



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 581, 3 August 2007

Articles & Other Documents:

[National Security and Nuclear Weapons: Maintaining Deterrence in the 21st Century](#)

[Russia To Increase Military Might And Spy Efforts](#)

[Administration Urges Full Warhead Funding](#)

[Al Qaeda Seen In Search Of Nukes](#)

[New nuke strategy](#)

[U.S. To Announce Nuclear Exception For India](#)

[In Its Nuclear Deal With India, Washington Appears To Make More Concessions](#)

[IAEA Team Arrives To Monitor Shutdown](#)

[Secretary Rice's Mideast Mission: Contain Iran](#)

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

National Security and Nuclear Weapons: Maintaining Deterrence in the 21st Century

**A Statement by the Secretary of Energy, Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State
July 2007**

A principal national security goal of the United States is to deter aggression against ourselves, our allies, and friends. Every American administration since President Truman's day has formulated U.S. national security policy in much the same terms, making clear to adversaries and allies alike the essential role that nuclear weapons play in maintaining deterrence. Sustaining U.S. deterrence policy has required decades of dedicated service from the men and women of our armed forces, skilled representation by America's diplomats, and painstaking, often dangerous work by America's nuclear scientists, engineers, and technicians. The extension of a credible U.S. nuclear deterrent has been critical to allied security and removed the need for many key allies to develop their own nuclear forces. Above all, maintaining a credible deterrent has required a decades-long, bipartisan partnership with Congress. Some in Congress have recently expressed the view that we lack a coherent nuclear weapons strategy that provides the direction and rationale for the post-Cold War U.S. nuclear force structure. To address these concerns in more depth, a detailed report will follow this summary paper. The report will lay out the data and methodology used to determine our nuclear weapons force structure, outline knowledge points for measuring progress in transforming our nuclear stockpile, and dispel a number of myths that have grown up around U.S. nuclear forces.

It is the policy of this Administration to achieve an effective strategic deterrent at the lowest level of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security and our commitments and obligations to allies. In 2001, President Bush directed that the United States reduce the number of operationally deployed strategic nuclear weapons from about 6,000 to 1,700-2,200 by 2012 – a two-thirds reduction. Corresponding reductions in the nuclear stockpile will result in the lowest level since the Eisenhower Administration.

Several factors have permitted these dramatic reductions from our large Cold War nuclear arsenal built and maintained from the 1950s to the 1990s. For several decades, the Soviet Union represented a large, intractable, ideologically motivated adversary; its fall has allowed us to reassess our nuclear force requirements. In 2001, the President also directed the transition to a new set of military capabilities more appropriate for credible deterrence in the 21st Century. This “new triad” of strategic capabilities, composed of non-nuclear and nuclear offensive strike forces, missile defenses, and a responsive national security infrastructure, reduces U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons while mitigating the risks associated with drawing down U.S. nuclear forces.

However, other contemporary factors lead us to conclude that nuclear weapons will continue to be required for the foreseeable future. The future security environment is very uncertain, and some trends are not favorable. Rogue states either have or seek weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and the risk of future proliferation cannot be ignored. The future direction that any number of states may take, including some established nuclear powers with aggressive nuclear force modernization programs, could have a dramatic effect on U.S. security and the security of our allies. We seek to assure our allies that the U.S. nuclear arsenal continues to serve as the ultimate guarantor of their security, thus obviating any need for them to develop nuclear weapons of their own. Indeed, the nuclear weapons programs of North Korea and Iran underscore the importance of U.S. security guarantees to key allies around the world. Credible U.S. nuclear capabilities and our security commitment to allies remain an indispensable part of deterrence and an important element in our effort to limit proliferation.

The Administration believes that an operational force between 1,700 and 2,200 strategic warheads, while much smaller than our Cold War arsenal, still provides sufficient capability to achieve these goals. This force will demonstrate to allies and adversaries alike that the United States has the necessary means, and the political will, to respond decisively against aggression and the use of weapons of mass destruction.

The current plan preserves options for future administrations to make additional adjustments in the U.S. nuclear force posture as changes in the international security environment warrant.

We are at a critical juncture that requires the U.S. to invest now in the capabilities needed to maintain a credible deterrent at the lowest level of nuclear weapons.

