



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.

## RELATED ARTICLES

### **How to Check Both Iran and Israel**

Analysis by Jerrold Kessel and Pierre Klochendler

TEL AVIV, Feb 27, 2010 (IPS) - The U.S. is raising the stakes in its bid to halt Iran's nuclear programme, putting the issue on a "pressure track", says top U.S. general David Petraeus. The U.S. and other world powers are drumming up support for a fourth round of UN sanctions against Iran for its refusal to comply with repeated ultimatums to suspend uranium enrichment and to agree to a deal involving UN-backed nuclear fuel. <http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50476>

### **What Will China Do With Its Veto?**

By Mohammed A. Salih and Eli Clifton

WASHINGTON, Feb 23, 2010 (IPS) - With relations between China and the U.S. taking some bitter turns in recent months, how China responds to mounting pressure from the U.S. and its European allies for tougher sanctions on Iran is being viewed as a major test of the current relations and a determinant of the future shape of bilateral ties between Washington and Beijing.

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50433>

### **U.S.: Nuke Plants Back in Vogue, as Climate Bill Stalls**

By Matthew Berger

WASHINGTON, Feb 16, 2010 (IPS) - After decades of debate, the United States is poised to build its first new nuclear reactors since the early 1970s.

Speaking at a job training centre northeast of Washington Tuesday, President Barack Obama announced the federal government would underwrite the construction of two new reactors to be built in Georgia.

The loan guarantee will be for 8.3 billion dollars, meaning a sizable percentage of the reactors' 8.8 billion price tag will be put up by the government – and absorbed by it, were Southern Company, the energy firm building the plants, to default.

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50356>

### **West Treats Iran's Nuclear Offer with Caution**

By Mohammed A. Salih

WASHINGTON, Feb 3, 2010 (IPS) - The declaration by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad that his country is ready to exchange low-enriched uranium for nuclear fuel has been met with a mostly cautious reaction by Western leaders.

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50213>

## OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

## CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

## WHAT OTHERS SAY



## RELATED ARTICLES

### How to Check Both Iran and Israel

Analysis by Jerrold Kessel and Pierre Klochendler

**TEL AVIV, Feb 27, 2010 (IPS) - The U.S. is raising the stakes in its bid to halt Iran's nuclear programme, putting the issue on a "pressure track", says top U.S. general David Petraeus. The U.S. and other world powers are drumming up support for a fourth round of UN sanctions against Iran for its refusal to comply with repeated ultimatums to suspend uranium enrichment and to agree to a deal involving UN-backed nuclear fuel.**

Petraeus, the head of U.S. Central command, said the Obama administration intends to "send the kind of signal to Iran about the very serious concerns that the countries in the region and, indeed, the entire world have about Iran's activities in the nuclear programme."

In parallel, his commander, Admiral Mike Mullen, the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff who just returned from the Middle East, made a point of warning that any military strike against Iran would not be "decisive" in countering Tehran's nuclear programme.

The top U.S. military commanders were speaking on the eve of talks in Washington with Israel's Defence Minister Ehud Barak.

For now, both Barak and Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu have lined up solidly behind the U.S.-led attempt to gain Security Council approval for sanctions against Tehran. However, in Netanyahu's description this week, the sanctions must be "crippling".

The Israeli leaders have been careful not to express publicly any doubts about the U.S. strategy. But there remain residual misgivings here whether sanctions will indeed go through at the UN. And, whether they will work.

That was what lay behind Mullen's pointed recent visit to Tel Aviv.

The motive for the U.S. admiral's visit was unexpectedly transparent - his purpose not only to coordinate policy with Israel, but to restrain Israel from independent action.

Although re-emphasising that President Obama has made his policy abundantly clear - "Iran cannot have nuclear weapons," Mullen addressed the persistent speculation that Israel has not abandoned its ongoing preparations for a possible pre-emptive strike against Iran's nuclear facilities.

If a regional confrontation were to break out following a strike on Iran, the U.S. military chief said bluntly, "it would be a big, big, big problem for all of us. I worry a great deal about

the unintended consequences of a strike."

To underline this concern, Mullen took the almost unprecedented step of convening a short news conference at the U.S. embassy here before entering meetings with Barak and Israel's military command.

He even agreed to be interviewed by the three main Israeli television stations, using the opportunity again to caution that Israel should exercise complete restraint and do nothing to disturb U.S. coordination of the international sanctions drive.

Mullen's strictures were an echo of the last time he was in Israel 18 months ago when he was dispatched by the Bush Administration to deliver a similar message that Israel should not think of going it alone in trying to neutralise the perceived threat from Iran.

Mullen did, however, reiterate the U.S. assessments that unless the Iranian nuclear programme is halted, Tehran could make a nuclear bomb "within one to three years."

The Israeli prime minister seems to have absorbed the message.

When Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad warned that Iran would side with Syria and Lebanon if attacked by Israel, Netanyahu made the point of stating categorically that Israel "was not planning any wars", blasting the Iranian president for trying to "manipulate the situation" in a bid to head off the sanctions drive.

So, where does all this leave Israeli concerns about Iran?

