

# Nuclear, Missile & Space Digest

Volume 4, Number 15 A Fortnightly Newsletter from the Indian Pugwash Society August 07, 2012

**Convenor**

**&**

**Editor**

**Dr Arvind Gupta**

**Executive Council**

**Dr Anil Kakodkar**

**Dr Ashok Parthasarthy**

**Lt Gen (retd) Satish  
Nambiar**

**Dr R R Subramanian**

**Dr Rajiv Nayan**

**Dr Manpreet Sethi**

## Contents

### A. Us & Europe

- U.S., Poland discuss Missile Defence
- America's Role in Helping Iran Develop its Nuclear Program
- Obama signs bill for Israel missile defence
- Quick decommissioning in Germany
- French Nuclear Dismantling Funds May Fall Short, Report Says

### B. Russia

- Medvedev Calls for Faster Missile Rearmament
- Russia to get stronger nuclear navy, Putin says
- Putin pushes nuclear, space defence reform
- Russia to Launch Construction of Fourth Borei-Class Sub

### C. China & East Asia

- China in talks to build five new reactors in UK-paper
- South Korea "For Sure" to Get Longer Ballistic Missile Range: Minister
- S. Korea raises eyebrows over move to process nuclear fuel on its own
- With UAE Nuclear Partnership, South Korea Gains Mideast Traction
- N. Korea's Kim orders realignment of some military bases: source
- N. Korea says will build up nuclear arsenal against U.S.
- Japan government names radiation physicist as new atomic regulator head
- Nominee for Japan Nuclear Chief Vows Higher Safety
- Anti-nuclear campaigners launch Japan's first green party



**Indian Pugwash Society**

No.1, Development Enclave,  
Rao Tula Ram Marg, Near USI  
Delhi-110010

Tel. No (91-11) 2671-7983  
Fax No. (91-11)2615-4192

Extn 7014 & 7012  
Email: indianpugwash@yahoo.com

**D. West Asia**

- 'Israel can rely on Obama to stop nuclear Iran'
- Israel's intentions towards Iran - the pressing question
- Iran Agrees To Discuss International Concerns On Nuclear Program
- P5+1 must recognize Iran's right to enrichment: Salehi
- Iran military 'will not allow enemy to advance' in Syria
- Diplomats: Iran nuke talks remain stalled
- Iran: Nuclear Negotiators Meet; No Progress Reported
- Iran atomic chief pours cold water on n-ship idea
- Understanding Iran's Right to Enrichment
- Panetta: no Iran attack plans to be discussed with Israel
- Iran to take legal action against US, EU over sanctions: Official
- Iran Completes Cleanup of Suspect Nuclear Site, Group Says
- Deal Struck to Tighten Sanctions Against Iran
- Iran vows to counter any cyber attacks on nuclear facilities
- Iran to Open Cases against Nuclear Terrorism at National Courts
- Saudis 'mull buying nukes from Pakistan'
- Saudis, Emirates push nuclear power plans
- Turkey's New Ballistic Missile Program Raises Eyebrows and Concerns
- Turkey begins work on ICBM

**E. India**

- Nuke capable missile Agni-II user trial soon
- US Keen to Help India in Ballistic Missile Programme
- India quietly gate crashes into submarine-launched ballistic missiles club?
- Indian Nuclear Forces, 2012
- India to use "plutonium" reactor in two years: Atomic Energy Commission
- Gorakhpur farmers paid Rs 182 crore for land acquired for N-plant: Hry
- Who pays in case of accident at Kudankulam, asks PM

**F. Pakistan**

- Regular military exchanges between Pakistan and China to further strengthen strategic ties
- Pakistan, Indonesia, Kazakhstan among countries at nuke security workshop at Y-12

## **G. Opinions**

- It's Not as Easy as 1-2-3, Jeffrey Lewis
- Gen. Cartwright: "the retaliatory capability of 300 nuclear weapons...is catastrophic", Kingston Reif
- Iran, Israel waging silent war, By Walter Pincus
- The Next Civ-Nuke Deal? Michael Krepon
- What Iran Sanctions Can and Can't Do?, Emanuele Ottolenghi
- India's Military Comes of Age: The BrahMos Missile, James R. Holmes
- Nuclear Threat Initiative: How India stands to gain Indrani Bagchi
- Wanted: Better American missile defense: Peter Hussey

## **H. Reports/Papers/Press Releases**

- Reset or Restart? The Impact of Fukushima on the Japanese and German Energy Sectors: Briefing Paper, Antony Froggatt, Catherine Mitchell and Shunsuke Managi, July 2012
- Uranium 2011: Resources, Production and Demand: OECD, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA): Published by: OECD Publishing, Publication date: 01 Aug 2012
- Africa: The African Commission on Nuclear Energy Convenes its Second Meeting: PRESS RELEASE: July 26, 2012
- Stress tests and Peer Review Process: Joint statement of ENSREG and the European Commission 26 April 2012
- Strategic Weapons: Changes in the Nuclear Weapons Targeting Process Since 1991, July 31, 2012: Congressional Committees
- Proceedings: Strengthening the NPT: On July 23, the Non-proliferation Policy Education Center and the Foreign Policy Initiative in cooperation with the office of Congressman Fortenberry, hosted an event on Capitol Hill entitled "How Much Tighter Must the NPT Be?"

All the articles are available from the mentioned sources in original format.

## **A. Us & Europe**

### **U.S., Poland discuss Missile Defence** July 26,

2012, *UPI.com*

WARSAW, Poland, July 26 (UPI) — The U.S. and Polish governments are coordinating plans for the development of a missile interceptor site in Poland by 2018, a military spokesman said. Polish Defense Minister Tomasz Siemoniak met with U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta in to Warsaw to discuss the deployment of a missile defense system.

U.S. Defense Department spokesman George Little said Washington welcomes Poland's support for European missile defense, noting Warsaw was the first country to establish a ballistic missile defense agreement with the United States. "The two nations are working closely together to establish an SM-3 ballistic missile interceptor site in Poland by 2018," he was quoted by Russia's state-run news agency RIA Novosti as saying.

Plans for a missile defense system in Poland were scrapped in 2010 but revisited last year by U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Minsk in December took delivery of two of the 12 Tor-M2 anti-aircraft missile systems from Russia. The Belarusian government said the short-range surface-to-air system will be deployed near the western border with Poland....

[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/Special/2012/07/26/US-Poland-discuss-missile-defense/UPI-14791343323206/#ixzz22YiK5TUb](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Special/2012/07/26/US-Poland-discuss-missile-defense/UPI-14791343323206/#ixzz22YiK5TUb)

### **America's Role in Helping Iran Develop its Nuclear Program**

By Matthew Fuhrmann, *The Atlantic*, July 26, 2012

Yes, the U.S. once aided Tehran's civilian nuclear program, a reminder that even peaceful nuclear cooperation can have unintended consequences. Iran's nuclear program poses a threat to many nations—particularly Israel and the United States. Yet, it is sometimes forgotten that Washington was an early supporter of Tehran's nuclear ambitions.

The United States provided peaceful nuclear assistance to Iran from 1957 to 1979, when the two states were allies. Washington exported the Tehran Research Reactor (TRR), enriched uranium to fuel it, and "hot cells," which can be used to produce plutonium—a critical ingredient for making nuclear weapons. All of this aid was provided for civilian uses, but it ended up indirectly augmenting Iran's nuclear weapons program. For example, from 1988 to 1992 Iran conducted covert plutonium reprocessing experiments using fuel pellets irradiated in the TRR.

The Iranian experience exposes a problem known as the dual-use dilemma: because nuclear technology has both peaceful and military applications, nuclear energy aid provides a potential foundation for a bomb program.

However, this danger has not deterred the United States from

providing nuclear energy assistance to many countries. Today, for instance, Washington is in the midst of negotiating agreements with Jordan and Vietnam that would permit the sharing of nuclear technology, materials, and know-how. Deals such as these could be a recipe for the further spread of nuclear weapons. In a new book, I explore the relationship between peaceful nuclear assistance and nuclear proliferation.

*<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/07/americas-role-in-helping-iran-develop-its-nuclear-program/260334/>*

## Obama signs bill for Israel missile defence

Al Jajira, July 27, 2012

US president releases an additional \$70m aid timed to upstage Republican rival Mitt Romney's trip to Jerusalem. US President Barack Obama will release an additional \$70m in military aid for Israel, a previously announced move that appeared timed to upstage Republican presidential rival Mitt Romney's trip to Israel this weekend.

The stepped-up aid, first announced in May and reiterated on Friday, will help Israel expand production of a short-range rocket defence system. The system, known as Iron Dome, has proved successful at stopping rocket attacks fired at Israeli civilians from close range, including from Gaza.

Obama announced the new military assistance as he signed a bill in the Oval Office expanding military and civilian co-operation with Israel. Obama said the bill underscores the United States' "unshakable commitment to Israel". The White House focus on Israel this week comes as Romney prepares to visit Jerusalem, where he will meet Prime Minister Binyamin

Netanyahu, with whom Obama has had frosty relations.

Both Romney and Obama's campaigns are eager to earn support from Jewish voters in the United States. The presumptive Republican nominee, who will face Obama in November elections, has said Obama is not supportive enough of Israel, and he has promised to ramp up US aid. Obama officials say the administration already provides record levels of funding.

*<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/americas/2012/07/201272718113852794.html>*

## Quick decommissioning in Germany

World Nuclear News, August 03, 2012

Two of the German reactors ordered to shut after Fukushima will be dismantled as soon as possible. EnBW has applied for permission to do the work and said it has more than enough funds set aside. Neckarwestheim 1 and Philippsburg 1 were both among the older reactor units that Chancellor Angela Merkel forced to close early in the week of the Fukushima accident in March 2011. Built in 1976 and 1981 respectively, their operation had been set to continue until 2017 and 2026. Merkel's move, however, brought their power generation careers to an abrupt end.

Normal practice in nuclear decommissioning allows time for radioactive decay before the main components and buildings are tackled. Sometimes a reactor building is sealed up and put in a 'safe storage' mode to allow radioactive decay to the point that the work can take place under normal industrial regulation

rather than nuclear regulation. This kind of postponement makes the work easier and cheaper to carry out while also allowing more time for decommissioning funds to grow.

During their lifetimes, Neckarwestheim 1 and Philippsburg 1 produced over 186 and 187 billion kWh of electricity respectively. Had Germany stuck to its 2010 negotiated policy, they would have probably produced a further 31 billion and 89 billion kWh. Despite this loss of income and corresponding payments to its decommissioning fund, EnBW said it still has more than enough money for decommissioning and waste disposal.

Instead of following this strategy, EnBW has opted to complete the work as soon as possible. "We are taking note of our responsibility and not putting off the issue of decommissioning work any longer," said Jorg Michels of EnKK, the company that operates the plants for EnBW. "With direct decommissioning we are achieving clarity for the public, employees and our business partners."

*[http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR\\_Quick\\_decommissioning\\_in\\_Germany\\_0308121.html](http://www.world-nuclear-news.org/WR_Quick_decommissioning_in_Germany_0308121.html)*

## **French Nuclear Dismantling Funds May Fall Short, Report Says**

Tara Patel, Bloomberg, July 24, 2012

Electricite de France SA and Areva SA (AREVA), along with other French nuclear operators, may not be setting aside enough funds to pay for future dismantling of reactors and treatment and storage of atomic waste, according to a parliamentary report.

Cost estimates by atomic operators don't have a "safety margin and risk being raised in the future," according

to a report published today by a national panel charged with evaluating the financial costs of atomic decommissioning. Current estimates carry "large margins of uncertainty."

Under French law, nuclear operators including EDF and Areva have to build portfolios or amass funds to pay for the decommissioning of reactors and radioactive waste storage. The cost estimates vary, including for planned development of France's underground atomic waste site. That is estimated at between 14.4 billion euros (\$17.4 billion) and 35 billion euros, the report said.

The costs that needed to be covered at the end of last year reached 34.8 billion euros, for which operators have made provisions of 31.6 billion euros, the report said. Total costs of dismantling and treating atomic waste were estimated at 92 billion euros. "What is not tolerable is that the funds are managed by the operators," French Socialist deputy Christian Bataille said today. "They should be under state control because they are there to manage nuclear waste for the whole French population. Over the past six years there has been a veritable veil pulled over this subject."

EDF was supposed to have set aside enough money by the end of June 2011 for decommissioning all of its nuclear assets and waste storage. A power law gave the utility a five-year extension on the deadline to 2016. The Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique, another operator of nuclear sites, uses state backing as its provisions, the report said.

*<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-07-24/french-nuclear-dismantling-funds-may-fall-short-report-says.html>*

## B. Russia

### Medvedev Calls for Faster Missile Rearmament

KOLOMNA, RIA

*Novosti*, July 23, 2012

Prime Minister Dmitry Medvedev called for an increase in the pace of Russian rearmament on Monday during a visit to an arms-making plant. "We need a different pace of rearmament, which is especially important considering the adoption of a unified system of pricing for weapons," Medvedev said.

The prime minister added that recent decisions by the government to seek procurement of complete defense systems instead of disparate parts is a key part of improving Russian rearmament. He cited the situation with Iskander missile systems, which until recently have been delivered by separate elements rather than in complete sets.

"So our decision on the need for these weapon systems to be delivered in complete sets is absolutely right. Iskander M missile systems are superior to their foreign counterparts and should become the core of the Ground Forces missile units, Medvedev said.

"The Iskander M is without doubt one of the most effective systems in its class and, in our opinion, is ahead of foreign analogs," he said.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20120723/174740545.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20120723/174740545.html)

### Russia to get stronger nuclear navy, Putin says

Gleb Bryanski, *Reuters*, July

30 2012

By SEVERODVINSK, Russia (Reuters) - President Vladimir Putin oversaw the start of construction of one of Russia's newest generation submarines on Monday and vowed to boost nuclear naval forces to safeguard the country's position as a leading sea power.

Warning that its navy would protect top energy producer Russia's interests in the oil-rich Arctic, Putin led the ceremony to begin building the submarine Prince Vladimir, named after the ruler who founded a precursor state to modern Russia. The vessel is the fourth Borei class submarine, designed to carry one of the country's newest and most powerful intercontinental nuclear missiles, the Bulava, or Mace.