Without assuming serious risk, further reductions in the total stockpile are only achievable with a responsive nuclear infrastructure. Without a responsive nuclear infrastructure, the United States must continue to manage the technical risks associated with an aging stockpile of Cold War-era nuclear weapons, and the geopolitical uncertainties of the years ahead, by maintaining a sizable inventory of reserve weapons to support the operationally deployed force. This is an increasingly expensive and potentially risky approach to stockpile stewardship. Successive efforts at extending the service life of the current inventory of weapons drives these weapons farther away from the original source data derived from underground nuclear tests, and risks incorporating or accruing technical changes that could, over time, inadvertently undermine their reliability and performance. The skills and technologies needed to refurbish and maintain these older weapon designs are increasingly difficult to sustain or acquire. Furthermore, some of the materials employed in these older weapons are extremely hazardous. Moreover, it is difficult to incorporate modern safety and security features into Cold War-era weapon designs.

Finally, as the United States continues to observe a moratorium on underground nuclear testing, it becomes increasingly difficult to certify the existing stockpile of weapons.

To address these issues of sustainability, safety, security and reliability, and to achieve a smaller yet credible nuclear deterrent force, the United States needs to invest in the Reliable Replacement Warhead (RRW) program. Pursuit of this program is critical to sustaining long-term confidence in our deterrent capability—especially as the U.S. reduces its nuclear forces, the total number of weapons in the stockpile, and the size of the nuclear weapons infrastructure. RRW is a replacement warhead – it will help reduce the size of the nuclear stockpile and will not provide new military capabilities. Instead, RRW will make U.S. nuclear weapons safer and more secure against unauthorized use by incorporating state-of-the-art security features that cannot be retro-fitted to older weapons. RRW designs will provide more favorable reliability and performance margins than those currently in the stockpile, and will be less sensitive to incremental aging effects or manufacturing variances.

Thus, RRW will allow the United States to manage the risks and challenges of the 21st Century while reducing the likelihood of returning to nuclear testing to certify reliability. Over time, RRW will enable the United States to transition to a smaller, more responsive nuclear infrastructure that will enable future administrations to adjust the U.S. nuclear stockpile as geo-political conditions warrant. RRW is key to sustaining our security commitment to allies, and is fully consistent with U.S. obligations under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty—including Article VI.

Without Congressional support for the Reliable Replacement Warhead program we are concerned for the long-term ability of the United States to sustain its strategy of deterrence, meet its security commitment to allies, and pursue further reductions in nuclear weapons without assuming additional risk. Delaying progress on RRW will force the United States to maintain a large stockpile of nuclear weapons and sustain it through increasingly costly and risky Life Extension Programs. Delays on RRW also raise the prospect of having to return to underground nuclear testing to certify existing weapons.

Maintaining a credible deterrent has required a decades-long, bipartisan partnership with Congress; this partnership will be no less critical in the future than in the past.

Over the next two decades Congress will make many decisions, including decisions on RRW, that will help determine how fast and how far the United States can go in transforming and reducing its nuclear forces, nuclear stockpile, and nuclear infrastructure to make them smaller, safer, more secure, and more appropriate to managing the risks and challenges of the 21st Century. We must make progress toward creating a nuclear weapons infrastructure that can respond quickly and effectively to emerging threats and to technological surprise. This will assure our ability to maintain deterrence over the long-term, and enable future reductions in both the operationally deployed force and the overall nuclear weapons stockpile. The sooner Congress authorizes and funds transformative programs like RRW, the sooner the United States and its allies can realize the benefits this approach holds for maintaining a credible and effective deterrent with the lowest possible level of nuclear weapons.

<http://www.nnsa.doe.gov/docs/factsheets/2007/NA-07-FS-04.pdf>

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

New York Times

July 26, 2007

Russia To Increase Military Might And Spy Efforts

MOSCOW, July 25 (AP) — President Vladimir V. Putin said Wednesday that he intended to strengthen Russia's military capacity and to step up spying abroad in response to plans by the United States to build missile defense sites and deploy troops in Central Europe.

“The situation in the world and internal political interests require the Foreign Intelligence Service to permanently increase its capabilities, primarily in the field of information and analytical support for the country's leadership,” Mr. Putin said at a meeting with senior military and security officers in remarks that were posted on the Kremlin's Web site.

The Foreign Intelligence Service is a successor agency to the K.G.B.

Mr. Putin did not identify what nations would be the targets of the expanded effort, but officials in the United States and Britain said recently that Russia had intensified its spying in those countries.

Russia's relations with the United States and other Western nations have grown increasingly acrimonious amid Western concerns that Russia is edging away from democracy and Kremlin suspicions about the West's intentions. Mr. Putin said that American plans to base sites for a missile defense system in Poland and the Czech Republic posed a security challenge for Russia. The United States says the facilities are necessary to protect the United States and Europe from missiles that could be launched by Iran or other states.