The answer may be in another candid interview - with Israel's UN ambassador, Gabriella Shalev. Asked by Israeli reporters in Washington, "Why is Israel recently so calm regarding Iran?" she responded, "We are very anxious. But...if the Security Council will not impose on Iran what Secretary Clinton called 'crippling sanctions,' we'll end up just having the individual states working together on this issue." >>>

## RELATED ARTICLES

### **How to Check Both Iran and Israel / 2**

Shalev expressed concern that the Security Council "can be paralysed" because of the veto power of the five permanent members. "It took some time for the new U.S. administration to figure out that the UN is not what they hoped for. Now they realise the complexities," she added quite undiplomatically.

Pressed on the possibility of the Israeli pre-emptive strike, she said frankly, "It's one of the options and all options are on the table. It's one of the bad options, though we don't think it's as bad as Iran having nuclear weapon. For us it's an existential threat."

Pressed further whether the U.S. and Israel were still on the same page, the Israeli ambassador said, "I'm sure yes we are. The U.S. fully understands the threat. There are two very bad possibilities: That Iran will go forward and end up with a bomb - just imagine that terrorist groups on our border will have this terrible weapon; and, the second is war. We hope neither of these possibilities occurs."

If, back in Jerusalem official Israel is being particularly careful not to express such public doubts about whether sanctions will eventually be effective, this is not true of some informed experts.

Emily Landau, a senior research associate at the Institute for National Security Studies in Tel Aviv, and an expert on arms control and regional security, writes in Haaretz: "If we assume that ultimately there will be sanctions, so what? The involvement with sanctions, who's for and who's against, when, why and to what extent, deflects from the primary problem - the absence of an American strategy for tough negotiations with Iran."

At this stage, the problem is not so much whether Israel will disrupt the U.S. sanctions strategy, but a still deep-rooted conviction held by many in Israel that the Obama Administration might be beginning, in Landau's phrase, "to resign itself not only to the fact that Iran will continue to enrich uranium, but also to recognition that the Islamic republic could ultimately build a nuclear bomb."

Which is why, unless sanctions prove to be working and Tehran is really made to shift its determined stance that it has the right to develop a nuclear capability as it itself sees fit, the potential for open confrontation will keep haunting the region. And, will keep bedeviling the diplomatic attempts to defuse global tensions on several fronts. (END)

---

## **What Will China Do With Its Veto?**

**By Mohammed A. Salih and Eli Clifton**

**WASHINGTON, Feb 23, 2010 (IPS) - With relations between China and the U.S. taking some bitter turns in recent months, how China responds to mounting pressure from the U.S. and its European allies for tougher sanctions on Iran is being viewed as a major test of the current relations and a determinant of the future shape of bilateral ties between Washington and Beijing.**

A series of actions and statements in recent months have given rise to tensions between the U.S. and China. The U.S. recently sold 6.4 billion dollars worth of arms to Taiwan, slammed the Chinese government over internet censorship and hacking, imposed tariffs on Chinese tyres and has called on Beijing to readjust its currency.

In addition, President Barack Obama received the Tibetan spiritual leader Dalai Lama in the White House last week. In turn, China has threatened retaliatory tariffs on U.S. products and sanctions against companies that participated in the Taiwan arms sale. Moreover, Beijing has begun to shift its balance of payments surplus away from U.S. dollars and decried U.S. condemnation of internet censorship as "information imperialism".

With domestic pressure mounting for the White House to take action against Iran's nuclear activities, the administration's top officials have engaged in an intensive diplomatic campaign to convince key players, in particular China, to get on board with plans for harsher sanctions.

Thus far, China has adamantly opposed attempts by the U.S. and its western European allies to impose tougher sanctions on Iran and advocates diplomacy to forge an agreement. In early February, Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi said during a conference in Europe that "to talk about sanctions at the moment will complicate the situation and might stand in the way of finding a diplomatic solution." >>>



## RELATED ARTICLES

### **What Will China Do With Its Veto? / 2**

Many analysts attribute Beijing's position to its traditional opposition to sanctions and its growing trade relationship with Iran.

"Philosophically they don't like sanctions and don't think they work so there's not much good about this from China's point of view," Chas Freeman, co-chair of the U.S.-China Policy Foundation and a former U.S. ambassador to Saudi Arabia, told IPS. "So the only reason to do it is to please the Americans. And we haven't exactly gone out of our way to make them feel kindly about us."

A Financial Times report earlier this month said China is now Iran's leading trade partner, overtaking the European Union (EU).

The volume of Iran's commerce with China totaled 36.5 billion dollars in 2008, according to the FT, while the EU's trade with Iran stood at 35 billion dollars for the same year. Iran is now the third major oil supplier to China. According to the Iran-China Chamber of Commerce, Iran provides 11 percent of China's energy needs.

Recognising the importance of Tehran to Beijing's soaring energy needs, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton visited the Gulf region recently, urging Iran's Arab neighbours to provide oil to China in the event of sanctions. Washington hopes that with Arab states supplying China's energy needs, Beijing will drop its opposition to Western plans for more sanctions. As of now, it is not clear yet whether the Gulf's Arab countries will go along with the U.S. proposal.

