“U.S., Iran Expected to Spar at U.N. Nuclear Meeting” (National Public Radio)

*Expert:* commitment to disarmament. The question is whether U.S. actions will persuade most other nations to support pressure on Iran, says Leonard Spector, a former energy department official and now deputy director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies. "Iran will pound away at that, but I think most states are going to say the United States has really made some progress. It's committed quite openly to the vision of disarmament which we had not seen in the previous administration.


“Iran Draws Western Criticism at Opening of U.N. Nuclear Talks” (PBS News)

*Excerpt:* Margaret Warner: Leonard Spector is deputy director of the non-proliferation center at the Nonproliferation Center at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. Leonard Spector: The crucial issue on the front burner for everyone is dealing with the Iranian nuclear problem. It won't get played out that way. There will be other discussions.

Source: http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/middle_east/jan-june10/iran_05-03.html?print

“Monterey County residents speak on etiquette of displaying foreign flags” (The Salinas Californian)

*Excerpt:* At the Monterey Institute of International Studies' Morse building in Monterey, flags from up to 70 countries, varying each semester, are displayed along with the American flag. The display is meant to welcome the international students at the school, said Barbara Burke, executive assistant to the president at MIIS. More than 33 percent of its students are from foreign countries, she said.

Source: http://www.thecalifornian.com/article/20100505/NEWS01/5050312/1002/Monterey-County-residents-speak-on-etiquette-of-displaying-foreign-flags

“La Puente Students explore nuclear bomb issues” (San Gabriel Valley Tribune)

*Excerpt:* The students' research is part of a program by the Monterey Institute of International Studies in Monterey, which involved the students putting together four reports and a presentation on "Nuclear Nonproliferation: Global Opportunities and Regional Challenges" over a six-month process.

Source: http://www.sgvtribune.com/highlanders/ci_15025849

“The Difference between Translation and Interpretation” (Articles Base)

*Excerpt:* A simple illustration was created by interpreters Johanna Parker and Sam Pinilla while they were pursuing graduate studies in translation and interpretation at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. It was distributed to moviegoers in the "Language Capital of the World" when the *The Interpreter* was released in 2005.
“Professor Gives Insight into Stock Market Plunge” (KSBW News)
Excerpt: Monterey Institute professor Moyara Ruehsen shares her insight on the recent stock market plunge. Monterey Institute professor Moyara Ruehsen shares her insight on the recent stock market plunge.

May 8, 2010
“Why anti-sweatshop campaigns might just do it after all” (Financial Times and Tim Harford)
Excerpt: intrigued to discover two new pieces of research addressing these questions. One is an article in March’s American Economic Review, written by Ann Harrison of the University of California, Berkeley, and Jason Scorse of the Monterey Institute. Harrison and Scorse study data from Indonesia. In the 1990s, Indonesia was the focus of anti-sweatshop campaigns that persuaded the US government to put pressure on its Indonesian counterpart, and encouraged...

May 12, 2010
“Uranium Enrichment and the NPT: Preventing the next Iran” (World Politics Review)
Excerpt: international community must make a serious diplomatic effort to develop and agree on such measures, in order to manage the nuclear issue in the 21st century. Cole Harvey is a research associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Washington, D.C. He is the author of a March 2010 report for the Arms Control Association, entitled "Major Proposals to Strengthen the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty." His work has appeared in Arms Control Today and on the .

“Nuclear Modernization making a mockery of Disarmament” (Huffington Post and; ABC 40, WVVA)
Excerpt: Last summer, the Economist published a letter from hawkish Arizona Senator John Kyl (currently neck deep in the springtime of his state's immigrant shame). Cole Harvey of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies reports that Kyl wrote: "Every nuclear weapons power -- with the exception of the US -- is currently modernising its nuclear weapons and weapons delivery systems. ..."
Source: http://www.huffingtonpost.com/russ-wellen/nuclear-modernization-mak_b_571267.html?view=print

May 22, 2010
“Thousands Celebrate Commencement at CSUMB” (CSUMB)
Excerpt: Cicilia Chudivan, a business major who maintained a very high grade-point average while leading the women's golf team to its best season in school history. A native of Indonesia, she will attend the Monterey Institute of International Studies to pursue a master's degree.
Source: http://csumb.edu/site/x25312.xml

May 23, 2010
“Renowned translator of Japanese literature moves to China’s ‘source of sources” (Palm Beach Arts Paper)
Excerpt: Wilson earned a bachelor’s in Japanese literature and language at the Monterey Institute of Foreign Studies in Monterey, Calif. He studied Edo period philosophy at the Aichi Prefectural
University in Nagoya, Japan. He translated his first book, *Hagakure*, an 18th-century martial arts classic, to fulfill an academic requirement – with no thought it might be published.


**May 27, 2010**

“*MIIS ranks Fourth for Peace Corps Graduate School Students*” (The Californian)

*Excerpt*: The *Monterey Institute of International Studies* ranked fourth this year among 61 schools for number of students in a Peace Corps Master's International ...

Source: [http://www.thecalifornian.com/article/20100527/NEWS01/5270322](http://www.thecalifornian.com/article/20100527/NEWS01/5270322)

**May 28, 2010**


*Excerpt*: the document breathes new life into a treaty seen as under threat, analysts said. “That is the positive, there is much more attention on future action and new benchmarks,” said Prof. William C. Potter, the director of the center for nonproliferation at the *Monterey Institute of International Studies*.


“*Scholars Debate: Is China Becoming a Responsible World Leader?*” (UCLA International Institute)

*Excerpt*: China is going to be through actions and not just words? Panelist Jing-dong Yuan, associate professor of international policy studies at the *Monterey Institute of International Studies*, said that the main question that China's leadership is grappling with is whether China should continue to follow the instructions of late Communist Party leader Deng Xiaoping to keep a…


**May 29, 2010**

“*Israel key to conference on banning nuclear arms*” (Associated Press and; LA Times, Hawaii News Now, News Vine, News West 9, WMBF News)

*Excerpt*: with Iran," said Kimball, of Washington's Arms Control Association. Still, much could go wrong for the Americans in the coming three weeks of conference bargaining. "We must'n be complacent," said Patricia Lewis, a nuclear expert at the *Monterey Institute of International Studies*. "Although there's a lot of good will over the changes in U.S. policy, what there's unease about is whether or not the U.S. administration can deliver, for example, on the CTBT" - the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty...


“*Buena Vista ISD Students attend International Conference*” (Ford Stockton Pioneer)

*Excerpt*: their sponsor, Buena Vista High School science teacher Clabe Webb returned to Imperial late Sunday afternoon. Students from the Buena Vista science classes worked for many weeks preparing for their presentation in front of an international audience of about 125 peers and academics at the *Monterey Institute for International Studies (MIIS)*.


“*Getting a Career in Green Business*” (Profitable-It)

*Excerpt*: Clayton Snyder, a graduate from the *Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS)*, speaks about coming to the Institute to get a dual Master’s degree in International Business Administration and International Environmental Policy.

An appendix of clips follows. They are compiled in chronological order.
We will push to make sure that there are real consequences for those states that choose not to comply with their non-proliferation obligations. We will work to prevent states from cynically violating the treaty and then exercising their withdrawal rights to evade accountability," Tauscher said.
In order to be more effective in bolstering the non-proliferation pillar of the treaty, the Obama administration has taken several steps to reduce the American nuclear arsenal. That's also one of the pillars of the NPT — disarmament, whereby the five nuclear weapons states are committed to eventual total nuclear disarmament.

Recently, the U.S. signed a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty with Russia, and issued a new set of policies that greatly diminish the role of nuclear weapons in the defense of the United States. Nevertheless, Iran has challenged the Obama administration's commitment to disarmament. The question is whether U.S. actions will persuade most other nations to support pressure on Iran, says Leonard Spector, a former energy department official and now deputy director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies.

"Iran will pound away at that, but I think most states are going to say the United States has really made some progress. It's committed quite openly to the vision of disarmament which we had not seen in the previous administration. Maybe now it's time for us, the other countries, to stand behind the United States in an effort to reinforce the non-proliferation parts of the treaty," Spector said.

Mitchell Reiss, an expert on nuclear issues at the College of William & Mary, argues that the NPT holds security benefits for the non-nuclear states, regardless of whether the U.S. reduces its nuclear arsenal.

"It's the non-nuclear-weapons states that have the most to gain for making sure that the NPT is robust and that safeguards are effective and that cheaters like North Korea and Iran are punished," Reiss said. "Our reductions aren't a prize or a reward to the non-nuclear-weapons states. It's something that we do out of our self-interest. But the NPT is in their self-interest."

The U.S. and other nations will almost certainly be pressing for a conference declaration, which must be accepted by consensus — meaning all 189 states agree. Iran's opposition alone would stymie consensus. But that might not be a bad outcome, Spector said.

"If you build consensus and you almost get all the way home, and Iran blocks the consensus, you know, even that is a somewhat important victory. Because it isolates Iran and it shows that the international community and Iran are at odds," he said.

