



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 840, 3 September 2010**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[U.S. May Ratify Arms Reduction Treaty By Yearend - Russian Lawmaker](#)

[Tony Blair: West Should Use Force If Iran 'Continues To Develop Nuclear Weapons'](#)

[UN Atom Chief Invited Israel To Mull Joining NPT](#)

[Israel Resists IAEA Move To Unravel Its Nuclear Status](#)

[Iran Could Strike Israeli Nuclear Site If Attacked](#)

[China Pushes Six-Party Talks With North Korea, But Others Remain Skeptical](#)

[Skeptical US Lays Ground For N.Korea Talks: Analysts](#)

[FACTBOX - What Do The Six Parties Want From North Korea Talks?](#)

[Doubt Grows As N.Korea Prepares For Succession](#)

["N.Korea Likely To Conduct Another Nuclear Test In Coming Months](#)

[US Won't Be Duped Again By The North: Experts](#)

[Destruction Of Discarded Arms Begins In China](#)

[India Prepares Laser-Guided Missiles](#)

[West Did Not Oppose Pak N-Programme Due To Afghan War: AQ Khan](#)

[Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal Has Prevented War With India: A Q Khan](#)

[Russia To Resume Test Launches Of Troubled Bulava Missile Sept. 9-12](#)

[Preventing Dirty Bombs](#)

[Texas Senator Calls For Border Focus At Domenici Conference](#)

[HALTING DISASTER: Maxwell's Nuclear Defense Center Works To Prevent Disaster](#)

[Air Force General Kehler To Head Up STRATCOM](#)

[EO Showing Way Forward For Sanctions](#)

[Office 39, Call Office 99](#)

[If Saddam Had Stayed](#)

---

*Welcome to the CPC Outreach Journal. As part of USAF Counterproliferation Center's mission to counter weapons of mass destruction through education and research, we're providing our government and civilian community a source for timely counterproliferation information. This information includes articles, papers and other documents addressing issues pertinent to US military response options for dealing with chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats and countermeasures. It's our hope this information resource will help enhance your counterproliferation issue awareness.*

*Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.*

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **U.S. May Ratify Arms Reduction Treaty By Yearend - Russian Lawmaker**

3 September 2010

The United States is likely to ratify a new strategic arms reduction treaty with Russia by the end of this year, a senior Russian lawmaker said on Friday.

The new START treaty was signed on April 8 in Prague, replacing the START 1 treaty that expired in December 2009. The new pact obligates both nations to limit their fielded strategic nuclear weapons to 1,550 warheads, while the number of deployed and non-deployed delivery vehicles must not exceed 800 on either side.

"We are waiting for the corresponding decisions from the Senate. The foreign affairs commission's meeting is scheduled for September 15 or 16, and our U.S. colleagues have assured us a positive decision on ratification will be taken there," Konstantin Kosachev said in an interview with the Russia 24 TV channel.

Russia will follow the same course towards ratification in both the State Duma and Federation Council, Kosachev said.

The Russian and U.S. presidents earlier agreed that the ratification processes should be simultaneous.

MOSCOW, September 3 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100903/160454852.html>

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

London Guardian – U.K.

## **Tony Blair: West Should Use Force If Iran 'Continues To Develop Nuclear Weapons'**

*Former prime minister says it is wholly unacceptable for Tehran to seek nuclear weapons capability*

By Mark Tran

Wednesday, 1 September 2010

The west should use force against Iran if it "continues to develop nuclear weapons", Tony Blair said today, aligning himself with US hawks who have called for strikes against Iranian nuclear sites.

The former prime minister made his comments in a BBC interview to publicise his memoirs, *A Journey*, which are published today.

Blair said it was "wholly unacceptable" for Tehran to seek a nuclear weapons capability and insisted there could be "no alternative" to military force "if they continue to develop nuclear weapons".

Speaking to Andrew Marr in a BBC interview to be broadcast tonight, Blair says: "I am saying that I think it is wholly unacceptable for Iran to have a nuclear weapons capability and I think we have got to be prepared to confront them, if necessary militarily. I think there is no alternative to that if they continue to develop nuclear weapons. They need to get that message loud and clear."

Iran is enriching uranium at its main, internationally-monitored plant at Natanz and is building a second enrichment facility run by the Revolutionary Guards inside a mountain at Fordo, near Qom, southwest of Tehran. Enriched uranium can be used as fuel to power nuclear reactors as well as to make the fissile core of an atom bomb.