"We believe that our country should maintain its status of one of the leading naval powers," Putin told a meeting of naval commanders and government officials at the sprawling Sevmash shipbuilding yard in northern Russia.

Invoking Cold War rhetoric, Putin took a stab at the United States nuclear submarine forces, which Moscow carefully watched across the Atlantic Ocean for decades. "First of all we are talking about the development of the naval part of our strategic nuclear forces, about the navy's role in maintaining the strategic nuclear parity," he said.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/30/us-russia-putin-navy-idUSBRE86T1D320120730>

### Putin pushes nuclear, space defense reform

RT, 26 July, 2012

President Putin has said Russia is not planning to enter a new arms

race, but urged senior officials to develop the nuclear arsenal further, along with Russia's own air and space defenses, so that no one in the world doubts their effectiveness.

Putin was speaking at a special meeting on the state weapon program that took place in the southern Russian city of Sochi on Thursday. "We are not going to enter the arms race, but no one should have any doubts in the reliability and effectiveness of our nuclear potential, as well as the means of air and space defense," Putin told the meeting.

The president pointed out that all nations that possess nuclear weapons and means of air and space attack are currently investing in their development and perfection. They are actively developing the guidance systems and boosting the effectiveness of their observation and reconnaissance systems.

Putin again stressed that the nuclear forces were playing a key role in Russia's national security.

"The nuclear weapons remain the most important guarantee of Russia's sovereignty and territorial integrity, and play a key role in maintaining the regional balance and stability," he said.

<http://rt.com/politics/re-armament-sets-defense-priority-100/>

## Russia to Launch Construction of Fourth Borei-Class

**Sub** Global Security Newswire,

July 24, 2012

Russia is set before August to formally begin construction of its fourth Borei-class ballistic missile submarine, the country's Sevsmash shipyard said on Monday (see GSN, July 5).

Top defense, navy and sea vessel construction officials are expected to participate in marking the Russian Navy Day event at the Severodvinsk facility, ITAR-Tass reported. The planned submarine, dubbed Prince Vladimir, would be part of a planned line of upgraded "Borei-A" vessels (see GSN, Feb. 2). "The series of nuclear-powered submarines of the fourth generation, armed with the Bulava ballistic missile system, is to become the basis of Russia's naval strategic nuclear forces for the next few decades," the shipyard stated (ITAR-Tass, July 23).

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/russia-launch-construction-fourth-borei-class-sub/>

## C. China & East Asia

### China in talks to build five new reactors in UK-paper

Reuters, July 21 2012

LONDON, July 21 (Reuters) - Chinese nuclear firms are considering investing 35 billion pounds in building up to five new nuclear reactors in Britain, a newspaper reported on Saturday. A team from the Shanghai Nuclear Engineering Research and Design Institute (SNERDI), an arm of the China National Nuclear Corporation (CNNC), met senior British officials in the past week, the Guardian newspaper said on its website.

The first part of the plan would involve CNNC and another state-owned firm, China Guangdong Nuclear Power Corporation, bidding in two separate groups against each other for a stake in the Horizon project, it said.

The paper, citing unnamed sources

close to the Chinese, said the Chinese are also interested in other locations at Bradwell in Essex, in the southeast, Heysham in Lancashire and Hartlepool in County Durham, both in northern England.

“The Chinese have the money and the experience,” the paper quoted a source close to the Chinese as saying. They see setting up in the UK as an opportunity to show they can operate in one of the world’s toughest regulatory environments so they can then move into other markets in Africa and the Middle East.” The French company EDF is also interested in building new reactors in Britain.

[http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/07/21/nuclear-britain-china-idINL6E8IKHDI2012021?utm\\_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Nuclear+News+Digest&utm\\_campaign=9a14bace8a-RSS\\_EMAIL\\_CAMPAGN&utm\\_medium=email](http://in.reuters.com/article/2012/07/21/nuclear-britain-china-idINL6E8IKHDI2012021?utm_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Nuclear+News+Digest&utm_campaign=9a14bace8a-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAGN&utm_medium=email)

## South Korea “For Sure” to Get Longer Ballistic Missile Range: Minister Aug. 2,

2012, *Global Security Newswire*

South Korea’s defense chief said he was certain the United States will agree to allow his country to develop high-altitude missiles with ranges longer than those currently permitted, Agence France-Presse reported on Thursday (see GSN, July 11).

Seoul and Washington are presently discussing altering a bilateral defense agreement that currently prohibits South Korea from producing ballistic missiles with ranges longer than 186 miles or with explosive payloads greater than 1,100 pounds.

Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin told the Segye Times, “One thing I can say

for sure is that the range will be improved compared to now.” Kim said he was aiming to reach agreement with Washington on a new missile range before 2012 is over. The South argues it needs a more powerful ballistic missile arsenal to counter rival North Korea’s own ongoing missile development.

“The U.S. has agreed on the need for us to strengthen ballistic missile capability in order to better respond to North Korea’s ballistic missile threat,” the minister said (Agence France-Presse I/Asia One News, Aug. 2).

Meanwhile, the South is slated to hold routine armed forces maneuvers in mid-August on an island that is contested by the North, AFP cited a military spokesman as saying (Agence France-Presse II/Channel News Asia, Aug. 2).

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/south-korea-sure-get-longer-ballistic-missile-range-official/>

## S. Korea raises eyebrows over move to process nuclear fuel on its own Akira

Nakano, *The Asahi Shimbun*, July 24, 2012

SEOUL—South Korea is negotiating with the United States to reprocess spent nuclear fuel from its power plants and to enrich uranium, the South Korean media reported July 23. South Korea is believed to be aspiring to become a nuclear-power giant free of U.S. intervention, but the move is expected to face objections inside and outside the country due to concerns about possibly using such fuel to make nuclear weapons.

Major conservative newspapers, including the Chosun Ilbo, ran reports saying that Seoul was seeking U.S. agreement on domestic reprocessing and enrichment in talks on revising a nuclear energy agreement in place since 1974. Washington was reportedly showing reluctance, out of concerns over nuclear proliferation.

South Korean anti-nuke civic groups said the move runs counter to the wishes of South Koreans, who want a nuclear-free world.

Under the nuclear deal signed between the two nations 38 years ago, reprocessing fuel and enrichment require prior U.S. approval. It is believed the deal was sought to deter moves by President Park Chung-hee, who was pushing for a nuclear weapons program in the 1970s.

[http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/korean\\_peninsula/AJ201207240076](http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/korean_peninsula/AJ201207240076)

## **With UAE Nuclear Partnership, South Korea Gains Mideast Traction**

By Jonathan Berkshire Miller, *World Politics Review*, July 30, 2012

Earlier this month, Abu Dhabi officially green-lighted construction of its first nuclear power plant, under the stewardship of the Korea Electric Power Corporation (KEPCO), at the Braka site located just west of the Emirati capital. The historic construction marks the first nuclear power plant on the Arabian Peninsula and highlights how the oil-flush region has been forced to recalibrate its energy strategy in light of soaring demand for electricity.

The move also acts as a soft hedge against the potential weaponization of Iran's nuclear program, which is a

primary security concern for the United Arab Emirates (UAE) and its neighbors in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC). For Seoul, it represents a successful first step toward establishing itself in the region as a trusted energy and commercial partner.

Seoul's ties with the UAE became a top-tier priority after KEPCO beat out a Japanese-American consortium in 2009 for the lucrative multibillion-dollar deal to build four nuclear reactors for the emirates by 2020. The contract, reported to be worth nearly \$40 billion, was a key foreign policy coup for South Korea and another sign that it is able to forge new partnerships in regions where it previously had little diplomatic capital.

The contract remains the linchpin of bilateral relations between Seoul and Abu Dhabi, but South Korea is quickly moving to challenge Japan's established influence in the Middle East through its aggressive style of business diplomacy. The move also sends notice to China that its targeted approach to seeking energy security in Africa has consequences, with established partners in the Middle East looking elsewhere for potential relationships.

<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12211/with-uae-nuclear-partnership-south-korea-gains-mideast-traction>

## **N. Korea says will build up nuclear arsenal against U.S.**

*Yonhap News Agency*, July 31, 2012

SEOUL, July 31 (Yonhap) — North Korea vowed on Tuesday to further build up its nuclear capabilities,

accusing the United States of attempting to topple its communist regime. In a statement carried by the North's Korean Central News Agency, a spokesperson of the North Korean foreign ministry said the country will counter any U.S. hostility with the utmost resoluteness.

"While talking about the livelihood of people in other countries, the U.S. is blocking our economic development and improvement of our people's livelihood with its most vicious and persistent anti-republic sanctions," the statement said. "And for such a country to say we will be better off once we give up our nuclear weapons only reminds us of a coyote who tells a ram that it will not be eaten if it gives up its horns."

The statement said the North did not need the U.S.'s support to develop its economy now that it has nuclear capabilities and the means to further build up its stockpile.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2012/07/31/34/0301000000AEN20120731011800320F.HTML>

## **Japan government names radiation physicist as new atomic regulator head**

By Tetsushi Kajimoto, Reuters, July 26 2012

TOKYO (Reuters) - Japan's government on Thursday nominated Shunichi Tanaka, an expert in radiation physics, to head a new safety regulator, taking a step forward in its efforts to restore trust in nuclear power, shattered by last year's Fukushima disaster. But it is uncertain whether confidence can be restored with public feeling running

high against the "nuclear village" — industry officials, politicians and utility operators seen as failing to avert the disaster.

The Fukushima accident - meltdowns linked to the March 2011 earthquake and tsunami that crippled the plant - has rejuvenated the anti-nuclear movement. A rally last week drew 100,000 protesters.

The government hopes that the new safety body, to be launched in September, will instill more confidence than two current regulatory bodies, both heavily criticized for their cozy ties with the power industry. Tanaka, 67, a former deputy head of the Cabinet Office's Atomic Energy Commission, was nominated for the new safety watchdog along with four other candidates.

"We're in an extremely severe situation as to whether we can regain public confidence in the state and the administration," Environment Minister Goshi Hosono told reporters after the government put forward the nominations to parliament.

"We have selected suitable persons from the standpoint that those who have not learned a lesson from Fukushima are not qualified to be involved in nuclear energy administration." Japan restarted two reactors this month to avoid a potential blackout in the summer — all of Japan's 50 operating nuclear reactors had been taken offline for checks after the disaster. But reconnecting even two reactors to the power grid has consolidated anti-nuclear feeling.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/26/us-japan-nuclear-watchdog-idUSBRE86POLH20120726>

## Nominee for Japan Nuclear Chief Vows Higher Safety

By MARI YAMAGUCHI, *Asahi Simbun*, August 02, 2012

The government's candidate to head Japan's new nuclear regulatory body vowed Wednesday to impose stricter safety standards on utility companies that run nuclear power plants and brushed off accusations that he has a pro-industry bias.

Shunichi Tanaka is a former executive of the Japan Atomic Energy Agency, which promotes development of nuclear energy. Criticism of collusion between regulators and the nuclear industry following last year's accident at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear plant has led to the creation of a more independent regulatory body which is to be launched in September.

Tanaka's nomination to head that body has triggered protests from activists and anti-nuclear lawmakers. In a parliamentary hearing Wednesday, Tanaka said he is committed to nuclear safety and protection of people's lives. His nomination requires approval from parliament.

Tanaka said the safety standards that were used to recently restart two reactors in western Japan — the first to go back online since the crisis — are insufficient and need a full review. Japan's remaining 48 reactors are shuttered for inspections. He also said he will shut down reactors if active earthquake faults are found underneath them

<http://abcnews.go.com/International/wireStory/nominee-japan-nuclear-chief-vows-higher-safety-16903988#.UBzOlvYgfuM>

## Anti-nuclear campaigners launch Japan's first green party

Justin McCurry, *guardian.co.uk*, July 30, 2012

Members of Greens Japan during their inaugural party meeting. The party wants to emulate other green parties of Europe and influence Japan's energy policy. Photograph: Greens Japan Anti-nuclear campaigners in Japan have launched the country's first green party, more than a year after the triple meltdown at Fukushima Daiichi power plant created a groundswell of opposition to atomic energy.

Greens Japan, created by local politicians and activists, hopes to satisfy the legal requirements to become an officially recognised political party in time for the general election, which must be held by next summer but could come much earlier.

The party said it would offer voters a viable alternative to the two main parties, both of which have retained their support for nuclear power, particularly after the recent decision to restart two nuclear reactors in western Japan.

The ruling Democratic party of Japan and the minority opposition Liberal democratic party [LDP] both supported the nuclear restart, which came after Japan was briefly left without nuclear power for the first time in more than 40 years.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2012/jul/30/japan-green-party-nuclear-power>

## D. West Asia

### **‘Israel can rely on Obama to stop nuclear Iran’** By YAAKOV KATZO,

*Jerusalem Post, August 02, 2012*

Michele Flournoy, former top US defense official and Obama adviser, vows president won't allow nuclear Iran; says day after military action, unified international effort will be needed to keep Iran from restarting nuclear program.

Israel can rely on the US to take the necessary steps – including possible military action one day – to stop Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Michele Flournoy, former undersecretary of defense for policy, has told The Jerusalem Post.

Speaking following US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta's visit to Israel on Wednesday, Flournoy said Obama was serious about stopping Iran. "He chose his words carefully that the policy is not containment and I think he is serious about that," she added, giving as examples how the president has followed through on his policy statements regarding Iraq, Afghanistan and in the war against al-Qaida.

"My experience with this president is that there is no light between what he says and does. Obviously, it will be his decision at the time, but I believe there is a strong consensus to prevent this [Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon]," she added.

Flournoy – who is familiar with Israel's top defense chiefs including Defense Minister Ehud Barak and IDF Chief of Staff Lt.-Gen. Benny Gantz from her three years at the Pentagon – admitted that Israel and the US view the Iranian threat differently, and the time that remains to stop it, mostly as a result

of their different military capabilities.

She said though that both Israeli and American intelligence agencies agreed that the Iranians have not yet begun "weaponization" and that once they do so, it will still take time before they obtained a weapon. "The US view is that it is not time [for a strike]. There have just been new sanctions put in place and those take time but the screws have been turned and the impact will take several months," she said.