The NPT review conference is expected to end on May 28.
Jimmy Miller (TruthJustice) wrote:
Greg Lemond (Nascarfan44) wrote:"Curiously, states that are even WORSE human rights abusers but official allies like Saudi Arabia or Egypt are a blind spot for NPR."
I've argued that exact point myself on this forum. It is so obvious how closely the media follows the US administration party line. No attention is given to the Human Rights and Nuclear Proliferation issues in countries which are allies, like Saudi Arabia or Israel.
Yet Iran becomes the media's focus since it is seen as a threat by the administration and its allies.
It's outrageous when these news organizations portray themselves to be independent and unbiased!!
Monday, May 03, 2010 3:58:14 PM
Recommend (1)  Report abuse

Jimmy Miller (TruthJustice) wrote:
Greg Lemond (Nascarfan44) wrote:"So, let's bully a state that has no nukes and no programs while ignoring those who do have all that."
The obvious Double Standard within the US foreign policy, is ridiculous.
What's worse, this double standard permeates through to so-called independent news organizations, like NPR. Way to go guys!!
Monday, May 03, 2010 2:12:25 PM
Recommend (4)  Report abuse

Dave Old-Wolf (oldwolf49) wrote:
When he starts all Clinton has to do is swat him on the nose with a newspaper a couple of times and he will learn his place. Nuf said.
Monday, May 03, 2010 9:57:11 AM
Recommend (1)  Report abuse

Jimmy Miller (TruthJustice) wrote:
Richard Ling (Free_Truth) wrote:"Iran has been run by nothing but corrupt men for the last 2000 years"
First off, prove this!
Second, most everyone who's lead Israel (a nuclear armed entity) has been accused of corruption.
Why the double standard Richard???
Monday, May 03, 2010 9:43:16 AM
Recommend (3)  Report abuse

Richard Ling (Free_Truth) wrote:
An NPR moderator has removed this comment because it does not adhere to the discussion guidelines
Monday, May 03, 2010 7:20:15 AM
Recommend (2)  Report abuse
Rick James (IamRickJames) wrote:
@Mike
I think that the "threat" from Iran is much greater in one sense, because they will have the capability for nuclear weapons. That being said, Iran doesn't have a history of using WMDs, nor do we have much to fear from Iran attacking anyone with WMDs should they ever obtain them. The fear, real or not, is that Iran will give WMDs to some of the terrorist/freedom fighters it supports. Should that happen, I have no doubt those groups wouldn't hesitate to use them.
But I wholeheartedly agree with you that evidence should be proffered, and hopefully this is something the UN and international community can rightly resolve. Iran doesn't have the "right" to nuclear technology, as it has signed the NPT, but that doesn't mean that, given Iran's current stance, we shouldn't accomodate them. It does no one any good to fight an extant fact, and the fact is, Iran is determined to be a nuclear power. I say embrace it, but give Iran something to lose.
Monday, May 03, 2010 2:20:55 AM
Recommend (0)

Rick James (IamRickJames) wrote:
An NPR moderator has removed this comment because it does not adhere to the discussion guidelines
Monday, May 03, 2010 2:12:21 AM
Recommend (1)

Mike Vaupel (s8nsez10) wrote:
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CoaPa5A7DE0&feature=related
this is what Max Keiser put out on Iranian Press-TV.
In a clip Sec.O'State Hillary Clinton says the US is spending $5,000,000,000 on updating the nuclear weapons of the United States.
Also I truly cannot trust the United States gov't about threats from the Middle East after the WMD scare aka -FALSE INFORMATION- that was spewed about as facts leading up to the Iraq occupation. I also really think Congressman Ron Paul is a voice of truth and reason on this matter when he said "What proof is there?" on CNBC after winning the CPAC nomination.
Thanks for reading my thoughts and comments
Monday, May 03, 2010 1:19:12 AM
Recommend (2)

Rick James (IamRickJames) wrote:
@Mark, you're right, they don't. I am not going to get into an argument on the rightness or wrongness of the Israeli state, my only point is that I don't think Israel and Iran are truly comparable. They are apples and oranges, and both have good and bad elements.
Sunday, May 02, 2010 11:42:24 PM

Rick James (IamRickJames) wrote:
Jews in Iran don't fire rockets and blow up busses
Sunday, May 02, 2010 11:10:12 PM
 Recommend (1)
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Iran Draws Western Criticism at Opening of U.N. Nuclear Talks | PBS NewsHour

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/middle_east/jan-june10/iran_05-03.htm...
REPORT
AIR DATE: May 3, 2010

Iran Draws Western Criticism at Opening of U.N. Nuclear Talks

SUMMARY
As the United Nations began its conference on nuclear weapons, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad drew ire with accusations that the U.S. is leading the charge to intimidate non-nuclear states. Margaret Warner reports on the growing tensions between Iran and Western nations.

Transcript

JUDY WOODRUFF: Next: A country that may be developing nuclear weapons shows up at a conference to stop the spread of nuclear weapons.

Margaret Warner has our story.

PROTESTER: No nukes, no wars.

MARGARET WARNER: Holding signs reading "No Nukes, No War," thousands massed in New York City streets this weekend to call for a permanent end to nuclear weapons.

PROTESTER: We cannot continue to play with fire any longer.

MARGARET WARNER: They marched in advance of a United Nations conference convened to strengthen the current treaty to curb the spread of nuclear weapons.

U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon opened the conclave this morning.

BAN KI-MOON, United Nations secretary-general: The work you undertake this day is of immense importance to humankind.

MARGARET WARNER: Every five years, the signers of the 40-year-old Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT, meet to review how well it's working and what else needs to be done. But looming over the month-long conference this time is an item not explicitly on the agenda: Iran's ongoing nuclear program.

And today made it clear this conference is going to be a showdown of sorts between the two main protagonists: Washington and Tehran.

LEONARD SPECTOR, Monterey Institute of International Studies: This is going to be a face-off between the United States and Iran.

MARGARET WARNER: Leonard Spector is deputy director of the non-proliferation center at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

LEONARD SPECTOR: The crucial issue on the front burner for everyone is dealing with the Iranian nuclear problem. It won't get played out that way. There will be other discussions. But underlying each one of these on nuclear energy, on disarmament, on building consensus, is, can we bring pressure to bear on Iran?

MARGARET WARNER: Iran is hard at work enriching uranium for civilian energy purposes, it insists. But the U.S. and its allies believe Tehran is bent on developing weapons and is pushing for tougher sanctions at the Security Council to try to thwart its ambitions.

Secretary-General Ban started off by calling on Iran to lay suspicions about its program to rest. But, at his turn to speak, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad hit back, saying there was no credible proof his country was working on such weapons and insisting that it was the states with nuclear arms that were encouraging proliferation.

MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD, Iranian president (through translator): There are reportedly more than 20,000 nuclear warheads worldwide, half of which belong to the United States. And the other competing groups continue to develop nuclear weapons under the pretext of deterrent. The trend constitutes a violation of obligations under the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty, or NPT.

MARGARET WARNER: Delegates from Britain, France, and the United States walked out of the hall as he spoke. But that didn't deter Ahmadinejad from also taking aim at the U.S. for retaining the right to use nuclear weapons.

MAHMOUD AHMADINEJAD (through translator): It is a misperception that it is OK to use nuclear weapons. Regrettably, the United States has not only used nuclear weapons, but also continues to threaten to use such weapons against other countries, including my country.

MARGARET WARNER: In a new nuclear strategy unveiled last month, the Obama administration pledged for the first time that the U.S. would never use nuclear weapons against a non-nuclear state, if, and only if, that state was abiding by its obligations under the NPT not to develop nuclear arms of its own.

Spector found Ahmadinejad's remarks entirely predictable.

LEONARD SPECTOR: Iran's strategy is to deflect attention away from Iran. This speech by Ahmadinejad was strictly about disarmament, and had nothing to do with compliance with the treaty or, you know, his own behavior.

MARGARET WARNER: And by disarmament, he's talking about the nuclear states, like the United States?

LEONARD SPECTOR: Principally, the United States.
Support the kind of journalism done by the NewsHour...Become a member of your local PBS station.

http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/middle_east/jan-june10/iran_05-03.htm...
Monterey County residents speak on etiquette of displaying foreign flags

BY KIMBER SOLANA • ksolana@thecalifornian.com • May 5, 2010

As residents in the Salinas area celebrate Cinco de Mayo today, with many displaying Mexican flags, strong feelings can rise about the etiquette of displaying a foreign country's banner.

On one side of the issue: "This is the United States of America; there's only one flag we should fly," said Dennis Miller, 63, of Prunedale.

On the other: "As long as it's done in a respectful way and not inciting violence or hatred, then it should be fine," said Blanca Zarazua, a Salinas lawyer and honorary Mexican consul, on flying foreign flags. "It's part of democracy."

The issue comes in the wake of an alleged hate crime Sunday in Castroville. Monterey County sheriff deputies arrested a 32-year-old man accused of spitting on Mexican flags and vandalizing the vehicle they were displayed from.

The topic was already a sensitive one after a series of rallies over the weekend — including in Salinas, Watsonville and Santa Cruz — protesting Arizona's new law against illegal immigrants.

The new rule requires law enforcement to question people about their immigration status if there is reason to believe they are in the country illegally. Protesters say the law opens the door to racial profiling of Latinos.

In this environment, flying the Mexican flag could be perceived as flaunting support for Mexico and illegal immigration.

But according to the Independence Hall Association at www.ushistory.org, the country's flag code does not forbid the display of a foreign flag or require individuals to fly the American flag. The code says only federal institutions, including schools, are required to fly a U.S. flag.

Zarazua said she would ask those offended by foreign flags why they have a sensitivity to non-U.S. flags.

"Why does it upset them so much?" she said. "People need to ask them." Miller, a veteran who served in the U.S. Air Force from 1966 to 1972, said those flying a foreign flag should also display the American flag out of respect.

"It just hurts me to see another flag flying without the American flag," he said. "A lot of my friends died serving this country, and the American flag just means a lot to me."