"Relations with Iran fit into the larger picture of China's burgeoning international energy diplomacy. With soaring energy needs, it cannot be too choosy in the partners it keeps," wrote Kerry Brown, a senior fellow at the London-based think tank Chatham House, in an article for the forthcoming issue of *The World Today*, a Chatham House monthly magazine.

"With a government which places economic growth at the centre of its legitimacy, and which needs to pump out eight percent gross domestic product increases at least for the next five years, having the energy to achieve this is crucial. The Communist Party will be finished if it fails to improve the economic lot of its people," Brown wrote.

Earlier on the 31st anniversary of Iran's 1979 Revolution, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad boasted that his country is now a nuclear power, saying Iranian scientists had succeeded in enriching uranium to 20 percent. Western officials have disputed the claim, and say Iran could not have made such rapid progress.

Iran needs 20 percent-enriched uranium to operate a medical research reactor in Tehran.

As the U.S. and its allies increasingly lose patience with Iran, an important trump card in their hands to leverage China to comply with their demands is the threat of Israeli strikes on Iran's nuclear facilities.

The West hopes the prospect of instability in the centre of world's energy resources could persuade a reluctant China to join them, something that Freeman describes as a "blackmail or a protection racket." But it is not clear how serious Beijing takes Israel's repeated threats to bomb Iran's nuclear installations.

Many doubt if Israel will be able to attack Iran given the high costs of such an action. In an analysis, a group of experts at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace wrote that any Israeli assault on Iran will push up oil prices to heights that will plunge the world economy into a new recession.

Israeli officials will head to Beijing in late February to convince Chinese leadership to get in line with Western plans for more sanctions. But the Israelis apparently had little success in convincing Russia to support tougher sanctions, even though Moscow until recently was deemed to have a softer stance toward sanctions on Iran.

But Russia also appears to have introduced some degree of change to its position. Following a visit by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to Moscow in early February to demand "crippling sanctions" on Iran, statements by top Russian officials showed the Kremlin has serious disagreements with the West over the severity of potential sanctions. >>>

## RELATED ARTICLES

### What Will China Do With Its Veto? / 3

"The term 'crippling sanctions' on Iran is totally unacceptable to us...We certainly cannot talk about sanctions that could be interpreted as punishment on the whole country and its people for some actions or inaction," Sergei Ryabkov, Russia's deputy foreign minister, told Interfax news agency last Friday.

The strong message out of Moscow may bring some relief to officials in Beijing as a Russian refusal to back strong sanctions would take some of the pressure off China. But as a permanent veto-wielding member of the United Nations Security Council, China will have to make a difficult decision if Russia chooses not to veto sanctions on the floor of the Council.

"What they (Chinese) have always tried to do in the past is hide behind the Russians. If the Russians are non-cooperative [in sanctions] then the Chinese are off the hook and can avoid taking sides," Freeman said. "To use [the Chinese saying], they can sit on the mountain and watch the tigers fight. But this time the Chinese may not be able to play this game and may have to make a decision."

Although sanctions politics appear to be popular among politicians both in the Obama administration and Congress, some doubt if they can really bring about any change in Iran's behaviour. They see it only as a move to satisfy the "have-to-do-something itch" in Washington in the face of increasing Iranian defiance.

Steve Clemons, an expert at the New America Foundation, argued during a discussion on Blogsheadtv.com that sanctions are "more designed to be about the West's emotional and political needs rather than a strategy that would really move Iran to a new course."  
(END)

---

## U.S.: Nuke Plants Back in Vogue, as Climate Bill Stalls

By Matthew Berger

**WASHINGTON, Feb 16, 2010 (IPS) - After decades of debate, the United States is poised to build its first new nuclear reactors since the early 1970s.**

Speaking at a job training centre northeast of Washington Tuesday, President Barack Obama announced the federal government would underwrite the construction of two new reactors to be built in Georgia.

The loan guarantee will be for 8.3 billion dollars, meaning a sizable percentage of the reactors' 8.8 billion price tag will be put up by the government – and absorbed by it, were Southern Company, the energy firm building the plants, to default.

This investment in nuclear power is not unexpected and has two main objectives in addition to addressing the omnipresent objective of job creation. Obama hopes recharging the country's nuclear industry will help usher in an era of cleaner energy and help build a bridge between those, including the president, who want Congress to pass significant climate change legislation and those, mainly Republicans, who do not.

"Even though we've not broken ground on a new power plant – new nuclear plant – in 30 years, nuclear energy remains our

largest source of fuel that produces no carbon emissions. To meet our growing energy needs and prevent the worst consequences of climate change, we'll need to increase our supply of nuclear power. It's that simple," Obama said Tuesday.

He said that one of the new plants would produce 16 million fewer tonnes of carbon pollution a year when compared to a similar coal plant. "That's like taking 3.5 million cars off the road," he said.

Obama admitted, however, that the environmental benefits of nuclear power were not that clear cut. But he seemed willing to accept the scepticism of environmentalists for what he saw as the clean energy advantages of nuclear – both emissions-wise and politically.

