remarks to say he had apologized to Mr. Maliki on Monday morning.

But Mr. Kouchner has a reputation for being unable to hide his true feelings. He also suggested in the same sentence that the beleaguered Iraqi prime minister was already on his way out, saying that he "may be leaving us soon." The audience, made up of ambassadors, other invited guests and journalists, laughed.

Most of Mr. Sarkozy's speech was devoted to plotting a new, activist course for France's role in the world, particularly in preventing what he called a confrontation between Islam and the West by working to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and crises in Lebanon, Iran and Iraq.

Praising his predecessor, he reiterated, "France was — thanks to Jacques Chirac — is and remains hostile" to the American-led war in Iraq. "History proved France right," he added.

Calling for a concrete deadline for the withdrawal of troops from Iraq, he described it as "a nation that is falling apart in a merciless civil war," where the Sunni-Shiite divide could ignite conflict throughout the Middle East and where terrorists are setting up permanent bases to attack targets around the world.

During a headline-grabbing three-day visit to Iraq last week, Mr. Kouchner offered France's help in stabilizing the country, including mediating among warring communities, and working with the United Nations to play a bigger role.

Although Mr. Sarkozy praised Mr. Kouchner's mission and said in his speech that France was prepared to engage with Iraq, he did not make a specific proposal.

Mr. Sarkozy, who is often faulted for being too pro-American, proudly restated France's friendship with the United States, where he spent a two-week vacation this summer.

In a move that is certain to be welcomed in Washington, he announced that France would send more troops to Afghanistan to train the Afghan Army, despite his statement during the campaign that France would not remain in Afghanistan forever. The Defense Ministry confirmed that France would send 150 additional troops.

But Mr. Sarkozy harshly criticized the Bush administration for going to war against Iraq on its own and for failing to address the global warming crisis adequately.

“It is clear now, and I mean it, that the unilateral use of force leads to failure,” he said of the Iraq crisis. As for the environment, he said the United States “unfortunately is not demonstrating the ‘leadership’ capacity that it claims in other areas.”

“When you make a claim of leadership, you have to assume it in every domain,” he added.

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/28/world/europe/28france.html?_r=1&oref=slogin

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

YAHOO! News

Iran agrees to reveal nuclear info

By GEORGE JAHN, Associated Press Writer

Tue Aug 28, 6:24 AM ET

VIENNA, Austria - Iran on Monday offered some cooperation with an International Atomic Energy Agency probe of an alleged secret uranium processing project linked by U.S. intelligence to a nuclear arms program.

The Iranian pledge was contained in a memorandum reached between Iran and the IAEA and published on the agency's Web site at the request of Tehran's mission to the agency. In it, Tehran also outlined its timetable for providing other sensitive information sought by the IAEA in its probe of more than two decades of nuclear activity by the Islamic republic, most of it clandestine until revealed more than four years ago.

The document reiterated Iran's allegations that the search for information on the so-called "Green Salt Project" was "politically motivated" and founded on "baseless allegations."

But as a "sign of good will and cooperation with the agency . . . Iran will review" documentation on the project provided by the agency "and inform the agency of its assessment," according to the memorandum

There was no official comment from the IAEA.

Less than a week ago, Iran and the Vienna-based IAEA announced an agreement on the timetable for full Iranian cooperation with the agency's nuclear investigation. It is only one of the demands set by the U.N. Security Council in attempts to dispel suspicions that Iranian claims it wants to develop a full nuclear cycle for generating power is merely a cover for a covert weapons program.

But of most concern to the council are activities that could lead directly to the making of nuclear weapons. Tehran has defied demands to stop developing its uranium enrichment program, which can produce fuel and the core of warheads, and mothball construction of a plutonium-producing reactor which, once completed, can also make weapons material, leading to two sets of council sanctions.

In the past, Iran has refused to answer questions about secret plutonium experiments in the mid-1990s and IAEA findings that Iran has not accounted for all the plutonium it has said it possessed.

Public mention of the "Green Salt Project" first surfaced in an IAEA report drawn up last year.

The report voiced concern that under the "Green Salt Project," conversion of uranium — a precursor of enrichment — was linked to suspected tests of "high explosives and the design of a missile re-entry vehicle, all of which could have a military nuclear dimension."

Diplomats familiar with the report said the IAEA was basing its concerns on several pages of U.S. intelligence that had been declassified and shared with agency officials so that they could confront the Iranians with it. Among the links, they said, was the participation of several officials on conversion, high explosives — which can be used to detonate a nuclear charge — and warhead design work.