The U.S. flag code says when flying American and foreign flags together, they should be on separate staffs but placed at the same height and be of similar size.

Miller said he spent five days in Mexico in February and did not see one American flag flying.

"But that was the country I was in, and I realized that," Miller said.

Zarazua said people should avoid assumptions about people's patriotism.

"It shouldn't be assumed that you're unpatriotic if you don't fly the American flag," she said. "It's about giving people the option and a choice."

Respecting all cultures
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On the Monterey Peninsula, a popular tourist destination, many businesses display flags of other countries to celebrate cultural diversity and welcome foreign visitors.

At the Barnyard Shopping Village in Carmel, several flags — including banners from Japan, Italy, the United States and Mexico — fly side-by-side.

"It's our way to share with the community that we're an international shopping village," said Angela Cordrey, the Barnyard's property manager. The flags represent the cuisines of the restaurants in the shopping village.

At the Monterey Institute of International Studies' Morse building in Monterey, flags from up to 70 countries, varying each semester, are displayed along with the American flag.

The display is meant to welcome the international students at the school, said Barbara Burke, executive assistant to the president at MIIS. More than 33 percent of its students are from foreign countries, she said.

"We want to make sure we respect all our students, [some of whom] traveled long distances to come to our school," Burke said. "Certainly you don't spit on the American flag, and of course you don't spit at someone else's flag."

She was referring to Sunday's incident, in which sheriff's deputies arrested Joseph Hardy of Castroville on suspicion of felony vandalism and a misdemeanor hate crime.

Deputies said Hardy took issue with a man's black sport utility vehicle decorated with Mexican flags for Cinco de Mayo, which commemorates the Mexican army's unlikely victory over French forces at the Battle of Puebla in 1862.

According to the Sheriff's Office, Hardy spat on the flags and scratched the hood of the 2001 Chevrolet Tahoe. Damage to the SUV is estimated at $500.

On Tuesday, a jail official said Hardy has posted his bail of $7,500.

Hardy said Tuesday he did not commit the crimes he is accused of and has proof that he was not in Castroville at the time of the incident. Hardy declined to elaborate his side until he meets with a lawyer today.

If brought to trial and convicted on the hate crime allegations, Hardy could face up to a year in jail, a fine of up to $5,000 and 400 hours of community service, officials said.

To learn more about the United States' guidelines for flags, visit www.ushistory.org/betsy/flagcode.htm.
La Puente students explore nuclear bomb issues

By Claudia S. Palma, Staff Writer

Posted: 05/06/2010 02:55:15 PM PDT

A handful of juniors at La Puente High school learned so much about nuclear bombs recently - history, testing, current challenges, opportunities for nonproliferation, world politics, international relations, policies ... It seemed their heads were about to explode.

"We read for hours. It was confusing at first," said Adan Gonzalez, 17, of La Puente.

Instead the six students were happy to absorb the information and to become more aware of the world around them.

"It's surprising how much many people don't know about nuclear bombs," added Gonzalez.

Led by Andrew King, U.S. history AP teacher and director of activities at La Puente High School, students Stephanie Ayon, Gonzalez, Elizabeth Jimenez, Rigoberto Lopez, Arthur Ortiz, Cesar Torres, took

Elizabeth Jimenez of La Puente High School talks during her team's presentation on "Nuclear Nonproliferation: Global Opportunities and Regional Challenges" at the Critical Issues Forum, a conference in Monterey in April. (Photo provided to Highlander)

Cesar Torres of La Puente High School talks during his team's presentation on "Nuclear Nonproliferation: Global Opportunities and Regional Challenges" at the Critical Issues Forum, a conference in Monterey in April. (Photo provided to Highlander)

Rigoberto Lopez, Arthur Ortiz, Cesar Torres, took
on the challenge of nuclear nonproliferation - to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction.

The students' research is part of a program by the Monterey Institute of International Studies in Monterey, which involved the students putting together four reports and a presentation on "Nuclear Nonproliferation: Global Opportunities and Regional Challenges" over a six-month process.

"(Most of the research) was here at school and online at home," said Jimenez, 16, of La Puente. "Mr. King was our ultimate resource."

The group gave its presentation at the culmination of the program - the Critical Issues Forum, an annual conference organized by the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey institute.

The local students joined more than 100 students from 12 U.S. and 10 Russian high schools also taking part in the program. Seven of the schools were from California.

"We were pretty good for our first time," said Arthur Ortiz of their presentation. "Most of the schools' presentations gave facts, we gave analysis."

This is the first time the school has participated.

The students' journey into the world of nuclear bombs began when King's former professor, Tom Ilgen, Jones Foundation professor of political studies at Pitzer College in Claremont, suggested the program.

"I studied nuclear weapons in college and I'm constantly doing research," said King.

He opened up the program to the entire school. Out of many interested students, it came down to the six juniors.

"I know nuclear weapons are something not always addressed, but nuclear weapons is a global issue," said King.

Aside from doing research in the classroom and at home, King wanted the students to get real hands-on experience, so the group took a field trip to the Atomic Testing Museum and the restricted Nevada Nuclear Test site. The Nevada site is only open a few times a year and visitor access is limited.
"I tried to make it as engaging as possible," said King.

"We got to drive on a crater," said Gonzalez.

"It was amazing," added Lopez.

"The thought of how little (the nuclear bomb was compared to how big they are now) that created the crater, and the crater was huge," said Ayon.

Lopez said he was surprised to know there are still places like the Nevada site and that there is still testing going on.

"Before, I thought bombs were a good thing to protect ourselves," said Ortiz. "Then I started to learn about the effects and the consequences."

The field trips and research opened the students' eyes and they were determined to have a great presentation at the forum.

"That whole week (of the forum) we didn't sleep much," said Ayon of how much the group practiced to perfect their presentation.

"We just wanted to do really good," said Lopez.

King said he helped the students with the first report but the other reports and presentation were all the students' work.

"I just helped them edit the final result," he said. "I didn't want them to have 'death by Powerpoint.' I wanted them to be interactive with their presentation. I was very proud."

Each school's reports will be posted online and published after the forum.

For the event, each student chose a topic and took turns speaking on that issue during a 25-minute presentation.

The students covered issues such as the Iranian threat, North Korea, the opportunity of Global Zero, improving U.S.-Russia relations. They wanted to address their fellow youth to help them become more aware of the real threat of nuclear weapons.

"We gave our thoughts on our current issues,"
"We had to predict what might happen if the NPT (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty) failed," added Jimenez.

With the signing of a nuclear arms reduction treaty by President Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev earlier that month, the group was sure to touch on that subject as well.

King said he made sure to have the students read newspapers and other material from other countries to understand their perspective.

The students were excited to meet and make friends with many students from around the country and from Russia.

"It was cool interacting with everybody," said Lopez. "They spoke so many different languages."

Now the students have a new set of Facebook friends, they noted.

"We want to go to Russia and visit with our new friends," said Gonzalez.

One thing the La Puente students noticed they had in common with all the teens they met at the conference was they were just like them in many ways.

"Everybody wants proliferation," said Ayon.

King was glad to see the students were able to talk to other teens about something other than music or movies.

"They shaped the opinion of (American teens for) the Russian students, just the way (the Russian teens) shaped their experience," said King. "They are not just American citizens, this just made them more global citizens."

The La Puente High group all agreed they are more interested now in international relations and will keep up with the issues as they develop.

"I would like to follow politics," said Lopez.

"I still want to have something to do with police or politics," added Ayon, "but this opened my eyes to other things."

The word has spread throughout the school and community about the school and there is already a list of students interested in joining the program next year.

"We've got a lot of positive feedback," said King.

The group was also recognized by Victory Over Violence, Inc., (VOV) a national organization "dedicated to creating a positive force in the media to offset the cynicism and negativity, which create a climate of violence."

VOV donated a variety of books focused on peace and understanding to the school's library.
"We're all pretty excited about the selection of books," said King.

He said the recognition was important to the students since they felt they were not just doing the program for themselves, they were representing the school, the district, and Southern California.

"I got chills when I heard (about the recognition)," said Gonzalez.

Funding for the La Puente High's participation in the program was provided by Pitzer College.

The James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) developed the Critical Issues Forum (CIF) to increase awareness of disarmament and nonproliferation issues and to engage and recruit the next generation of nonproliferation specialists.

The CIF Program is supported by grants from the U.S. Department of Energy and the Ford Foundation and hosted at The Center for Nonproliferation Studies (CNS) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

For more information, visit www.criticalissuesforum.org.

claudia.palma@sgvn.com

626-962-8811, Ext. 2110
If you are an author, reporter, or journalist of some type, you have probably been referred to this page because someone wants to politely explain to you the difference between translation and interpretation. There is no need to take offense. This is just an effort to educate many people who have previously been unaware. Not everyone outside the language industry knows the difference, but here is a basic principle you need to understand if you want to maintain credibility and appear as if you know what you are talking about.

**Translation is Written & Interpretation is Spoken**

It is really very simple. Translation is written. Interpretation is spoken. Translators work with written language. Interpreters deal with spoken language. That's it! There is nothing more to it!

Still, many reporters and journalists get this wrong on a daily basis. I will not cite any examples here because I am not looking to embarrass anyone, but examples can be found easily with a quick Google search.