"There are also going to be those who strongly disagree with this announcement. The same has been true in other areas of our energy debate, from offshore drilling to putting a price on carbon pollution," Obama said. >>>





## RELATED ARTICLES

### **U.S.: Nuke Plants Back in Vogue, as Climate Bill Stalls / 2**

"But what I want to emphasise is this: Even when we have differences, we cannot allow those differences to prevent us from making progress. On an issue that affects our economy, our security, and the future of our planet, we can't keep on being mired in the same old stale debates between the left and the right, between environmentalists and entrepreneurs," he said.

This action comes as no surprise following the several nuclear-related proposals Obama has put forward over the past couple weeks. Obama announced his intention to pursue "a new generation of safe, clean nuclear power plants" in his State of the Union speech last month. The following week, his administration proposed a budget that would triple the amount of loans available to energy utilities with plans to build new nuclear plants.

This tripling raises the amount available to the industry to 54 billion dollars, up from the 18.5 billion Congress authorised for such loan guarantees under the 2005 Energy Policy Act. The 8.8 billion announced for the Georgia reactors Tuesday is part of the Congressional allotment.

A major reason for these moves has been that in the bitter fight over climate legislation that has been ongoing on Capitol Hill, nuclear power has been one of the few issues that seems to have the ability to draw Republican support.

Sen. Lindsey Graham, a Republican who is working with Democrats on crafting a bipartisan proposal, has said nuclear will have to be part of any successful bill.

Even the right-wing pundit and one-time vice presidential candidate Sarah Palin has spoken favourably of Obama's nuclear agenda.

"I was thankful that the president at least mentioned nuclear power in the State of the Union. But again, we need more than words, we need a plan to turn that goal into a reality, and that way we can pave the way for projects that will create jobs," she told a crowd of supporters Feb. 6.

Tuesday's announcement will work to pave the way toward a nuclear reality that Palin and other conservatives want, and so Obama hopes it will also pave the way toward bipartisan agreement on a climate bill.

"My administration will be working to build on areas of agreement so that we can pass a bipartisan energy and

climate bill through the Senate," Obama said Tuesday, explaining he sees "real common ground" between the two political sides.

He also pointed out to those who have opposed a bill capping greenhouse gas emissions – but are in favour of new nuclear plants – that "we're not going to achieve a big boost in nuclear capacity unless we also create a system of incentives to make clean energy profitable."

The U.S. currently has 104 nuclear reactors, which together provide 20 percent of the country's electricity. The new plants whose funding was announced Tuesday are expected to be able to produce 2.2 gigawatts of electricity once they come online in 2016 or 2017.

The U.S.'s nuclear production is dwarfed by other countries. France, for instance, has 59 plants, which provide nearly 80 percent of its power. Japan is a much distant second.

Obama noted Tuesday how these two countries "have long invested heavily in this industry. Meanwhile, there are 56 nuclear reactors under construction around the world: 21 in China alone; six in South Korea; five in India."

He drew parallels between the U.S. lagging behind other countries in nuclear power and its lagging behind in renewable power sources.

"Whether it's nuclear energy, or solar or wind energy, if we fail to invest in the technologies of tomorrow, then we're going to be importing those technologies instead of exporting them. We will fall behind," he said.

The last time a nuclear power plant was completed in the U.S. was in the early 1970s. Plans for reactors that had been approved after 1973 were subsequently cancelled and many partly-built facilities were abandoned following the 1979 accident at the Three Mile Island nuclear facility outside Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, which released radioactive gases into the air after a partial core meltdown.

Tuesday, U.S. Energy Secretary Steven Chu explained that nuclear technology has come a long way since then and that the new reactors were part of a new, safer generation. "If you lose control, it will not melt down," he said.

Regulators must still approve the proposed plants for licensing before construction can go forward. >>>



## RELATED ARTICLES

### **U.S.: Nuke Plants Back in Vogue, as Climate Bill Stalls / 3**

Most environmental groups were not pleased by the news. Nuclear, they felt, is hardly clean.

"We need to prioritise the cleanest, cheapest, safest, and fastest ways to reduce emissions and nuclear power is neither clean, cheap, nor fast, nor safe," said Sierra Club executive director Carl Pope.

He was particularly critical of the way the loans put "taxpayers on the hook for billions, particularly when the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office puts the risk of default at over 50 percent."

Chu disputed the 50 percent number.

The biggest environmental problem regarding nuclear power is the safe storage of the waste the reactors produce. The

Obama administration has shut down longstanding plans to bury such waste in Nevada's Yucca Mountain. Last month, they set up a "blue-ribbon commission" to look into possible storage solutions.

Obama recognises the problems. "Now, none of this is to say that there aren't some serious drawbacks with respect to nuclear energy that have to be addressed. As the CEOs standing behind me will tell you, nuclear power generates waste, and we need to accelerate our efforts to find ways of storing this waste safely and disposing of it," he said.