<http://www.jpost.com/IranianThreat/News/Article.aspx?ID=279942&R=R1>

### **Israel's intentions towards Iran – the pressing question**

Harriet Sherwood in Jerusalem,  
*Guardian, August 02, 2012*

The Obama administration is anxious to reassure Netanyahu that it is committed to tackling the Iranian nuclear threat, following Romney's visit. Speculation over whether Israel is preparing for a unilateral military strike on Iran's nuclear facilities has intensified in the past few weeks after a period in which the atmosphere was less febrile.

The visit of four senior US administration officials – the secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, the defence secretary, Leon Panetta, the national security adviser, Tom Donilon, and the counter-terrorism chief, John Brennan – suggests that Washington is renewing its efforts to rein in Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu's inclinations towards military action.

It can be assumed that the administration is also anxious to reassure Netanyahu that it is committed to tackling the Iranian

nuclear threat following presumptive Republican candidate Mitt Romney's visit to Jerusalem earlier this week. Romney, assisted by his senior aide Dan Senor, positioned himself in hawkish solidarity with Israel. Senor even suggested that Romney would back unilateral action launched by Israel, although there was some later backtracking on that stance.

The message to Israel from administration officials boils down to this: the US is serious about preventing a nuclear-armed Iran, you need to trust us on this, we will in the end use force if we have to and we are much better equipped to do so than you, so don't muck it all up by going ahead on your own. An analysis in the Jerusalem Post by Yaakov Katz summarises the debate within Israel's political and military establishment..

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/iran-blog/2012/aug/02/israel-intentions-iran-pressing-question>

## **Iran Agrees To Discuss International Concerns On Nuclear Program** *RTT News, August 03, 2012,*

(RTT News) - Iran has agreed to discuss with P5+1 international concerns about its disputed nuclear program by the month-end. This was announced by European Union Foreign Policy Chief Catherine Ashton after talks, as agreed after the Moscow meeting, with Iran's chief nuclear negotiator Saeed Jalili on Thursday on how to carry forward the talks with the Islamic Republic on the nuke issue.

"Since these talks resumed in April, I, supported by the representatives of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and

the United States of America, have explored diplomatic ways to resolve international concerns about Iran's nuclear program," she said in a statement on Friday.

Ashton said she "impressed Dr. Jalili the need for Iran now to address the issues we have raised in order to build confidence." Jalili agreed to her proposal that "we talk again after further reflection at the end of the month," she added...

[http://www.rttnews.com/1939080/iran-agrees-to-discuss-international-concerns-on-nuclear-program.aspx?type=gn&utm\\_source=google&utm\\_campaign=sitemap](http://www.rttnews.com/1939080/iran-agrees-to-discuss-international-concerns-on-nuclear-program.aspx?type=gn&utm_source=google&utm_campaign=sitemap)

## **P5+1 must recognize Iran's right to enrichment: Salehi**

*Press TV, July 31, 2012*

Iran's Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Salehi says Tehran will try to allay concerns about its nuclear energy program once the six major world powers of the P5+1 recognize its right to uranium enrichment.

In an interview with the Austrian daily, Der Standard, published on Monday, Salehi described the recognition of Iran's right to enrichment as a "matter of principle."

Commenting on the future of the talks between Iran and the P5+1 - Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States plus Germany -, Salehi said, "I can't say it with certainty, but if everything proceeds normally, then there would be further negotiations."

"No one wants a breakdown in talks, and ambiguities can only be cleared through dialogue," the Iranian foreign minister added. On July 27, Ali Akbar

Velayati, a senior advisor to Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei, said Iran and the P5+1 would proceed with their multifaceted talks to eventually achieve “positive and constructive” results.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2012/07/31/253610/p51-must-respect-iran-enrichment-right/>

## Iran military ‘will not allow enemy to advance’ in Syria *Agence*

*France-Presse*, Jul 31, 2012

TEHRAN: Iran “will not allow the enemy to advance” in Syria, but does not yet see the need to directly intervene, the deputy chief of the Islamic republic’s armed forces was quoted as saying in reports today.

“There is still no need for Syria’s circle of friends to fully enter the arena, and our assessment is that there will be no need to do so,” Brigadier General Masoud Jazayeri said, according to the Shargh daily. “In special situations, we decide how to support the regional [anti-Israeli] resistance and our friends. We shall wait to see the future situation and conditions,” he said.

“We are very sensitive when it comes to our friends in the resistance in the region, and we will not allow the enemy to advance,” he said. A senior commander in Iran’s elite Revolutionary Guards, General Hamid Reza Moqadam Far, was quoted in another newspaper, Kayhan, saying that Syrian civilians were now fighting rebels alongside the regime’s troops.

<http://www.thenational.ae/news/world/middle-east/iran-military-will-not-allow-enemy-to-advance-in-syria>

## Diplomats: Iran nuke talks remain stalled

George Jahn, *Huffington Post*, July 27, 2012

VIENNA — A senior EU official is reporting no progress in the newest international push to persuade Iran to curb activities that could be used to make nuclear weapons, leaving the resumption of high-stakes negotiations with Tehran in doubt, diplomats said Friday.

A meeting Tuesday between senior EU envoy Helga Schmid and Ali Bagheri, Iran’s deputy nuclear negotiator, was an attempt to restart top-level nuclear talks between Tehran and six world powers after the last round in Moscow fizzled on June 19.

Neither side wants to give up the talks. Iran seeks relief from sanctions, including recently enacted international embargoes on its oil, its main source of revenue. The U.S and other countries at the table with Tehran fear that the failure of negotiations could prompt Israel to make good on its threat to attack Tehran’s nuclear installations – a move that could draw Washington into the conflict.

The six want the Islamic Republic to end enriching uranium to a level that can be turned quickly into fissile warhead material. Tehran refuses, says it is enriching only to make nuclear fuel and medical isotopes and insists it has a right to enrich under international law. With no progress back in June, the two sides agreed to kick the talks down to low-level experts in an attempt to better understand each-others’ positions.

That expert meeting in June was followed by the Schmid-Bagheri talks, which looked for signs of possible nearing of positions. But one of two diplomats told The Associated Press that Schmid has reported “no progress” to EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton, who in turn is informing the six powers – the U.S., Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany – of the results of the meeting.

<http://www.huffingtonpost.com/huffwires/20120727/iran-nuclear/>

## Iran: Nuclear Negotiators Meet; No Progress Reported

By Rick Gladstone, *New York Times*, July 25, 2012

Envoys for Iran and the group of six nations negotiating with it over its nuclear program met in Istanbul on Tuesday in an effort to narrow differences. There was no indication whether they made progress, and no indication when another meeting might be held. The discussions followed a meeting on July 3 between lower-level technical experts from both sides.

The six nations, the five permanent Security Council members and Germany, have demanded that Iran stop enriching uranium to 20 percent purity, export its stockpile and close a heavily fortified enrichment facility. Iran, which has insisted its nuclear program is peaceful, has indicated a possible willingness to discuss these demands but wants all sanctions terminated and an acknowledgment of its right to enrich uranium.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/25/world/middleeast/iran-nuclear-negotiators-meet-no-progress-reported.html>

## Iran atomic chief pours cold water on n-ship idea

Tehran (AFP)

July 22, 2012

Iran’s atomic chief on Sunday undercut an idea put forward by some lawmakers to make nuclear-powered submarines and ships, even though he claimed Tehran had the technology to do so later if it wished. The comments by Fereydoon Abbasi Davani, head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organisation, as reported by the news agency ISNA, poured cold water on a recent draft bill by some Iranian parliamentarians that seeks to give Tehran a reason to produce high-enriched uranium.

“We don’t have a plan right now in this area,” Abbasi Davani was quoted as saying. He asserted, though, that “we do have the ability to design such reactors for ships” if a decision was made to go in that direction.

Enrichment is at the heart of the showdown between Iran and the West over Tehran’s nuclear programme. Iran, which currently enriches uranium up to 20 percent, ostensibly to make medical isotopes in its Tehran research reactor, insists its programme is exclusively peaceful.

[http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Iran\\_atomic\\_chief\\_pours\\_cold\\_water\\_on\\_n-ship\\_idea\\_999.html](http://www.spacewar.com/reports/Iran_atomic_chief_pours_cold_water_on_n-ship_idea_999.html)

## Understanding Iran’s Right to Enrichment

By Nathan Donohue, *CSIS*, July 23, 2012

The Wall Street Journal recently featured an article on their Opinion page entitled “Iran Has No ‘Right’ to

Enrich Uranium.” The article, written by Michael Makovsky and Blaise Misztal of the Bipartisan Policy Center’s Foreign Policy Project, discussed Iran’s right to enrich uranium, or lack thereof.

Iran maintains that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) defends their right to uranium enrichment, which they are currently conducting in facilities such as the underground Fordow Fuel Enrichment Plant outside of Qom. For almost a decade Iran has maintained that the recognition of this right is a prerequisite for Iranian participation in nuclear talks.

As Iran’s chief negotiator stipulated in September 2004, “no international body can force Iran” to legally cease its peaceful nuclear activities, but that Iran might choose voluntarily to suspend enrichment, albeit with the right to resume enrichment later. However, Makovsky and Misztal purport that the NPT does not specifically enumerate this right to enrichment and that “nothing in the NPT implies a right to possess all, especially potentially military, elements of nuclear technology.” With a firmly established treaty in place, why is there this ongoing debate?

To begin, it is important to understand what is written in Article IV of the NPT. Article IV states: Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all the Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of this Treaty.

<http://csis.org/blog/understanding-irans-right-enrichment>

## **Panetta: no Iran attack plans to be discussed with Israel**

Phil Stewart, *Reuters*, July 31 2012

CAIRO (Reuters) - U.S. Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta denied media reports on Tuesday that he would discuss possible military attack plans against Iran during a brief visit to Israel. Speaking at a press conference in Cairo shortly before departing for Israel, Panetta said he would be talking about “various contingencies”, but said specific military plans would not be put forward.

“I think it’s the wrong characterization to say we are going to be discussing potential attack plans. What we are discussing are various contingencies and how we would respond,” he said. Asked whether these included military options, he said: “We obviously continue to work on a number of options in that area, but the discussions that I hope to have with Israel are going to be more about what is the threat that we’re confronting and to try to share both information and intelligence on that.”

Western powers believe Iran is seeking the technology to build a nuclear bomb and Israel has repeatedly hinted it might use force to try to halt its arch foe’s atomic program. Tehran says its nuclear work is for peaceful purposes. The United States has said it is determined to prevent Iran from getting the bomb, but has called on Israel to give more time for increasingly severe economic sanctions to work.

“Both of our countries are committed to ensuring that Iran does not develop a nuclear weapon and to that extent we continue to work together in the effort to ensure that Iran does not reach that point of developing a nuclear weapon,” Panetta said. Top selling Israeli daily Yedioth Ahronoth said on Tuesday that Panetta intended to show Israeli leaders the plans being drawn up by the Pentagon to stop Iran if diplomacy and sanctions failed to persuade Tehran to halt its nuclear program.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/07/31/us-usa-israel-iran-idUSBRE86U18J20120731>

## Iran to take legal action against US, EU over sanctions:

**Official** *Press TV*, Jul 29, 2012

Iran will take a legal action against the United States and Europe for imposing unilateral sanctions on the Islamic Republic out of the auspices of the UN Security Council, an Iranian official says. “The complaint will be registered and pursued soon based on international regulations,” Head of the Presidential Center for International Legal Affairs Majid Jafarzadeh said on Sunday.

He added that supporting national interests, which mainly include ways to counter hostile measures by Western powers in slapping restrictions and unilateral and multilateral sanctions on Iran, is a top priority at the center. The center has carried out various measures to counter sanctions and oppose measures by big powers against the Islamic Republic, the official pointed out. Jafarzadeh expressed the center’s readiness to provide consultation to Iranian ministries and state organizations and added that the body is also ready to help individuals

who are arrested for refusing to implement the US-engineered sanctions.

At the beginning of 2012, the United States and the European Union (EU) approved new sanctions against Iran’s oil and financial sectors. The embargoes aim to prevent other countries from purchasing Iranian oil or transacting with the Central Bank of Iran.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2012/07/29/253320/iran-to-take-legal-action-against-west/>

## Iran Completes Cleanup of Suspect Nuclear Site, Group Says

Terry Atlas, *Bloomberg*,

August 01, 2012

Satellite images show that Iran has completed cleanup activity at a suspected nuclear weapons-related site, a Washington-based research group said today.

The Parchin military complex attracted international attention early this year when the United Nations’ nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna, sought to inspect the site because of suspected undeclared nuclear activities.

The Institute for Science and International Security, a Washington-based non-profit research group, reported in May that satellite images taken in April indicated that Iran had begun substantial earth removal and other activities at the site to eliminate evidence of nuclear weapons work.

“Over the subsequent four months there was considerable activity with the razing of two buildings within the

site, notable earth removal and displacement, the likely cleanup of the inside of the suspect building and possibly its exterior surfaces, the removal of the security perimeter, and the removal of all roadways,” according to the report today by David Albright, president of the non-profit research group, and Robert Avagyan.

“The degree of the site’s modification and the fact that this apparent cleanup work started soon after the IAEA’s request for access cast further doubt on Iran’s claims that its nuclear program does not or has never had any military aspects,” they wrote.

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-08-01/iran-completes-cleanup-of-suspect-nuclear-site-group-says>

## Deal Struck to Tighten Sanctions Against Iran THE

*ASSOCIATED PRESS*, July 31, 2012

WASHINGTON (AP) — House and Senate negotiators reached an agreement Monday night on a new round of sanctions against Iran, cracking down on energy, shipping and insurance sectors with punitive measures intended to derail what the West suspects is Tehran’s push to be able to build nuclear weapons. Lawmakers filed a final bill late Monday, with a House vote expected as early as Wednesday in the last week of work for Congress before its August recess.

“The bill sends a clear message to the Iranian regime that the U.S. is committed, through the use of sanctions, to preventing Iran from crossing the nuclear threshold,” said Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, the Florida Republican who is chairwoman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Senator Tim

Johnson, the South Dakota Democrat who is chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, said the bill reconciled the House and Senate bills and incorporated new provisions from lawmakers. He vowed to help pass it in the Senate before Congress adjourned.