Mr. Putin has proposed that the United States use a Soviet-built radar base in Azerbaijan for missile defense. American officials have said that the site in Azerbaijan was less useful because it is too close to Iran to intercept missiles fired from there.

On Wednesday, Mr. Putin said the United States was stonewalling. “Alternative ways of protection from hypothetical missile threats which we proposed have been left unanswered,” he said.

“All-round strengthening of our military forces is one of our indisputable priorities,” Mr. Putin said, promising to continue equipping the military with new weapons.

Mr. Putin also criticized the United States and other NATO members for failing to ratify an amended version of the 1990 Conventional Forces in Europe treaty, which limits the deployment of tanks, aircraft and other heavy nonnuclear weapons around the Continent.

Earlier this month, Mr. Putin suspended Russia's participation in the treaty and threatened to withdraw from it completely if NATO nations did not ratify its amended version, which was signed in 1999, to reflect changes since the Soviet collapse.

NATO members have refused to do that until Russia withdraws its troops from the former Soviet republics of Moldova and Georgia.

Mr. Putin said that the old version of the treaty counted arsenals of former Soviet satellites and republics that are now NATO members as part of the Soviet bloc. In particular, it counted weapons in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania as part of what was the Soviet Baltic Military District.

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

Washington Post

July 26, 2007

Pg. 9

Administration Urges Full Warhead Funding

Old Weapons May Need Testing, It Warns

By Walter Pincus, Washington Post Staff Writer

The Bush administration has told Congress that delays in funding for a new generation of nuclear weapons may require a return to underground testing to ensure that older warheads remain reliable.

The administration included the warning in a four-page statement on nuclear weapons signed by the secretaries of energy, defense and state and sent to Congress this week. The document defended the so-called Reliable Replacement Warhead program, the funding for which is contained in fiscal 2008 authorization and appropriations bills still before Congress.

In their statement, the secretaries said, "Delays on RRW . . . raise the prospect of having to return to underground nuclear testing to certify existing weapons."

The White House had sought \$82 million for the program and hoped to have Congress vote next year on proceeding with production of new warheads that could be deployed by 2012.

However, House and Senate committees have reduced the \$82 million to prevent a congressional vote next year on the production phase. The committees have also included proposals in the bills for year-long studies that would lay out a detailed strategic nuclear weapons policy before Congress moves ahead with the warhead program.

The administration's statement, "National Security and Nuclear Weapons: Maintaining Deterrence in the 21st Century," said that a more detailed justification for the warhead program would follow.

The secretaries also said that the administration intended to achieve "an effective strategic deterrent at the lowest level of nuclear weapons consistent with our national security and our commitments and obligations to allies." They pointed to President Bush's directive that the number of operational deployed weapons will drop from about 6,000 to between 1,700 and 2,200 by 2012 -- a level set by the agreement Bush signed with Russian President Vladimir Putin in 2002.

The administration justified the RRW program as necessary to provide a safe and secure warhead for the next 25 years to replace weapons built for the Cold War era. The statement criticized the current lifetime extension program -- begun during the Clinton administration -- as requiring an excessive number of stockpiled warheads to make certain the country had enough for a deployed operational force of 1,700 to 2,200.

"We are committed to maintaining the nuclear weapons stockpile, but as our Cold War-era weapons age, this becomes more and more difficult and very costly," Energy Secretary Samuel W. Bodman said yesterday. "This document clearly lays out the best actions we can take in the face of an uncertain future."

Sen. Pete V. Domenici (R-N.M.), a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee and an advocate of the new warhead program, said yesterday: "I remain hopeful that Congress will fund the feasibility study of the Reliable Replacement Warhead, because it offers the best opportunity to transition from the large and highly specialized Cold War stockpile to a smaller, more secure and lower-cost deterrent in the future."

Stephen Young, a senior analyst with the Union of Concerned Scientists, described the secretaries' statement as "an almost desperate plea for support for the program, which provides nothing that would justify Congress funding it."

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/07/25/AR2007072502093.html>

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

Washington Times

July 26, 2007

Pg. 4

Al Qaeda Seen In Search Of Nukes

Defense official warns U.S. still group's target

By Bill Gertz, Washington Times

Al Qaeda terrorists are continuing to plan attacks against the United States and are seeking nuclear and other unconventional arms for the strikes, a senior Pentagon official told Congress yesterday.

Retired Air Force Lt. Gen. James Clapper, the undersecretary of defense for intelligence, told a joint House committee hearing that al Qaeda has conducted terrorist attacks against more than two dozen nations since September 11.