Tehran insists its nuclear activities are purely peaceful and argues that as a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) it has the right to peaceful nuclear technology. But the UN last month imposed a fourth round of sanctions on Iran because of fears it may be secretly developing nuclear weapons.

The US and Israel – an undeclared nuclear power outside the NPT – have both refused to rule out military action against Iran.

In his exclusive interview with the Guardian, Blair elaborates on why it is unacceptable for Iran to have nuclear weapons, linking this to the 9/11 attacks on the US. The former prime minister wishes he had seen earlier that 9/11 had "far deeper roots" than he thought at the time.

"The reason for that, let me explain it, is that in my view what was shocking about September 11 was that it was 3,000 people killed in one day but it would have been 300,000 if they could have done it," Blair said, appearing to equate al-Qaida with Iran. "That's the point ... I decided at that point that you cannot take a risk on this. This is why I

am afraid, in relation to Iran, that I would not take a risk of them getting nuclear weapons capability. I wouldn't take it.

"Now other people may say: 'Come on, the consequences of taking them on are too great, you've got to be so very careful, you'll simply upset everybody, you'll destabilise it.' I understand all of those arguments. But I wouldn't take the risk of Iran with a nuclear weapon."

In the postscript to his book, Blair writes: "Iran with a nuclear bomb would mean others in the region acquiring the same capability; it would dramatically alter the balance of power in the region, but also within Islam."

Blair's approach to Iran aligns him with US hawks such as John Bolton, the former American ambassador to the UN, who believes that Israel should have attacked Iran before it started loading fuel into its first nuclear power plant in the southern port city of Bushehr on 21 August, although nuclear experts say Bushehr has no link with Iran's secretive uranium enrichment programme, seen as the main "weaponisation" threat, at other installations.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2010/sep/01/tony-blair-west-use-force-iran-nuclear-weapons>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

## **UN Atom Chief Invited Israel To Mull Joining NPT**

By Reuters

3 September 2010

VIENNA - The head of the U.N. nuclear watchdog has invited Israel to consider joining a global anti-nuclear arms pact and to place all its atomic facilities under his agency's inspections, an IAEA report said on Friday.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) report said Director General Yukiya Amano met with Israeli leaders during a visit to Israel last month to discuss an Arab-led push for the Jewish state to accede to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

By staying outside the treaty, Israel has maintained secrecy over a programme widely believed to have yielded the Middle East's only atomic arsenal — seen as an irritant and threat among its neighbours.

The issue is expected to be debated again at IAEA board and general assembly meetings later this month in Vienna.

Last year, Arab countries backed by Iran won narrow backing for a non-binding assembly resolution urging Israel to join the NPT and asking Amano to consult "concerned states" on how to achieve this and report back to this month's meeting.

The IAEA report said Amano during his visit to Israel had conveyed the assembly's concern about the Israeli nuclear capabilities and "invited Israel to consider to accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and to place all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards", as requested by last year's resolution.

Israel has conditioned its joining the NPT on comprehensive Middle East peace — something unlikely when powers like Iran refuse to recognise the Jewish state.

Western powers, which see Iran as the region's main nuclear proliferation threat, have warned that singling out Israel could jeopardise broader steps aimed at banning weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Western diplomats say it could complicate a plan to hold a conference in 2012 to discuss banning weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East.

Amano's report was published a day after Israeli and Palestinian leaders meeting in Washington agreed to a series of direct talks, seeking to forge the framework for a U.S.-backed peace deal within a year.

President Barack Obama, aiming to resolve one of the world's most intractable disputes, has set a goal of striking a deal within 12 months to create an independent Palestinian state that exists peacefully, side-by-side with the Jewish state.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/displayarticle.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/September/middleeast\\_September98.xml&section=middleeast&col=](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/displayarticle.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/September/middleeast_September98.xml&section=middleeast&col=)

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

RTT News

## **Israel Resists IAEA Move To Unravel Its Nuclear Status**

By RTT Staff Writer  
September 3, 2010

(RTTNews) - Israel has outrightly rejected the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) attempts to gain access to its nuclear program and join the global campaign to check the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the IAEA said in a report on Friday.

The Jewish State has been following a policy of nuclear ambiguity neither confirming nor denying the existence of a nuclear arsenal. Despite this it is widely believed that Israel possesses the technology needed to manufacture nuclear weapons.

After Yukiya Amano took over as IAEA Chief from Mohammed El-Baradei last year, Arab leaders had requested Amano to launch efforts to get Israel to open its nuclear installations to a team of international inspectors.