Unless Iranians “come clean on their nuclear program, end the suppression of their people and stop supporting terrorist activities, they will face deepening international isolation and even greater economic and diplomatic pressure,” Mr. Johnson said.

The two lawmakers and their staff members worked for weeks to come up with a bill. Sanctions have broad bipartisan support in Congress, and officials at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, the powerful pro-Israel lobbying group, said they supported the legislation.

Any company shipping proliferation-sensitive goods to Iran would be subject to penalties under the bill, a provision pushed by Senator Robert Menendez, Democrat of New Jersey. The bill would target the National Iranian Tanker Company, the state-run company and shipping line, as the measure tries to undermine the ways Iran ships oil.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/31/world/middleeast/deal-struck-to-tighten-sanctions-against-iran.html?\\_r=2&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/31/world/middleeast/deal-struck-to-tighten-sanctions-against-iran.html?_r=2&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss)

## Iran vows to counter any cyber attacks on nuclear facilities

*English.news.cn*, July 26, 2012

TEHRAN, July 26 (Xinhua) — Iran has vowed to counter any cyber attacks on its nuclear facilities, Tehran Times

daily reported on Thursday. An unnamed official at Cyber Command of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of Iran's Armed Forces Headquarters said that the Islamic republic will give a strong response to any possible cyber attacks on the country's nuclear facilities, Tehran Times said.

"They should be aware that Iran will give a proper response to any act of defiance," the official was quoted as saying in response to reports about possible cyber attacks on Iran's nuclear facilities. The Washington Post reported on Wednesday that two of Iran's uranium-enrichment plants were struck by a cyber attack earlier this week that shut down computers.

The virus closed down the automation network at Iran's Natanz and Fordow facilities, said the report. In June, Washington Post reported that the United States and Israel had jointly developed a computer virus known as "flame" targeting Iran's nuclear ability.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2012-07/26/c\\_131741432.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2012-07/26/c_131741432.htm)

## Iran to Open Cases against Nuclear Terrorism at National Courts

*Fars News Agency, July*

24, 2012

TEHRAN (FNA)- The Iranian parliament plans to file complaints at the country's courts against those responsible for nuclear terrorism against Iran before filing similar lawsuits at the international courts, a senior Iranian lawmaker stated.

"The committee against nuclear terrorism plans to lodge complaints with domestic courts before filling any lawsuit against the nuclear terrorists at international courts," Rapporteur of

the parliament's Legal and Judicial Commission Mohammad Ali Esfanani told FNA on Tuesday.

He said the parliament will ask Iranian courts to punish the elements and the masterminds of terror attacks on Iran's nuclear scientists and cyber attacks on Iran's infrastructures. Esfanani further noted that everybody, even the CIA chief, will be legally sued by Iran if they are convicted in an Iranian court.

In similar remarks on Saturday, Chairman of the parliament's Legal and Judicial Commission Allahyar Malekshahi said that the Iranian parliament's Public and International Rights Committee plans to file a lawsuit at international legal bodies against nuclear terrorists.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=9104251236>

## Saudis 'mull buying nukes from Pakistan'

*UPI.com, July 25, 2012*

RIYADH, Saudi Arabia, July 25 (UPI) — King Abdallah of Saudi Arabia met Pakistani Prime Minister Raja Pervez Ashraf in Jeddah a few days ago as Riyadh began sending its Special Forces to Pakistan for training.

The Islamic countries, both dominated by the mainstream Sunni sect, have long had a particularly close relationship and these events heightened speculation Riyadh is trying to strike a secret deal with Islamabad to acquire nuclear weapons to counter Iran.

Abdallah's surprise July 19 appointment of Prince Bandar bin Sultan, the kingdom's ambassador in Washington in 1983-2005 and a veteran of its usually clandestine

security policy, as his new intelligence chief may be part of murky mosaic linking Saudi Arabia and Pakistan.

Bandar played a key role in the clandestine arming of by the United States and Saudi Arabia, via Pakistan's intelligence service, of the Afghan mujahedin during the 1969-79 Soviet invasion. Bandar's appointment as the head of Saudi Arabia's General Intelligence Presidency, its foreign intelligence service, was one of several critical security related command changes made in recent days.

These took place as the kingdom, the world's largest oil exporter, faces a swarm of regional challenges, the most prominent of which is nuclear wannabe Iran. As the confrontation between the United States and Iran over Tehran nuclear program builds up in the Persian Gulf, Riyadh is increasingly looking eastward to longtime ally Pakistan, the only nuclear Muslim power, for support.

[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/Special/2012/07/25/Saudis-mull-buying-nukes-from-Pakistan/UPI-94601343239152/print#ixzz22YjcSosk](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Special/2012/07/25/Saudis-mull-buying-nukes-from-Pakistan/UPI-94601343239152/print#ixzz22YjcSosk)

## **Saudis, Emirates push nuclear power plans**

*UPI.com, July 26, 2012*

RIYADH, Saudi Arabia, July 26 (UPI) — RIYADH, Saudi Arabia, July 26 (UPI) — Saudi Arabia is pressing ahead with its ambitious plans to develop nuclear power to meet rising electricity demand and save oil for export. But the outlook for other Arab states is less promising because of political turmoil and a lack of financial resources.

The Saudis have built a foreign assets cushion of around \$500 billion from oil exports. It has used this immense wealth to buy its way out of trouble;

for instance, heading off pro-democracy protests with massive social spending in recent years. But, the Middle East Economic Digest observed, "a more serious set of challenges now faces the kingdom that threaten to be even more destabilizing.

"Inefficient and wasteful energy consumption, coupled with a rising population, is leading the kingdom to burn even more of its natural resources at home rather than selling them abroad and adding to the proceeds of the half-trillion-dollar cash pile. "

Unless action is taken, the kingdom could find it needs the oil price to be \$320 a barrel by 2030 just to balance the budget," the weekly, published in the United Arab Emirates, warned. Nuclear power is seen as the solution. But, as MEED stressed, "time is of the essence." For one thing, Saudi Arabia and other Arab states, including the United Arab Emirates, Kuwait, Qatar and Egypt, have no wish to lag any further behind Iran and Israel in developing nuclear technologies.

[http://www.upi.com/Business\\_News/Energy-Resources/2012/07/26/Saudis-Emirates-push-nuclear-power-plans/UPI-96201343332843/print#ixzz22ZCordNN](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Energy-Resources/2012/07/26/Saudis-Emirates-push-nuclear-power-plans/UPI-96201343332843/print#ixzz22ZCordNN)

## **Turkey's New Ballistic Missile Program Raises Eyebrows and Concerns**

*Aaron Stein, World Politics Review, July 31, 2012*

Turkey's defense procurements to date have focused heavily on defensive systems aimed at the

former Soviet Union and offensive systems designed to attack the Kurdistan Workers Party (PKK). Backed by the safety and security offered by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's collective security guarantee, as well as between 60 and 70 American tactical nuclear weapons stationed on Turkish soil, Ankara revamped its national security strategy in October 2010.

In a sharp departure from the past, Ankara announced that it was removing old foes Iran, Iraq, Greece and Russia from the list of countries considered to be a threat and embarking on a more inclusive foreign policy.

While the events of the past 18 months have altered Turkey's security situation, Ankara has not announced any changes to its 2010 defense policy. Turkey remains committed to its long-standing pursuit of defeating its Kurdish insurgency, establishing regional stability and securing economic and political influence in neighboring countries. Therefore, Turkey's recent announcement that it intends to develop 1,500-mile medium-range ballistic missiles is a bit baffling. The missile is not useful for the fight against the PKK, nor is it entirely clear whom Ankara will aim it at.

<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/12216/turkeys-new-ballistic-missile-program-raises-eyebrows-and-concerns>

## **Turkey begins work on ICBM** *Reuters, August 4 2012*

The Turkish Armed Forces have begun working on a project to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), broadcaster NTV reported on its website today.

A decision to launch the project was made in a July 17 meeting of the Defense Industry Executive Board, headed by Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdoğan and Chief of General Staff Gen. Necdet Özel. Erdoğan had previously requested that the military develop missiles with a 2,500-kilometer range.

The board decided to form a satellite launch center that would have a two-fold effect on Turkey's aerospace and military endeavors. First, the center will enable Turkey to place its own satellites in orbit, and second, the center will allow the Turkish military to launch missiles that can navigate outside of the Earth's atmosphere. Attaining an ICBM launch capability is reportedly the chief aim of the satellite launch center.

<http://www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-begins-work-on-icbm-.aspx?pageID=238&nid=26211>

## **E. India**

### **Nuke capable missile Agni-II user trial soon**

*By Hemant Kumar Rout, The New Indian Express, August 02, 2012*

After the BrahMos fiasco, the DRDO scientists are flexing their muscles for a successful user trial of 2000-km range nuclear capable Agni-II ballistic missile before the country goes into the celebration mode for the Independence Day.

Sources said a team of defence scientists and the personnel of Indian army are busy integrating the missile components and tracking systems at the Wheeler Island based test facility off the Odisha coast. The missile has

been scheduled to be test fired any time in between August 10 and 12.

Though the DRDO had planned a couple of test flights of pilot-less target aircraft (PTA) 'Lakshya' from the Integrated Test Range (ITR) prior to the Agni-II trial, all have reportedly been postponed after the unsuccessful test firing of BrahMos cruise missile.

On Sunday, the Indo-Russian joint venture missile BrahMos crashed mid-air after a vertical lift-up and fell into the Bay of Bengal before covering its pre-coordinated flight path. The trial also failed to validate the performances of some newer systems manufactured by Indian industries and incorporated in the missile system for the first time.

While with the missile components manufactured by the Russian industries earlier the same BrahMos has proved its capability making it the most sophisticated and maneuverable missile in the world, the India made apparatuses have put the missile scientists in a fix...

<http://newindianexpress.com/states/orissa/article581571.ece>

## US Keen to Help India in Ballistic Missile Programme

PTI, July 23, 2012

With India in the process of putting in place an indigenous Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) shield, the US today expressed interest in having cooperation in this area. "That is an important potential area for our future cooperation," visiting US Deputy Defence Secretary Ashton Carter said.

"I think BMD has great strategic importance and, therefore, the two governments should discuss that strategically before they discuss that

technically," he said while addressing a function here organised by CII. He was asked if the US and India could work together to develop a BMD shield to showcase their strategic relations. India is already working towards developing a missile defence shield on its own and is in the process of deploying its systems in Delhi and Mumbai. The two countries had earlier discussed the issue at several platforms.

"I am wary of showcases probably because it should have strategic and economic sense. It is fine to have symbolic sense but first and foremost it should have strategic and economic sense," Carter said. On the US stressing more on cooperation than trade in its ties in the defence sector with India, he said the two countries want to get out of the buyer-seller relationship and want to work on co-development of projects.

<http://news.outlookindia.com/items.aspx?artid=769753>

## India quietly gate crashes into submarine-launched ballistic missiles club?

Rajat Pandit, *Times News Network*, July 31, 2012

NEW DELHI: India in April yanked open the door of the exclusive ICBM (intercontinental ballistic missile) club with the first test of Agni-V. Now, if DRDO is to be believed, India has quietly gate-crashed into an even more exclusive club of nuclear-tipped submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs).

The annual awards function of the Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) on Tuesday will see PM Manmohan Singh hand over

the “technology leadership award” to a scientist, A K Chakrabarti of the Hyderabad-based DRDL lab, for the “successful development” of the country’s first SLBM. Apart from India, this capability has been acquired only by four nations, the US, Russia, France and China. Now, the SLBM system is ready for induction,” says the award citation.

Long shrouded in secrecy as a “black project”, unlike the surface-to-surface nuclear missiles like Agni, the SLBM may now finally come out of the closet. Called different names at different developmental phases, which included “Sagarika” for an extended period, the SLBM in question is the “K-15” missile with a 750-km strike range.

Celebrations, however, may be a little premature. Much like the over 5,000-km Agni-V that will be fully operational only by 2015 after four-to-five “repeatable tests”, the K-15 is also still some distance away from being deployed.

[http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-07-31/india/32960409\\_1\\_agni-v-slbms-ins-arihant](http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-07-31/india/32960409_1_agni-v-slbms-ins-arihant)

## **Indian Nuclear Forces, 2012** Hans M. Kristensen, Robert S. Norris, *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, July 20012

In April 2012, India successfully test-launched the Agni V ballistic missile—and though the missile needs more testing and is still several years away from operational deployment, the Agni V introduces a new dynamic to the already complex triangular security relationship among India, Pakistan, and China.

India is estimated to have produced approximately 520 kilograms of weapons-grade plutonium, sufficient

for 100–130 nuclear warheads; however, not all of the material has been converted into warheads. Based on available information about its nuclear-capable delivery vehicles, the authors estimate that India has produced 80–100 nuclear warheads. In this article, the authors explore how the country will need even more warheads to arm the new missiles it is currently developing....

<http://bos.sagepub.com/content/68/4/96.full>

## **India to use “plutonium” reactor in two years: Atomic Energy Commission**

*Economic Times*, July 26, 2012

INDORE: Describing India as self-reliant in nuclear energy, Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) Chairman Dr R K Sinha today said that due to shortage of uranium, India would start using “plutonium” based nuclear reactor in the second phase of its programme at Kalpakkam in two years.

It would be a “prototype fast breeder” (PFB) that has been indigenously designed and technologically sound, Dr Sinha, who is also Secretary, Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) told reporters after a convocation ceremony at Raja Ramanna Centre for Advanced Technology here today. Indian industries have played an important role in making the prototype fast breeder a success, he said, adding that many other countries were working on such fast breeders.

Dr Sinha said that until now, during the first phase of its nuclear programme, Indian reactors have been using uranium which was not

abundantly available in the country and hence plutonium, a trans-uranic radioactive material would be used in fast breeder reactors.

After using uranium in existing and running reactors, plutonium has been obtained. This could be used in upcoming reactors after re-processing, he added. In the third phase, thorium would be used in nuclear reactors, he said.