"Al Qaeda has and will continue to attempt visually dramatic mass-casualty attacks here at home, and they will continue to attempt to acquire chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear materials," Gen. Clapper said in discussing the National Intelligence Estimate (NIE) on threats to the United States. "And if they're so successful in obtaining these materials, we believe they would use them."

He spoke before a joint hearing of the House Armed Services Committee and House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Gen. Clapper said that al Qaeda has "reconstituted some of its command and support network" in tribal Pakistan along the Afghan border but that the estimates finding are "not a surprise."

"We are at war with an enemy not confined to national boundaries or a single ethnic group," he said. "Our fight against extremists in Iraq, Afghanistan and around the world has kept our nation safe from attacks here at home."

Gen. Clapper warned that al Qaeda is trying to develop or acquire from rogue states nuclear, chemical or biological weapons and said "we can be certain that they will use such weapons against the United States at their first opportunity, especially, if they can, on American soil to kill our citizens, destroy our property, disrupt our economy and attempt to break our national will to resist their extremist objectives."

The testimony followed comments by President Bush on Tuesday that al Qaeda is "fighting us in Iraq and across the world and plotting to kill Americans here at home again."

"The primary concern is al Qaeda in South Asia organizing its own plots against the United States," Edward Gistaro, a national intelligence officer who drafted the estimate, told the hearing.

Mr. Gistaro said "we do not see" al Qaeda operatives working inside the United States. "Our concern that we see increased efforts on the part of al Qaeda to try and find, train and deploy people who could get into this country," he said.

Rep. Ike Skelton, Missouri Democrat and chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said the findings of the estimate, a consensus analysis of all 16 U.S. intelligence agencies, show "the news is not good."

"The recent NIE paints this picture clearly — an unstable region within the borders of Pakistan," Mr. Skelton told the hearing. "It describes a strong and resurgent al Qaeda; and it warns of a heightened threat environment — one that is, in my humble opinion, unworthy of a superpower."

Mr. Skelton asked whether the estimate should prompt a review of the U.S. military force posture, U.S. modernization plans and whether policies should be changed to deal with a near-term threat scenario.

Rep. Silvestre Reyes, Texas Democrat and chairman of the intelligence committee, said the intelligence showing al Qaeda is regrouping contradicts Mr. Bush's statements four years ago that al Qaeda was "on the run."

"The NIE released earlier this month indicates that today our intelligence community believes otherwise," he said. <http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20070726/NATION/107260062/1002>

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

Washington Times

July 27, 2007

Pg. 6

Inside The Ring

By Bill Gertz

New nuke strategy

The Bush administration told Congress this week that U.S. nuclear weapons and the infrastructure to support them will be needed for the foreseeable future, as Russia and China continue to build up their nuclear arsenals and rogue states such as Iran and North Korea continue work on nuclear arms.

"We're going to need nuclear weapons for a while and we're going to need to make them safer and more secure," said Steve Henry, assistant secretary of defense for nuclear matters, in summing up the report to Congress on U.S. nuclear strategy.

The report, "National Security and Nuclear Weapons: Maintaining Deterrence for the 21st Century," is a statement by the secretaries of energy, defense and state.

It stated that "the future security environment is very uncertain, and some trends are not favorable."

"Rogue states either have or seek weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons, and the risk of future proliferation cannot be ignored," the report said. "The future direction that any number of states may take, including

some established nuclear powers with aggressive nuclear force modernization programs, could have a dramatic effect on U.S. security and the security of our allies."

Mr. Henry said Russia and China both are established powers with nuclear buildups under way that need watching and require the United States to keep nuclear weapons ready and to have a system in place, with both people and facilities, that could respond to any potential unsettling strategic imbalances.

On Russia, Mr. Henry said, "You can't ignore what countries say and their rhetoric, and you can't ignore what they are doing in practice."

The Russians are "aggressively modernizing their nuclear forces," he said, and China is building new strategic nuclear forces and the buildup cannot be ignored.

The United States is "a little bit unsure as to the future of their program," Mr. Henry said. "Today [China's program] is much smaller than the U.S. or that of the Russians, but how do you judge what the future may be?"

Mr. Henry also said the United States is worried that al Qaeda and other terrorists will obtain nuclear weapons, specifically getting nuclear material from rogue states, and that U.S. nuclear weapons can be used to deter those states from supplying terrorists with that material. Such states would be "held accountable" if their nuclear material is used in attacks on the United States, he said.

The report said the nuclear programs of Iran and North Korea show the need for the United States to provide nuclear guarantees to key allies.

Mr. Henry said the United States is committed to reducing nuclear stockpiles but must maintain capabilities for security.