Without a plan for dealing with the highly contentious problem of radioactive waste, though, Obama's loan plan only addresses the very first of many hurdles to his proposed new generation of nuclear. (END)

---

## **West Treats Iran's Nuclear Offer with Caution**

**By Mohammed A. Salih**

**WASHINGTON, Feb 3, 2010 (IPS) - The declaration by Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad that his country is ready to exchange low-enriched uranium for nuclear fuel has been met with a mostly cautious reaction by Western leaders.**

Ahmadinejad told Iranian state television Tuesday that it would be no problem for Iran to send its uranium abroad, to Russia and France, in exchange for nuclear fuel to operate its reactors.

"Our colleagues had proposed that the exchange of 3.5-percent (enriched) fuel with 20-percent (enriched) fuel be done in three stages, but the foreign side's view was that this was not technically possible and they were right," he said.

Western powers had made an offer to Iran last fall, in which Iran would give 75 percent of its 3.5 percent enriched uranium to the West and in return receive nuclear fuel of 20 percent enriched uranium.

Although Iran did not respond positively to that offer at the time, saying it needed to be done in stages, Tuesday's remarks by Ahmadinejad are seen as an acceptance of the Western proposal.

The U.S. State Department spokesman demanded concrete action from Iran to follow up on Ahmadinejad's remarks.

"It's unclear what the president was referring to yesterday. I think from our standpoint, we will look for actions as opposed to just words," said Philip Crowley, a State Department spokesman. "We will look forward to hearing about the Iranian position through the IAEA. So – but it's – I think we're just seeking clarification through the IAEA as to whether Tehran has changed its current position."

Iranian officials have not elaborated on the details of President Ahmadinejad's offer and it is not clear yet whether this is an official offer that Iran will present to the U.N. nuclear watchdog, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). >>>



## RELATED ARTICLES

### **West Treats Iran's Nuclear Offer with Caution / 2**

"Nobody knows if it's for real. I think what he is mostly trying to do is to stave off another round of sanctions at the U.N. Security Council and other unilateral sanctions that are being planned by the U.S. and the Europeans," said Barabara Slavin, an Iran expert at the Council on Foreign Relations, during a panel discussion at the Washington-based think tank New America Foundation.

The U.S.'s European partners also reacted sceptically to Ahmadinejad's comments. The French foreign minister, Bernard Kouchner, suggested Iran might be trying to "buy time", while German Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle also demanded that Iran match its words with actions.

"If that doesn't happen and it's all just tactics, the international community will agree on further measures. Then sanctions cannot be ruled out," Westerwelle said.

Although some have expressed doubts that the Iranian government would take major decisions on the nuclear programme in its talks with the West, President Ahmadinejad appears to have partly made the statement to challenge his domestic opponents.

"Some people inside the country made noises that they (the West) will take the (Iranian) fuel and will not give us back (nuclear) fuel. We replied, so if they wouldn't give us fuel what will happen? Whose words will be proved? If they (the West) will not abide by their commitment, then it will become clear that their words were not true and... (then) our hands will be freed to do our job by ourselves," Ahmadinejad told the Iranian state TV.

Iran's nuclear programme has been a source of controversy with the Western world as well as Middle Eastern countries, in particular Israel. They doubt Iran's nuclear activities are for peaceful energy purposes and charge that Iran is seeking a nuclear bomb.

Iranian officials have repeatedly rejected this claim and say the programme is solely geared toward peaceful purposes, such as producing electricity.

Iran's nuclear programme has increased tensions in the region as its Arab neighbours fear Tehran's influence. It has also touched off an apparent arms race as Iran's neighbours in the Gulf are becoming some of the world's leading weapons buyers. The United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia purchased 25 billion dollars worth of weapons over the past two years.

With the fate of talks between Iran and the West shrouded in uncertainty, the U.S. is pushing hard to convince China to agree to sanctions against Iran. Despite its previous resistance, China now seems to be going along with Western demands. That comes amid recent tensions between the U.S. and China over Washington's sale of arms to Taiwan, which China considers parts of its territory.

If Iran fails to meet Western demands, sanctions seem to be the most likely scenario for the U.S. and its allies to pursue. Despite past threats by the U.S. and Israel to use military force against Iran's nuclear installations, many analysts see that option as out of the question.

Henry Barkey and Udi Dadush, experts at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, argued in an analysis that the U.S. will not attack Iran because any military action would cause oil prices to skyrocket to over 150 dollars a barrel, plunging the world economy into a new recession.

It will also, they say, spark conflict in places like Lebanon, the Palestinian territories and Israel, as Iran would seek to retaliate through groups like Hezbollah and Hamas. The gravity of the consequences of such attack on Iran, they add, means that Israel cannot afford to trigger such blowback. (END)

More articles at:

<http://www.ipsnews.net/news.asp?idnews=50213>

<http://www.nuclearabolition.net>



## OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

### Unified Approach Needed For Nuclear Disarmament by Jayantha Dhanapala / 1

...؟؟ | وكيل الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة الأسبق: الحل هو إزالة كل الأسلحة النووية بلا استثناء

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/print.asp?idnews=1779>



INTER PRESS SERVICE

وكالة الأنباء العالمية انتر بريس سيرفيس (آي بي إس)

وكيل الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة الأسبق:  
الحل هو إزالة كل الأسلحة النووية بلا استثناء

بقلم جايناثا داناपालا/وكالة انتر بريس سيرفيس

كاندي، سري لانكا، فبراير (IPS) - المنظور الوحيد الممكن لتفضية الأسلحة النووية هو إزالتها كلها وفي كل مكان، بلا استثناء وتحت رقابة صارمة، وهو ما لن يتحقق من خلال التفاوض التدريجي حول معاهدة الأسلحة النووية حسبما يدعو الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة.