[http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-07-26/news/32869614\\_1\\_ahwr-reactors-kalpakkam?utm\\_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Nuclear+News+Digest&utm\\_campaign=5a64354dd0-RSS\\_EMAIL\\_CAMPAIGN&utm\\_medium=email](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2012-07-26/news/32869614_1_ahwr-reactors-kalpakkam?utm_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Nuclear+News+Digest&utm_campaign=5a64354dd0-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN&utm_medium=email)

## **Gorakhpur farmers paid Rs 182 crore for land acquired for N-plant: Hry**

*Press Trust of India, August 04, 2012*

The Haryana government has so far compensated 375 farmers by paying them Rs 182 crore for the 592 acres of land acquired for the proposed Gorakhpur nuclear plant in Fatehabad district of Haryana, an official said on Thursday. Fatehabad revenue officer Ram Singh Bishnoi said the farmers of Gorakhpur, Baropal and Kajalheri villages had been paid the money.

The state government's announcement came even as former army chief Gen (ret'd) VK Singh, who had been in the news for the date of birth controversy at the fag-end of his career, on Tuesday lent support to farmers protesting against the nuclear plant. Gen Singh had asked the state government to reconsider the proposal.

The revenue officer said the Rs 182 crore had been paid ever since the state government had on July 18

announced an increased compensation of Rs 46 lakh per acre for the farmers, whose land had to be acquired.

The protest by farmers protesting against the nuclear plant has often taken political overtones. Political part Indian National Lok Dal has often opposed the plant, citing safety issues. The state government, on the other hand, has maintained that the power plant was required to meet the growing demand for electricity.

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/StoryPage/Print/907179.aspx>

## **Who pays in case of accident at Kudankulam, asks PM**

Special Correspondent, *The Hindu*, August 3, 2012

According to NDTV, the Prime Minister asked the DAE how the provisions of the 2010 Act could be overruled and suggested the matter be referred to the Ministries of Law and Justice and External Affairs. Activists citing concerns about the fate of local residents in the event of an accident at the Kudankulam nuclear power plant received a boost from an unexpected source with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh questioning the Department of Atomic Energy's decision to waive its legal right to claim damages against the NPP's Russian suppliers.

On Thursday, NDTV disclosed that Dr. Singh, who is also the Minister for Atomic Energy, has objected to a request by the Nuclear Power Corporation of India Ltd. — the operator of the Kudankulam facility — to waive its right to recourse under Section 17 of the Nuclear Liability Act if an accident in the yet-to-be-built

units 3 and 4 results from faulty equipment.

A senior PMO official confirmed to The Hindu that the Prime Minister had raised certain questions and that the DAE's answers were being awaited.

Under the terms of the December 2008 Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between Russia and India for the supply of units 1 and 2, the entire liability burden for accident-related damage must be borne by the Indian operator. Under Russian pressure, the DAE and NPCIL agreed last month that the same liability condition would carry over to units 3 and 4 despite the provisions of the Nuclear Liability Act, which became law in 2010. The DAE told the Cabinet Committee on Security that this was permissible since India had already committed itself in 2008 to making the Indian operator fully liable for any damages resulting from an accident.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/article3718602.ece>

## F. Pakistan

### Regular military exchanges between Pakistan and China to further strengthen strategic ties *Associate Press*

*of Pakistan, July 30, 2012*

(APP): Regular exchanges between the armed forces of Pakistan and China would deepen the existing strategic ties and give further push to the all-weather and time-tested friendship between the two countries. Ambassador Masood Khan expressed these views while speaking at an impressive graduation ceremony of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Aviation Industry Corporation of China (AVIC)-Pakistan Air Force (PAF) Officer Development Programme

(APOD) held in Beijing Saturday.

The Pakistan Envoy in China expressed deepest appreciation to AVIC, China National Aero-Technology Import and Export Corporation (CATIC), and the AVIC University for organizing an advanced and sophisticated programme with rich contents for the participants from the PAF.

The next step should be closer ties between AVIC University and the PAF, said Ambassador Masood Khan. The APOD is a one-month course conducted by the AVIC University for officers from the Engineering Branch of the PAF. The course is especially designed to impart knowledge to the participants in a wide range of general and technical subjects. At the heart of this course lies the deep trust between the government, people and institutions of China and Pakistan, said Ambassador Masood Khan. He said that PAF is playing an important role in the defence of Pakistan and we are proud of its achievements. The interface between PAF and AVIC University would open new avenues of cooperation, he added.

Praising the role of AVIC in China's aviation industry, Ambassador Masood Khan said that the AVIC University is leading Chinese aviation industry's academic competence and practical performance. PAF is proud of its association with AVIC and CATIC, he said.

Terming the friendship between Pakistan and China as legendary, Masood Khan said that the PAF and AVIC/CATIC have played a key role in cementing the defence ties between the two countries. They have collaborated in co-producing an advanced technological platform in

the form of JF-17 fighter aircraft, he added. In Pakistan, JF-17 aircraft has become a symbol of Pakistan-China friendship, said Masood Khan. "This is our countries' pride," he said.

[http://app.com.pk/en\\_/index.php?option=com\\_content&task=view&id=203561&Itemid=2](http://app.com.pk/en_/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=203561&Itemid=2)

## **Pakistan, Indonesia, Kazakhstan among countries at nuke security workshop at Y-12**

*Knoxnews.com, August 02, 2012*

More than 20 countries sent representatives to the World Institute for Nuclear Security (WINS) workshop held this week at the Y-12 nuclear weapons plant, according to info from the National Nuclear Security Administration.

Countries represented at the workshop included Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Indonesia, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Lithuania, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Nigeria, Pakistan, South Africa, Spain, Taiwan, The Netherlands, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and, of course, the United States.

It was the first ever workshop in the U.S. for WINS. It was co-sponsored by NNSA and the Defense Department.

According to the NNSA, the work involved best security practices for nuclear power plant, as well as other types of major nuclear facilities — including weapons sites.

NNSA's Douglas Freemont said in a statement that the workshop helps with efforts to secure "the safety, security and effectiveness of the nuclear deterrent, in addition to

securing vulnerable nuclear material around the world and strengthening nuclear nonproliferation."

<http://blogs.knoxnews.com/munger/2012/06/akistan-indonesia-kazakhstan.html>

## **G. Opinions**

### **It's Not as Easy as 1-2-3**

Jeffrey Lewis, Foreign Policy, August 1, 2012

The Obama team fights over how to promote nuclear energy without promoting nuclear weapons.

You may not have noticed — hardly anyone has — but Barack Obama's administration is rewriting the rules governing the global trade in civil nuclear technology. The revisions are the most significant in three decades, and the outcome will probably determine whether the anticipated expansion of nuclear power in the developing world — the so-called nuclear renaissance — happens without a corresponding spread of nuclear weapons programs.

In 2009, the United States seemed to signal a hard-line approach when it agreed to cooperate with the United Arab Emirates (UAE) on civilian nuclear technology only on the condition that the country not pursue the ability to enrich uranium to make fresh nuclear fuel or to reprocess plutonium from spent nuclear fuel to recycle it in reactors. These technologies, as every casual Iran watcher now knows, are the same as those used to make fissile material for a nuclear bomb. Officials from George W. Bush's administration subsequently described the UAE pledge as the "gold standard" for new nuclear cooperation accords — known as "123 agreements."

The Obama administration has been more hesitant, saying instead that each new 123 agreement would be negotiated on a case-by-case basis. In other words, the administration would try to replicate the ban on enrichment and reprocessing when possible, while strongly suggesting that the UAE was a unique circumstance. That disappointed many nonproliferation experts — both within the administration and without — who believed that Washington was surrendering an opportunity to stem the spread of enrichment and reprocessing technology, even as the president continued to warn of the danger from weapons-usable nuclear material falling into the wrong hands. The gold standard languished in another policy review while the administration continued to negotiate 123 agreements — until last week anyway, when, according to a report published in *National Journal*, the State Department made a play for a new 123 agreement with Taiwan.

The Obama administration largely finds itself an accidental architect of the new civil nuclear order. In addition to a new wave of countries seeking nuclear help from the United States, many 123 agreements that were negotiated 30 years ago — during the last wave of enthusiasm for nuclear power — will expire between now and 2014. When this flurry of activity ends, the United States will have negotiated more than a dozen nuclear cooperation agreements in a four-year period, many with the most important emerging nuclear powers. Dick Stratford, a senior State Department official, told a conference that he carried around a little list in his pocket because he had trouble keeping all the negotiations straight.

Although the moment is largely one of circumstance, the Obama

administration has revealed a distinct philosophical approach, taking a market-oriented approach to discouraging new countries from building their own facilities for enrichment and reprocessing (sometimes called “ENR”). In practice this means exploring how to offer fuel-cycle services at reasonable prices and providing assurances that states that rely on the market, rather than their own capabilities, will not have their supply of fuel disrupted.

The thinking goes that the United States can best discourage states from developing their own enrichment and reprocessing capabilities by ensuring that the nuclear industry provides such comprehensive fuel services as part of any agreement to sell nuclear reactors. If that helps U.S. industry and its international partners, all the better. (This is not yet a capability that U.S. industry can provide, particularly in the arena of taking back spent nuclear fuel.) The Obama administration has also supported the creation of separate U.S. and International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) “fuel banks” that would provide states that relied on the market a supplier of last resort in the event of a disruption in the supply of nuclear fuel.

Before joining the Obama administration, Deputy Energy Secretary Daniel Poneman outlined a very similar approach in a 2004 article written with three colleagues titled “Making the World Safe for Nuclear Energy.” A wag might note that a better goal is making nuclear energy safe for the world, but no matter. The best way to prevent the spread of ENR technology, Poneman and his colleagues argued, was to rely on “market forces ... supplemented by government-to-government

assurances that fuel services to users not be withheld for any reason other than a material violation of international non-proliferation commitments.” This approach was decidedly all carrot and no stick because, Poneman and his colleagues warned, trying to dictate who is allowed to enrich and reprocess and who is not “will almost certainly ignite debates and passions that are more likely to strangle than to promote the prospects of this regime.” Attempting to impose ENR restrictions, they concluded, might actually spur proliferation.

Creating market incentives to discourage the spread of enrichment and reprocessing seems like a reasonable thing to do — except that most states make nuclear decisions on something other than a cost basis. Nuclear power enthusiasts have been no strangers to wishful thinking, starting with claims that nuclear energy would be “too cheap to meter.” Government decisions about nuclear power tend to prioritize concerns about sovereignty and keeping technological pace with neighbors. It is not hard to see national nuclear programs as something akin to national airlines — money-losing prestige projects that barely take market forces into account. Often, aspiring nuclear states look to countries like the United States and Japan as models. If such countries invest heavily in fuel-cycle services, developing states might try to copy them rather than simply become their customers.

That’s why others in the nonproliferation community have argued that the United States should use its desirability as a partner in nuclear cooperation as leverage. States are unlikely to forgo ENR programs simply because the United States or others offer cheap alternatives. A little muscle is called for — and

circumstances have offered leverage: With more than a dozen new agreements to be negotiated, the Obama administration has an opportunity to write into many agreements a new, stronger nonproliferation standard.

So far, however, the administration has been reluctant to put the squeeze on potential partners. Many Obama officials took the view outlined by Poneman in his article — that asking states to renounce ENR could make the situation worse. (It is important to note that I am not aware of Poneman’s view inside the interagency deliberations.) So the administration has largely avoided pressuring states to renounce enrichment and reprocessing capabilities. Despite early talk of the “gold standard,” this January the administration announced it would take what officials described as a case-by-case approach. In bureaucratic terms, this amounts to having no standard at all. It is hard to imagine a less restrictive policy. I suppose the administration could announce it would not even try. As it is, they will try — but not very hard.

The reaction on Capitol Hill to the “case-by-case” approach was bipartisan and hostile, in no small part because the UAE’s pledge contains an “out” in the event another country in the region receives a 123 agreement without a “no ENR” pledge. It is one thing to not get a nonproliferation pledge; it is another thing to lose such a pledge, especially in a region as volatile and proliferation-prone as the Middle East. The possibility of losing the nonproliferation assurance in the UAE agreement became a central matter in negotiations with Jordan, and it looms as an issue with Saudi Arabia. Congressional Democrats and Republicans, including Howard

Berman and Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, have introduced different pieces of legislation that would make it very difficult for any new 123 agreements that did not contain a pledge to forgo enrichment and reprocessing to receive approval on the Hill. In response, the Obama administration announced it would undertake another review. But it keeps negotiating.

Enter Taiwan. According to the National Journal report, the Obama administration, through an interagency review process, had agreed that it would not begin negotiation of a new 123 agreement with Taiwan until 2013 or 2014. Instead, it would first pursue its negotiations with a series of other countries such as South Korea. The State Department suddenly jumped Taiwan to the front of the line, sending a draft 123 agreement to the Energy Department — at a time when that department was busy with other matters — that contained a “no ENR” provision basically identical to the one found in the UAE agreement.

Why? Because someone in the State Department is apparently not willing to give up on the gold standard. Like many interagency fights, a battle over process is really a battle over substance. In this case, the order the agreements are negotiated may matter a great deal. Proponents of the gold standard would rather start with their best chance, hoping to create a precedent for following agreements. Taiwan is almost certainly the most likely candidate to make a no-ENR pledge because it has very little leverage. Taiwan is not a state, and it is not a member of the IAEA. Its safeguards agreements are administered through the United States. If Taiwan walks away from its agreement with the United States, it has no other partners. We should not be at all surprised that someone at the State Department who would put a no-

ENR provision in the Taiwan draft would also try to jump it forward in the queue.

By the same token, if you believe that the “gold standard” is a dangerous illusion that will prevent the United States from reaching many important 123 agreements, you do not want to negotiate with Taiwan first. You would see Taiwan in the same way you see the UAE — a sui generis case unlikely to be replicated that creates a misleading impression about U.S. leverage over certain partners. And you would hope no one spoke Latin.

Happily, I can explain this in plain English: “One is an accident; two is a coincidence; three is a trend.” Someone at the State Department is trying to start a trend. He or she is probably tired of hearing the argument that negotiating another “gold standard” 123 agreement is not possible, when he or she knows opportunities do exist. If the administration really can persuade Taiwan and Jordan to agree to accept the gold standard, doing so will demonstrate that the United States can negotiate nuclear trade agreements that also have strong non-proliferation provisions. And this, in turn, will put pressure on the tougher cases, like South Korea and Saudi Arabia, to conform with what will appear to be an emerging global standard — 24 carats and nothing less.