One of the most important elements of current nuclear arms strategy is developing the Reliable Replacement Warhead, a newer, safer and more reliable warhead that will be fashioned from existing warheads but will be less expensive to maintain, Mr. Henry said.

The report said without the replacement warhead, the ability of the United States to maintain its nuclear deterrent over the long term will be in question.

The United States plans to have a strategic nuclear warhead arsenal of between 1,700 and 2,200 by 2012, the report said.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20070727/NATION04/107270092/1002/NATION>

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

New York Times

July 27, 2007

Pg. 8

U.S. To Announce Nuclear Exception For India

By David E. Sanger

WASHINGTON, July 26 — Three years after President Bush urged global rules to stop additional nations from making nuclear fuel, the White House will announce on Friday that it is carving out an exception for India, in a last-ditch effort to seal a civilian nuclear deal between the countries.

The scheduled announcement, described Thursday by senior American officials, follows more than a year of negotiations intended to keep an unusual arrangement between the countries from being defeated in New Delhi.

Until the overall deal was approved by Congress last year, the United States was prohibited by federal law from selling civilian nuclear technology to India because it has refused to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. The legislation passed by Congress allows the United States to sell both commercial nuclear technology and fuel to India, but would require a cutoff in nuclear assistance if India again tests a nuclear weapon. India's Parliament balked at the deal, with many politicians there complaining that the requirements infringed on India's sovereignty.

Under the arrangement that is to be announced by Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, Mr. Bush has agreed to go beyond the terms of the deal that Congress approved, promising to help India build a nuclear fuel repository and find alternative sources of nuclear fuel in the event of an American cutoff, skirting some of the provisions of the law.

In February 2004, President Bush, in a major speech outlining new nuclear policies to prevent proliferation, declared that "enrichment and reprocessing are not necessary for nations seeking to harness nuclear energy for peaceful purposes." He won the cooperation of allies for a temporary suspension of new facilities to make fuel, but allies that include Canada and Australia have also expressed interest in uranium enrichment.

The problem is a delicate one for the administration, because this month American officials are working at the United Nations Security Council to win approval of harsher economic sanctions against Iran for trying to enrich uranium. India is already a nuclear weapons state and has refused to sign the treaty; Iran, a signer of the treaty, does not yet have nuclear weapons.

But in an interview Thursday, R. Nicholas Burns, the under secretary of state for political affairs, who negotiated the deal, said, "Iran in no way, shape or form would merit similar treatment because Iran is a nuclear outlaw state." He noted that Iran hid its nuclear activities for many years from international inspectors, and that it still had not answered most of their questions about evidence that could suggest it was seeking weapons.

Because India never signed the treaty, it too was considered a nuclear outlaw for decades. But Mr. Bush, eager to place relations with India on a new footing, waived many of the restrictions in order to sign the initial deal. It was heavily supported by Indian-Americans and American nuclear equipment companies, which see a huge potential market for their reactors and expertise.

Representative Edward J. Markey, a Massachusetts Democrat who opposed the initial deal and said he would try to defeat the new arrangement, said Thursday, "If you make an exception for India, we will be preaching from a barstool to the rest of the world."

Though India would be prohibited from using the fuel it purchases from the United States for nuclear weapons, the ability to reprocess the fuel means India's other supplies would be freed up to expand its arsenal.

"It creates a double standard," Mr. Markey said. "One set of rules for countries we like, another for countries we don't."

Robert J. Einhorn, a scholar at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, said that in "the first phase of negotiations with India, the administration made concessions that put the country on par with countries that have signed" the Nonproliferation Treaty. (Israel and Pakistan are the only other countries that have refused to sign it, and North Korea quit the treaty four years ago.)

"Now we've gone beyond that, and given India something that we don't give to Russia and China."

In general, advocates of a far-stronger relationship between India and the United States have favored the nuclear cooperation deal, and it passed through Congress fairly easily. But those arguing that the administration has not made good on its promises to clamp down on the trade in nuclear fuel argue that Mr. Bush could be setting a precedent that will undercut his nonproliferation initiative.

Mr. Burns said he disagreed because "this agreement is so very much in our national interest."

"It will further our nonproliferation efforts globally" by gradually bringing India into the nuclear fold, he said.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/27/washington/27india.html>

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

New York Times

July 28, 2007

Pg. 9

News Analysis

In Its Nuclear Deal With India, Washington Appears To Make More Concessions

By Somini Sengupta

NEW DELHI, July 27 — After a year of negotiations, India and the United States on Friday announced completion of a civilian nuclear accord, which Indian officials hailed as preserving India's national security interests and as a testament to its emerging strategic importance to the United States.