**Authoritative References on the Difference**

Trust me. You can take my word for it since I've worked as both a translator and an interpreter, and I've managed both translators and interpreters. If that is not enough to make you believe me, then check out a few of these authoritative references:

> Although interpretation and translation have much in common, the practice of each profession differs in the same way that written language differs from spoken... Interpreters must be good public speakers who are adept at grasping meaning and solving complex linguistic problems quickly, whereas translators must be able to conduct thorough and meticulous research and produce accurate, camera-ready documents while adhering to tight deadlines.
> *Graduate School of Translation, Interpretation, & Language Education, Monterey Institute of International Studies*

> Translation refers to the rendering of written materials into a different language.... Interpretation refers to the relaying of spoken words, such as lectures or conversations, into another language....
> *Center for Language Study, Yale University*

> Translators work with the written word.... Interpreters work with the spoken word....
> *American Translators Association*

> Interpreters deal with spoken words, translators with written words.
> *US Bureau of Labor Statistics*

Even Wikipedia recognizes that many people attempt to use the word "translation" to refer to both; however, "interpretation and translation are not synonymous."
Maintain Journalistic Credibility when Reporting on Language Services

I hope by now you get it and you think I'm beating a dead horse. If you find this repetitive and are almost ready to click away from this page, that is a good thing. Unfortunately, after all the evidence above has been presented, there are still some incredibly stubborn people who bury their heads in the sand and insist the two words are interchangeable. Sometimes these people will become very defensive and attack the person correcting them. I once had a reporter tell me he would not pay any attention to my suggestion because I had omitted a serial comma from my email. Please don't be one of those people. It will only embarrass you.

Imagine how embarrassing it would be for a reporter to confuse "libel" with "slander," when there is such a clear difference: libel is written, and slander is spoken. Or imagine how silly it would sound if a reporter referred to how a pair of political candidates demonstrated what great writers they were as they spoke impromptu in a recent debate. Clearly speakers speak and writers write, and it is just plain wrong to think that the words for speaking and writing are interchangeable.

- Writing ≠ Speaking
- Authors ≠ Orators
- Translation ≠ Interpretation
- Translators ≠ Interpreters

Journalists and reporters can maintain or lose credibility depending on how well they convey their understanding of the differences between the following: U.S. House and Senate; libel and slander; civil court and criminal court; speaking and writing; translation and interpretation; and more...

The Nicole Kidman Example

For one final example, remember Hollywood's 2005 film starring Nicole Kidman. Hollywood does not always get it right, but it did in this particular case. The film is correctly called The Interpreter, NOT The Translator, because Kidman's character works as a U.N. interpreter and deals with the spoken word, NOT the written word.

A simple illustration was created by interpreters Johanna Parker and Sam Pinilla while they were pursuing graduate studies in translation and interpretation at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. It was distributed to moviegoers in the "Language Capital of the World" when the The Interpreter was released in 2005. In a very simplified "see-Jane-run" style with stick figures, the illustration read: "Why isn't this movie called ‘The Translator?’ See Nicole. See Nicole listen. See Nicole interpret. See Lydia. See Lydia read. See Lydia translate. Got it?"

Thank You for Writing about Translation & Interpretation

So, after kicking this dead horse a few more times, I hope you are convinced enough to use the words translation and interpretation correctly in the future. No one was insulting you by directing you to this link. This is merely an effort to educate journalists and reporters. Greater understanding will benefit everyone, and anyone reporting on this topic will be taken much more seriously if he or she uses these terms correctly.

Thank you for taking the time to write about or report on translation or interpretation. And thank you for taking the time to educate yourself about these two professions and their differences.
Additional Information on Translation & Interpretation

Contact Globalization Group, Inc. for professional language translation services, conference interpretation, and additional multilingual services including multilingual voiceover in Japanese, Chinese, Spanish, and more than 200 other languages and dialects.

About the Author

Adam Wooten has experience working in all areas of the translation and interpretation industry. He has worked as a court interpreter, an in-house translator, a translation project manager, an interpreter coordinator, a translation technology instructor, director of sales and marketing, country general manager, and director of automated solutions. He has also taught courses on translation technology as an adjunct professor at the Graduate School of Translation & Interpretation, part of the Monterey Institute of International Studies, and at Brigham Young University.

Adam is currently putting this experience to use as Vice President at the translation and localization services company Globalization Group, Inc. Contact him to find the best solutions to your language needs or to discuss the latest trends in the translation and interpretation industry.
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Why anti-sweatshop campaigns might just do it after all

By Tim Harford
Published: May 8 2010 01:25 | Last updated: May 8 2010 01:25

When my book The Undercover Economist was published five years ago, I would occasionally be asked whether I was in favour of sweatshops in developing countries. Not at all, I would reply. But I could see where the question was coming from, because I was certainly worried as to whether campaigning against them would do any good.

My argument had a logic that will be familiar to economists. Unless sweatshop workers are literally slaves, they are presumably working long hours in horrible conditions for low pay only because the alternative ways of making a living are worse.

When a well-meaning group of activists launches a campaign against sweatshop labour among, say, Nike suppliers in Indonesia, the obvious risk is that the sweatshops are closed, workers are tossed out on to the street, and the work is shifted to computerised sewing machines in Osaka. This is surely not the aim. The only alternative is economic growth: while it may be frustratingly slow, it finishes off sweatshops by producing far more attractive jobs.

But while the logic is straightforward enough, it is not watertight. A successful multinational may be profitable enough to be able to afford wage increases, and may prefer to take wage increases on the chin rather than move its business around. Economic growth itself can increase the demand for child labour as well as reducing the supply.

So I was intrigued to discover two new pieces of research addressing these questions. One is an article in March’s American Economic Review, written by Ann Harrison of the University of California, Berkeley, and Jason Scorse of the Monterey Institute. Harrison and Scorse study data from Indonesia. In the 1990s, Indonesia was the focus of anti-sweatshop campaigns that persuaded the US government to put pressure on its Indonesian counterpart, and encouraged US consumers to boycott companies such as Nike. (An influential study in 1989 had found that Nike’s suppliers paid lower wages than other companies in the export sector.) Harrison and Scorse look at the footwear, textile and clothing sectors and compare regions with lots of brand-name suppliers to regions with lower-profile businesses.

If my argument is correct, Harrison and Scorse would have found a slump in employment in export factories in the brand-name regions. There is little sign of this. Profits do fall, and so does investment. Some small plants closed. But few, if any, jobs seem to have been lost.

The minimum wage in Indonesia more than doubled between 1989 and 1996, after inflation, and this did depress employment. But there seemed to be no additional effect in the districts with lots of brand-name suppliers, despite the fact that wages in those regions outpaced wage increases elsewhere by almost a third.

The second paper was presented in draft form at the Royal Economic Society meeting in Guildford at the end of March. This research, by Nigar Hashimzade and Uma Kambhampati of the University of Reading, shows that economic growth – at least in the short-term – is not enough to reduce child labour. Complementary policies to strengthen schools and the incentive to attend them seem to be necessary.

Neither piece of research is the last word, and neither discounts the long-term effectiveness of economic growth in improving working conditions. But I am having to think again about anti-sweatshop campaigns. At least I am in good company. John Maynard Keynes is reported to have quipped, “When the facts change, I change my mind. What do you do, sir?”

Tim Harford’s latest book is ‘Dear Undercover Economist’ (Little, Brown)
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Iran's alleged clandestine pursuit of a nuclear-weapon capability dominated the headlines last week during the ongoing Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference. However, beyond the theatrics of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's verbal exchange, it is important to remember, and ultimately to address, the root cause of the Iranian nuclear problem — namely, the spread of dual-use technologies such as uranium enrichment to countries outside the ring of first-order world powers.

The problem with uranium enrichment is its ambiguity: It is a vital component of the civilian nuclear power industry, yet it can also be used to produce fissile material for nuclear weapons. The same centrifuges that enrich natural uranium to the levels required by many civilian power reactors can also enrich uranium to the high levels required by nuclear bombs.

Since uranium enrichment cannot be banned outright or limited to certain states by fiat, voluntary solutions must be found that make multilateral enrichment programs more attractive to states than pursuing their own national uranium enrichment programs. Coupled with an international norm discouraging the spread of national uranium enrichment facilities, states could then profit from enrichment while making the sovereign choice to eschew national control over the technology.

In recent years, several states have proposed various multilateral approaches to uranium enrichment. The most far-reaching proposal came from Germany, which called for the creation of a uranium enrichment center on international territory — similar to the territory occupied by the U.N. headquarters — controlled and administered by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Two Russian proposals, however, have gained the most traction.

The first, the International Uranium Enrichment Center at Angarsk, is already up and running in central Russia. The IUEC is essentially an international joint stock venture. States that buy shares in the center gain a voice on its management board and access to its services. However, only Russia operates the facility and has access to the enrichment technology. The shareholders also receive dividends from the sale of enrichment services, enhancing the appeal. Currently, Armenia, Kazakhstan and Ukraine participate in the IUEC, along with Russia.

Secondly, Russia and the IAEA have agreed to establish an international low-enriched uranium (LEU) fuel bank at Angarsk. The fuel bank concept is similar to insurance for states that choose not to develop their own domestic enrichment facilities. If the supply of reactor fuel to an importing state were cut off for political reasons, it could apply to the fuel bank through the IAEA for an emergency shipment of LEU. The guarantee would not apply in cases where the importing country had violated its safeguards obligations or defaulted on bilaterally contracted payments.

Together, the IUEC and Angarsk fuel bank provide a compelling alternative model to nationally controlled enrichment centers. Participating states would avoid the high capital investment costs of developing indigenous enrichment facilities, while maintaining assurance of supply. The cost of importing uranium could be offset by dividends from owning a stake in the international enrichment center. The importer gains security and cheaper reactor fuel, while sacrificing only the possibility of one day turning a civilian enrichment center into a military one — a possibility that is forbidden under the NPT anyway, unless the state first withdraws from the treaty.