فتمة أرضية مباشرة لإمكان التوفيق بين قضايا نزع السلاح النووي وحظر إنتشارها، إذ كرر رئيسا الولايات المتحدة باراك أوباما وروسيا ديمتري ميدفيدف تأييدهما لغيابة عالم متحرر من الأسلحة النووية.

لمفهوم "إنتشار" السلاح النووي بعدان: الأفقي (الإنتشار الجغرافي) والرأسي (تطوير الترساتل الموجودة). هنا دأبت الدول المسلحة نوويا، بدعم من بلدان حلف شمال الأطلسي وتلك الموضوعه تحت "المظلة النووي"، علي التشديد علي أهمية البعد الأول (الإنتشار الجغرافي) ولكن مع التشجيع علي البعد الثاني (تطوير أسلحتها النووية).

لكن ما يحدث هو أن الدول المسلحة نوويا إعادت علي إشهار هلعها -الميرر أو غير الميرر- من خطر مقدم نول نووية جديدة في العالم، وهو ما يقودها إلي بذل جهود يائسة (كالتزو غير القانوني للعراق) لمنع هذا الخطر من خلال التشديد علي الحاجة لزيادة مراقبة البعد الجغرافي لإنتشار الأسلحة النووية.

بيد أن لمتل هذا الخطر الأجنبي المفتعل غرضان: فهو يخدم الدول الحائرة علي أسلحة نووية كأرضية لترشيد تطوير (تحديث) ترساتلها النووية، لكنه يساعدها أيضا علي تبرير تجنيل عملية النزع السلاح إلي أجل غير مسمي.

هذا المعيار الإنتقائي من جانب الدول المسلحة نوويا أحاط مؤامرة الصمت علي قدرات إسرائيل من الأسلحة النووية -التي بنتها بمساعدة بعض هذه الدول- بالمزيد من الغموض والإبهام.

يضاف إلي هذا أنها وضعت تمييزا تعسفيا للتفريق بين نشري السلاح النووي "الصالحين" ونشريه "الطالحين". وإطلاقا من هذا، إعتبرت الهند نشرا "صالحا"، الأمر الذي أتاح لها إمدادات التكنولوجيات والمواد النووية تحت غطاء إتفاقيه تعاون نووي مع الولايات المتحدة.

نفس القول ينطبق أيضا علي إستمرار الولايات المتحدة في نشر أسلحتها النووية في خمس نول أوروبية -علي الرغم من الإعتراضات الشعبية عليها- والذي تيرره بتسمية "مشاركة نووية".

ثم جاء إحتمال حصول جماعت إرهابية علي أسلحة نووية وإستخدامها هوو الإحتمال المروع الوارد- ليمتل شكلا إضافيا لإنتشار السلاح النووي، والذي إغتنمته الدول الحائرة علي أسلحة نووية لتحديد الإنتباه بعيدا عن أسلحتها النووية الخاصة بها، وهي التي لا قيمة عسكرية مفهومة لها في مكافحة الإرهاب.

القضية الأساسية هي أن الأسلحة النووية تمثل في حد ذاتها خطرا محنقا في أي أيدي كانت.

هذا التمييز الصاعد/الهابط بين من يحوز أسلحة نووية ومن لا يحوزها يعد خبيثا أيضا لإخفاء الواقع، وهو أن نزع السلاح وعدم الإنتشار النووي ما هما سوي وجهان لعملة واحدة، ينبغي أن يعزز كل منهما الآخر بالتبادل وفي مسلمات متوازية.

## OTHER LANGUAGES [Translations | Adaptations]

### Unified Approach Needed For Nuclear Disarmament by Jayantha Dhanapala / 2

...؟؟ | وكيل الأمين العام للأمم المتحدة الأسبق: الحل هو إزالة كل الأسلحة النووية بلا إستثناء

<http://www.ipsinternational.org/arabic/print.asp?idnews=1779>

لقد سجل مقدم الأسلحة النووية في القرن العشرين كأكثر أسلحة الدمار الشامل دماراً ورعباً نقطة تحول، فقد برهنت على قدرتها الجبارة على تدمير حياة البشر والتسبب في أثار إيكولوجية وجينية طويلة الأجل. وبالتالي أصبح التحكم فيها وإزالتها بمثابة أولوية قصوى للأمم المتحدة والمجتمع الدولي.

فجاءت الإتفاقيات الثنائية بين أكبر دولتين نوويتين (الولايات المتحدة وروسيا تملكان نحو 95 في المائة من كافة الأسلحة النووية في العالم)، والإتفاقيات الدولية التي تحظر إجراء تجارب نووية وإنتشار الأسلحة النووية، لتسعي إلى تنظيم البعدين الرأسي والأفقي للإنتشار النووي.