The Indian national security adviser, M. K. Narayanan, called it "a touchstone of a transformed bilateral relationship between India and the United States."

In Washington, Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice called the agreement a "historic milestone" that would enhance relations with India.

The agreement, which was forged during five rounds of negotiations, requires India to separate its civilian nuclear power reactors and open them to international inspections.

But in the end it was the United States that appeared to make more concessions. India stuck fast to its demand to be able to reprocess spent fuel from the reactors on the civilian side, which had raised concerns in Washington about opportunities to produce weapons-grade plutonium for India's military arsenal.

The final agreement will allow India to carry out the reprocessing but requires it to develop a new facility dedicated to that purpose and subject to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards.

It also allows India to develop "a strategic reserve of nuclear fuel" in case of a disruption of fuel supply, according to the Indian foreign ministry. Under American law, the United States would have to cut fuel supply in the event of another Indian nuclear test; the final agreement does not spell out what would happen in such an eventuality.

"We've got a very good deal, which we believe will meet the requirements of both countries," Mr. Narayanan said at a news conference here Friday evening.

For their part, Bush administration officials largely sidestepped questions about why they decided to carve a large exception to President Bush's declaration three years ago that no additional countries should be manufacturing nuclear fuel.

They argued that India — one of three countries that have refused to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, along with Israel and Pakistan — has never posed a proliferation risk, and would use its new fuel solely for peaceful purposes, at a safeguarded facility.

But in other cases, most notably that of Iran, the United States has rejected building such facilities, even if international inspectors are resident there. While India has committed to using American-produced fuel for only civilian reactors, outside experts have noted that a result will be to free up other sources of fuel for its weapons.

“At the very least, the Bush administration should not make it easier for New Delhi to resume nuclear testing and to produce fissile material for nuclear weapons,” said Michael Krepon, co-founder of the Washington-based Henry L. Stimson Center.

Some critics of the deal, led by Representative Edward J. Markey of Massachusetts, a Democrat, have vowed to try to defeat it. But it appears unlikely that they will muster the votes, especially in an election year when Indian-Americans are courted by both parties.

The accord allayed the two sticking points that Indian critics of the deal — including, most important, its scientific community — had held up as offending to national sovereignty.

Sitting beside Mr. Narayanan at the news conference was the last holdout on the deal, the Indian Atomic Energy Commission chairman, Anil Kakodkar, who went as far as to call it “a satisfactory thing.”

Mr. Narayanan said Mr. Kakodkar's blessings would help to blunt political criticism of the deal. Neither the opposition Bharatiya Janata Party nor the government's leftist allies, who have balked at India's friendlier relations with the United States, commented Friday night.

The left has said it would make an assessment after reviewing the full text of the agreement, which has not been made public. Government negotiators took pains to point out that India's fast-breeder reactor would remain outside the safeguards.

The agreement bears on far more than nuclear matters. It potentially smoothes over abiding Indian distrust of American intentions ever since New Delhi conducted its first nuclear test more than 30 years ago. India has been a nuclear renegade ever since. By refusing to sign the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, India has been ineligible to buy nuclear technology, including fuel.

“The deal was always about the relationship,” said C. Raja Mohan, a professor of international relations at Nanyang Technological University in Singapore and a proponent of both deal and relationship. “That was rooted in the idea that India is rising and cooperation with India would be good for the United States.”

Indian analysts argued that the agreement could speed broader strategic cooperation, unlocking the door on nuclear commerce and potentially other defense deals for American firms. In a news release, the U.S.-India Business Council said the expansion of India's civilian nuclear energy program would generate \$150 billion in commercial opportunities over the next 30 years.

“This opens up a huge gamut of possibilities for strategic cooperation, but more importantly, it positions the U.S.-India bilateral relationship on a very, very firm footing,” said Amitabh Mattoo, a former member of the Task Force on Global Strategic Development, which advised the prime minister, Manmohan Singh, on international issues, including India-U.S. relations.

“The United States has taken a view that a democratic, pluralistic, secular growing India is in its national interest and that most of the time there will be a convergence of interests,” he added. “Sometimes there won't. It's worth investing in India rather than alienating India.”

Convergence of interests is likely to be tested soon on what to do about Iran. India has pressed ahead on negotiations for a natural gas pipeline from Iran through Pakistan to Iran. The United States has repeatedly hectoring India against it.

In an editorial Thursday, The Hindustan Times credited the government for creating what it called an “audacious” accord. “India will be the only country that gets to retain and pursue its nuclear weapons programme while getting the benefits of nuclear collaboration on an equal footing with other countries,” the newspaper wrote.