Besides, Amano was expected to get Israel to sign up to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). Apparently neither of this happened.

According to the report, Amano asked Israeli President Shimon Peres and other leaders to consider joining the NPT and accepting IAEA inspections during a visit to the country in August.

But the reply from Tel Aviv was a verbatim reproduction of an earlier statement made by Israeli Foreign Minister Avigdor Liberman.

"(IAEA's request is) a politically motivated resolution (that) attempts to divert attention from the real proliferation challenges of the Middle East, namely non-compliance by Iran and Syria with their NPT obligations, by singling out Israel," he had said in an official letter.

Further Liberman said arms control in the Middle East should be implemented on the basis of lasting peace in the region and steps taken to ensure that all states fulfill their nuclear obligations.

Even though the IAEA has also been engaged in efforts to get Syria and Iran to throw light on their respective nuclear programs, the U.N. nuclear watchdog has not quite succeeded.

The issues, including Israel's intransigence, will figure at the IAEA's General Conference scheduled to take place on September 20 in the Austrian capital Vienna.

<http://www.rttnews.com/Content/GeneralNews.aspx?Id=1409725&SM=1>

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

Boston Globe

## **Iran Could Strike Israeli Nuclear Site If Attacked**

September 3, 2010

TEHRAN, Iran --Iran's military chief of staff says Tehran could strike Israel's nuclear facility if the Jewish state were to attack Iran's nuclear sites.

The semiofficial Mehr news agency quoted Gen. Hasan Firouzabadi as saying Iran hopes there won't "be a need to target the nuclear facility of the Zionist regime," but if there is Israel would receive "dreadful retribution."

Israel's main nuclear reactor is located near Dimona in the Negev desert.

Firouzabadi was speaking Friday on Quds Day, an annual state-backed anti-Israel rally in Iran. Iranian officials often use the occasion to make threatening remarks against Israel.

Israel has not ruled out a military strike against Iran's nuclear sites.

Tehran says its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes. Israel and the West fear Iran aims to develop nuclear weapons.

[http://www.boston.com/news/world/middleeast/articles/2010/09/03/iran\\_could\\_strike\\_israeli\\_nuclear\\_site\\_if\\_attacked/](http://www.boston.com/news/world/middleeast/articles/2010/09/03/iran_could_strike_israeli_nuclear_site_if_attacked/)

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

Washington Post

## **China Pushes Six-Party Talks With North Korea, But Others Remain Skeptical**

TOKYO - China is in the midst of a sales pitch. It is pushing for the resumption of six-party talks, the process concocted seven years ago to end a North Korean nuclear program that has not yet ended.

This time, Beijing says North Korean leader Kim Jong Il is onboard. And in recent days, China has sent its nuclear envoy to South Korea and Japan, touting the six-party idea to Washington's closest Asian allies. On Wednesday, he will visit Washington for a meeting at the State Department.

According to officials in Washington, Seoul and Tokyo, China has emerged as the driving force pushing to restart the talks, which Beijing sees as the best way to maintain security and status quo on the Korean Peninsula.

China has proposed a three-step process that calls first for bilateral talks between North Korea and the United States, perhaps in Beijing, Pyongyang or New York. That would be followed by a meeting of nuclear delegation leaders representing the six participating nations: Russia, Japan, South Korea, the United States, China and North Korea. Last, barring provocations from Pyongyang, the six countries would resume full-fledged talks for the first time since 2008.

But even as the Obama administration seeks palatable alternatives to its pressure-and-punishment stance toward North Korea, the six-party process seems, at best, months away.

On Wednesday, China's nuclear representative, Wu Dawei, will discuss the possibility of talks with deputy secretary of state James Steinberg, assistant secretary Kurt Campbell, North Korea envoy Stephen Bosworth and six-party talks ambassador Sung Kim. Analysts foresee a scenario where Bosworth soon travels to Beijing, Seoul or Tokyo to push the process farther along.

"We want to see North Korea take irreversible steps to fulfill its denuclearization commitments," State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley said. "If we see evidence that North Korea is prepared to move in that direction, then we are open to further engagement."

Although there is no agreement in Washington about the best way to proceed, analysts and experts on U.S. policy describe an overall cynicism about the usefulness of six-party talks, calling them a playground for Kim to make promises that he subsequently ignores.

With the United States having announced new sanctions against North Korea on Monday, many analysts and officials now envision a period of strategic patience, in which the United States consults closely with South Korea and possibly explores a new framework for dealing with the North - an alternative to six-party talks.