كذلك الأمر بالنسبة لمعاهدات المناطق الخالية من الأسلحة النووية التي أبرمتها الدول غير النووية.

هذا ويقر معهد استوكهولم الدرلي لبحوث السلام (سيبري) عدد الرؤوس النووية الموجودة حالياً في العالم بما يزيد على 23,300 رأساً، وأن الولايات المتحدة وروسيا وبريطانيا وفرنسا والصين والهند وباكستان وإسرائيل تملك 8,392 رأساً نووية متأهبة لإطلاقها في مجرد دقائق معدودة.

لقد تم حظر (لا تقبيل أو خفض) الأسلحة البيولوجية والكيميائية والمضادة للأشخاص والألغام، كذلك الذخائر العنقودية وأسلحة ليزر وغيرها من الفئات، على الصعيد العالمي من خلال إتفاقيات دولية قد لا تمون ذات بعد عالمي ويصعب التحقق من تنفيذها.

أما إتفاقية حظر إنتشار الأسلحة النووية، التي تسعي إلى الجمع بين نزع السلاح ومراقبته، فهي تلزم الدول النووية بالتفاوض على خفض وإزالة أسلحتها، فيما تحظر على الدول غير النووية نهائياً الحصول عليها. وتحظي الوكالة الدولية للطاقة الذرية بصلاحيات كاملة للتوصل إلى تسويات مع الدول غير النووية عندما يتعلق الأمر باستخدام الطاقة النووية لأغراض سلمية.

وفيما يخص مراقبة الأسلحة، يسمح للدول النووية بالإحتفاظ بأسلحتها في حدود القيود ذات الصلة والتي تنبثق عن إتفاقيات ثنائية ومتعددة الأطراف.

ومع ذلك، وعوضاً عن الوفاء باللتزاماتها بموجب إتفاقية عدم الإنتشار، تسعي الدول النووية إلى فرض المزيد من القيود على الدول غير النووية، تمهيداً لمؤتمر مراجعة إتفاقية حظر الإنتشار في مايو 2010، بغية تقبيل حق الإنسحاب منها المنصوص عليه في المادة العاشرة، وفرض مشروطية جديدة على حق إستخدام الدول غير النووية للطاقة النووية لأغراض سلمية، الوارد في المادة الرابعة.

لقد جاء إكتشاف برنامج سري عراقي لإنتاج أسلحة نووية في أوائل التسعينات، وإنسحاب كوريا الشمالية من إتفاقية حظر الإنتشار وتجاربها النووية اللاحقة، والإقرار بعدم وفاء ليبيا بالإتفاقية وتصحيحه، والتساؤلات الملحة حول ما تردد عن مفاعل نووي سوري دمرته إسرائيل، والتوترات المتواصلة حول برنامج إيران النووي، جاء كل ذلك بلا شك لإضعاف معاهدة الإنتشار.

الوسيلة الوحيدة لإنقاذ الإتفاقية هي توحيد مساري نزع السلاح وعدم الإنتشار. \*جايانثا دانابال، سفير سري لانكا السابق، ترأس مؤتمر مراجعة وتمديد إتفاقية عدم الإنتشار في 1995، وشغل منصب وكيل أمين عام الأمم المتحدة لشئون نزع السلاح في الفترة 1998-2003، ويتزأس حالياً مؤتمرات بوعاواش للعلوم والشئون الدولية. المقالة تعرب عن وجهات نظره الشخصية.

## CIVIL SOCIETY'S PERSPECTIVE

### **Excluding Trident makes nonsense of Defence Green Paper says CND**

03 February 2010

The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament has described today's Defence Green Paper as a disastrous missed opportunity. To review Defence priorities whilst specifically excluding Trident replacement is "avoiding the huge white elephant in the room".

A cross-party group of 117 MPs had protested as early as last July that today's review needed to include consideration of Trident. EDM 1883 in the last parliamentary session was tabled by former shadow Foreign Secretary Michael Ancram and former Defence minister Peter Kilfoyle [see note 3].

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "The exclusion of Trident, one of the most costly defence programmes, makes this review a nonsense. Bob Ainsworth talked of the 'real financial pressure' facing future plans, yet is living in a fantasy world if he thinks spending £76bn on Trident replacement won't have major opportunity costs in both defence and other areas. Excluding the ruinously expensive Trident is like avoiding the huge white elephant in the room.

"When all major parties are proposing huge spending cuts, this is the time for ministers to realise that scrapping Trident replacement would be one very positive and popular cutback. Polls [see note 4] consistently show a clear majority against Trident whilst at the same time a growing number of senior military figures have described the system as 'militarily useless'. Presidents Obama and Medvedev are both working towards a nuclear-free world - scrapping Trident would move us towards this goal, improving our security as well as freeing-up resources for spending on real priorities, not Cold War relics." ■