India will next have to negotiate separate deals with the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the atomic energy agency. Mr. Narayanan told reporters here this evening that Indian negotiators would seek an “unconditional, clean” agreement from the Nuclear Suppliers Group. The United States Congress would then have to render a final vote on the deal. Indian officials have insisted that civilian nuclear cooperation would have no impact on the balance of power in the region, referring to Pakistan's concerns about the potential growth of India's nuclear arsenal.

“We are not using it as an excuse to enhance our strategic fuel capabilities,” Mr. Narayanan told reporters Friday evening.

David E. Sanger contributed reporting from Washington.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2007/07/28/world/asia/28india.html>

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

Washington Times

July 29, 2007

Pg. 7

North Korea

IAEA Team Arrives To Monitor Shutdown

BEIJING — A second team of U.N. nuclear specialists arrived yesterday in North Korea to monitor the shutdown and sealing of the country's sole plutonium-producing reactor.

The six specialists from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will replace the initial team that went to North Korea on July 12 to supervise the shutdown of the Yongbyon reactor, the key component of the North's nuclear program.

The IAEA confirmed last week that North Korea shut down its sole functioning reactor at Yongbyon — the first tangible progress after years of negotiations between the communist regime and five other countries.

Officials said the team will put agency seals on parts of the complex that were closed and supervise the installation of surveillance cameras, whose recordings will be regularly downloaded and analyzed.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/article/20070729/FOREIGN/107290040/1003>

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

Christian Science Monitor

August 2, 2007

Pg. 1

Secretary Rice's Mideast Mission: Contain Iran

US plans to give more than \$20 billion in military aid to Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and other Sunni Arab states.

by Dan Murphy, Staff writer of The Christian Science Monitor, and Rasheed Abou-Alsamh, Correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor

Tel Aviv and Jeddah, Saudi Arabia -- US secretaries of Defense and State are using their high-profile meetings this week with Arab and Israeli leaders, in part to herald a new Bush administration strategy toward Iran: cold war-style containment.

The trip comes on the heels of a US proposal to offer \$20 billion in military aid to Arab Gulf states (mostly Saudi Arabia) and a \$30 billion package for Israel. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice did not mask the purpose of the deal when she called Iran “the single most important single-country challenge to ... US interests in the Middle East.” “The talks on Tuesday night between [Saudi Arabian] King Abdullah and US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice were very important, as they signaled the beginning of a political showdown between the US, Gulf states, and Egypt on the one hand, and Iran on the other,” says Adel al-Toraifi, a Saudi analyst who focuses on his country’s relations with Iran.

Mr. Toraifi says since the US “surge” in Iraq is not achieving fast results, America wants to shift attention to another front.

“The Americans were waiting for the surge in Iraq to take effect, but since the surge wasn’t going very well, they decided to announce the new offensive of containing Iran. It is important for the Bush administration to [show] some achievements in the Middle East” before a congressional review of the surge planned for September, he says.

“What America is doing now is containment, saying that the peripheral states [to Iraq] that are our allies have to be protected,” says Meir Javedanfar, a Tel Aviv-based Iran expert and author of “The Nuclear Sphinx of Tehran.”

“It looks inevitable that America will withdraw [from Iraq], so it’s building a giant fence around Iraq by supporting the countries it has good relations with.”

This may lead to shoring up Sunni states – particularly Iran’s neighbors in the Gulf – who will be a main driver of US policy as an eventual draw-down of US forces in Iraq looks more likely.

Israel, which vociferously opposed US arms packages to the Saudis in the 1980s, has made it clear it’s not opposed to this current deal. Prime Minister Ehud Olmert said he “understood” the US decision, and said “there is a need for a united front between the US and us regarding Iran.”

“For Israel, the No. 1 priority is Iran, and in this case they see the Saudis as on the same side as Israel. They have a mutual interest in containing Iran,” says Mr. Javedanfar.

Analysts say Israel also has an eye on drawing Saudi Arabia deeper into peace efforts with the Palestinians – and perhaps encouraging them to become the third Arab state to recognize Israel. President Bush is proposing an Arab-Israeli peace conference to be held in Israel in the fall. Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Saud al-Faisal said his country would consider attending, but only if it addresses “issues of real substance.”

That appeared to be a reference to a Saudi proposal made earlier this year that promises peace and recognition of all Arab states in return for Israel abandoning the territory it seized in the 1967 war.

But whether the US military aid will add up to much change – in either Iran’s ambitions, or the eventual stabilizing of Iraq – remains to be seen.