Media reports indicate that Argentina, Brazil, Egypt and South Africa were among the eight states that voted against the Russian fuel bank proposal when it came up for a vote at the IAEA in November 2009. Argentina, Brazil and South Africa are influential middle powers with relatively developed nuclear sectors. Egypt, while it has no nuclear program, is a leader of the large Non-Aligned Movement, whose 100-plus members are the largest bloc at the NPT Review Conference. These states fear that multilateral approaches to the fuel cycle will ultimately limit states' access to the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, a right that is enshrined in the Nonproliferation Treaty.

This reluctance has stymied a separate fuel bank proposal under which the IAEA would directly own and manage a supply of LEU. This proposal was put forward by the non-governmental Nuclear Threat Initiative, which offered to donate $50 million to the project if IAEA member states raised an additional $100 million. This condition was met in March 2009. However, the IAEA has been unable to forge an agreement to implement the proposal.

As a result, Russia has taken the lead on the issue of devising multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle, with the strong support of the United States. Together, and with their partners, they should work at the current NPT Review Conference to persuade skeptical states of the benefits of voluntary, non-political international uranium enrichment arrangements, as well as of the risks posed by the unchecked spread of enrichment technology to new states. A strong endorsement of the Russian proposals at the review conference will build momentum for multilateral approaches in other decision-making bodies, such as the United Nations and the IAEA, as well as in bilateral discussions between states.
The Iranian nuclear horse is already halfway out of the barn. Preventing a further fraying of the nonproliferation regime that has served the world well for four decades requires an attractive international alternative to national uranium enrichment. The international community must make a serious diplomatic effort to develop and agree on such measures, in order to manage the nuclear issue in the 21st century.

Cole Harvey is a research associate at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies in Washington, D.C. He is the author of a March 2010 report for the Arms Control Association, entitled "Major Proposals to Strengthen the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty." His work has appeared in Arms Control Today and on the Web site of the Nuclear Threat Initiative.

Photo: Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad touring Iran's uranium enrichment facility in Natanz, Iran, 2008 (Photo by the Web site of the president of Iran).
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Russ Wellen

... hearts hyenas.

Posted: May 12, 2010 11:47 AM

Nuclear Modernization Making a Mockery of Disarmament

THE DEPROLIFIERATOR -- Last summer, the *Economist* published a letter from hawkish Arizona Senator John Kyl (currently neck deep in the springtime of his state's immigrant shame). Cole Harvey of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies reports that Kyl wrote: "Every nuclear weapons power -- with the exception of the US -- is currently modernising its nuclear weapons and weapons delivery systems. ... Yet the US continues to permit its nuclear forces to atrophy and decline."

Harvey continued [emphasis added]: "Later in 2009, all 40 Republican senators at the time. ... wrote that the further reductions in the U.S. nuclear arsenal would be acceptable only if accompanied by. . . "funding for a modern warhead. . . involving replacement, or possibly, component reuse." Since President Obama would need some of their votes to ratify the new START treaty, an increase in nuclear funding for the administration's proposed 2011 budget was apparently perceived as necessary. [See below for how much. -- RW]

Meanwhile, what's italicized above provides a glimpse into how confusing the concept of nuclear modernization can be, as well as the degree to which it can be manipulated. According to an Arms Control Association (ACA) Fact Sheet, "This distinction between 'rebuilt' and 'new' has led some to reach the mistaken conclusion that the U.S. strategic weapon systems are not being 'modernized.' ... These systems are in many cases being completely rebuilt with essentially all new parts, although they are not technically 'new' systems."

The questions this raises might be familiar to those who restore classic cars. At what point does the identity of the car on which you're working run the risk of being lost and metamorphosing into a new one? For example, can the power train be replaced?

The author is scarcely equipped to answer that question. Still, it might prove helpful to acquaint ourselves with these three nuclear programs: Stockpile Stewardship, the Reliable Replacement Warhead, and Life Extension. You're right to be suspicious if they sound a little too reassuring -- "stewardship," "reliable," "life extension."
The Stockpile Stewardship Program, reports the ACA, "monitors weapons for signs of aging . . . conducts computer simulations [to verify they'll still detonate] . . . replaces aging components of weapons [and] adheres as closely as possible to the original design specifications of tested weapons."

Life Extension (LEP), Harvey writes, is the program in which, "Weapon refurbishment is carried out . . . for individual systems." For example LEP for one warhead is expected to extend its "life" [the span of time it's capable of dealing death, that is -- RW] for 30 years. The process includes "refurbishing the nuclear explosive package, the arming, firing, and fusing system . . . associated cables . . . valves, pads." You know -- the same way they keep airplanes flying for 50 years.

When it comes to the Reliable Replacement Warhead, though, Harvey explains: "Rather than rely exclusively on long-term life extension for existing warheads, the program called for the design and production of a new nuclear warhead" though "without the resumption of underground testing."

In a show of rare good sense, Congress terminated that program. But the current senior White House coordinator for WMD counterterrorism and arms control, Gary Samore, was recently quoted by Martin Matishak at GSN: "From what I understand ... refurbishment and reuse will be perfectly fine for the foreseeable future. But if I'm wrong, and replacement becomes necessary, the president has the option to do that." Matishak continues: "The approach to renovation of each warhead type will be determined [as it] comes up for its periodic overhaul, and will be 'consistent with the congressionally mandated Stockpile Management Program,' according to" the new Nuclear Posture Review.

Wait a minute -- Stockpile Management Program? What's the difference between that and the Stockpile Stewardship Program?

According to Matishak, the former replaced the Reliable Replacement Warhead program. "The stockpile management program [enables] modernizing the U.S. nuclear stockpile along a spectrum of options ranging from . . . refurbishment to the manufacture of 'new' weapons. [But any new design should] adhere to well known designs and components, and be undertaken only in support of further reductions in the stockpile and the continued moratorium on nuclear tests. [Emphasis added.] In other words, we're supposedly pursuing these programs to advance our progress on the path to disarmament. But, for 2011, "the Obama administration is requesting $7 billion, a 10 percent increase, in funding for weapons activities in the . . . National Nuclear Security Administration."

Besides the Life Extension Program, this money would help fund, among other things:

. . . large increases for the . . . plutonium facility at Los Alamos National Laboratory, N.M., which would see its budget increased from $97 million [in 2010] to $225 million in [2011] ... complete rebuilds of the Minuteman III ICBM and Trident II [submarine]. ... Additionally, a new submarine, the SSBN-X, is undergoing development in an effort that is expected to cost $85 billion. The B-2 strategic bomber, a relatively new system, is being upgraded, as is the B-52H bomber.

**Disarmament in Name Only**

You can be forgiven for wondering if these programs don't cancel out the token reductions in the START treaty and then some. In fact, it's hard to deny that START and the Nuclear Posture
Review give every appearance of functioning as covers for the perpetuation of what's been called the nuclear-industrial complex. As disarmament authors Darwin Bond-Graham, Nicholas Robinson, and Will Parrish made abundantly clear at ZComm:

Rather than allowing a neat policy process carried out at the executive level to determine the future of the nuclear weapons complex, forces with financial ... stakes in nuclear weaponry, working through think tanks like [the Hoover Institute], or corporate entities like Bechtel and the University of California [which together manage Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore nuclear weapons laboratories], are actively attempting to lock in a de-facto set of policies by building a new research, design, and production infrastructure that will ensure nuclear weapons are a centerpiece of the US military empire far into the future. [Emphasis added.]

This is exemplified by the "Four Horsemen," as Henry Kissinger, former Senator Sam Nunn, former Secretary of Defense William Perry (now a senior fellow at Hoover), George Schultz (president of Bechtel for eight years before he became Secretary of State; also now a senior fellow at Hoover) became known after they wrote an op-ed for the Wall Street Journal in 2008 calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons. They solidified their position -- newfound for Kissinger and Perry -- with another such WSJ piece a year later.

Their third op-ed in the series, though, published earlier this year, was titled "How to Protect Our Nuclear Deterrent." The phrase "nuclear deterrent" is a tell that its user seeks to keep disarmament relegated to the slow lane, if not stalled out on the shoulder of the road. As the ZComm trio cited above (as opposed to the Four Horsemen . . . the Three Musketeers?) explained: "The Four Horsemen endorse the view ... that 'investments are urgently needed ... in the laboratories' budgets for the science, technology, and engineering programs that support and underwrite the nation's nuclear deterrent.'"

In fact, the three maintained: "With their direct links to the corporations that manage the weapons labs . . . the Four Horsemen are the chief negotiators working through public forums to limit the extent of arms control treaties and extract the biggest pro-nuclear lab concessions." The Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories, they wrote, "have long been known as powerful bulwarks against international treaties that limit nuclear arms development."

In other words, "statements of politicians and elder statesmen about a world free of nuclear weapons. ... has served to fix the attention of disarmament and antiwar activists on 'policy making,' which has 'blinded them to the political deal-making process at hand.'"

Or as disarmament sage Jonathan Schell, less than thrilled by the new START, wrote in the Nation:

If this trend continues, it is entirely possible that the ultimate mockery will occur: nuclear arsenals will march forward into the future under a banner that reads Ban the Bomb.

*First posted at the Faster Times.*

**Follow Russ Wellen on Twitter: www.twitter.com/http://twitter.**
Thousands celebrate commencement at CSUMB

Sylvia Panetta urges students to a life of service

On a sunny, breezy morning, Sylvia Panetta told the graduates of California State University, Monterey Bay to turn challenges into opportunities through service to others.