### **US 'missile defence' move criticised by CND**

04 February 2010 The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament regrets moves towards the establishment of a US interceptor missile base in Romania, announced only days after plans emerged to site Patriot batteries in four Gulf states. CND criticised the move as part of a deepening entrenchment of US forces in the region.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "President Obama's reconfiguration of plans for the Czech Republic and Poland allowed the 'reset' of relations with Russia. But deploying an ever-greater number of military systems across eastern Europe does nothing to help the US and Russia conclude a successor to the START disarmament treaty. Nor does it help make Europe safer. The suggestion that Aegis missile defence ships may patrol the Baltic and the Black Sea and that a Ukrainian radar may be used in the system, means there is a real risk that the thawing of US-Russian relations will be sent off-course. The US move to make permanent a temporary military base in Romania - and continued efforts to expand NATO - all serve to push Europe towards more military spending when it is completely unnecessary and we can ill afford it." ■

### **Hundreds blockade nuclear bomb factory**

15 February 2010

The Atomic Weapons Establishment at Aldermaston, Berkshire, was subject to the biggest blockade in years as 800 campaigners effectively blocked all entrances to the site for several hours. Anti-nuclear campaigners are intent on obstructing building work which is in preparation for the production of new nuclear warheads. British protesters joined with international activists to send a strong message to government here and worldwide, that the abolition of nuclear weapons is the only answer to security and proliferation risks.

Protesters were joined by two Nobel Peace Prize laureates - Jody Williams and Mairead Maguire who 'locked-on' to other campaigners at the designated 'Women's Gate'. The blockade was timed to raise the profile of the issue of Trident replacement in the run-up both to the General Election and the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference, in New York in May. Opinion polls now consistently show a majority against spending £76bn or more on Trident Replacement (see note 7). Spending on new facilities at AWE has increased seventeen-fold over the past decade, from £24m in 2000 to £420m last year. [note 6] This is in spite of government denials that any decision has been made to go ahead with new warheads, with Ministers stating decisions will not be made until the next Parliament.

Kate Hudson, Chair of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, said "The Prime Minister says he wants Britain to take a lead on nuclear disarmament. But he cannot do this if he is spending billions of pounds of taxpayers' money on upgrading the nuclear bomb factory at Aldermaston. As Britain goes to the UN nuclear talks in New York in May, we urge the Prime Minister to see sense as the majority of the British public have and end wasteful spending on weapons of mass destruction and commit genuinely to a nuclear weapons free world." ■

## WHAT OTHERS SAY

### **Nonproliferation's Contribution**

George Perkovich, Deepti Choubey *eJournal USA*, Vol. 15, No. 2, February 2010

The great destructive power of the first atomic bomb persuaded many leaders of the need to constrain that power. Thus was born the goal of nonproliferation and the search for a nonproliferation regime: a set of norms, rules, institutions, and practices to prevent both the spread of nuclear weapons and the material and know-how necessary to acquire them.

<http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa=view&id=40241>

### **Japan Pledges Abstinence As U.S. Reviews Nuke Posture**

By Jaya Ramachandran

*As the only country having suffered nuclear bombings and intermittently rattled by atomic tremors from Pyongyang, Japan is not only anxiously looking forward to a new orientation of the role and mission of the U.S. nuclear forces in the next five to ten years, but also trying to influence Washington's decisions.*

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-03-03%2011:04:43&key2=1>

### **U.S. Expected To Withdraw Nuclear Weapons from Europe**

By Ramesh Jaura

*The much awaited review of U.S. nuclear forces in Washington's global strategy in the coming years is expected to reduce the role of atomic weapons in regional scenarios and retire the nuclear-armed Tomahawk sea-launched land-attack cruise missile, according to the Federation of American Scientists (FAS). The ongoing Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), undertaken by the United States Department of Defense, is the third in a series that started with the first appraisal in 1994 and was followed by the second in 2002. The final report is National Security Classified and submitted to the U.S. Congress. However, the 2010 NPR is expected to include an unclassified version.* <http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-02-23%2002:45:40&key2=1>

### **People's Pressure Vital For A Nuclear-Weapons Free World**

By Taro Ichikawa

*'Cities and citizens of the world, unite! Unite for a world without nuclear weapons!' This is the clarion call Dr. Tadatoshi Akiba, Mayor of the City of Hiroshima, would like to hear resonate in the remotest corners of the globe. Because Dr. Akiba is convinced that "when cities become friends they become sister cities; when states become friends, they become military allies". Research and education should therefore pay more attention to cities' capabilities to promote peace and cooperation*

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-02-19%2022:11:01&key2=1>

### **Indo-Pak Rivalry Jeopardises Disarmament Conference**

By Ramesh Jaura

*Will the persistent distrust between Pakistan and India continue to litter the bumpy road to nuclear disarmament with shrapnel and spikes and bring to naught the multilateral conference in Geneva? Or, will the nuclear armed neighbours bury the hatchet defying legacy of the British divide-and-rule that culminated in partition in 1947, and rescue the Conference on Disarmament?*

<http://www.indepthnews.net/news/news.php?key1=2010-02-16%2003:57:37&key2=1>

---

Publisher: Mario Lubetkin  
CEO IPS-Inter Press Service Consortium  
Via Panisperna, 207, 00184 Rome  
Editor-in-Charge: Ramesh Jaura  
IPS-Inter Press Service Europe  
Marienstr. 19-20 | 10117 Berlin  
© 2010 IPS-Inter Press Service