Uranium conversion is the chemical process that changes raw uranium into the gas fed into centrifuges and spun repeatedly to separate out isotopes. Low enriched uranium can be used to make energy — which Iran insists is its only goal. But highly enriched uranium is used to make nuclear weapons.

http://news.yahoo.com/s/ap/20070828/ap_on_re_mi_ea/iran_nuclear;_ylt=Ag9VLSnN1lzJwyDUZ_QDkaBI2ocA

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

New York Times

August 29, 2007

Bush Cites Nuclear Risk Of Leaving Iraq

By Steven Lee Myers

RENO, Nev., Aug. 28 — President Bush told a receptive audience of veterans on Tuesday that an American withdrawal from Iraq would unsettle the entire Middle East, create a haven for Al Qaeda and embolden a belligerent Iran. He said Tehran's nuclear programs threatened to put "a region already known for instability and violence under the shadow of a nuclear holocaust."

Speaking here before the American Legion's annual convention, Mr. Bush said competing brands of Islamic extremism — the Sunni model exemplified by Al Qaeda and a Shiite version that he said was abetted by Iran — were vying for dominance in Iraq.

That, he said, made it imperative for the United States not to fail in establishing a pro-American government there. "I want our citizens to consider what would happen if these forces of radicalism are allowed to drive us out of the Middle East," he said in a speech interrupted several times by applause. "The region would be dramatically transformed in a way that would imperil the civilized world."

Mr. Bush has previously warned Iran about its involvement in Iraq and its nuclear programs, but his remarks on Tuesday were especially forceful, and suggested that he was blending the justification for staying in Iraq with fears held by members of both parties in Congress that Iran could emerge as a threat.

He reiterated accusations by officials and American military commanders that Iran was providing training and weaponry, including 240-millimeter rockets, to forces not only in Iraq, but also in Afghanistan, Lebanon and the Palestinian territories. He said he had authorized the military to "confront Tehran's murderous activities."

"For all those who ask whether the fight is worth it, imagine an Iraq where militia groups backed by Iran control larger parts of the country," he said.

One problem for Mr. Bush is that the most recent National Intelligence Estimate, an assessment released last week, suggested that that is already happening with the tacit consent of the Iraqi leaders Mr. Bush supports.

The future of Iraq has dominated Mr. Bush's recent public events, even as his administration dealt with the resignation of Attorney General Alberto R. Gonzales. It has been a concerted effort to make his case before a new legislative fight once Congress receives a much-anticipated progress report from the administration and the military next month.

Although Democrats and even a few Republicans have urged the White House to rethink its approach, Mr. Bush, in his remarks, showed little sign of bending. Administration and military officials have already indicated that any reduction of troops from today's level, which exceeds 160,000, would be gradual and incremental, not the substantial reductions that opponents have sought.

Congressional Democrats reacted with scorn to the speech. "The president continues to suffer from the Katrina complex," Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr. of Delaware told reporters during a conference call. "That's when you ignore all the warnings, bad things happen, you continue to follow the same bad policy, and things get worse."

Senator Harry Reid, majority leader, said Democrats would press their Republican counterparts again in the coming weeks for a change in American strategy in Iraq. "The president continues to stubbornly pursue a flawed strategy that has mired our troops in a civil war in Iraq and diverted our attention as Osama bin Laden and Al Qaeda grow stronger," Mr. Reid said in a statement. "Most Americans, and a bipartisan majority in Congress, believe this strategy is not in our national interest and the time for a major change is now."

Last week Mr. Bush appeared before another veterans group, the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Kansas City, Mo., and recalled the anger, humiliation and turmoil that followed the American withdrawal from Vietnam. On Tuesday, he sought to raise the specter of a new haven for terrorists and an Iran that dominated the region, threatening allies and energy supplies.

"This scenario would be a disaster for the people of the Middle East, a danger to our friends and allies, and a direct threat to American peace and security," he said.

Mr. Bush did not directly rebut critics of the war, especially Democrats in Congress, but he sought to preempt the coming debate over the success of the troop buildup. He said that the greater military effort this year had increased security even though it only reached full strength less than three months ago.

He also noted rare progress on political issues, welcoming an agreement by Iraq's political leaders to make modest steps toward the benchmarks outlined by Congress to evaluate Mr. Bush's military increase this year. And he urged patience. "It makes no sense to respond to military progress by claiming that we have failed because Iraq's Parliament has yet to pass every law it said it would," he said.