Mrs. Panetta, chair of the Board of Directors and president of the Panetta Institute for Public Policy, was the keynote speaker at the university's May 22 commencement. With almost 890 students receiving bachelor's and master's degrees, and more than 200 earning teaching credentials, it was the largest graduating class in school history.

They received their degrees before a capacity crowd of about 8,000 family members and friends.

In referring to the process by which Fort Ord became CSU Monterey Bay, Mrs. Panetta (pictured at right) reminded the audience that it took the work of countless local people to make a dream come true and convert swords into plowshares.

"Many people were afraid that the loss of Fort Ord would create a big economic hole on the Monterey Peninsula. But, there was a dedicated group of people who saw opportunity in challenge. People from diverse backgrounds and with very different interests came together to ensure that something remarkable could and would be created," she said.

"Today, the creation of the university, something we thought was a good idea, has proven to be a brilliant idea. Your graduating class is the fulfillment of the dream that our generation . . . had for the land where this university now thrives."

She reminded the graduates that the country's founders created not just a nation and a Constitution, they created "an obligation in each of us to serve this nation and honor that Constitution. We were each given a duty to fulfill the most important moral covenant we have - to care for each other."

While acknowledging the current economic climate and related job market will not be easy to navigate, she encouraged the graduates to remind themselves of their responsibility to serve others.

"The challenges you face cannot be used as an excuse for apathy or as justification for disengagement," she told them. "You can, and you must, remember your commitment to your community, to your nation and to the world. You are already on that path; it's now time to take the next steps."

Sounding a familiar theme, she told the students that they had had the unique opportunity to learn from service and were equipped with a set of skills that connects them to their environment and to people.

"Why not take the educational tools that you have acquired and find a way to serve? The skills you will gain will serve you for the rest of your life."

The ceremony opened with the traditional welcome in Spanish, Japanese, Italian and Chinese, delivered by members of the faculty.

In her remarks, President Dianne Harrison pointed out that the graduating class "boasts an amazing array of talent."

"Many have overcome enormous challenges, attaining academic..."
success, achieving as athletes, receiving prestigious honors, and sharing their gifts and abilities with fellow students and the community. Their success is incredibly rewarding," she said.

Dr. Harrison (pictured at right) shared the stories of a few of these students:

- Cicilia Chudivan, a business major who maintained a very high grade-point average while leading the women's golf team to its best season in school history. A native of Indonesia, she will attend the Monterey Institute of International Studies to pursue a master's degree.

- Adan Romero, a first-generation student from Salinas who majored in biology. He was inspired to pursue a career in medical research by his mother, who suffers from osteoarthritis. In the summer of 2008, he conducted research on an early diagnostic tool for the disease at UC San Francisco. He will continue his work to better people's lives when he heads to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology this fall to pursue a Ph.D. in biological engineering.

- Yvette Cervantes, a global studies major, overcame a number of obstacles to get to college. A child of farm workers, she started college but had to drop out in her first year. But she kept at it, graduated from Hartnell College in Salinas and then transferred to CSUMB. Her desire to help others led her, as a student employee in the Office of Admissions, to provide the first Spanish-language tours of campus. And she's been involved with the University Promise program, which encourages sixth-graders to go to college.

President Harrison then introduced the student speaker, Hayley Allison, this year's winner of the President's Medal for Exemplary Student Achievement. Allison, a Teledramatic Arts and Technology major, produced the first Monterey Bay Teen Film Festival in 2009 and further developed the event this year. As a Service Learning leader, she was instrumental in establishing film and video workshops for at-risk teens.

Referring to the university requirement that all students complete service learning classes, Allison told her fellow graduates, "We have given our service to the region, and we have changed it. We must now put that experience to work on a larger scale."

Two faculty members were also honored. Dr. Amalia Mesa-Bains was awarded emeriti faculty status, acknowledging her distinguished service to the university. Dr. Pat Tinsley McGill was acknowledged for winning this year's Griffin Award for outstanding teaching.

To see video shout-outs to the Class of 2010, click here.
Bomb School

How one little-noticed outcome of Obama's Nuclear Security Summit -- a new commitment to nuclear education and training -- could change the world.

BY WILLIAM C. POTTER | APRIL 23, 2010

During his luncheon remarks at U.S. President Barack Obama's Nuclear Security Summit last week, Yukiya Amano, the new head of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), is said to have emphasized the important educational dimension of his agency's work. This emphasis might be expected given his past service as Japan's leading Foreign Ministry expert on disarmament and nonproliferation education.

More surprising was the degree to which the summit communiqué (and work plan for its implementation) also highlighted the role of education, training, and capacity-building as tools to forestall nuclear terrorism and foster a nuclear security culture. Although this issue is not a headline-grabber (it was ignored by the media and largely overlooked by summit critics and supporters alike), it represents the most novel and potentially significant long-term product of last week's meeting. As the summit leaders appear to recognize, absent greater attention to the "human factor," more guards, guns, and gates will have little effect in securing and safeguarding the enormous stocks of fissile material scattered around the world.
One reason why education has remained an underutilized tool for promoting nuclear security and nonproliferation is that national governments and international organizations have tended to fixate on quick solutions to immediate crises rather than invest in longer-term educational programs. Consequently, one is hard-pressed to find high schools in the United States or elsewhere that provide any courses (or even components of courses) on nuclear security and nonproliferation topics. Regrettably, the situation is not much better at the undergraduate or graduate university level, and remarkably few colleges and universities offer courses that enable students to study the subject about which Obama, America's professor in chief, lectured his fellow heads of state last week.

In short, at a time when the leaders of the world appear to recognize the need for new thinking about nuclear dangers, there are few venues for training the next generation of specialists or even introducing our future leaders to the subject. The Nuclear Security Summit provided a much-needed clarion call to action, but was imprecise about what needs to be done.

Using education and training as a tool to promote nuclear security entails a combination of traditional and innovative teaching techniques to convey information and enhance analytical thinking. So-called active learning pedagogical approaches, such as simulations and role-playing exercises, have proved themselves as particularly effective means to encourage "thinking with the eyes of others" and to convey and hone practical skills to future nuclear analysts and policymakers. In fact, current U.S. national security officials also would profit from the opportunity periodically to switch roles in a simulation context and, at least for a short time, view the problems of international peace and security from the vantage point of an adversary or reluctant ally. Given the lack of current activity at the long-stalled Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, ostensibly the principal negotiating forum for multilateral arms-control negotiations, it might be an ideal venue for such a simulation.

A very important educational supplement to formal classroom training is on-the-job training, which may be undertaken at research centers, national nuclear laboratories, government agencies, international organizations, and NGOs with responsibilities and expertise in the nuclear sector. Such training, under the mentorship of experienced professionals, will vary widely depending on the organization in question and might include such tasks as research, data collection and analysis, development of course materials, reporting on conferences and interagency meetings, and performance of routine office work. What all meaningful on-the-job training programs have in common is provision of opportunities for trainees to apply their classroom knowledge to practical problems they are apt to encounter in their subsequent careers.

Today, there is a tremendous opportunity to exploit new information and communication technologies for nuclear security and nonproliferation training. These technologies facilitate the development and dissemination globally of interactive and multilingual courses and resource materials, and make it possible to bring experts anywhere in the world into the classroom in real time or be viewed by students on their laptops at their convenience.

However, a great gap currently separates national and international statements about the dangers of nuclear
terrorism and the paucity of funds allocated to train the next generation of specialists on nonproliferation, including nuclear security. One useful step that could be taken to remedy this situation in the United States would be enactment of legislation that creates a National Nuclear Security and Nonproliferation Education Act. A one-time appropriation of around $50 million would provide up to 50 fellowships per year to graduate students to pursue advanced multidisciplinary training in nuclear security and nonproliferation at universities of their choice. Legislation of this sort would have the dual positive effect of attracting bright young talent to the field and encouraging more universities to offer courses on nonproliferation in order to secure tuition-paying students.

Development of a global nuclear security culture such as that envisaged by last week's summit cannot be accomplished easily or quickly. Nor will an influx of money alone solve the problem. What is required is a sustained educational effort as part of a broader strategy to build a global community of informed and dedicated specialists. This strategy has governmental, international organizational, academic, and nongovernmental components and requires for its success a partnership among representatives from each of these communities.

This partnership received a much-needed boost during the Nuclear Security Summit and the parallel meeting of representatives from the NGO and academic community, and the White House is to be congratulated for encouraging meaningful input from the nongovernmental sector. The real test, however, lies ahead. The next security summit is planned for 2012 in Seoul and will provide a benchmark against which to judge how well the Class of 2010 performed its assignments. We know Obama is an inspirational teacher. Let's hope he is also a tough grader.

**William C. Potter is director of the James Martin Center for nonproliferation studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies and Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar professor of Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute. In the fall of 2010, the Monterey Institute will offer the world's first master's degree program in nonproliferation and terrorism studies.**
A Global Commitment to Nuclear Education and Training - By William C.... http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/04/23/bomb_school?print=...
Books feature: Renowned translator of Japanese literature moves to China's 'source of sources'

By Chauncey Mabe

After the Bible, the *Tao Te Ching* is the second most translated text in the world, and certainly it is the most famous and influential book of ancient Chinese wisdom in the West. Why, then, with dozens of versions already available, would we need a new one – especially by a translator who made his name in classical Japanese samurai literature?