**Gen. Cartwright: “the retaliatory capability of 300 nuclear weapons...is catastrophic”** Kingston

*Reif, Nukes of Hazard, August 02, 2012*

On July 25 the Senate Energy and

Water Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing on the appropriate size of the US nuclear weapons stockpile to maintain a credible deterrent. Former Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Gen. James Cartwright headlined the witness panel, which also included former US Ambassador to Russia Tom Pickering and NoH favorite Keith Payne.

Cartwright and Pickering briefed the findings and proposals of the Global Zero U.S. Nuclear Policy Commission, on which they both served. The Commission's recent report (titled "Modernizing U.S. Nuclear Strategy, Forces and Posture for the 21st Century") calls for significant changes to nuclear strategy and posture, headlined by an illustrative recommendation to reduce the size of the US arsenal to 900 total nuclear weapons by 2022, 450 of which would be deployed on an ICBM-less dyad of submarines and bombers. Cartwright and Pickering clarified that 900 total nuclear weapons should be the aim of the next round of arms control negotiations with the Russians, though they did not rule out unilateral steps or parallel reciprocal steps to help jumpstart the process.

See here for our initial summary of the Commission's report. And check out John's excellent summary of the hearing over at the Chain Reaction.

In his opening testimony and during the Q/A, Payne expressed concern that the reductions called for by Cartwright would pose grave risks to US security. According to Payne, a much smaller, ICBM-less force would render the United States vulnerable to a nuclear first strike by reducing the number of aim points an adversary would need to hold at risk. Payne outlined a scenario whereby a first strike against the notional Global Zero force structure would leave only 135-180 surviving US

warheads on ballistic missile submarines that were already at sea when the attack occurred.

Gen. Cartwright, no stranger to the devastating effects of US thermonuclear weapons and the intricacies of the current US nuclear war plan, had this to say in response:

Key — could you sneak in in the middle of the night and attack? The idea that only 300 nuclear weapons or 200 or whatever...is insignificant if they're launched against somebody is wrong. It's just patently wrong. Any president — it doesn't matter whether they call it tactical or strategic, if it blows up, it is a catastrophic event in this world. And we shouldn't under-characterize that, you know. And so the likelihood of somebody launching 300 missiles over the pole at us and whatnot should not be dismissed, but the retaliation capability that we're preserving here — and you can mix and match it; you can have more ICBMs and less of some — but the retaliatory capability of 300 nuclear weapons on anybody's territory is catastrophic — catastrophic. [emphasis mine.]

In other words, even a few hundred nuclear weapons would provide a devastating deterrent (whether such a force would be able to wipe out a nuclear-armed adversary's ability to wage nuclear war in a preemptive first strike is another matter). Given Cartwright's knowledge of the factors that drive the size and structure of the US nuclear arsenal, as well as the threats the US military must be prepared to combat, it's clear he believes that the 1,550th, 964th, and 451st deployed US warheads are redundant and would not provide an additional deterrence benefit that can't otherwise be provided by other US military capabilities.

The Global Zero report is yet further evidence that there is a growing consensus among former US military leaders and government officials from both parties in support of a smaller nuclear arsenal pegged to the 21st century security environment, even if there is still some disagreement about how low we can go and how a smaller arsenal should be postured. The current US arsenal of approximately 5,000 nuclear weapons does nothing to address contemporary threats such as terrorism, cyber-attack, and weak/failing states. It also provides Russia with an incentive to maintain a similarly bloated force. The more nations that have nuclear weapons and material around the world, the greater the chances weapons or material could be stolen by terrorists and the greater the risks of the unauthorized, miscalculated, or accidental use of nuclear weapons.

Moreover, the financial commitment required to recapitalize such a large force is unaffordable and takes money away from other, more pressing national security priorities that support our troops.

In short, the world has changed. Our current arsenal and the assumptions that dictate it, such as the capability to wage nuclear war and the requirement for prompt launch, were devised for a bipolar conflict with the Soviet Union that no longer exists. A recent GAO report starkly illustrated the degree to which US deterrence objectives have remained largely consistent since the end of the Cold War despite significant changes to the international security environment.

Per the recommendation of General Cartwright and others, we should update our nuclear posture and spending accordingly.

## Iran, Israel waging silent war

By Walter Pincus,  
*Washington Post*, August 2, 2012

Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei believes that his government is so deeply penetrated by U.S., Israeli and other intelligence agencies that when he eventually gives an order to build a nuclear weapon it will be quickly known.

As a result, Khamenei is creating redundancy in production sites, adding centrifuges and more low- and medium-level enriched uranium to Iran's stockpile so when the time comes Israel will not have the capability to carry out a surgical strike against Tehran's nuclear complex. Perhaps not even the United States could do it major harm.

This is no leak of a classified government report. It was Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak speaking on CNN's "Situation Room" on Monday. But it was the first time I believe that any high official had described, if not directly, the current capabilities of U.S. and Israeli intelligence when it comes to Iran.

If you take Barak at his word, the United States and Israel not only know that Khamenei has not given the order, but also why he has not given it. In an April 20 CNN interview, Barak said, "It's true that probably Khamenei has not given orders to start building a [nuclear] weapon," but at that time the Israeli defense minister gave no hint about why or how he knew it. On Monday, however, Barak told an expanded story.

"He did not tell his people to start and build it — a weapon. We think that we understand why he does not give this order," Barak said. "He

[Khamenei] believes that he is penetrated through our intelligence and he strongly feels that if he tries to order, we will know it — we and you [the United States] and some other intelligence services will know about it and it might end up with a physical action against it,” Barak said.

Barak maintained that Khamenei wants a nuclear weapon but he will wait until he reaches what the Israelis call the “zone of immunity” from an attack. “By then,” Barak said, “he will have to consider when and how to go into building it.” While there seems to be agreement on intelligence about the Iran nuclear program, there is disagreement, according to Barak, on the aftermath of any attack on Iran. “We agree on the rhetoric, but we do not agree on the consequences,” Barak said. It is understood that the Israelis do not believe that the Iranians would respond as strongly as Washington fears. Nor do they see such an attack generating a broader anti-Israel, anti-U.S. reaction throughout the Middle East.

In short, Israel apparently believes the biblical “eye-for-an-eye” concept does not apply when it strikes the first blow. Israel, however, certainly supports an “eye for an eye” when its people are victimized. Listen to Barak on CNN about the July 18 bombing of a tourist bus in Bulgaria that killed five Israeli tourists, the bus driver, and wounded 34 other Israelis.

“We will find a way to settle the account with those who executed, ordered and sent those terrorists,” Barak said. He used as an example Israel’s response to the Munich bombing 40 years ago when 11 Israeli athletes at the 1972 Olympics were killed by Palestinian terrorists. He recalled that then-Israeli Prime

Minister Golda Meir ordered the Mossad, Israel’s intelligence agency, and the Israeli army “to find a way to settle the accounts with every individual that was part of it. And we did it.”

As for the Bulgarian attack, Barak insisted that his government had “hard evidence,” which it has shared with the United States and others. “We are confident without any doubt about the responsibility of Hezbollah to the actual execution of the operation — preparation, planning and execution. And we know that. We know that Hezbollah is acting under Iranian inspiration.”

He referred to a story about plotters who allegedly attached a magnetic bomb to an Israeli Embassy car in New Delhi, wounding a diplomat. The Times of India had reported that a journalist working part time for an Iranian news service had been arrested and police were asking Tehran about several other Iranians who had come to India on tourist visas.

This is all part of the silent war that is going on between Iran and Israel. Iranians talk about five of their nuclear scientists who have been killed over the past five years, often by someone using the same technique of a magnetized bomb used in New Delhi. “In the Middle East,” Barak told CNN, “you should have a long memory in order to survive and be able to settle accounts with those who killed indiscriminately your people.” Why would anyone not expect the Iranians to have a similar “eye-for-an-eye” view.

*[http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/iran-israel-waging-silent-war/2012/08/01/gJQAdYxKQX\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/iran-israel-waging-silent-war/2012/08/01/gJQAdYxKQX_story.html)*

## The Next Civ-Nuke Deal?

Michael Krepon, Arms

Control Wonk, July 28 , 2012

If you liked the 2005 U.S.-India civil nuclear agreement, you'll love providing U.S. technology or hardware to India for ballistic missile defenses.

The deal between President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, affirmed by the Nuclear Suppliers Group and the Indian Parliament in 2008, was characterized as a boon for U.S.-India relations and a grave threat to Pakistan's national security. It was widely heralded by U.S. advocates as opening the Indian market to American-designed power plants, combat aircraft, retail goods, and insurance companies. The deal was also supposed to usher in a new era of strategic cooperation, as Washington assisted New Delhi to become a counterweight to China. In Pakistan, the deal was seen as the harbinger of a steep build-up in Indian nuclear forces.

Wildly optimistic and pessimistic assessments of the deal have been unwarranted. So far, the deal has mostly been a damp squib. Seven years after its announcement, Indian policies continue to make it very hard for U.S. firms to invest and to sell their goods and services. U.S. military cooperation and arms sales have certainly increased – which would have been the case with or without the deal – but New Delhi remains as vigilant as ever in protecting its strategic autonomy. Indian leaders will continue to resist choosing between Washington and Beijing – unless Beijing becomes belligerent. Over time, increased U.S. market share in some sectors are likely to be realized, but for now, the dividends are far below expectations. (For particulars, see my posts, “Six Years Later, I & II,” on 6/27/11 and 6/

30/11.)

The only true believers in the civil-nuclear deal, besides its U.S. boosters, were the stewards of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal. After the deal was struck, Pakistan's requirements for credible deterrence, which were set high to begin with, appear to have grown higher still. Three related developments seem especially noteworthy: the start-up of construction on a fourth plutonium production reactor to increase Pakistan's inventory of nuclear weapons, the imposition of a veto against negotiations for a fissile material cut-off treaty, and the explicit requirement for battlefield, or tactical, nuclear weapons. The first two appear to have been a direct consequence of the deal; the third was a consequence of the Indian military's adoption of a “pro-active” defense doctrine (known as “Cold Start” in some circles) and a growing disparity in Indian and Pakistani conventional capabilities, as well as the deal.

The civ-nuke deal added insult to injury in Pakistan, where it was perceived as providing an international escort for India to sit at the high table of states possessing nuclear weapons, while leaving Pakistan out in the cold. The deal was characterized as a threat to national security because it permitted a significant influx of foreign-origin nuclear power plants and fuel; because Indian authorities stated their intention to build eight new, unsafeguarded domestic power plants; and because India's breeder-reactor program would produce a flood of new fissile material.

These worst-case planning factors have not panned out. True, India has purchased uranium from abroad for

its power plants, freeing up domestic material for bomb-making, but the Indian Parliament continues to resist liability limits for foreign companies, which stands in the way of power-plant construction for the United States and other sellers. Domestic construction of power plants also remains in the doldrums, and the ambitious plans of India's Department of Atomic Energy for breeder reactors are as suspect as those of the Defense Research and Development Organization for the development of tanks, planes, and missiles. [For a withering critique of the DAE and DRDO, see Verghese Koithara's outstanding new book, *Managing India's Nuclear Forces* (2012).]

DRDO's promises have become even more wildly optimistic under the leadership of Dr. V.K. Saraswat, who is now promoting effective, near-term ballistic missile defenses for Delhi and Mumbai. Just as few in the Pakistani media question their military's nuclear requirements, few in the Indian media question the claims of DRDO and DAE. Instead, they serve as a transmission belt and lobbying arm for these enclaves. A case in point is this unsigned article in the June 24th issue of the Indian Express:

Delhi and Mumbai, the two most vital metros of India, have been chosen for DRDO's Ballistic Missile Defence system that can be put in place at short notice. The detailed proposal is being prepared for final clearance from the Cabinet Committee on Security. The strategic planning has already begun to install the BMD system in the two cities and the final proposal will be put before the government after detailed analysis of the entire project, sources said here...

To ensure maximum protection against air-borne threats, DRDO will put a mix of counter-attack missiles which will

be able to shoot down enemy missiles both within earth's atmosphere (endo-atmospheric) and outside it (exo-atmospheric). The BMD system will require minimum human intervention due to the complete automation of tracking devices and counter-measures. Human intervention will be required only to abort the mission, the sources said. After successful implementation in Delhi and Mumbai, the system will be used to cover other major cities in the country, they added.

India appears to have flight tested six BMD interceptors – two of which were liquid-fueled. The United States, in contrast has flight-tested 67 interceptors since 2001, 53 of which have very generously been labeled as successes. Even so, U.S. BMD programs face severe challenges. If Dr. Saraswat is to be believed, India will not need U.S. assistance for ballistic missile defense deployments. Far more likely, significant U.S. assistance would be required – if BMD deployments are a higher priority for New Delhi than new ships, planes, and improved equipment for ground forces, and if the necessary funding can be found.

All of these premises are dubious, but this need not foreclose Indian requests to Washington for ballistic missile technology transfers. As readers of these posts know, I favor limited U.S. BMD deployments and technology transfers in tense regions where U.S. allies and friends are threatened by the nuclear and missile programs of outlier states. In my view, Washington has a responsibility to protect partners and to demonstrably shore up non-nuclear weapon states in this way, among others. In these cases, BMD deployments have symbolic value, while shoring up the Nonproliferation Treaty and offering the possibility to

counter rudimentary missile threats. These arguments don't apply to the subcontinent, where Pakistan and India have significant missile inventories and growing nuclear arsenals, outside the purview of the NPT.

The civil-nuclear deal and DRDO's record of poor performance suggest that it would be wise to avoid unduly optimistic and pessimistic assessments about Indian missile defenses. Nonetheless, U.S. technology transfers for BMD, like the civ-nuke deal, would have little up-side potential and considerable down-side risk. These transfers would not help India produce an effective missile-defense system, nor change New Delhi's embrace of strategic autonomy. They would, however, add further impetus to a three-cornered nuclear arms competition in southern Asia. President Obama has not endorsed BMD transfers, but President Romney might.

