



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



NUMBER 04

A Monthly Newsletter for Strengthening
Awareness of Nuclear Abolition

This page includes independent news coverage which is part of a project supported by Soka Gakkai International.

IPS, the global news agency, brings you independent news and views on nuclear abolition. In this newsletter you will find in-depth reports by IPS correspondents and project partners from around the world as well as columns by experts, in addition to special sections for news from international NGOs and a review of the global media for a glimpse of what is happening on the ground. Join us in helping strengthen awareness about the abolition of nuclear weapons – and encourage your friends and colleagues to subscribe to this free monthly newsletter.

INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial

By Ranjit Devraj

NEW DELHI - As U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian officials in New Delhi on Monday to take a forward a civilian nuclear cooperation agreement, signed by the previous Bush administration, it was apparent that there were many roadblocks to be cleared before deals worth an estimated 10 billion dollars are signed.

Robert Blake, assistant secretary of state for South Asia, said last week, that the deal presented a "major opportunity for American companies, and opens up as much as 10 billion dollars worth of exports to India".

But standing in the way of those business opportunities -- involving the export of reactors and technology -- is legislation pending in Indian parliament that would shield U.S. suppliers from liability in the event of an accident, thereby allowing them to access insurance cover. *MORE >>*

DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea

By Sanjay Suri

LONDON - Too early yet to call it a victory for anti-nuclear lobbyists, but the British government decision last week to put off an upgrade of its Trident nuclear system is at least denial of immediate victory to those who want newer nuclear weapons. A move to upgrade the Trident system was due to get going in September. But several MPs asked for a debate on this, rather than have the move go ahead while Parliament was in recess. Prime Minister Gordon Brown did one better – he has put off the decision until after the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) meeting due in May of next year.

"This is consistent with the intentions of the Prime Minister in favour of multilateral disarmament decisions worldwide," Kate Hudson, chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) Kate Hudson told IPS. *MORE >>*

MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War

Analysis by Jerrold Kessel and Pierre Klochendler

JERUSALEM - Ambiguity - is it the watchword for all involved in the issue over whether Iran goes nuclear, especially in light of the ongoing political uncertainties that engulf the Islamic Republic? In trying to decipher the Iranian nuclear puzzle it is perhaps worth going back to the attitude that, during the Cold War, became U.S. doctrine under Robert McNamara (who died just last week). During his tenure as secretary of defence, the prevailing conception of nuclear deterrence became known as "mutual assured destruction" wherein the U.S. and then Soviet Republic both knew that they could destroy the other even if the other struck first. *MORE >>*

RELATED ARTICLES

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

WHAT OTHERS SAY



INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial

By Ranjit Devraj

NEW DELHI, Jul 21 (IPS) - As U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian officials in New Delhi on Monday to take forward a civilian nuclear cooperation agreement, signed by the previous Bush administration, it was apparent that there were many roadblocks to be cleared before deals worth an estimated 10 billion dollars are signed.

Robert Blake, assistant secretary of state for South Asia, said last week, that the deal presented a "major opportunity for American companies, and opens up as much as 10 billion dollars worth of exports to India".

But standing in the way of those business opportunities -- involving the export of reactors and technology -- is legislation pending in Indian parliament that would shield U.S. suppliers from liability in the event of an accident, thereby allowing them to access insurance cover.

Probir Purkayastha, a leading member of the Delhi Science Forum, told IPS that placing responsibility on Indian operators alone while protecting U.S. suppliers was "unacceptable" and likely to be challenged by human rights activists and also by opposition groups in parliament whenever it comes up.

Purkayastha, said he was not opposed to the use of nuclear power to meet India's energy needs but was worried because of the sheer cost of U.S. atomic energy which he estimated at around 5.6 million dollars per megawatt.

U.S. firms like GE-Hitachi and Westinghouse Electric already face competition from suppliers such as the Paris-based Areva SA and Russia's Rosatom Corp. which are covered by sovereign immunity because they are fully or partially controlled by governments when it comes to liability issues.

While sites have already been identified in the Indian states of Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat, where U.S. nuclear power plants may be built, separate talks between Indian and U.S. officials are to begin later this week in Vienna to determine how spent fuel generated by U.S. supplied reactors will be reprocessed.

Under the pact signed last year between the two countries to open up sales of civilian nuclear technology to India, after a gap of three decades, India was to build a specially safeguarded facility where the reprocessing of spent fuel would be carried out.

India, under the deal, gains access to U.S. technology and atomic energy it allows inspection of Indian civilian nuclear facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Military sites are excluded and this has been a sticking point with arms-control advocates who opposed deal on the grounds that there were inadequate safeguards to separate India's military nuclear programme from its power-generation.

As part of the deal, the Bush administration had obtained for India a special waiver on nuclear trade from the 45-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). The group ruled last September that "participating governments may transfer nuclear-related dual-use equipment, materials, software and related technology to India for peaceful purposes and for use in IAEA safeguarded civil nuclear facilities."

However, the G8 nations, at their summit in L'Aquila, Italy earlier this month, declared a ban on the transfer of enrichment and reprocessing (ENR) technology and equipment to countries that have not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). India has consistently refused to sign the NPT saying it is discriminatory.

The G8 declaration welcomed efforts to "reduce the proliferation risks associated with the spread of enrichment and reprocessing facilities, equipment and technology," and the "progress that continues to be made by the NSG on mechanisms to strengthen controls on transfers of such enrichment and reprocessing items and technology."

However, the declaration committed NSG member countries to implement on a "national basis" proposals that were "useful and constructive" to strengthen controls on ENR items and technology developed at a November 2008 meeting of its consultative group. >>>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



U.S. involvement in the G8 sparked fears being expressed in India that the administration of President Barack Obama was targeting India as non-signatory of the NPT. But these fears were allayed in Parliament by Finance Minister Pranab Mukherjee on Jul. 13 when he told members that because there was an "India-specific safeguards agreement with the IAEA, we are not concerned over what position the G8 takes."

Analysts say that India's real bargaining strengths lie in its plans to spend at least 175 billion dollars on nuclear energy production in the next 30 years and the fact that it has developed its own technologies in spite of technology sanctions on reactors, technology and fuel imposed immediately after it carried out nuclear tests in 1974.

There are other worries for the main U.S. nuclear suppliers, Westinghouse and General Electric because of their close links with Japan, a country with which India does not have a nuclear cooperation agreement. Westinghouse is owned by Japan's Toshiba Corp., while GE has a strategic partnership with Hitachi to jointly execute nuclear energy projects worldwide

On Sunday, the Imagindia Institute, an independent think-tank, issued a statement that said: "It is our significant worry that unless Japan and India have a nuclear cooperation agreement, it may be difficult for Westinghouse and GE to participate in Indian business."

According to the Institute's statement, unless Toshiba and Hitachi obtain specific clearances from Tokyo "the ability of GE and Westinghouse to engage in India's nuclear business may be severely handicapped."

But the biggest opposition to U.S. companies may come from activists who are citing the dismal record of the Union Carbide Corp. which was responsible for the world's worst industrial disaster when its pesticides plant in Bhopal city killed 3,800 people following a leak of cyanide gas in December 1984.

In June, a group of 27 members of U.S. Congress wrote to Dow Chemicals, which took over Union Carbide's assets in Bhopal in 2001, to accept responsibility for meeting the medical needs of the survivors and their economic rehabilitation, besides cleaning up the soil and water of the area around the site.

"Despite repeated public requests and protests around the world, Union Carbide has refused to appear before the Bhopal District Court to face the criminal charges pending against it for the disaster," the letter to Dow said.

"With what happened in Bhopal in view, we will oppose any move to bring in legislation to shield U.S. suppliers from liability in the event of a nuclear accident," S.P. Udayakumar, convenor of the National Alliance of Anti-nuclear Movements (NAAM), told IPS.

In particular, NAAM is opposed to India acceding to the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage which makes plant operators responsible for damages from any accident while shielding suppliers from liability. (END/2009)



DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea

By Sanjay Suri

LONDON, Jul 20 (IPS) - Too early yet to call it a victory for anti-nuclear lobbyists, but the British government decision last week to put off an upgrade of its Trident nuclear system is at least denial of immediate victory to those who want newer nuclear weapons.

A move to upgrade the Trident system was due to get going in September. But several MPs asked for a debate on this, rather than have the move go ahead while Parliament was in recess. Prime Minister Gordon Brown did one better – he has put off the decision until after the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) meeting due in May of next year.

"This is consistent with the intentions of the Prime Minister in favour of multilateral disarmament decisions worldwide," Kate Hudson, chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) Kate Hudson told IPS.

The question of the extension of the Trident system will also now be included in the Strategic Defence Review due to begin in the spring of next year.

Trident is a system comprising 58 nuclear-armed submarine-launched ballistic missiles fitted on to four submarines. At least one of these submarines is on constant patrol. The system is a shorter version of the U.S. Navy's fleet of 14 submarines each equipped with nuclear missiles.