“My friends all ask that same question,” says William Scott Wilson, the renowned translator of *Hagakure: The Book of the Samurai*, *The Unfettered Mind: Writings of the Zen Master to the Sword Master*, and *The Book of the Five Rings*, among other medieval samurai classics.

One reason, says Wilson, who grew up in Fort Lauderdale and now lives in Miami, is the deep connection between the *Tao* and *Zen* Buddhism, which, in turn exerts a strong influence on the Japanese martial arts tradition. In a way, he says, all his samurai translations have led him back in time toward the *Tao Te Ching*.
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MIIS ranks fourth for Peace Corps graduate school students

The Monterey Institute of International Studies ranked fourth this year among 61 schools for number of students in a Peace Corps Master's International program.

The Peace Corps master's degree program combines international service with graduate schools, sending students on a 27-month Peace Corps assignment overseas after completing one year of graduate work in the United States.

MIIS now has 16 students in a PCMI program.
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189 Nations Reaffirm Goal of Ban on Nuclear Weapons

By NEIL MacFARQUHAR

UNITED NATIONS — Hard-fought negotiations over the future of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty ended here on Friday with 189 nations reaffirming their commitment to eliminating all nuclear weapons and setting a new 2012 deadline for holding a regional conference to eliminate unconventional weapons from the Middle East.

The complicated 28-page final document from the treaty review conference calls for the United Nations secretary general, along with the United States, Russia and Britain, to appoint a facilitator and consult with the countries of the Middle East convening the conference.

That goal was considered the landmark achievement of the negotiations, aside from reaffirming the basic premise of the treaty. Review conferences are held every five years and the last one, in 2005, ended in disarray, the gap between states with nuclear weapons and those without too wide to bridge.

Given the current tense realities in the Middle East, senior government officials and diplomats on all sides conceded that even calling such a conference, much less accomplishing any of its goals, remained a distant prospect.

“People are not going to come to a disarmament conference voluntarily if they are at war with their neighbors,” said Ellen O. Tauscher, the under secretary of state for arms control and international security affairs, who led the American delegation. Washington’s support for such a conference does not supersede the longstanding United States policy that disarmament requires a comprehensive peace in the region first, she said.

But in 1995 Arab states accepted the indefinite extension of the nonproliferation treaty, in exchange for a commitment for such a Middle East conference. Since there had been no movement on the issue for 15 years, Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz of Egypt had made it clear from the outset that fellow Arab states and the nonaligned movement demanded some concrete steps to support the document this year.

Tensions over the content of the final document after a month of negotiations went down to the wire, with diplomats portraying the last few days as a poker game with the United States and Iran
each trying to call the other’s bluff so that one might be blamed for the failure of the conference to reach consensus.

In the end, the United States accepted one reference to Israel in the final document, in the section on the Middle East, which basically repeats a previously stated position that Israel should join the 40-year-old nonproliferation treaty. The Israeli Mission to the United Nations would not comment on the outcome. The Israeli government has never confirmed the widespread consensus that it holds at least 100 nuclear missiles.

The document also emphasizes the need for countries to respect treaty guidelines for keeping their nuclear programs open to international inspection and suffering the consequences if they do not. Such measures are likely to strengthen the Security Council’s stand in its current confrontation with Iran over possible new sanctions because of suspicions that it is trying to develop nuclear weapons, which Tehran vehemently denies.

“My guess is that language caused the Iranians pretty significant heartburn even though they decided to go along with it,” said Gary Samore, the White House coordinator for unconventional weapons.

Much of Friday was spent waiting to hear if Iran would accept the final document. Diplomats said that the conference chairman, Libran N. Cabactulan of the Philippines, even called the leaders of Brazil and Turkey, temporary Security Council members who have been trumpeting their ability to reach a compromise with Iran, to prevail on Tehran not to foil the agreement.

In a speech after the document was adopted, Ali Asghar Soltanieh, the Iranian envoy, listed at least nine ways in which Iran thought the document was weak. A proposed 2025 deadline for the elimination of all nuclear weapons had been scuttled by the nuclear weapons states, he noted, as had a proposal for a legally binding commitment from states with nuclear weapons not to use them against those without.

“It is of course far from our expectations, but at the same time it is a step forward toward our goal of disarmament,” Mr. Soltanieh told reporters. Iran had also pushed for more stringent language demanding that Israel join the nonproliferation treaty.

Earlier in the week, Vice President Joseph R. Biden Jr. and Gen. James L. Jones, the national security adviser, met with Arab ambassadors at the White House to work out compromise Middle East language. The United States accepted dropping direct linkage between a comprehensive Middle East peace and the regional denuclearizing conference, Arab diplomats said, as well as the one reference to Israel.

The United States repeatedly said Friday that it objected to the language singling out Israel, but accepted it because consensus on the overall document underscored President Obama’s
commitment to eliminate nuclear weapons.

“There is no problem with the language, but having that language in the Mideast section we think sends a really negative political signal,” Mr. Samore said. “It suggests the conference will be designed to single out Israel.” That would decrease the likelihood of such a conference ever happening, he said, which is why the United States insisted in retaining a role as a sponsor.

Given that all 189 states that have signed the nonproliferation treaty had to agree to the wording, including 64 separate ways to move forward, all the major players found flaws in the outcome. It meant many steps had to be watered down.

Although the document singles out North Korea by name, for example, saying its nuclear program constitutes a threat to “peace and security,” it was not as strong as the condemnation initially proposed.

Aside from Israel, the document also calls on India and Pakistan, both holding nuclear weapons but not nonproliferation treaty members, to join it.

While rejecting a deadline, for the first time the main five nuclear weapons states accepted vague language referring to a new, stronger international convention on eliminating nuclear weapons, and the idea of a “timeline” was introduced.

Despite differences over the pace of disarmament and proliferation concerns, the document breathes new life into a treaty seen as under threat, analysts said. “That is the positive, there is much more attention on future action and new benchmarks,” said Prof. William C. Potter, the director of the center for nonproliferation at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.
Richard Baum, (second from the left) one of UCLA’s top China experts, shares his views on whether China is willing to engage in international affairs as a responsible world leader. (Photo by Todd Cheney)

Scholars Debate: Is China Becoming a Responsible World Leader?

The fundamental question of whether China is on the path to becoming a responsible stakeholder in world affairs or acting as a revisionist superpower was put to a prestigious group of China scholars from universities and think tanks across the country. Watch video of the keynote address by John Podesta, president and CEO of the Center for American Progress.

By Cynthia Lee for UCLA Today

With tensions rising between North Korea and South Korea over the torpedoing of a South Korean ship, the U.S. is urging China to condemn North Korea’s actions. Will China act as it did last year when it took a stand and criticized North Korea for testing a nuclear weapon? Or will it do nothing?

The fundamental question of whether China is on the path to becoming a responsible stakeholder in world affairs or acting as a revisionist superpower was put to a prestigious group of China scholars from universities and think tanks across the country. They gathered Monday, May 24, at the James West Alumni Center for an all-day conference that focused on China’s engagement on key international issues.

The conference was hosted by the Washington, D.C.-based Center for American Progress and, from UCLA, the Burkle Center for International Relations, the Center for Chinese Studies and the International Institute.

In trying to ascertain what path China is taking, participants took into consideration a wide range of factors, among them, that country’s reaction when the Dalai Lama visited the White House, China’s efforts to build up its navy and its rising economic stature perhaps most clearly evidenced by being the first nation to emerge from the global financial crisis.

“The problem, of course, is we can’t infer anything just from what they say,” said David Lake, Distinguished Professor of Political Science at UC San Diego, who moderated a panel on China’s role in regional and global security challenges. “You can say anything — it's cheap talk. The question is, what do you do? Can you demonstrate what kind of superpower China is going to be through actions and not just words?”

Panelist Jing-dong Yuan, associate professor of international policy studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies, said that the main question that China’s leadership is grappling with is whether China should continue to follow the
instructions of late Communist Party leader Deng Xiaoping “to keep a low profile and develop overall national strength, but
not to take the lead in international affairs.”

“Or has China now become powerful enough that it should take a leading role?” Yuan asked. “I think the jury is still out on
that regard.”

Deng Xiaoping’s admonishments in the ‘80s to his colleagues to observe developments soberly, meet challenges calmly,
conceal China’s capacities and never claim leadership has been an imperative that China has followed, more or less, for two
decades, said Richard Baum, one of UCLA’s foremost scholars on China and a professor of political science.

“There’s a big debate in China today about whether this is the time to start revising that,” Baum said. “China has been
seeking safety in multilateralism for well over a decade now, and not taking the lead. The question of whether a rising China
has the same need to conceal capacity … that’s a big issue for the next generation of leaders.”

Baum added that the polarization that has been pulling China in opposite directions on this question was palpable at a
Beijing forum he attended in 2005, along with China’s top international theorists and strategic thinkers.

Participants “were buzzing about this term, ‘responsible stakeholder,” and how seriously to take it,” Baum said. Some of the
Chinese at the forum felt it was an extension of American neocolonialism and “an affront to Chinese national pride and
dignity to be told they should be carrying the water for the international community by having a responsible stake in
somebody else’s game.”

Others took the term very seriously as a “new opening for a possible convergence of U.S. and Chinese strategic thinking,”
Baum said. In the end, he recalled, the dominant view among the Chinese was to give the concept a try and see what the
Americans really have in mind. “It was, ‘if they (the Americans) just want us to be a spear carrier for them, no, thank you. But
let’s look and see what the stakes in the system are.’”