Ms. Rice and Defense Secretary Robert Gates’s trip to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Israel, and the Palestinian Authority’s headquarters in Ramallah began with potentially embarrassing comments from the US ambassador to the UN, Zalmay Khalilzad, who is the former ambassador to Iraq. He accused Saudi Arabia of undermining Iraq’s stability, an allegation similar to the ones the US has lobbed at Tehran.

After a meeting with Rice on Wednesday morning in Jeddah, the Saudi foreign minister said he was “astounded” by the criticism, and said his country was doing all that it can. Then his government agreed to a US request to upgrade its diplomatic relationship with Iraq. Rice praised the Saudis: “We are good friends, we are allies.... [But] it doesn’t mean there won’t be disagreements about policies, tactics.”

Jamal Khashoggi, editor in chief of the Saudi daily Al-Watan, said that Saudi Arabia has not helped the US in Iraq until recently as former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld made a point of telling Saudi Arabia and other moderate Arab countries to stay away from Iraq.

“While our presence is visible in Lebanon, our presence in Iraq is very limited because of the Americans, especially when Rumsfeld was the secretary of Defense. Saudi Arabia and Jordan felt unwelcome in Iraq, but the Americans are now asking for our help there,” he says.

Mr. Khashoggi says there is only so much Saudi Arabia can do to keep jihadis, many of whom are Saudi nationals, from traveling into Iraq.

He says the Kingdom has fully secured its border with Iraq, and that it was Syria that was allowing Saudi fighters to be smuggled into Iraq through its borders.

“The problem here is Syria – all the suicide bombers are going into Iraq through Syria,” he says.

The new strategy of containing Iran taking shape in the Middle East resembled the cold war standoff with the Soviet Union. At that time, the US bolstered the militaries of regimes such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt as well as the Western democracies of Europe with a twofold objective: to create powerful friends and thereby restrict that country’s territorial ambitions, and to draw the Soviets into an arms race that some strategists believed the US and its friends would be better able to afford economically than the Kremlin.

Rice, whose academic expertise was on the Soviet Union and the strategies to oppose that regime, now looks to be running Middle East policy from an old playbook.

“Iran is not the Soviet Union. In 1946, the Red Army was all the way to Berlin and had helped win the war,” says Ervand Abrahamian, an Iran analyst and historian at Baruch College in New York. “What capabilities do the Iranians have? These old cold warriors need a reality [check].”

Mr. Abrahamian also says the notion that arming Saudi Arabia and its neighbors will somehow contain Iran is inaccurate, and may in fact encourage Iran in the view that a nuclear bomb is its best guarantee of survival.

“Iran has no military capability outside its own territory, its military budget is the total of Kuwait’s and the United Arab Emirates combined and ... it has no projection ability,” he says. “Sure, Iran can support the militias in Iraq, but that’s not a threat to Saudi Arabia. I think the point is to harness in the Saudis and Gulf States diplomatically so they can say ‘Hey, we’re building an anti-Iranian coalition,’ [which] draws attention from the Iraq and Palestinian issues.”

Asked if the logic is to draw Iran into a costly arms race, Abrahamian says it might, but worries about the consequences. “I can’t imagine that Iran is not going to somehow react. The danger is if Iran is pushed into an arms race, the cheap answer to the problem is to go nuclear.”

Javedanfar also worries that any arms raise could encourage Iran in its nuclear ambitions, but has the added concern that the US is rewarding the Saudis at a time when he and many others believe that country is contributing to the bloodshed in Iraq, something which in turn could help Iran.

“Instead of selling weapons to the Saudis, the Americans should be twisting their arms, saying if they don’t contain the Sunni elements now, they get nothing,” he says.

“To give weapons to the Saudis now, while they are also part of the problem in Iraq, is going to mean a bigger mess. It’s going to strengthen the Iranian position, because the Shiites, who were hoping America would be an ally, will fall into the Shiite camp with more enthusiasm than before.”

US officials appear to believe that Saudi Arabia could wield influence in Iraq to bring Sunni militants to the peace table.

Analysts in Saudi Arabia say that while the country is happy to have more aid, the Kingdom will evade outright confrontation with the Islamic Republic of Iran and is likely to take a different tack than the US. The country recently hosted a visit by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmedinejad.

“Saudi Arabia is working to contain Iran, based on its own interests. Our policy is not to leave a vacuum for them – but [also] not to escalate things with them but to engage with them positively,” says Mr. Khashoggi “Saudis have realized that there are two fronts in Iran – the hard-liners and the moderates,” he says.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/2007/0802/p01s01-wome.html>

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