The Trident system was considered by many to be outdated even when it entered service in 1994; the Soviet threat against which it was designed had already receded. The case for keeping up such a system is now far weaker.

"We don't believe the UK needs a nuclear weapons system, and we are very pleased that recent polls show that the UK should scrap it," says Hudson. "Retired generals and field marshals have been saying the system is militarily useless and should be scrapped."

A Guardian/ICM poll on Jul. 14 indicated that 54 percent of Britons want the country to get rid of nuclear weapons, and that only 42 percent want replacement of the Trident with a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Britain keeps the system going at a considerable cost of up to 2 billion pounds (3.2 billion dollars) a year. The official upgrade cost would be 76 billion pounds (124 billion dollars). Taking into account the cost of dealing with the present system, Britain is looking at a nuclear weapons bill of 100 billion pounds (160 billion dollars).

But there is a cost here that goes far beyond money. Many fear it is damaging to keep a useless system going just in case of some threat that may emerge in the future, even if there is none at the moment that the submarines are guarding Britain against.

"It cannot be just a matter of keeping these weapons in the cupboard just in case," says Hudson. "That would only encourage others to have them, and as a result you might just end up creating a situation where one might actually need them. Instead we need a virtuous cycle, and begin to come down to the global zero that everyone in the world aspires to."

The push to include the Trident replacement in the Strategic Defence Review has a limited degree of cross-party support, but the position on the Trident is certain to change after elections due in Britain next year – possibly around the same time as the NPT conference in May. There are clear indications that the Conservative Party will win the next election. The Conservatives have traditionally been keener on nuclear weapons than Labour.

Conservative Party leader David Cameron has backed modernisation of the Trident system. "That's a mandate if we're elected that we will have to deliver," he says.

But a British leadership would have to take its cue from the trends that emerge from any agreement between U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev. Talks between the two leaders in London in April and again in Moscow earlier this month have yielded encouraging signs of steps towards reduction of nuclear stockpiles, if not outright disarmament. >>>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



Any British move towards upgrading to new weapon systems would fly in the face of the trends Obama may set. And it may not be entirely a choice for Britain to make, dependent as it is on the U.S. to supply much of these systems, even though officially Britain's nuclear weapons programmes is independent of that of the U.S.

Any move to renew the Trident system also sets the government in London against Scottish parties; the nuclear submarines are all based at Clyde in Scotland. The Scottish National Party that campaigns for independence of Scotland from the UK has the support of several smaller parties, and a renewal of the Trident could strengthen these parties' campaign against the government at Westminster in London.

Scottish National Party leader Alex Salmond has already clashed with Conservative Party leader David Cameron over a Trident renewal, following Cameron's call not to obstruct the programme for renewing the Trident.

"If that missile system is unwanted by the body politic of Scotland, unwanted by Scottish members of parliament at Westminster, not wanted by the Scottish Parliament, then surely that Prime Minister would expect the Scottish Parliament to make its view known in every area and way that was open to it to do." (END/2009)

MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War

Analysis by Jerrold Kessel and Pierre Klochendler

JERUSALEM, Jul 13 (IPS) - Ambiguity - is it the watchword for all involved in the issue over whether Iran goes nuclear, especially in light of the ongoing political uncertainties that engulf the Islamic Republic?

In trying to decipher the Iranian nuclear puzzle it is perhaps worth going back to the attitude that, during the Cold War, became U.S. doctrine under Robert McNamara (who died just last week). During his tenure as secretary of defence, the prevailing conception of nuclear deterrence became known as "mutual assured destruction" wherein the U.S. and then Soviet Republic both knew that they could destroy the other even if the other struck first.

Perhaps Iran is heading precisely this way with regard to Israel, surmises Ehud Ya'ari of Israel's Channel 2 TV, considered a leading Middle East analyst, and known for his "reliable sources" within Israel's security establishment.

Iran will not desist from its civilian nuclear programme, but is projecting a deliberately ambiguous attitude with respect to its nuclear ambitions, said Ya'ari who speculated that Iran would not hold back from completing the very last phase of converting nuclear knowhow for civilian purposes into a military capability. "They're going to keep that ambiguity until 'breaking point', which is defined by nuclear experts as the capability to make a bomb."

Strikingly, this is the kind of policy to which Israel has itself cleaved for decades when declaring, "We will never be the first to introduce nuclear weapons in the Middle East." Israel has consistently stuck to this formula in a bid to ward off the charge that it is already a nuclear power with dozens of nuclear warheads at its disposal.

Until now while provocatively parading its enhanced missile delivery programme, Iran under President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has stuck to the line that it has an alienable right to acquire nuclear knowhow, but has steered clear of saying out loud that it intended to move its civilian nuclear programme to the level of military capability.

The U.S. attitude to this Iranian imbroglio remains ambiguous - for all President Barack Obama's declared intention to move the world towards greater and greater nuclear disarmament, not just within the parameters of the Russian-U.S. equation.

This U.S. ambiguity was crystal clear when the President and his Vice- President, Joe Biden, made differently nuanced statements reflecting U.S. concern on how Israel deals with its concerns about Iran. The U.S., Biden said on ABC television, "cannot dictate to another sovereign nation, what they can and cannot do" if it feels threatened by another country. >>>



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



Israel might well have understood that Biden's statement should not be understood as a U.S. green light to bomb Iran's nuclear facilities. But just a day later, Obama felt obliged to make a corrective categorical statement on CNN; "Absolutely not," he replied, when asked whether the U.S. has quietly given Israel such a green light.

An Israeli government source says Biden's statement was not coordinated with Israel.

After several days of "no comment" in response to the flurry of U.S. declarations, the first statement by an Israeli official came in the form of a startlingly frank weekend interview by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu's National Security Advisor, Uzi Arad.

He told Ha'aretz that Iran has already crossed the point of nuclear no-return which could be defined, he said, "as the point at which Iran has the ability to complete the cycle of nuclear fuel production on its own; the point at which it has all the elements to produce fissionable material without depending on outsiders. Iran is now there," Arad told the paper. "I don't know if it has mastered all the technologies, but it is more or less there."

But, Arad added, "Iran is not yet nuclear and not yet operational. Serious obstacles still lie in the way. The international community still has enough time to make it stop of its own volition...Obviously not enough was done. And what was done was too late, too little and too feeble. In practice we will be able to block Iran. But the line that was termed a 'red line' has been crossed."

Arad was asked, "Isn't it time to accept that Iran will be a nuclear power?"

He responded: "The major fear is that a nuclear Iran will burst the dam of nuclear proliferation in the region. It is wrong to say that just as in the Cold War, the world lived with a nuclear Soviet Union and with a nuclear China, we will also be able to live with a nuclear Iran. The subject is not just a nuclear Iran; the subject is a multi-nuclear Middle East.

"Serious experts, who are not Israelis, look at the Middle East and say that if Iran becomes nuclear in 2015, the Middle East will be nuclear in 2020. And a multi-nuclear Middle East is a nightmare. Five or six nuclear states in a jumpy, unstable region where the world's energy resources are located will not create nuclear quiet, but nuclear disquiet. A nuclear Middle East will be exactly like an upside-down pyramid."

Arad added, "I will say that independent strategists believe that anyone who wants a deal with the Iranians must have a military option. The more credible and concrete the option, the less likely that it will be needed; in fact, those who do not put a military option on the table are liable to find themselves having to resort to it."

A stark and somewhat less ambiguous assessment than has become customary whenever the Iran nuclear issue is addressed. A fine-tuning of Cold War days of nuclear deterrence: to deter Iran before it reaches its sought-after breaking point. At least perhaps, to deter Iran from going down the road of Israel's own policy of deliberate nuclear ambiguity. (END/2009)

RELATED ARTICLES

INDIA: With Nuke Submarine Launch, India Displays its Growing Military Prowess

By Ranjit Devraj

NEW DELHI , Jul 31 (IPS) - With the launch of an indigenously made nuclear-powered submarine, India has caused an international uproar. But back home, observers played it down as nothing more than a long-term naval enhancement in a peninsula country with a long coastline.

Predictably, the sharpest reactions came from India's arch-rival Pakistan which, on Tuesday, officially described the development as a "threat to regional peace and security" and vowed to "take appropriate steps to safeguard security, without entering into an arms race."

Speaking to Dawn News television, Pakistan's navy spokesman, Captain Abid Majeed Butt, called the launch a "destabilising step" that would "jeopardise the security paradigm of the entire Indian Ocean region."

But, at the launch on Sunday - which made India only the sixth country in the world with its own nuclear-powered submarines - prime minister Manmohan Singh clarified that India had no aggressive designs on any country.

MORE >> <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=47913>

DISARMAMENT: Anti-Nuclear Japanese To Lead Atomic Agency

By Baher Kamal



VIENNA, Jul. 3 (IDN) - Japan, the sole country that has been suffering, for over half a century now, the abject consequences of the United States' nuclear bombs during the II World War, will soon be leading international efforts towards a world free of nuclear weapons.