<http://krepon.armscontrolwonk.com/archive/3498/the-next-civ-nuke-deal#more-2694>

## What Iran Sanctions Can and Can't Do

By Emanuele Ottolenghi, *Wall Street Journal*, July 24, 2012

Sanctions may not bring the mullahs to heel on nuclear arms, but they can help topple the regime. Ordinary Iranians are having to tighten their belts since the European Union's oil embargo came into force on July 1. The decades of economic mismanagement by Iran's authoritarian leaders have culminated in five years of increasingly stern sanctions that are crippling Iran's economy. And notwithstanding the regime's defiant dismissal of their impact, sanctions have left many Iranian families with empty bank accounts and hollow stomachs.

While government fat cats are unaffected, ordinary Iranians must contend every day with a currency devalued by hyperinflation and an official unemployment rate of 29.1% for people under 25. (Some analysts believe the rate is twice as high.) And things are about to get worse. The threat of further sanctions in the wake of the oil embargo, and a new U.S. ban on doing business with Iran's central bank, won't only affect Iran's energy sector.

It's not just in their quality of life that ordinary Iranians are suffering. The state has long lost any legitimacy through its censorship and human-rights abuses. In recent weeks, special forces have begun to enforce the ban against satellite dishes with new intensity. Moreover, new raids on coffeehouses and stricter clothing regulations have exasperated an already frustrated population. A brain drain now threatens Iran's ability to compete in the modern world.

Meanwhile, the regime's paranoid obsession with dark international conspiracies continues. Government officials blame "Zionist bankers" for the global economic downturn and impute a fierce drought in the country's southern districts to a "soft war" waged by the West. In a functioning democracy, an ill economy and an increasingly disaffected population would trigger a change of government, a drastic reassessment of national priorities, or both. In Iran, the state can only try to pin the blame elsewhere, inventing enemies at home and conspiracies abroad while the house burns down around it.

Given the nuclear threat, however, Western powers dealing with Iran seem content to reach an agreement with this ruthless regime. Their strategic priorities are understandable but shortsighted.

For the West, the best way out of the current impasse is not an agreement that might give the state a lifeline, but a popular uprising in the pattern of the Arab Spring. Triggered by growing economic distress, such an event could topple Iran's radical and irresponsible regime, allowing the emergence of leaders committed to democracy and ready to uphold Iran's international obligations in a transparent fashion.

Skeptics will assert that betting on such a scenario is a fool's errand. Three years ago, the regime successfully crushed post-election protests that the Obama administration could not bring itself to support. But betting on Tehran's continued stability under present conditions may be no safer. Stronger sanctions will not persuade the regime to accept compromise over its nuclear program, as they were initially designed to do. A paranoid and oppressive regime is, after all, not likely to act reasonably at the negotiating table.

Instead, sanctions serve a better role as a tool to precipitate the regime's collapse. When the oil embargo was adopted, skeptics both feared a dramatic price hike and doubted that an embargo would work without China and India on board. Six months later and with the help of lower global oil prices, Iran's oil sales are down by more than a third. Iran's automotive industry's sales are down by 36%, with 500,000 jobs in jeopardy as a result of sanctions. Layoffs at factories are routine. The country's exports are rapidly declining. Even innocent sectors such as carpet sales are suffering. Sanctions must pile on the pressure—not because the regime will eventually compromise, but because ordinary Iranians will blame their rulers for the suffering they must endure on account of their nuclear follies.

For too long, the West has ignored Iran's opposition, preferring a deal with the regime. After nine years of negotiations, there is no deal to be had.

The West should finally abandon its hesitation and more openly and aggressively support efforts by Iran's opposition to bring about change inside their country. The sooner Iran's regime collapses, the better. The better-prepared Western powers are when that happens, the less likely a transition is to result in chaos and create a breeding ground for extremism.

Mr. Ottolenghi is a senior fellow at the Foundation for Defense of Democracies and the author of "The Pasdaran: Inside Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guards' Corps" (FDD Press, 2011).

## **India's Military Comes of Age: The BrahMos Missile** By

James R. Holmes, *The Diplomat*,  
July 27, 2012

Indians take pride in the BrahMos anti-ship cruise missile, or ASCM. I was taken aback some years ago when some Indian friends—gentle souls with little interest in military affairs—professed satisfaction at this successful venture into defense R&D. While that encounter induced some vertigo, it makes sense when you think about it. The Indian military has long been a consumer of hardware manufactured by others. By fielding the BrahMos, India in effect kicked in the door to an exclusive club of nations that design and produce high-tech defense articles.

Beyond simply augmenting the Indian Navy's (and Army's, and eventually Air Force's—of which more later) striking power, this lethal “bird” signifies that India is coming of age as a great power. Great powers operate aircraft carriers and nuclear submarines. They build their own military equipment. Seemingly workmanlike endeavors like weapons design and manufacturing present an aspirant to global leadership a kind of talisman. Indigenously built weapons embody intangibles like national honor and grandeur.

Here endeth the philosophizing. Jointly developed by India's Defense Research and Development Organization and Russia's Mashinostroyeniye Company, the BrahMos is a stealthy, supersonic missile designed to elude shipboard defenses like the Aegis combat system, a combined radar and fire-control system found on board American, Japanese, and South Korean destroyers and cruisers. (Spain and Norway operate the system as well, while the Royal Australian Navy is outfitting its next-generation warships with it.) Aegis has stood at the vanguard of fleet air defense since the early 1980s, when USS Ticonderoga, the U.S. Navy's first Aegis cruiser, stood out to sea. Getting past Aegis is an achievement.

Judging from the technical parameters, the Indian Navy has one-upped the U.S. Navy in this niche technology. On paper, the Indian ASCM appears superior to the AGM-84 Harpoon, long the U.S. Navy's workhorse anti-ship missile. It certainly outranges the Harpoon. The BrahMos can strike at targets 290 kilometers distant, more than double the advertised range “in excess of” 67 nautical miles (77 statute miles, or 124 kilometers) for the Harpoon. And with a top speed approaching Mach 3.0, the supersonic BrahMos far outstrips the subsonic Harpoon.

Speed kills. Helter-skelter speed compresses the time air defenders have to respond—and time is the critical determinant in the “detect-to-engage” sequence. It allows crews to attempt electronic countermeasures, loft surface-to-air missiles, launch decoys, or—as a last-gasp effort—engage an incoming missile with short-range guns. Shorter detect-to-engage time, then, means fewer rounds or countermeasures in the air to stop or deflect a hostile bird. But there's another, less obvious advantage to high speed. Velocity imparts kinetic energy to any moving body. Accordingly, one body inflicts more damage when it slams into another at higher speed. Breakneck velocity magnifies a missile's hitting power beyond the explosive power designed into its payload.

That a speedy, extended-range weapon like the BrahMos is crucial to naval warfare in this age of long-range anti-ship weaponry is obvious from the US Navy's 2009 decision to hurriedly develop a long range anti-ship missile, or LRASM, of its own. Otherwise U.S. surface action groups may not land the first blow in combat. And they may have to take a pounding for some time before hitting back. Even if fleets close on each other at top speed, it takes quite awhile for lumbering ships to cover the 166 kilometers separating the Harpoon's range from that of the BrahMos. Assuming the technology pans out, LRASM will even the terms of long-range engagements.

The Harpoon remains a good missile, that is, but American ships have to get fairly close to cut loose with Harpoon barrages. If the enemy outranges them, they have to beat back enemy missile attacks while closing to ASCM range. That increases their chances of incurring

serious if not fatal damage before even taking offensive action. Admiral Horatio Nelson famously instructed Royal Navy commanders that “no Captain can do very wrong if he places his Ship alongside that of an Enemy.” But Lord Nelson lived before the advent of accurate long-range fire. He never would have given such advice knowing his ships could be put out of action before getting alongside for close-range gunnery duels.

### **What about the quality of the BrahMos?**

Any weapon is like a “black box” until it’s used in combat against real, thinking adversaries with the capacity to deploy countermeasures or strike back at the launch platform. So it’s hard to judge for sure.

If nothing else, Russian involvement in the program should give us pause. Westerners have long ridiculed Soviet-built hardware, but the Soviet Navy was asymmetric before asymmetric warfare was cool. Soviet weapons scientists and engineers displayed impressive ingenuity, fielding an imposing array of anti-ship missiles. Some remain in service today, bedeviling prospective opponents. For instance, Sovremenny-class guided-missile destroyers transferred to China’s navy sport SS-N-22 Sunburn ASCMs designed to evade or overpower Aegis-equipped destroyers and cruisers. With its high speed and capacity to make radical evasive maneuvers during its terminal phase of flight, the Sunburn kept American air defenders up nights during my time in uniform—and doubtless still does so today. To all appearances, the BrahMos is cast in the same mold.

There’s more to anti-ship missiles than surface vessels pounding away at one another from afar. For example, the BrahMos can be fired from mobile launchers—basically trucks—on

land. (Submarine- and air-launched variants are reportedly in the works as well.) That raises a host of intriguing possibilities for the Indian military. It promises to let New Delhi influence events at sea from the shore, much as Chinese rocketeers do off the East Asian seaboard.

Think about Indian Ocean geography. South Asia’s maritime geography is less convoluted than East Asia’s, but India does possess some strategically placed features beyond the subcontinent—notably the Andaman and Nicobar island chains. The islands lie athwart the western approaches to the Strait of Malacca. They also lie within BrahMos range of one other, while nearby landmasses in Southeast Asia fall within range of the northernmost and southernmost islands. That means the Indian Army could emplace BrahMos batteries in the Andamans and Nicobars to threaten shipping passing through these archipelagoes.

That would project India’s military reach to Southeast Asia without leaving Indian soil. An extreme measure? Sure. But no more extreme than Japan’s thinking about how to close the straits through the home islands and the Ryukyus in wartime. Small wonder Chinese pundits liken the Andaman and Nicobar islands to a “metal chain” stretched across sea lanes vital to China’s economic development.

There are other possibilities. For example, the Indian Navy has “inducted”—that maddeningly vague term—its first nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarine into the fleet while predicting the boat will be operational by the end of this year.

But even if engineers have gotten the kinks out of the hull and its propulsion plant, INS Arihant will

patrol the seas without working ballistic missiles to fire. As an interim measure, my friend Andrew Winner speculates (in our—finally!—forthcoming volume on nuclear strategy) that India will try to miniaturize a nuclear warhead sufficiently to fit on the BrahMos. The manufacturer is working on a missile variant that can be launched from torpedo tubes. If the technical details sort themselves out, that would give New Delhi an equivalent to the TLAM-N, the nuclear variant of the US Navy's Tomahawk land-attack cruise missile.

While unsatisfactory over the long haul, a nuclear-tipped BrahMos would supply the third leg of a nuclear triad, letting the Indian Navy threaten sites in Pakistan as a deterrent. Because of the BrahMos's short range relative to ballistic missiles, however, the Arihant and its sisters would have to cruise the South China Sea—or beyond—to menace targets in China. The implications of Indian submarines' prowling the crowded, increasingly contested South China Sea are worth pondering. It remains to be seen whether Indian technical wizardry will render such a system workable if New Delhi decides to pursue one, or whether engineers perfect a sea-launched ballistic missile first.

The BrahMos program, then, is worth tracking—both as a yardstick for Indian scientific and technical progress and for its strategic and political implications. We live in interesting times. The Indian military's new bird of preymakes them a little more interesting.

James Holmes is an associate professor of strategy at the U.S. Naval War College. The views voiced here are his alone.

<http://thediplomat.com/the-naval-diplomat/2012/07/27/indias-military-comes-of-age-the-brahmos-missile/>

## Nuclear Threat Initiative: How India stands to gain

Indrani Bagchi, *Times News Network*, July 22, 2012

In January this year, just as foreign secretary, Ranjan Mathai was getting ready to host a meeting of sherpas in the run-up to the Nuclear Security Summit in Seoul, a US nuclear advocacy group, Nuclear Threat Initiative (NTI) surprised South Block with a nuclear materials security index.

India scored poorly. India did very well on parameters like on-site physical protection of nuclear materials, commitment and implementation of UNSCR 1540, response capabilities and control and accounting procedures. But the index pointed out that rampant corruption and lack of transparency of procedures, apart from other extraneous societal factors were threatening India's nuclear materials from being secure. Needless to add, India's nuclear establishment blew a blood vessel.

On the overall rankings, India came in at a lowly 28, not far from genuinely scary countries like Pakistan and North Korea. In their press statement, NTI said, "Australia ranks number one out of the 32 states with weapons-usable nuclear materials, with Hungary, the Czech Republic, Switzerland, and Austria rounding out the top five. The United Kingdom ranks highest among nuclear-armed states at 10; the United States ranks 13th. Among countries without weapons-usable nuclear materials, Denmark earns the top spot."

The index is welcome, because it attempts to quantify security

parameters of a sector that, too often, is a mystery wrapped in an enigma. Besides, it is important for every country to constantly revalue its own security parameters.

That said, the above statement is one of the reasons why it's so difficult to take this index seriously. First, neither Australia, nor any of the others adorning the top of the list are nuclear "weapon" states. The index categorizes states as countries with those with "weapons-usable" materials and those without. It would have been much more realistic to classify states according to their weapons capabilities. So yes, Australia, or Germany have materials that can be used in nuclear weapons, but they don't have a military programme. That automatically puts them in a completely different category. So you can't really club Israel or India along with say, Hungary or Czech Republic, or Switzerland or Austria.

Related to this is the fact that countries with active weapons programmes would naturally have parallel and non-intersecting systems separating civilian and military structures. The index does not distinguish between civilian and military systems. That makes it weak. No self-respecting nuclear weapon state would put on public record the security structures of the nuclear materials for their weapons programme. And neither should they. The index authors said they used public domain information to write the index, which automatically means their information is incomplete.

The Indian government threw a fit that NTI's partner, Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) which crunched the data and worked out the index added societal factors like corruption to "cloud" the index. Actually, the addition of corruption parameters are probably necessary, because ultimately

proliferation, diversion or security breaches will be done by human beings, who would be rendered more vulnerable in a pervasively corrupt system.