Helene Cooper contributed reporting from Washington.

http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/29/washington/29prexy.html?_r=1&ref=world&oref=slogin

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

New York Times
August 29, 2007

Plan Released By Iran And U.N. Atomic Agency Is Faulted

By Elaine Sciolino

PARIS, Aug. 28 — An agreement between Iran and the United Nations nuclear agency aimed at allaying suspicions about Tehran's past nuclear activities is inadequate and is likely to delay further international sanctions against the country, some Western governments and nuclear experts say.

On Monday, Iran and the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency released a plan laying out a step-by-step timetable of cooperation with the goal of resolving by December issues that have been under investigation for four years. Agency officials have praised the timetable as a breakthrough and Iran's president, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, on Tuesday said the investigation into his country's nuclear activities was now closed.

"Not one member of the International Atomic Energy Agency has cooperated as well as Iran," Mr. Ahmadinejad said at a news conference in Tehran, according to The Associated Press. He added: "So from our point of view, Iran's nuclear case is closed. Iran is a nuclear nation and has the nuclear fuel cycle."

Mr. Ahmadinejad repeated his stance that Iran would not buckle under international pressure to curb its nuclear projects, which Iran insists are for peaceful purposes, and the United States and some European nations believe are to make nuclear weapons.

But a number of Western governments, including the United States and France, as well as leading arms control experts, fault the plan as evidence of a new and dangerous strategy by Iran to drag out the process and answer questions about its past treaty violations bit by bit to avoid further punishment by the United Nations Security Council.

"There is no way to verify any of Iran's claims — the agency doesn't get access to people, documents, sites," said David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security, a private Washington research organization. "The agency loses its right to ask follow-up questions in the future, a really strange development that sets a bad precedent. You're left wondering whether the I.A.E.A. was tricked because it was so eager for a deal." In its plan, the agency announced that Iran had resolved questions about its past experiments with plutonium, a material that can be used to make nuclear weapons, although it offered no explanation of how Tehran had done so. It also said Iran was finally prepared to clear up other issues, including explaining a document Iran probably received from Abdul Qadeer Khan, a Pakistani nuclear engineer, showing how to make uranium into hemispheres, a shape suitable for use in a weapon.

Although officials at the International Atomic Energy Agency have not commented since the plan was released, the agency's deputy director, Olli Heinonen, praised it as "an important milestone" during a visit to Iran last week in which the plan was finalized. While saying the process "will take time," he added: "We have in front of us an agreed work plan. We agreed on modalities on how to implement it. We have a timeline for the implementation."

But Mark Fitzpatrick, a senior fellow at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, called the document "superficial," noting that it "drags negotiations on for many months and runs the risk that the agency will be left with incomplete and misleading answers from Iran."

The agreement also makes it easier for Russia and China to oppose new sanctions in the Security Council, because they can claim that Iran is showing some cooperation with the international watchdog agency. The United States and some European governments find that development worrying, because Iran is continuing to produce enriched uranium, which can be used to make electricity or a bomb, in violation of past Council resolutions.

"We are at a crucial moment in diplomacy and the international community could very well lose its unity of purpose," said one senior French official, who spoke anonymously because he is involved in negotiations on potential new sanctions. "Meanwhile, Iran is gaining time."

The United States, which with France and Britain is pushing for a third round of sanctions against Iran, has expressed its displeasure with the plan.

Gregory L. Schulte, the American envoy to the atomic agency, told reporters in Vienna last week that the timetable had "real limitations." He faulted Iran for refusing the Council's demand that it freeze its uranium enrichment program and for failing to carry out the "additional protocol" to Iran's nuclear agreement with the agency. That protocol gives the agency's inspectors the right to ask for wider access to Iran's nuclear facilities.

Iran agreed last June to draw up a plan within 60 days to give the agency's nuclear inspectors more access to its nuclear sites and to answer outstanding questions about its nuclear program.

Details of the timetable will be included in a report for the agency's 35-country governing board that could be released Wednesday. The report is expected to be more detailed than the timetable, and answer some criticisms. Iran has threatened to curb cooperation with the agency if the Council does not delay a drive for new sanctions. "If they make an irrational move, then Iran's cooperation" with the agency "will be sterile," Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, Ali Larijani, said.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/29/world/middleeast/29iran.html?ref=world>

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