In fact, subsequent to a highly disputed selection process, the Vienna-based International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) appointed on July 3 Yukiya Amano, the Japanese ambassador and expert on disarmament, non-proliferation and nuclear energy policy, as its new Director General.

Following the vote, Amano referred to Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the two Japanese cities that the U.S. army attacked with nuclear bombs. He said that "as a national coming from Japan, I'll do my utmost to

prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. In order to do that, solidarity of all the member states countries from North, from South, from East and West is absolutely necessary".

Speaking to reporters, Amano said he was "determined to prevent nuclear proliferation" and considered "a unified approach among IAEA members as crucial to achieving that goal".

As the new director general of the IAEA, Amano vowed: "I will do my utmost to enhance the welfare of the human beings and ensure sustainable development through the peaceful use of nuclear energy."

Amano, 62, permanent representative and plenipotentiary ambassador of Japan to international organisations in Vienna, and Governor on the IAEA Board of Governors which selected him, has been involved in the negotiation of major related international instruments.

The Japanese ambassador, who was selected by the 35-member IAEA Board of Governors on July 2, receiving the required two-thirds majority of votes cast, was competing for the post with two strong candidates: Abdul Samad Minty of South Africa, and Luis Echávarri of Spain. Amano and Minty were the candidates in the final round of balloting.

MORE >> <http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2009-07-03%2018:29:43&key2=1>

OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

English-Spanish

INDIA-EEUU: Escollos para acuerdo de cooperación nuclear

Por Ranjit Devraj on 21/07/2009 23.54.24 GMT

NUEVA DELHI, 21 jul (IPS) - En los primeros contactos directos de la secretaria de Estado (canciller) de Estados Unidos, Hillary Rodham Clinton, con el gobierno de India, quedó claro que hay varios obstáculos para avanzar en el millonario acuerdo de cooperación nuclear.... <http://www.ipsnoticias.net/nota.asp?idnews=92782>

ORIGINAL: INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=47736>

Adaptation into Arabic

FRANCE: Ambiguous on Nuclear Disarmament

By Alecia D. McKenzie PARIS June 30 (IPS) - As the international war of words over nuclear programmes heats up, with North Korea threatening to strengthen its "nuclear deterrence" against the United States, countries such as France are taking a position that some analysts describe as ambiguous and hypocritical. MORE >>

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=47426>

Arabic: <http://ipsinternational.org/arabic/nota.asp?idnews=1585>



INTER PRESS SERVICE

وكالة الأنباء العالمية انتر بريس سيرفيس (آي بي إس)

نزح السلاح النووي في العالم:
فرنسا الخريفة، بين الغموض والتناقض

بقلم أليسيا ماكينزي/انتر بريس سيرفيس

باريس، يوليو (IPS) - وصف تحالف من أكثر من 800 منظمة مناهضة للأسلحة النووية موقف حكومة باريس من هدف تحرير العالم من الأسلحة النووية، بأنه غامض ومتناقض. فمن ناحية تؤكد السياسة الرسمية الفرنسية على ضرورة خفض هذه الأسلحة وحظر التجارب النووية، لكنها من ناحية أخرى لا تظهر أي التزام بنزع السلاح النووي نهائياً في العالم.

ويستدل التحالف بأحدث تصريحات الرئيس نيكولا ساركوزي بشأن سباق التسلح النووي، إذ شارك زميله الأمريكي باراك أوباما في تحذير كوريا الشمالية وإيران من إنتاج أسلحة نووية، أثناء مؤتمر صحفي مشترك في يونيو الماضي. لكن ساركوزي بعد إدراكه التجربة النووية الكورية الشمالية في مايو، صرح أيضاً أن "إيران من حقها امتلاك قنطرة نووية مدنية، لا عسكرية".

هذه عقب بيير إيمانويل فيك، المتحدث باسم التحالف المناهض للأسلحة النووية المعروفة باسم "الخروج من العصر النووي" والذي يضم 841 منظمة، عقب قائل أن "كل هذا الكلام هو مجرد نفاق".

وشرح في حديثه لوكالة انتر بريس سيرفيس "لا يمكن الفصل بين برنامج للطاقة النووية المدنية وبين السلاح النووي... فعندما تبيع فرنسا مفاعلات نووية لبلدان مثل ليبيا لتوليد الكهرباء، فإننا نترك أن القنبلة النووية ليست بعيدة المثل".

وأضاف أن موقف فرنسا "غامض ومبهم"، فهي ترغب في خفض مخزونها من الأسلحة النووية، لكنها تتردد في الإقدام على ذلك طالما حافظت قوتها عظمى ككلولايك المتحددة وروسيا على ترساناتها النووية الكبيرة، وطالما توجد تهديدات من دول "غير مستقرة" مثل إيران وكوريا الشمالية.

كما تقول فرنسا أنها خفضت عدد الأسلحة النووية المحمولة جواً بمعادل الثلث، لكنها تبقى على رؤوس نووية بلغ عددها 300 في سبتمبر الأخير. كذلك فهي تكتفح بانها كانت الوحيدة من أصل خمس قوتها نووية عظمى التي فككت منشآت التجارب وإنتاج الوقود النووي، فيما لم توضح القوتها الأخرى موقفيها في هذا الشأن.

هذا ونقد حذر المتحدث باسم التحالف المناهض للأسلحة النووية "الخروج من العصر النووي"، أن "نزح الأسلحة النووية لن يتم قريباً طالما كان هذا هو مستوى المواقف، "القنطرة النووية علامة على القوة النووية، والدول تستخدم الأسلحة النووية كأداة مسلومة مقابل أشياء كثيرة، بما فيها المساعدات".

ومن جانبهم، أكد خبراء آخرون أن الدول النووية "الجديدة" مثل كوريا الشمالية، إيران، إسرائيل، الهند وباكستان، ستواصل التثبت بحققها في تطوير برامج نووية، طالما الدول الخمس العظمى (الولايات المتحدة، بريطانيا، فرنسا، روسيا، والصين) لا تؤدي المتوقع منها.

قالت أوكا زايف، الرئيسة المشاركة لمجموعة البرلمانيين من أجل حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية وإلغائها في العالم التي كتلت البرلمانيين على تطورات سولستك الأسلحة النووية، قالت أن "غالبية مواطني دول حلف شمال الأطلسي لا يدركون أن حكوماتهم لا تزال راضية عن إستخدام الأسلحة النووية".

Page 2 of 2 | نزح السلاح النووي في العالم: فرنسا الخريفة، بين الغموض والتناقض

وأضافت أن المواطنين "لا يدركون أن بعض دول حلف شمال الأطلسي، كبلجيكا وألمانيا وإيطاليا وهولندا وتركيا، لا تزال تأوي أسلحة نووية أمريكية في أراضيها لإستخدامها في النزاعات". ويذكر أن فرنسا قررت العودة إلى صفوف الحلف في أوائل هذه السنة العام بعد أن غابت عنها طيلة 43 عاماً.

وفي نفس الوقت، طالبت جماعات فرنسية بخفض برامج تطوير الطاقة النووية المدنية، وإنفاق المزيد من الأموال على مصادر الطاقة المتجددة، حيث تحصل فرنسا على نحو 80 في المائة في طاقته من 59 مفاعل نووي موزعة في مختلف أنحاء البلاد.

PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

"Springtime of Hope" Seen for Nuke Disarmament (May 4)

Thalif Deen interviews JAYANTHA DHANAPALA, former under-secretary-general for disarmament affairs

Published in 'Christians of Iraq and The World' - Iraq



07/07/2009
am 5:00

مقابلة مع وكيل أمين عام الأمم المتحدة الأسبق : نزع الأسلحة النووية

أعرب وكيل الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة الأسبق لشؤون نزع السلاح، جايناثا دانابالا، عن أمله في تحقيق غاية نزع الأسلحة النووية في العالم، وذلك بمناسبة الإجتماع الجاري في مقر الأمم المتحدة في نيويورك للتخصير للمؤتمر العالمي المقرر في 2010 لإستعراض معاهدة حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية.

ويذكر أن هذه المعاهدة السارية منذ أربعة عقود، تنص علي وقف إنتشار تكنولوجيات الأسلحة النووية، وتفكيك الترسانات النووية، وحق الإستخدام السلمي للتكنولوجيات النووية.

وأعرب جايناثا دانابالا، الذي يعتبر واحدا من أبرز الخبراء الدوليين في قضايا نزع السلاح والذي يشارك في هذا الإجتماع التخصيري الذي يختتم أعماله في 15 مايو، أعرب في مقابلة خاصة مع وكالة انتر بريس سيرفس عن "أمله الحذر" تجاه إمكانية تحرير العالم من الأسلحة النووية.