China has shown that it is willing to engage responsibly in international issues, Baum noted. In its criticism of North Korea’s
nuclear weapons testing, China “certainly acted as if they have a stake in the denuclearization of Korea. They may not haveacted as strongly or decisively as we would have liked them to act, but they certainly were on the right side of that issue —
tentatively, meekly to be sure — but on the right side.”

Similarly with their membership in the World Trade Organization, China has pledged to live by its rules, Baum said. And with
respect to President Hu Jintao’s presence at the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington, D.C., in April, “they had to be
dragged kicking and screaming into the talks with Washington,” Baum said. “But they showed up and at least in principle
supported the United Nations Security Council resolutions.”

“I would give them good marks on being a responsible stakeholder so far,” said Baum, “although with an asterisk: There are
some issues that are not amenable to shared stakeholding at this point.”

The current conflict over North Korea’s attack on a South Korean ship may fall in that category. So far, Baum said, China
has basically ducked and hedged.

“China probably will condemn North Korea,” said Yuan, by going along with a UN Security Council statement of
condemnation. But China will weigh heavily the possibility that taking action could further worsen the situation and
destabilize the Korean peninsula.

Richard Rosecrance, a former director of the UCLA Burkle Center who now teaches at the John F. Kennedy School of
Government at Harvard, maintained that this is a clear case where North Korea’s actions should be condemned. But China,
in the past, has “dropped the ball,” he said, in not playing a very important role as the host of the six-party talks on the North
Korean nuclear issue and in not facilitating bilateral talks between the U.S. and North Korea.

Another panel that included retired Gen. Wesley Clark, who served as NATO’s Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and is
currently a senior fellow at the Burkle Center, pondered the question of what the U.S. can do to shape China’s engagement.

In dealing with China, Clark said the U.S. must recognize that there has been a shift in the balance of power between the
two governments. “When an American leader goes to Beijing and says, ‘Let’s talk,’ it’s a different Beijing and a different
balance than existed even two or three years ago," he said. "I think President Obama knows it, and I'm certain the Chinese
know it. I think we have a new relationship with China, whether it's advertised as such or not."

If we ask China, for example, "Are you a responsible stakeholder?" then you have to ask whether the U.S. is behaving
likewise, Clark said. "You have to ask how is it we allowed [in the case of the global financial crisis] the perpetuation of
fraudulent contracts, peddled them to the rest of the world, used leverage, destabilized currencies, almost brought down
banks and ended up with our major export in debt? ... Was that a position for a responsible stakeholder?"

The public's perception of a shift in the balance of power, the scholars noted, was picked up last year by a Pew Research
Center survey that showed that 41 percent of the American public believes the U.S. plays a less important, less powerful role
as a world leader than it did a decade ago, while 44 percent believe China is now the top global economic power. In reality,
however, scholars at the conference predicted that it will take two or three decades, or more, for China to catch up with
Americans economically.

In the end, the U.S. only has itself to blame for this shift of balance, Clark said. "If our economy is relying on Chinese
demand to stimulate it and relying on Chinese purchases of American debt to keep it going, then we've put ourselves in a
position where we don't have the same degree of bargaining power" that a comparison of economic standards and military
might suggests.
After 15 years, Arab nations finally won agreement from the United States and the other nuclear powers to take the first step toward banning nuclear weapons from the Middle East. Now the next move is Israel's.

But the Israeli government rejected the resolution Saturday, calling it "deeply flawed and hypocritical."

Although the U.S. joined the 188 other member nations of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty on Friday in giving a green light to a conference in 2012 "on the establishment of a Middle East zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction," senior U.S. officials appeared to backtrack afterward, setting several conditions for the talks to go ahead.

Taking the toughest line, U.S. National Security Adviser Gen. James Jones said in a statement Friday night that the United States has "serious reservations" about the 2012 conference and believes Mideast peace and full compliance by all countries in the region to their arms control and nonproliferation obligations "are essential precursors" of a WMD-free zone. The compliance demand appeared to be aimed at Iran, which the U.S. believes is pursuing a nuclear weapons program despite Tehran's claims its only goal is nuclear power.

Jones also strongly defended longtime U.S. ally Israel, which was singled out for not being a member of the NPT. He said the United States "deplores" the naming of Israel which puts prospects for the 2012 conference "in doubt." As a co-sponsor of the conference, Jones said the United States will ensure that it will only takes place "if and when all countries feel confident that they can attend."

Israel, which has not signed the NPT, said due to the "distorted nature" of the resolution, it would not take part in its implementation.

"It singles out Israel, the Middle East's only true democracy and the only country threatened with annihilation. Yet the terrorist regime in Iran, which is racing to develop nuclear weapons and which openly threatens to wipe Israel off the map, is not even mentioned in the resolution," Israel's government said in its statement.

It said the resolution ignores "the real threats" facing the Middle East and "not only fails to advance regional security but actually sets it back."

The Arab proposal for a WMD-free zone — to pressure Israel to give up its undeclared arsenal of perhaps 80 nuclear warheads — was endorsed by the 1995 NPT conference but never acted on. At this month's NPT review, a conference to begin talks on a nuclear-free Mideast was considered by many delegates as "the make-or-break issue," and agreement on the 2012 meeting was widely welcomed after the 28-page final declaration was approved by consensus.
But the U.S. reaction raised questions and doubts about whether Israel, Iran and other countries in the Mideast will even hold a meeting in two years.

Several delegates suggested that earlier comments by U.S. Undersecretary of State Ellen Tauscher and President Barack Obama's coordinator for weapons of mass destruction, Gary Samore, warning about the difficulties of holding a conference and persuading Israel to attend may have been sparked by the upcoming visit of Israel's Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu to the White House on Tuesday.

Egypt's U.N. Ambassador Maged Abdelaziz, speaking for the 118-nation Nonaligned Movement of mainly developing countries, said that during the negotiations there was "a little bit of disagreement" on mentioning Israel.

But he said NAM members thought that since the document issued at the end of the 2000 NPT review conference mentioned the need for Israel to join the treaty and subject its nuclear capabilities to International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards there was "no going back on that commitment" and Israel had to be mentioned in the 2010 document as well.

Iran had loomed as a potential spoiler that would block consensus at this conference, and Iran and Syria dissented loudly on various points in the final hours, but no objections were raised in the concluding session.

Facing possible new U.N. sanctions because of its refusal to suspend uranium enrichment and enter negotiations on its nuclear program, the Iranians had sought to turn the spotlight instead on the big nuclear powers, demanding the final document call for speedier disarmament moves.

Iran's chief delegate Ali Asghar Soltanieh lamented that the deadline of 2025 sought by NAM for complete disarmament was not included in the final document. Nonetheless, Soltanieh called "the limited measures" in the agreement "a step forward."

Jones, the U.S. National Security Adviser, said the failure of the resolution to mention Iran, which he said poses the greatest threat of nuclear proliferation in the region, is "deplorable."

Iran's Soltanieh said the Americans should "think twice" before making such statements. "This was not the right reaction to a positive response, positive measure by our delegation joining the consensus," he said.

According to the final document, U.N. Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon and the co-sponsors of the 1995 Mideast resolution — the U.S., Russia and Britain — will now appoint a "facilitator" to conduct consultations in preparation for the 2012 conference.

Jones said the United States "will insist that the conference operate only by consensus by the regional countries."

Under the 1970 nonproliferation treaty, nations without nuclear weapons committed not to acquire them; those with them committed to move toward their elimination; and all endorsed everyone's right to develop peaceful nuclear energy.

The last NPT conference, in 2005, failed to adopt a consensus declaration. In sharp contrast, a final declaration was not only adopted this year but for the first time it laid out complex action plans for all three of the treaty's "pillars" — nonproliferation, disarmament and peaceful nuclear energy.

Under its action plan, the five recognized nuclear-weapon states — the United States, Russia, Britain, France and China — commit to speed up arms reductions, take other steps to diminish the importance of atomic weapons, and report back on progress by 2014. The plan also has 24 steps to promote nonproliferation including making the treaty universal to include Israel, Pakistan India and North Korea, all of which have or are suspected of having nuclear arsenals.
Buena Vista ISD Students attend International Conference

Before the sun came up Wednesday morning, 21 April 2010, Buena Vista High School students Kolton Reid, Zack Bugg and Austan Paulk were at the Midland airport getting ready to board a plane bound for Monterey, California.

The Buena Vista students were part of the Critical Issues Forum (CIF) Program. By invitation only, high school students from across America and Russia get together every year to make friends and share a little academic competition on an international stage. Buena Vista High School represents the only invited group from Texas this school year. The students were charged with the challenge of college level research on the timely issue of weapons of mass destruction world-wide. The research topic this year was “Nuclear Nonproliferation: Global Opportunities and Regional Challenges.”

After almost five full days in beautiful Monterey students and their sponsor, Buena Vista High School science teacher Clabe Webb returned to Imperial late Sunday afternoon. Students from the Buena Vista science classes worked for many weeks preparing for their presentation in front of an international audience of about 125 peers and academics at the Monterey Institute for International Studies (MIIS). MIIS is a private graduate school in Monterey.

After a splendid conference students were invited to visit the world famous Monterey Bay Aquarium and Cannery Row Saturday morning before departing Monterey Peninsula Airport Sunday for home.
Clayton Snyder, a graduate from the Monterey Institute of International Studies (MIIS), speaks about coming to the Institute to get a dual Master’s degree in International Business Administration and International Environmental Policy. Clayton
currently works at CBS Corporation as a Manager of their Environmental Projects. To learn more about the programs and degree offerings of the Monterey Institute, visit www.miis.edu.
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