According to NTI officials, India blew them away repeatedly, and would not give them the time of day. They even believe the UPA government didn't like their index because it would be grist to the mill for sections like the Kudankulam protesters. That's nonsense. On the Indian side, nobody in the system believes that NTI has honourable intentions - "they just want us to tell them where we keep stuff," said one indignant official.

The Indian nuclear establishment is famously insular and nothing gets them back into their burrows faster than an American organisation giving them a hard time on nuclear issues. It took several years of coaxing by George W Bush for India to separate its nuclear programmes and become more globally engaged as a nuclear power. NTI found their phone calls and emails were falling into a black hole.

Next week, NTI is trying to breathe fresh life into the nuclear index project by calling in a dialogue (at one-point-five track) to talk about a future security regime and what it should look like. It would be too much to expect South Block to be there. But clearly, India has decided to engage — former DAE chief, Dr Anil Kakodkar will represent India (if he gets to travel to the US, that is). That's very important and has to be done. India cannot claim to be a "responsible" nuclear power by being lax about its nuclear materials. But equally, India cannot be a responsible power and not engage meaningfully with the world about its nuclear structures. India is different from Pakistan, China and North Korea. But we're the only ones who know

how much. And some of that knowledge can surely be shared. In the 21st century, NGOs and advocacy groups often drive the global agenda on many multilateral issues. As Prof Rajaraman says, “India’s interests don’t benefit if we stay away.”

[http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Globespottin/entry/nuclear-threat-initiative-how-india-stands?utm\\_source=Paid%20Ads&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=9440&utm\\_term=.RSS\\_EMAIL\\_CAMPAIGN&utm\\_medium=email](http://blogs.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/Globespottin/entry/nuclear-threat-initiative-how-india-stands?utm_source=Paid%20Ads&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=9440&utm_term=.RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN&utm_medium=email)

## **HUESSY: Wanted: Better American missile defense** Peter

Huessy, *The Washington Times*, July 23, 2012

The security of the United States, its NATO allies and its friends in the Middle East — especially Israel — remains significantly dependent on America’s ability to provide a robust defense for its own territory and that of its allies. In the post-Cold War era, this may seem an anachronism, but recent events highlight the need for America’s military strength. Russian military supplies for Syria may be conveyed by Russian navy vessels. Not only small-scale weapons, but high-tech helicopters and eventually MiG airplanes appear to be on Damascus’ shopping list. In addition, Moscow has furnished more than \$5 billion in critical military equipment to Iran over the past few years.

Rebecca Heinrich of the Heritage Foundation has noted Russia’s use of explicit nuclear threats 15 times over the past few years, a phenomenon outlined in congressional testimony by Mark Schneider of the National Institute of Public Policy. In an unpublished paper, another Russia expert within the U.S. government has explored stated Russian strategic and

nuclear doctrine. The investigation uncovered explicit Russian consideration of using nuclear weapons early in a crisis as a de-escalatory move, whether dealing with Chinese conventional threats to Russia’s east, terrorist threats from the Caucasus in the south, or high-tech NATO threats from the west.

Particularly worrisome is the continued Russian avoidance of sanctions against Iran. This includes loopholes in United Nations resolutions and waivers granted by the U.S. administration from congressionally passed sanctions. While perhaps not intended, this action has given Moscow a green light to arm both Iran and its key ally, Syria. Notably, included in those arms has been ballistic missile technology, though Russia claims only rogue business elements have been furnishing such technology to Iran.

A new U.S. government report, required annually by Congress, says Iran has dramatically improved its offensive missile capability with respect to range, destructive power and day-to-day alert status. While many analysts see little threat from Iran to the continental United States, they assume Tehran’s reach is solely a function of long-range intercontinental ballistic missiles, which the mullahs have not yet deployed.

Buried in the new report to Congress is a repetition of the findings of an earlier assessment acknowledging that Iran very well may acquire such a long-range missile capability as early as 2015. Tehran could deploy ballistic missiles of various kinds in the Western Hemisphere, say in Venezuela, Nicaragua or even Cuba. Combine that scenario with the fact that the head of Britain’s foreign intelligence agency, MI6, just

predicted that Iran would be nuclear-capable within two years, and it is clear that Americans and our allies have every reason for concern.

A replay of the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962 could be precisely what the Russians and their allies might engineer, with their surrogate coalition partners in Tehran carrying out such designs. An electromagnetic-pulse-type attack using rockets launched from offshore freighters sitting somewhere in America's vast maritime environment could kill millions of innocent American civilians and cripple the U.S. ability to respond to a crisis in the Middle East or elsewhere. And the identity of the attacker could be masked.

Critical to defending against such threats is the acquisition of an adequate inventory of missile defenses, especially the U.S. Aegis-based standard missile and the SM-3 1B variant, Iron Dome units like those just deployed by Israel, and some combination of interceptors devoted to protecting the East Coast and Gulf Coast of the United States.

When Congress debated whether to add a third site to the missile-defense inventory — which now includes two sites in Alaska and California — critics were quick to complain that a ground-based interceptor (GBI) deployment in the East would not be technically capable of intercepting freighter-borne threats within hundreds of kilometers of the U.S. coast.

They assumed, wrongly, that the only interceptor being considered was additional GBIs. An East Coast deployment could and should include Aegis cruisers, armed with SM-3 IA and intercontinental ballistic interceptors, batteries of shore-based Aegis interceptors at U.S. military installations, or Iron Dome batteries

capable of protecting major American urban areas.

However, our current and planned inventory of such missile-defense interceptors is not adequate for the task at hand. It must be ramped up. That starts with the administration and Congress devoting greater funds to missiles currently deployed and in development.

Without this action, our federal government will fail to appreciably fulfill its constitutional oath to “provide for the common defense.”

Peter Huessy is president of GeoStrategic Analysis of Potomac.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/jul/23/wanted-better-american-missile-defense/print/>

## H. Reports/Papers/ Press Releases

### Reset or Restart? The Impact of Fukushima on the Japanese and German Energy

**Sectors** Briefing Paper, Antony Froggatt, Catherine Mitchell and Shunsuke Managi, July 2012

Japan and Germany are on the brink of a national energy transformation, implementing new energy policies that reduce reliance on nuclear power as a direct result of the Fukushima disaster in 2011. Both are seeking a significant expansion of renewable energy and energy efficiency programmes that will lead to a decrease in consumption, with a higher reliance on fossil fuels also envisaged in the short term.

In Germany the new national energy strategy, adopted by virtual consensus in the parliament, will phase out all nuclear power by 2022. In Japan, although some nuclear power stations are being restarted, it is doubtful that they will ever meet the pre-Fukushima contribution of 30% to the electricity mix, let alone the previously envisaged rise to 50% by 2030.

Geopolitical considerations are vital for a successful energy transformation. Europe's integrated electricity grid has enabled Germany's relatively radical denuclearization without affecting energy service or price. However, Japan is unable to access electricity transmissions from neighbouring countries, and the fragmented nature of the national electricity grid has further exacerbated electricity supply. Public opinion has been a key driver for policy-making since the Fukushima incident.

<http://www.chathamhouse.org/publications/papers/view/185005>

## Uranium 2011: Resources, Production and Demand

OECD, International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Published by : OECD Publishing , Publication date: 01 Aug 2012

In the wake of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear power plant accident, questions are being raised about the future of the uranium market, including as regards the number of reactors expected to be built in the coming years, the amount of uranium required to meet forward demand, the adequacy of identified uranium resources to meet that demand and the ability of the sector to meet reactor requirements in a challenging investment climate. This 24th edition

of the "Red Book", a recognised world reference on uranium jointly prepared by the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency, provides analyses and information from 42 producing and consuming countries in order to address these and other questions.

It offers a comprehensive review of world uranium supply and demand as well as data on global uranium exploration, resources, production and reactor-related requirements. It also provides substantive new information on established uranium production centres around the world and in countries developing production centres for the first time. Projections of nuclear generating capacity and reactor-related requirements through 2035, incorporating policy changes following the Fukushima accident, are also featured, along with an analysis of long-term uranium supply and demand issues.

<http://www.oecdbookshop.org/oecd/display.asp?lang=EN&sf1=identifiers&st1=978-92-64-17803-8>

## Africa: The African Commission on Nuclear Energy Convenes its Second Meeting

PRESS RELEASE:

July 26, 2012

The African Commission on Nuclear Energy (AFCONe), established within the framework of the African Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone Treaty, also known as the Treaty of Pelindaba, held today, at the African Union (AU) Headquarters, in Addis Ababa, its second ordinary session, to finalize and adopt key documents required for

its early and full operationalization. The first ordinary session of AFCONE took place in Addis Ababa, on 4 May 2011.

Today's meeting adopted the rules of procedure, structure, programme of work and budget of AFCONE. The programme of work focusses on the following areas: monitoring of compliance by the State Parties with their non-proliferation obligations; nuclear and radiation safety and security; nuclear sciences and technology; partnership and technical cooperation. Regarding the budget, the meeting agreed to an amount of approximately US \$800,000 per year for the period 2012-2014. The meeting also agreed on the scale of assessment for contributions to the budget of AFCONE. The conclusions reached will be submitted to the second Conference of State Parties, scheduled to be held in Addis Ababa, in November 2012.

The meeting provided an opportunity to review and adopt the Terms of Reference of AFCONE Executive Secretary, who is in charge of the day-to-day activities of the Commission. The representatives of the Government South Africa seized the opportunity to provide an update on the steps being taken for the establishment of AFCONE Executive Secretariat, which will be based in Pretoria. The Government of South Africa will provide the required facilities in terms of office space and equipment.

[http://allafrica.com/stories/201207261025.html?utm\\_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Unclear+News+Digest&utm\\_campaign=5a64354dd0-RSS\\_EMAIL\\_CAMPAIGN&utm\\_medium=email](http://allafrica.com/stories/201207261025.html?utm_source=Paulo%27s+Corner+Daily+Unclear+News+Digest&utm_campaign=5a64354dd0-RSS_EMAIL_CAMPAIGN&utm_medium=email)

## **Stress tests and Peer Review Process: Joint statement of ENSREG and the European Commission** 26 April 2012

The national European regulators and the European Commission as European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG) have endorsed today the peer review board report prepared as an answer to the mandate delivered by the European Council of 25 March 2011, asking for the launch of stress tests on the European NPPs;

ENSREG and the European Commission share the view that the work achieved since the Fukushima accident has been of exceptional nature from a quantitative and qualitative point of view. The seventeen national reports covering all nuclear power plants of the EU and of participating countries have been assessed by 80 reviewers from 24 nations in Europe and the European Commission; ENSREG and the European Commission underline that the stress tests and peer review have been a rigorous review of the safety of NPPs in the light of three main areas of the Fukushima accident. This review was carried out through three different steps....

<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EC%20ENSREG%20Joint%20Statement%2026%20April%202012%20Final%20to%20publish.pdf>

## **Strategic Weapons: Changes in the Nuclear Weapons Targeting Process Since 1991, July 31, 2012: Congressional Committees**

Section 1047 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 required us to update our September 1991 report on the nuclear weapons targeting process. Since we last reported on this subject, the United States now faces a more complex security environment that potentially affects U.S. nuclear weapons employment policy and targeting. The Department of Defense's (DOD) 2010 Nuclear Posture Review concluded that the United States could reduce the role of nuclear weapons in the U.S. security strategy. Although the threat of nuclear or conventional war with Russia has been reduced, DOD's 2010 Nuclear Posture Review Report identified new threats and a small number of contingencies that may require the use of nuclear weapons, even as the United States has substantially reduced the size of its nuclear weapons stockpile....

<http://gao.gov/assets/600/593142.pdf>

## **Proceedings: Strengthening the NPT**

On July 23, the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center and the Foreign Policy Initiative in cooperation with the office of Congressman Fortenberry, hosted an event on Capitol Hill entitled "How Much Tighter Must the NPT Be?" The event which was moderated by Executive Director at the

Nonproliferation Policy Education Center Henry Sokolski, featured presentations by former Nuclear Regulatory Commissioner Victor Gilinsky, Executive Director at the Foreign Policy Initiative Jamie Fly, and Director of the Nuclear Policy Program at the Carnegie Endowment for Peace George Perkovich.

## **First Speaker - Victor Gilinsky**

Victor Gilinsky stated that the U.S. needs to pursue five new policies to guide nonproliferation efforts and the U.S. approach to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT). In the interim of achieving these policy goals, Gilinsky argues that the U.S. should not be expanding nuclear power and technology worldwide.

<http://csis.org/blog/strengthening-npt>

### Contribute Articles

Indian Pugwash Society welcomes research articles from students, researchers and faculties on Space, Missile, nuclear technology, WMD proliferation, arms control, disarmament, export controls and other related issues. Articles should be crisply written and should address contemporary debates in the policy arena. Manuscripts submitted for the consideration of the Indian Pugwash Society should be original contributions and should not have been submitted for consideration anywhere else. Please confirm to the guidelines prescribed in the website before submitting the manuscript for consideration.

Details are available at: [http://www.pugwashindia.org/contribute\\_articles.asp](http://www.pugwashindia.org/contribute_articles.asp)

The Indian Pugwash Society aims to promote the study, discussion, and knowledge of and to stimulate general interest in, and to diffuse knowledge in regards to problems relating on WMD proliferation, arms control, disarmament, space security, export controls, nuclear technology and other related issues. This newsletter is part of the project “Emerging Nuclear Order in Asia: Implications for India” sanctioned to us by Department of Atomic Energy-Board of Research in Nuclear Sciences (DAE-BRNS).

#### Disclaimer:

**Data included in this newsletter is only for educational purpose and wider dissemination. All liabilities and rights belong to respective writers & authors.**

#### Team of Indian Pugwash Society

**Convener:** Dr Arvind Gupta  
**Consultant:** Prof. K. D. Kapoor  
**Associate Editors :** Mr Kapil Dhanraj Patil  
Ms Nupur Brahma

#### Indian Pugwash Society

No.1, Development Enclave,  
Rao Tula Ram Marg, Near USI, Delhi-110010  
Tel. No (91-11) 2671-7983  
Extn 7014 & 7012  
Fax No. (91-11)2615-4192  
Email: [indianpugwash@yahoo.com](mailto:indianpugwash@yahoo.com)