وقال دانابالا، الذي يتراس مؤتمرات 'يوغواش' للعلوم والشؤون الدولية 'نحن نعيش الآن في ربيع الأمل الذي يتبع شتاء قاتما من الإحباط' في مجال نزع السلاح النووي في العالم.

وعلق في مقابته مع انتر بريس سيرفس (أي بي اس) علي خطاب الرئيس الأمريكي باراك أوباما في أبريل في براغ، والذي تعهد فيه بأن تتخذ بلاده 'خطوات محددة نحو عالم دون أسلحة نووية'. قائلًا أنه يجب بلورة ذلك في صورة أعمال محددة، ولكن مع عدم التقليل من شأن الأطراف المعارضة لها. وفيما يلي أبرز ما ورد في المقابلة.

أي بي اس: هل تتوقع أي نتيجة حاسمة بشأن التصديق علي إتفاقية حظر التجارب النووية وسط هذا المناخ الجديد؟

دانابالا: لو صادقت الولايات المتحدة علي هذه الإتفاقية لمثل ذلك دفعة بالغة الأهمية، مع التنكير بأن هناك ثمان دول أخري ينبغي أما أن توقع عليها أو أن تصادق عليها حتي تدخل حيز التنفيذ.

وتكمن أهمية المصادقة علي إتفاقية حظر التجارب النووية في أنها تعتبر إمتحانا لنوايا نزع الأسلحة النووية في العالم، لأنه دون تجارب جديدة، سيتوقف إنتاج المزيد من الأنواع والقدرات النووية الجديدة، لا مجال لمساومة حول هذه القضية، وإلا لثارت تآثرة المدافعين عن نزع السلاح.

أي بي اس: هل تتوقع تطورات هامة علي مسار تنفيذ معاهدة حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية؟

دانابالا: هذه المعاهدة يشوبها التمييز غير المقبول، فهي تفرض إلتزامات غير متساوية أو متكافئة، وتطبق علي الدول التي لا تحوز أسلحة نووية بينما تتيح للدول النووية الإحتفاظ بأسلحتها النووية.

كما يواجه إستعراض معاهدة إنتشار الأسلحة النووية (المقرر عقده في العام القادم) مشاكلا غير محولة تخص كوريا الشمالية وإيران، وصفقة التعاون النووي بين الهند والولايات المتحدة، وفشل الدول النووية في خفض وإزالة أسلحتها.

أي بي اس: ماذا عن غاية تحرير العالم من الأسلحة النووية؟

دانابالا: يقف أنصار إبرام معاهدة حول الأسلحة النووية لحظر هذه الأسلحة علي غرار إتفاقيات حظر الأسلحة البيولوجية والأسلحة الكيميائية، يقفون في وجه أولئك الذين يشعرون نظرية الإضطرابية، أي أولئك الذين يعتبرون أن عالما دون أسلحة نووية، كغاية أسمى، هو مجرد وهم وسراب.

الواقع المحدد هو أن عملية الإستعراض كما تراها إدارة أوباما ينبغي أن تنطلق من تغيير مذهبي، أي بالقضاء علي دور الأسلحة النووية في متطلبات الأمن القومي ما سيؤدي نحو أمن عالمي شامل خال من هذه الأسلحة.

<http://cr-iraq.mam9.com/montada-f43/topic-t2785.htm>

PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

DISARMAMENT: North Korea Test a Setback to Nuke-Free World

By Thalif Deen UNITED NATIONS, May 26 (IPS) - When the 2010 review conference on the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) takes place next April, there will be nine declared and non-declared nuclear powers in the world - and probably more waiting in the wings. <http://ipsnews.net/print.asp?idnews=46976>

Published by Atlas Al Maghreb

أطلس المغرب حادثة ديمقراطية حرية ابداع

28 مايو، 2009

كم عدد الخمس نول النووية؟ تسعة... أو عشرين؟
الأمم المتحدة، مايو (أي بي إس)



في أبريل 2010، وتزامنا مع بداية مفاوضات مراجعة معاهدة حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية، سيكُون عدد الدول النووية في العالم تسعة أو أكثر، وليس مجرد الخمس نول (الولايات المتحدة، روسيا، بريطانيا، فرنسا، الصين) التي تحظى بالعضوية الدائمة وحق الإعتراف في مجلس الأمن الدولي.

فقد حذر محمد البرادعي، المدير العام للمصرف لوكالة الطاقة الذرية في فيينا، أن الأرقام القليلة القادمة قد تشهد ظهور 10 إلى 20 "دولة نووية إفتراضية" إضافية، ما لم تتخذ خطوات حاسمة نحو نزع الأسلحة النووية في العالم.

وأنت تجربة كوريا الشمالية النووية في الأيام الأخيرة، الثانية التي تجربها منذ أكتوبر عام 2006، لتقدم دليلا علي صحة هذا التحذر. فتعتبر هذه التجربة الجديدة تهديدا للقارة الآسيوية، بل وبعقبة قوية في وجه مبادرة

الرئيس باراك أوباما للعيش في "عالم درن أسلحة نووية" حسب تصريحاته.

ومن الملفت للنظر أن القوى النووية المعلنة رسميا هي ذات الدول الخمس الأعضاء الدائمين في مجلس الأمن، فيما تصنف الهند وباكستان وإسرائيل وكوريا الشمالية كدول نووية غير معلنة.

فصرح جون بوروغ، المدير التنفيذي لهيئة رجال القانون المعنيين بالسياسات النووية ومقرها نيويورك، أن الخطر الحقيقي يكمن في أن تتسبب التجربة الكورية الشمالية، إضافة إليها البرنامج النووي الإيراني، في شد ساعد الجهات المعارضة لمبادرات نزع الأسلحة النووية، التي شدد علي مدى ضخامة نفوذها في الولايات المتحدة وغيرها من القوى النووية.

وأضاف الخبير القانوني في حديث لوكالة انتر بريس سيرفس أن "العالم سيضطر إلي إدراك أهمية التحرك العاجل علي جبهة نزع الأسلحة النووية، بغض النظر عن تذبذب جهود الحيلولة دون حصول دول جديدة علي أسلحة نووية".

هذا وكانت روز غوتينمولير، مساعدة وزيرة الخارجية الأمريكية، قد أعلنت في منتصف هذه الشهر أثناء إجتماع اللجنة التحضيرية لمؤتمر مراجعة معاهدة حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية، أن "الإلتزام العالمي لهذه المعاهدة، بما يشمل الهند وإسرائيل وباكستان وكوريا الشمالية، يعتبر هدفا أساسيا للولايات المتحدة".

ويشار إلي أن معاهدة حظر الإنتشار النووي لعام 1968 تهدف إلي الحد من إنتشار الأسلحة النووية، ووقعت عليها 189 دولة، بما فيها الخمس دول النووية المعلنة، لكن الهند وإسرائيل وباكستان كوريا الشمالية لم توقع عليها، وإن كانت هذه الأخيرة قد إنضمت إليها ثم إنسحبت منها.

ويتطلع مؤتمر مراجعة المعاهدة في العام المقبل إلي إتفاق كبرى الدول النووية علي إتخاذ خطوات محددة لتقليص عدد الأسلحة النووية ودورها في أنظمتها العسكرية، وإطلاق مسارا جديدا لإزالتها والغاءها مستقبلا في مختلف أرجاء العالم. وأعتبر الخبير جون بوروغ أن ذلك سوف يسهل بدرجة كبيرة مهمة تعبئة الحكومات من أجل العمل علي إحتواء إنتشار الأسلحة النووية والقدرة علي إنتاجه

(IPS وكالة الأنباء العالمية "انتر بريس سيرفس" / 2009)



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

[INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial](#)

INDIA-US: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial. ... India, under the deal, gains access to U.S. technology and atomic energy it allows ...
www.australia.to/index.php?...india-us-hurdles-aplenty-before-nuclear-deal-goes-commercial...

[INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial ...](#)

21 Jul 2009 ... Newspeg environment: NEW DELHI, Jul 21 (IPS) - As US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian officials in New Delhi on ...
en.newspeg.com/INDIA-U.S.--Hurdles-Aplenty-Before-Nuclear-Deal-Goes-Commercial-39043201.html

[India: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial - Last ...](#)

India: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial. Inter Press Service: As U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian ...
www.earth-stream.com/.../Nuclear/India-Hurdles-Aplenty-Before-Nuclear-Deal-Goes-Commercial_18_196_727_184993.html

[INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial ...](#)

NEW DELHI, Jul 21 (IPS) - As US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian officials in New Delhi on Monday to take a forward a civilian ...
www.rocketnews.com/.../india-us-hurdles-aplenty-before-nuclear-deal-goes-commercial-source-ips/

[INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial](#)

INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial. Source Inter Press Service Environment - Posted: July 21, 2009 4:30:40 PM ...
www.earthknowledge.net/locations/asia/india/default.asp?...

[INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial ...](#)

INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial · Log in to vote. 0. Posted on Jul 21, 2009 at 08:03. Tags: · PAKISTAN / INDIA ...
whatreallyhappened.com/.../india-us-hurdles-aplenty-nuclear-deal-goes-commercial -

[Full Coverage: INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal ...](#)

INDIA-U.S.: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial. jrc.it. 21-Jul-2009. Story Timeline: 7 days. By Ranjit Devraj NEW DELHI, Jul 21 (IPS) - As ...
www.newstin.co.uk/related.a?edition=uk...id=en...

[India: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial](#)

21 Jul 2009 ... As US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton began talks with Indian officials in ... India: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial ...
www.climateark.org/shared/reader/welcome.aspx?linkid...

[Silobreaker: India stands to gain from nuclear talks](#)

INDIA-us: Hurdles Aplenty Before Nuclear Deal Goes Commercial. Published 07/21/2009 by Inter Press Service. Nuclear Suppliers Group ...
www.silobreaker.com/india-stands-to-gain-from-nuclear-talks-16_2262470615908745223

[Terraviva EUROPE](#)

22 Jul 2009 ... INDIA-U.S.: HURDLES APLENTY BEFORE N-DEAL GOES COMMERCIAL ... where U.S. nuclear power plants may be built, separate talks between Indian ...
www.ipsterraviva.net/europe/article.aspx?id=7604 - Cached - Similar -

[TOWARD A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD | Nuclear Abolition News Service of ...](#)

Hurdles Aplenty Before INDIA-U.S. N-Deal Goes Commercial ... by the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII) says that the nuclear deal marks the beginning of ...
www.nuclearabolition.net/



PICKUPS BY WEBSITES

[DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea](#)

DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea. ... multilateral disarmament decisions worldwide," Kate Hudson, chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament ...
[www.australia.to/index.php?...12681%3Adisarmament-n-britain-goes-uselessly-to-sea... - Cached - Similar -](#)

[Silobreaker: DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea](#)

DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea - Inter Press Service [2 hours ago]. There are no more reports on this story yet. ...[www.silobreaker.com/disarmament-nbritain-goes-uselessly-to-sea-5_2262470606245068811](#)

[DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea](#)

Analysis/Comments LONDON, Jul 20 (IPS) - Too early yet to call it a ...
[www.newstin.com/tag/us/134201292 -](#)

[TOWARD A NUCLEAR FREE WORLD | Nuclear Abolition News Service of ...](#)

N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea. Too early yet to call it a victory for The issue of nuclear disarmament being discussed with new vigour in the halls ... [www.nuclearabolition.net/ -](#)

[Campaign For Nuclear Disarmament, Schema-Root news](#)

DISARMAMENT: N-Britain Goes Uselessly to Sea. Inter Press Service July 20, 2009 ... in favour of multilateral disarmament decisions worldwide," Kate Hudson, ...
[schema-root.org/.../disarmament/.../campaign_for_nuclear_disarmament/ -](#)

[Terraviva EUROPE](#)

DISARMAMENT: N-BRITAIN GOES USELESSLY TO SEA Sanjay Suri LONDON (IPS) - Too early yet to call it a victory for anti-nuclear lobbyists, but the British ...
[www.ipsterraviva.net/europe/article.aspx?id=7603 -](#)

[MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War](#)

MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War. ... to the attitude that, during the Cold War, became U.S. doctrine under Robert McNamara (who died just last week). ...
[www.australia.to/index.php?...mideast-fine-tuning-the-cold-war... -](#)

[MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War](#)

MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War. ... to the attitude that, during the Cold War, became U.S. doctrine under Robert McNamara (who died just last week). ...
[www.australia.to/index.php?...mideast-fine-tuning-the-cold-war... -](#)

[MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War](#)

[[Translate this page](#)]

File Format: Microsoft Word - [View as HTML](#)

Menyesuaikan Perang Dingin Jerrold Kessel dan Pierre Klochender. JERUSALEM (IPS) – AMBIGUITAS adalah istilah untuk semua pihak yang terlibat dalam isu ...
[www.suarakomunitas.net/download.php?id=852](#)

[MIDEAST: Fine-Tuning the Cold War](#)

MIDEAST: Analysis by Jerrold Kessel and Pierre Klochender JERUSALEM, Jul 13 (IPS) - Ambiguity - is it the watchword for all involved in the issue over whether Iran goes nuclear, especially in light of the ongoing political uncertainties ...
From JERROLD KESSEL AND PIERRE KLOCHENDER, [Inter Press Service](#), 13 Jul 2009
http://labs.daylife.com/journalist/jerrold_kessel_and_pierre_klochender

CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

IPPNW Response to the Moscow Summit

Released July 9, 2009

[\[PDF 64KB\]](#)

In March 2009, just before the historic first meeting between US President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War sent the two leaders [a letter](#) signed by more than 300 of the world's top physicians, appealing for leadership toward a world without nuclear weapons. Our hopes and expectations were raised by the statements issued from the London meeting, and by President Obama's speech in Prague a few days later, when he pledged "America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons" and added that "as the only nuclear power to have used a nuclear weapon, the United States has a moral responsibility to act."



From the perspective of the US-Soviet Cold War, when tens of thousands of nuclear weapons on hair-trigger alert threatened humanity with extinction, the goal announced by Presidents Medvedev and Obama this week in Moscow — the reduction of US and Russian strategic arsenals to their lowest levels since the mid 1950s — is welcome news.

As a promised "down payment" toward a nuclear-weapons-free world, however, this is a disappointingly small step. Combined stockpiles of 3,000 strategic warheads are still more than enough to kill and injure hundreds of millions of people, and plunge the Earth into a nuclear winter. Even a nuclear war using only a fraction of the proposed arsenals would result in a humanitarian and climate catastrophe to which physicians could offer no meaningful medical response.

There is no plausible definition of deterrence that could not be satisfied with far fewer weapons during the transition to a nuclear-free world. Engaging the other nuclear weapon states in meaningful negotiations will require deeper reductions by the world's largest nuclear powers, and we see no reason to postpone such reductions despite the need to resolve disputes about missile defenses, NATO expansion, and conventional force levels. Taking all US and Russian missiles off high alert would go a long way toward removing the danger of accidental nuclear war, and can be done by executive orders in Washington and Moscow. We have urged both leaders to take this security enhancing and confidence building step in the past, and we do so again.

Ridding the world of nuclear weapons will not happen overnight. But we should not have to wait for another generation of leaders to finish the task to which Presidents Obama and Medvedev say they are committed—and to which we believe they are committed. A nuclear-weapons-free world can be achieved in our lifetime, but it will require bolder action than we have seen so far.

The Russian and US negotiating teams, with the support of abolitionist Presidents, could exceed the modest goals set for them in Moscow, and we hope they will. IPPNW told Presidents Obama and Medvedev in March that "A thousand years from now no one will remember most of what you will do over the next few years; but no one will ever forget the leaders who abolished the threat of nuclear war." We reiterate that message as the Moscow summit comes to a close, and continue to offer our support, our encouragement, and our impatience for a world that is no longer held hostage to these instruments of mass extermination. ☑



CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Leading U.S. Arms Control Group: Obama-Medvedev Made Progress, Still Long Way To Go

July 6, 2009

Washington, D.C. -- In response to today's announcement by Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev concerning a follow-on agreement to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation commended the leaders' progress but warned that there is still much to be done.

"Today's events represent progress, but there is still a long way to go," said [John Isaacs](#), executive director of the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation. "It took George W. Bush eight years to unravel U.S.-Russian relations, and it will take Barack Obama more than eight months to stitch things back together."

START expires on December 5, 2009. The expiration will mean the loss of the ability to legally limit and verify the two countries' still enormous numbers of deployed nuclear weapons and delivery systems.

Added Isaacs: "There is a very good chance things could drag into 2010 because of the time-consuming nature of the newly-created commissions, negotiations over specific numbers, and gaining approval in the U.S. Senate."

"The congressional picture will come into better focus once more details and specific numbers are agreed upon," concluded Isaacs.

For background information on the START follow-on negotiations, visit the [START Resource Center](#).

Analysis of FY 2010 House Defense Appropriations Bill (HR 3326)

By Travis Sharp (July 28, 2009)

On July 22, 2009, the House Appropriations Committee completed its markup of the fiscal year (FY) 2010 Defense Appropriations bill (HR 3326). The Committee bill provides \$636.6 billion in total funding, \$3.8 billion less than the President's request. Of the total, \$508.4 billion is for the Department of Defense (DOD) "base" budget and \$128.2 billion is for ongoing military operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.

BASE BUDGET HIGHLIGHTS

Military Pay Raise – The Committee provided a 3.4 percent pay raise, 0.5 percent above the President's request
Compensation for Stop Loss – The Committee provided \$8.3 million in unrequested funding to pay service members \$500 for every month that they are retained as a result of application of stop loss authority, which forces service members to remain on active duty past their end of term of service date

F/A-22 "Raptor" Fighter – The Committee added \$368.8 million in unrequested advance funding for 12 F-22 aircraft, but Rep. John Murtha (D-PA) plans to try and remove the advance funds during floor consideration

F/A-18E/F "Super Hornet" Fighter – The Committee added \$603 million to the President's request to purchase nine additional Hornets (total FY 2010 buy will be 18 aircraft under Committee's plan); the Committee also included \$108 million for long lead equipment procurement on what will ultimately be a 5-year, 150-aircraft buy of F/A-18E/Fs and EA-18Gs

C-17 Globemaster Transport Aircraft – The Committee added \$674 million in unrequested funding for 3 C-17s

Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) – The Committee added \$780 million to the President's request to purchase an extra LCS vessel (total FY 2010 buy will be 4 ships under Committee's plan)

Missile Defense – The Committee added \$80 million in unrequested funding for the Kinetic Energy Interceptor (KEI) in order "to enable the continuation of the program and the leveraging of KEI products and expertise for early intercept capability and other missile defense applications"

Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ("Nunn-Lugar") – The Committee provided the President's full Nunn-Lugar request of \$404.1 million, a funding level that, after adjusting for inflation, is \$79 million (or 17 percent) less than the Bush-era annual average of \$474 million (2009 dollars) ([click here](#) for more on the Nunn-Lugar budget)



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

FUNDING PROVISIONS (BASE BUDGET)

Total Funding (figures reflect scorekeeping adjustments)

Request: \$511.8 billion

Committee: \$508.4 billion (\$3.4 billion below request)

Personnel

Request: \$125.3 billion

Committee: \$122.4 billion (\$2.9 billion below request)

Operations & Maintenance

Request: \$156.4 billion

Committee: \$154.2 billion (\$2.2 billion below request)

Procurement

Request: \$105.2 billion

Committee: \$104.8 billion (\$400 million below request)

Research, Development, Testing & Evaluation

Request: \$78.6 billion

Committee: \$80.2 billion (\$1.6 billion above request)

Revolving & Management Funds

Request: \$3.1 billion

Committee: \$3.1 billion (meets request)

Other DOD & Related Agencies

Request: \$32.4 billion

Committee: \$34.2 billion (\$1.8 billion above request)

MAJOR WEAPONS SYSTEMS (Figures include procurement plus research & development)

Ballistic Missile Defense

Request: \$9.184 billion, of which \$7.709 billion is for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) and \$1.475 billion is for Army programs (i.e. Patriot, THAAD)

Committee: \$9.137 billion, of which \$7.743 billion is for MDA and \$1.394 billion is for Army programs

Aircraft

F/A-22 "Raptor" Fighter

Request: \$1.0 billion for upgrades/maintenance; no funds for new aircraft

Committee: \$1.2 billion, of which \$368.8 million is unrequested advance funding for 12 aircraft (Rep. Murtha intends to try and remove these advance funds during floor consideration)

Joint Strike Fighter

Request: \$10.4 billion for 30 aircraft (4 Navy, 16 Marine Corps, 10 Air Force)

Committee: \$10.2 billion for 28 aircraft (4 Navy, 14 Marine Corps, 10 Air Force), of which \$560 million is unrequested funding for the Alternative Engine

F/A-18E/F "Super Hornet" Fighter

Request: \$1.2 billion for 9 aircraft

Committee: \$1.7 billion for 18 aircraft, of which \$108 million is for long lead equipment procurement on what will ultimately be a 5-year, 150-aircraft buy of F/A-18E/Fs and EA-18Gs

EA-18G Radar Jamming Aircraft

Request: \$1.6 billion for 22 aircraft

Committee: \$1.6 billion for 22 aircraft

V-22 "Osprey" Tilt-rotor

Request: \$2.6 billion for 35 aircraft (30 Marine Corps and 5 Air Force)

Committee: \$2.6 billion for 35 aircraft (30 Marine Corps and 5 Air Force)

C-130J Transport Aircraft

Request: \$992.9 million (base budget only) for 3 aircraft

Committee: \$738.5 million (base budget only) for 3 aircraft; \$254 million cut from modification request primarily due to low execution

C-17 Globemaster Transport Aircraft

Request: \$720.1 million (base budget only) for shutdown activities and modification

Committee: \$1.2 billion (base budget only), of which \$674 million is unrequested funding for 3 C-17s



CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Shipbuilding

DDG-1000 "Zumwalt" Destroyer [DD(x)]

Request: \$1.6 billion to complete the third, and final, ship in the class

Committee: \$1.6 billion to complete the third, and final, ship in the class

DDG-51 "Arleigh Burke" Destroyer

Request: \$2.2 billion for 1 ship

Committee: \$2.2 billion for 1 ship

LPD-17 "San Antonio" Amphibious Assault Ship

Request: \$1.1 billion to complete the 10th ship and advance procurement for the 11th

Committee: \$1.1 billion to complete the 10th ship and advance procurement for the 11th

SSN-774 "Virginia" Class Submarine

Request: \$4.2 billion for 1 ship

Committee: \$4.2 billion for 1 ship

Littoral Combat Ship (LCS)

Request: \$1.9 billion for 3 ships

Committee: \$2.6 billion for 4 ships, of which \$780 million is unrequested funding to buy an additional ship in FY 2010

T-AKE Supply Ship

Request: \$940.1 million for 2 ships

Committee: \$940.1 million for 2 ships

Army Programs

Stryker Armored Vehicle

Request: \$479 million for enhancements and engineering

Committee: \$704 million, of which \$225 million is unrequested funding for additional vehicles

Future Combat Systems (FCS)

Request: \$2.9 billion for development of the restructured FCS program

Committee: \$2.7 billion for development of the restructured FCS program

UH-60 Blackhawk Helicopter

Request: \$1.4 billion (base budget only) for 79 helos

Committee: \$1.4 billion (base budget only) for 79 helos

Non-Proliferation Programs

DoD Cooperative Threat Reduction Program ("Nunn-Lugar")

Request: \$404.1 million

Committee: \$404.1 million

IRAQ-AFGHANISTAN HIGHLIGHTS

Overseas Contingency Operations Transfer Fund (OCOTF) – Expressing concern that operations in Iraq and Afghanistan will change significantly in FY 2010 and that the Services therefore cannot budget accurately, the Committee created the OCOTF to facilitate a more flexible dispersal of funds. The Committee transferred 20 percent of the President's operations and maintenance request for Iraq and Afghanistan to the OCOTF

Review of the Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) – Citing concerns that CERP, a program that provides military commanders with funds that they can use for development and other projects in their area of responsibility, is suffering from mismanagement and abuse, the Committee requested a thorough Pentagon review of CERP

Guantanamo Bay Detention Facility – The Committee rejected the \$100 million requested to relocate detainees housed at Guantanamo

IRAQ-AFGHANISTAN FUNDING PROVISIONS

Total Funding: \$128.2 billion | Personnel: \$16.2 billion | Operations & Maintenance: \$88.0 billion | Procurement: \$20.4 billion | Research, Development, Testing & Evaluation: \$241.4 million | Revolving & Management Funds: \$412.2 million | Defense Health Program: \$1.2 billion | Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities: \$317.6 million | Joint Improvised Explosive Device Defeat Fund: \$1.5 billion

SOURCES

House Appropriations Committee Report 111-230 ([PDF](#)) | House Appropriations Committee Press Release ([PDF](#))

Program Acquisition Costs by Weapon System for FY 2010 ([PDF](#))

Travis Sharp 202-546-0795 ext. 2105 tsharp@armscontrolcenter.org

Travis Sharp is the Military Policy Analyst at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation. He has published articles on defense policy in scholarly journals, internet magazines, and local newspapers, and has appeared on or been quoted in media venues such as the *New York Times*, *Washington Post*, *Boston Globe*, CNN, and Al Jazeera



CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

Trident Replacement Pause is 'Excellent News' - Says CND (July 16)

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament warmly welcomed the suggestion that the Government is to delay the 'Initial Gate' decision on replacing the Trident nuclear weapons submarines, pending the outcome of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference in May 2010. Previously, the Government planned to move on to the next stage of the replacement process during the Parliamentary recess in September.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said:

"This delay is excellent news. We hope the Government will not only make a major contribution to advancing plans for global disarmament at the forthcoming international talks, but also use this pause to reconsider Britain's possession of nuclear weapons. Given the worsening economic climate, defence cuts will be necessary, but scrapping Trident would be positively beneficial to reducing global tensions.

"The current defence review and the Strategic Defence Review to be held after the next election are excellent opportunities to conclude that the challenges of the coming century cannot be met by costly Cold War weapons systems like Trident. We hope Ministers are brave enough to share the conclusion of the Generals who recently described Trident as 'militarily useless'.

"We hope this is the first sign that the Government is really prepared to respond to the changed mood not just from leaders like President Obama, but also from the British public. Recent polls show a majority oppose the UK's continued possession of nuclear weapons. This will be a vote winner for whichever party chooses to free itself - and Britain - from the dogma of the past. We are a world away from the tense world of the 1980s - the public recognises this, but now politics needs to catch up."

Earlier today over 30 MPs wrote to the Prime Minister and the Defence Secretary [names and text in note 3] demanding exactly such a delay to the Initial Gate. They called for Parliament to have further discussions on Trident replacement before such a major spending commitment is given. CND believes that it is essential that such a debate takes place before the next stage of the project commences, whenever that occurs.

The Initial Gate decision, which would allow detailed design work to commence, is estimated to commit £2-3bn. The procurement costs for the new submarines are likely to be in the order of £25bn, with total costs of £76bn for the project when running costs are included. ☑

Briefing on the costs of British nuclear weapons: http://www.cnduk.org/images/stories/briefings/trident/cost_british_nweapons_07.pdf

Brown 'Stuck in Cold War Rut' on Trident; MPs Demand New Debate (July 16)

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has today condemned Gordon Brown's promotion and funding of a global explosion of nuclear power production as 'the slow poison route to global destruction', which will make nuclear weapons proliferation more - not less - likely. CND deplores the Prime Minister's failure to address any of the current concerns about Trident and its replacement, in spite of extensive public concern and rethinking from across the political spectrum. Today over 30 MPs have written to the Prime Minister and the Defence Secretary demanding that parliament has further discussion on Trident replacement before a government decision to advance to the next stage. Currently the government plans to take this decision during the Parliamentary recess.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said: "This is a time of unprecedented popular opposition to, and widespread political concern about, Britain's nuclear weapons. It is outrageous that the Prime Minister has chosen to ignore these concerns and stick unquestioningly to the Cold War white elephant Trident. Instead he is promoting and funding - with British taxpayers' money - a global explosion of nuclear power that amounts to the slow poison route to global destruction.

"There are repeated calls - from all parts of the political spectrum - for a new debate on Trident replacement, and there is a clear demand that Trident should be included in the forthcoming defence review. Instead the government plans to progress to the next stage of the replacement process during the parliamentary recess. Mr Brown, who is clearly stuck in a Cold War rut, is ignoring the advice of the Foreign Affairs Committee which has demanded just such a debate, along with many MPs drawn from all parties.

"We welcome the MPs' letter today, to the Prime Minister and the Defence Secretary, calling for parliamentary scrutiny and debate before a government decision to progress to the next stage of Trident replacement. This issue is too important to be decided behind closed doors." ☑



WHAT OTHERS SAY

Voters Want Britain to Scrap All Nuclear Weapons, ICM Poll Shows

Survey for Guardian finds 54% support disarmament rather than replacing Trident deterrent

guardian.co.uk, July 13

Voters want Britain to scrap nuclear weapons altogether rather than replace Trident, according to a new Guardian/ICM poll today. The result marks a sharp turnaround in public opinion amid growing debate about the cost of a new generation of nuclear weapons and the impact of conventional defence cutbacks on the war in Afghanistan.

For decades nuclear disarmament has been seen as a minority issue, with most voters assumed to favour continued investment in an independent British nuclear weapons system. But today's poll shows that 54% of all voters would prefer to abandon nuclear weapons rather than put money into a new generation of Trident warheads, as the government plans.

Last week's G8 summit brought suggestions that Britain might include Trident in international disarmament talks. "What we need is collective action by the nuclear weapons powers to say that we are prepared to reduce our nuclear weapons," said Gordon Brown.

Today's figures mark a dramatic turnaround in public opinion since Trident renewal was announced by Brown three years ago. In July 2006, 51% backed renewal, while 39% opposed it. Since then support for a new Trident system has fallen by nine points while opposition has grown by 15 points.

READ MORE: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/jul/13/icm-poll-nuclear-weapons>

Nonproliferation a Cornerstone of Obama's Foreign Policy

July 15, 4:35 PM · Stephen Okin - NY International Security Examiner

During his short stint as a Senator, one of the main issues Barack Obama worked on was nonproliferation. In fact, one of his major legislative achievements was the Lugar-Obama Proliferation and Threat Reduction Initiative, which was signed into law on January 11th, 2007. The initiative expands U.S. cooperation to destroy conventional weapons such as Man Portable Air Defense Systems (MANPADS), and increases the State Department's ability to detect and interdict weapons and materials of mass destruction.

Obama has carried this passion for nonproliferation into his presidency. In his Person of the Year interview with Time Magazine, president-elect Obama claimed one of the things "that keeps me up at night is the issue of nuclear proliferation. We are going to have to take leadership in stitching back together a nonproliferation regime that has been frayed. We're going to have to do it at the same time as the Internet has made technology for the creation of weapons of mass destruction more accessible than ever before, and at a time when more countries are going to be pursuing nuclear power. That, I think, is going to be a great challenge."

Since becoming president, Obama has moved forcefully to confront the challenge of nonproliferation. In his dealings with Russia, Iran, North Korea, and Mexico, Obama has placed nonproliferation at the top of his agenda. With Russia, Obama has restarted nuclear disarmament talks and has offered to stop development of a missile defense site in Poland and the Czech Republic if Moscow cooperates in convincing Iran to give up its nuclear program. Furthermore, Obama has argued that Russia and the United States need to lead on nuclear disarmament in order to strengthen their credibility with North Korea and Iran when asking them to give up their nuclear programs.

Regarding Iran, Obama has taken a strong realist approach to their nuclear program. Instead of putting off discussions with the Iranian regime because of its harsh response to the presidential election protests, Obama has maintained his openness to discuss the nuclear issue with whomever is in power. Given Obama's persistence with this position in the face of criticism over his support for democracy, it can be concluded that nonproliferation is a guiding priority of his foreign policy.

READ MORE: <http://www.examiner.com/x-9463-NY-International-Security-Examiner~y2009m7d15-Nonproliferation-a-cornerstone-of-Obamas-foreign-policy>

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Continued Commitment Needed on U.S. Chemical Disarmament, OPCW Chief Says

By Chris Schneidmiller - *Global Security Newswire*



WASHINGTON (July 22) -- A leading international nonproliferation official is urging the United States not to retreat from providing sufficient funds to accelerate the complete elimination of the U.S. stockpile of chemical weapons (see [GSN](#), May 6).

"We hope that ... every [funding commitment] will be completed in good time for the facilities to be completed in good time and be able to destroy the remaining chemical weapons in good time," said Rogelio Pfirter, director general of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons.

The Defense Department's Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program stands to receive about \$550 million in fiscal 2010 as it continues construction of demilitarization plants at the Blue Grass Army Depot in Kentucky and the Pueblo Chemical Depot in Colorado. That would be a nearly 30 percent hike in resources from this year, and news reports indicate that the organization could collect \$1.2 billion in extra funding over several upcoming budgets.

The Pentagon today has destroyed more than 60 percent of its chemical arsenal, which was stored for decades at nine locations. The Colorado and Kentucky sites will be the last two installations to begin -- and presumably complete -- destruction of their stockpiles. As it stands, the end is more than a decade away.

Proposed ACWA funding in the next budget is "substantially sufficient for a one-year effort," Pfirter said in a June telephone interview with *Global Security Newswire*. There should be no letdown in spending, he said: "It will take much more than that just to complete the facilities." Pfirter was in Washington last month for his first meetings with Obama administration officials at the White House and the State and Defense departments, along with lawmakers on Capitol Hill.

During the subsequent interview, he avoided discussing details of the visit. However, the former Argentine diplomat said he left convinced that the new U.S. leadership is engaged on meeting its commitments under the international Chemical Weapons Convention.

The United States is one of 188 member nations to the 1997 pact that prohibits the development, production, stockpiling, use or proliferation of chemical warfare materials such as mustard blister agent and the lethal nerve agents VX and sarin. Any nation that joins the pact while in possession of banned armaments -- the list to date encompasses Albania, India, Iraq, Libya, Russia, the United States and a publicly unidentified nation widely understood to be South Korea -- is required to destroy those weapons and any production capabilities.

"The administration fully recognizes the convention and is totally aware. It doesn't need anyone else to remind them," Pfirter said. "The commitment is very, very strong toward the convention. I'm sure the United States will continue to look for ways of bringing their own destruction program in line with the convention."

Officials in Washington also said little about Pfirter's day and a half of talks. One congressional source said Pfirter met for a short time with then-Representative Ellen Tauscher (D-Calif.), who has since become undersecretary of state for arms control and international security. The two discussed the challenges facing the U.S. disarmament program, the source said.

"There was no big strategy discussion. I think it was a courtesy call on his part," according to the Capitol Hill official. The administration's public face on arms control has to date been squarely aimed at nuclear weapons, with President Barack Obama in April giving a highly publicized speech in Prague on disarmament (see [GSN](#), April 6). More recently, the U.S. president signed a pledge with his Russian counterpart to draw down their nations' strategic nuclear arsenals (see [GSN](#), July 6).

Image above: A truck transports a final bulk container of VX nerve agent for disposal last year at the Newport Chemical Depot in Indiana. An international nonproliferation official urged Washington to maintain a high funding level for its chemical-weapon destruction efforts (U.S. Army photo).



WHAT OTHERS SAY

“The State Department and Defense Department have taken President Obama’s Prague speech as their marching orders. So they view the president’s top arms control priorities as entirely nuclear, with much less of a focus on the other categories of WMD,” said chemical-weapon expert Jonathan Tucker, a senior fellow at the Washington office of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies.

Concerns in the intelligence community regarding the threat of terrorists developing and using chemical weapons have not resulted in new international policy initiatives, Tucker said. The White House has also not scheduled any sort of meeting on chemical-weapon issues similar to a planned August session on biological threats, he added.

Meanwhile, the State Department has yet to appoint a high-level diplomat to replace the Bush administration’s envoy to Pfirter’s organization, which monitors compliance with the convention, Tucker said. That position will be crucial for preparing Washington to deal with the diplomatic fallout expected when it inevitably misses the chemical-weapon disarmament deadline set by the document.

A Pressing Schedule

The convention originally set a deadline of April 29, 2007 -- one decade after its entry into force -- for its member nations to do away with their chemical stockpiles. In 2006, all declared arsenal holders but Albania received schedule extensions, with the United States and Russia being given a full five extra years (see [GSN](#), Dec. 11, 2006).

In the intervening years, Albania, India and South Korea have all completed their chemical demilitarization work (see [GSN](#), April 29).

The Defense Department, though, has acknowledged its inability to eliminate its weapons on time. “The DOD review has concluded that there are no realistic options available to destroy the complete U.S. stockpile by the CWC deadline of April 2012,” the Pentagon said last May in a report to Congress.

The latest plan calls for the Army Chemical Materials Agency around that time to complete destruction operations at storage sites that held 90 percent of the U.S. chemical warfare holdings. The organization by June 30 had eliminated more than 63 percent of the original U.S. arsenal of 31,500 tons of warfare materials. The remaining 10 percent would be eliminated by 2021 by the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program, according to the report.

Washington now has less than three years to persuade other CWC member states that delays in the destruction of its chemical stockpile are the result of factors beyond its control and that it is doing everything it can to meet its treaty obligations. Failure to do so could result in international criticism or more concrete penalties.

The best outcome for the administration would be that, rather than blaming or punishing the United States, the organization’s members simply require the Pentagon to eliminate whatever remains of its stockpile within a specified period of time, Tucker said. If U.S. officials fail to prepare the ground diplomatically, however, they should expect to face a blast of rhetoric when the deadline passes, he added.

Also possible, though less likely, is that OPCW member nations collectively or individually could impose sanctions against the United States, such as stripping it of its voting rights within the organization or cutting off trade in dual-use industrial chemicals listed in the pact.

“It’s hard to predict what the political dynamic in the OPCW will be in April 2012. Obviously it’s essential for the United States to begin preparing now to make a convincing case,” Tucker said. “The total quantity of CW agent that still remains to be destroyed ... will also be significant.”

“Already countries like Iran have been highly critical of the United States and I anticipate that that criticism will only increase, so it’s important that other CWC member states be seen as sympathetic to the U.S. position. That will take a fair amount of persuasion, I think,” he added.

U.S. diplomats are likely to argue that the treaty drafters set unrealistic deadlines that failed to account for the technical and political challenges involved in destroying chemical-weapon stockpiles in a safe and environmentally responsible manner, Tucker said. The United States could also point to recent increases in Pentagon funding as an illustration of its commitment to the spirit -- if not the letter -- of the treaty, he said.



BEYOND NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION



WHAT OTHERS SAY

Should diplomatic efforts prove persuasive, the United States might receive a pass similar to the one granted Albania, Tucker said. The Adriatic nation had to overcome technical difficulties in destruction of its 16.7-metric-ton arsenal of warfare materials but finished operations several months after the treaty-set deadline without sustaining any repercussions, he said.

In deciding against penalizing Albania, the OPCW Executive Council invoked a paragraph in Article 8 of the convention, which states: "In its consideration of doubts or concerns regarding compliance and causes of noncompliance ... the Executive Council shall consult with the states parties involved and, as appropriate, request the state party to take measures to redress the situation within a specified time."

Officials at the State Department told *GSN* they could not discuss a situation that is several years from being realized. "Of course people are aware of the present [schedule] estimates," Pflirter said. It is a political and diplomatic issue that will be "attended to," he said.

The Deadline at Home

Beyond the convention deadline is the Dec. 31, 2017, end-date demanded by Congress for complete elimination of the U.S. stockpile. That is also almost certain to be missed; as recently as last September, the military estimated that disposal operations at Blue Grass and Pueblo would have barely begun by then, much less finished.

The two installations have been beset by a variety of problems over the years. Federal legislation forced the Defense Department to find alternatives to destruction of weapons using incineration, the process used at most other sites. Military planners ultimately chose to employ chemical neutralization, but progress on the plants themselves has been slowed by major funding fluctuations -- as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq drew away money -- and a mandate for redesigns to restrict costs.

The projects, though, have been on an upswing in recent years. The ACWA program received \$427 million in this budget year, and lawmakers have already added \$5 million to the Pentagon's \$545 million request for fiscal 2010 as it makes its way through Congress. The next fiscal year begins Oct. 1.

Construction of the primary demilitarization facilities is now under way at both sites, with crucial equipment being installed at Pueblo, according to a [June update](#) from the program.

The United States can use the extra money to draw closer to the congressional deadline, but it will not meet it. "To achieve the congressional destruction mandate of 2017, only transporting portions of the stockpile to currently operating destruction facilities showed any reasonable probability of success, and this option is precluded by law," according to the Pentagon report.

The document recommends an expedited disposal program in which the program receives additional resources through several budgets -- annual funding that one expert said would be roughly equivalent to the amount requested this year, which would constitute a \$250 million yearly increase over previous estimates -- and all warfare agents, munitions and waste are treated on-site at the Colorado and Kentucky installations. Carrying out the effort would involve increasing personnel to allow for faster construction, an early beginning to testing of the plants and expanding disposal operations from four to seven days a week, 24 hours per day.

Neutralization of more than 2,600 tons of mustard agent in Colorado would begin in May 2014 and end in September 2017 -- three years ahead of existing schedule estimates. The Kentucky plant would begin operations in October 2018 and finish elimination of 523 tons of mustard, VX and sarin in May 2021 -- two years earlier than anticipated. Speeding the pace of work would actually save about \$235 million, bringing lifetime costs for the ACWA program to \$8.2 billion, the Defense Department found.

Spending on the entire chemical demilitarization effort would exceed \$35 billion, according to the DOD estimate. The strategy outlined in the document appears to reflect the administration's plan for the program.

"The current path forward is to use the fiscal resources in the FY 2010 president's budget request to accelerate the ACWA program to achieve destruction of the Colorado stockpile by 2017 and the Kentucky stockpile by 2021," a Pentagon spokesman stated today by e-mail.

WHAT OTHERS SAY

Assuming the funding comes through, the Defense Department is likely to meet its present goal of finishing off its prohibited arsenal 12 years from now, said Paul Walker, security and sustainability director for the environmental organization Global Green USA.

"It's a little too late to play complete catch-up. But the catch-up they're playing is a good sign," he said.

Walker argued, though, that the schedule could be cut by another one or two years through certain measures, such as use of explosive detonation chambers to destroy mustard-filled munitions at Blue Grass before the demilitarization plant itself is operating.

Pfirter, who has a year left in his eight-year stint as OPCW chief, acknowledged the challenges ahead. However, he also asserted that even the most recent target dates are not set in stone.

The Defense Department in 2006 estimated that operations at all existing disposal plants would be less than 70 percent complete by 2012, Pfirter noted. The latest assessment has all but two facilities wrapping up operations by then and just 10 percent of the stockpile remaining.

"We look forward to further estimates that will show further substantive progress in the pace of destruction, so as to ensure elimination is achieved," he said.

The Defense Department, though, has acknowledged its inability to eliminate its weapons on time. "The DOD review has concluded that there are no realistic options available to destroy the complete U.S. stockpile by the CWC deadline of April 2012," the Pentagon said last May in a report to Congress.

The latest plan calls for the Army Chemical Materials Agency around that time to complete destruction operations at storage sites that held 90 percent of the U.S. chemical warfare holdings. The organization by June 30 had eliminated more than 63 percent of the original U.S. arsenal of 31,500 tons of warfare materials. The remaining 10 percent would be eliminated by 2021 by the Assembled Chemical Weapons Alternatives program, according to the report.

Washington now has less than three years to persuade other CWC member states that delays in the destruction of its chemical stockpile are the result of factors beyond its control and that it is doing everything it can to meet its treaty obligations. Failure to do so could result in international criticism or more concrete penalties.