China attempted to build momentum for talks this week, as Kim traveled by armored train through its northeastern countryside. Analysts and North Korea watchers say Kim's trip had several purposes, both pragmatic and symbolic. He sought economic aid from China, his country's chief benefactor. He wanted to build support for an upcoming power transfer to his son. Just as important, in visiting two Chinese landmarks associated with his father, he wanted to reinforce the Kim family narrative, the sacrosanct underpinning of his reclusive nation.

But after Kim's return to Pyongyang, China emphasized North Korea's readiness for six-party talks. The official Xinhua News Agency said that Kim, who met with Chinese President Hu Jintao, sought an "early resumption" of the talks as a way to ease tensions. He also said, according to New China, that North Korea's stance toward denuclearization remained unchanged.

Notable to U.S. officials, however, was the rhetoric coming from North Korea: The state-run Korean Central News Agency made note of Kim's trip but did not mention six-party talks or disarmament.

"It's just stretching incredulity to think that six-party talks are some panacea where the region's problems disappear," said Patrick Cronin, senior director at the Asia-Pacific Security Program at the Center for a New American Security. "This is the same Kim Jong Il who said, months ago, that six-party talks are dead. And now what are we to believe? That Kim Jong Il is very serious this time?"

Among North Korean experts, South Korea is viewed as the six-party nation most reluctant about reengagement. In recent weeks, however, Seoul has signaled a modest shift. After an investigation that blamed Pyongyang for the March torpedoing of its Cheonan navy ship, South Korea cut off almost all trade and aid to the North. It also said that an apology for the Cheonan sinking was a prerequisite for reengagement.

South Korea's foreign minister, Yu Myung-hwan, said last week that the North needs to disable its nuclear facilities and permit international inspections before any engagement. According to the Yonhap News Agency, citing an unidentified Foreign Ministry official, South Korea has backed away from its demand that an apology is also

necessary. And Tuesday, South Korea's Red Cross pledged \$8.4 million worth of aid to the North Korea to help it recover from recent flooding.

Japan could also be a hard sell. On Tuesday, China's Wu met with Japan's foreign minister, Katsuya Okada in Tokyo. But Okada, according to Japanese media reports, told Wu that talks should not begin until North Korea abandons its nuclear program.

In Washington, according to numerous sources familiar with internal discussions, many senior U.S. officials see growing reason for some form of engagement with North Korea.

"I think the administration's feeling right now is, they're not comfortable with having zero contact with the regime," said Michael Green, a former Asia specialist at the National Security Council.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/08/31/AR2010083101909.html>

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

Bangkok Post – Thailand

## **Skeptical US Lays Ground For N.Korea Talks: Analysts**

By Agence France-Presse (AFP) News Agency

1 September 2010

After months of rising tension, the United States is gingerly exploring how to launch talks with North Korea without loosening the screws on the isolated state, experts say.

President Barack Obama has made dialogue a hallmark of his foreign policy, extending a hand to regimes no matter how odious in US eyes.

A major exception was North Korea, which since Obama took office has tested a nuclear bomb and allegedly torpedoed a ship in the deadliest inter-Korean incident in decades.

The United States has kept up the pressure, on Monday slapping sanctions against North Korean entities including its military intelligence bureau. But a growing number of US officials and analysts, even hawks, say talks have been moribund for too long.

"If you're whacking one end of the donkey with a stick, it's good periodically to check on the other end to see if the donkey has changed its behavior," said Bruce Klingner of the conservative Heritage Foundation.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton on Tuesday conferred with former president Jimmy Carter, who visited North Korea last week to secure the release of an imprisoned American teacher.

Top negotiators from China and South Korea are also visiting Washington this week to meet with senior US officials. North Korea's leader Kim Jong-Il just paid a five-day visit to China, his regime's main supporter.

Surprising many observers, Kim did not meet Carter, who helped broker an end to a 1994 crisis in North Korea. But the former president met with number two leader Kim Yong-Nam, who voiced support for resuming six-nation nuclear disarmament talks.

State Department spokesman Philip Crowley said North Korea must first end "provocative and belligerent behavior" and comply with a 2005 agreement reached during six-way talks, in which Pyongyang committed to ending its nuclear program in return for aid and security guarantees.

"If we see evidence that North Korea is prepared to move in that direction, then we are open to further engagement," Crowley told reporters.

North Korea has repeatedly voiced willingness to return to the table but insisted that the United States recognize it as a nuclear power.

L. Gordon Flake, executive director of the Mansfield Foundation, said that North Korea needed to moderate its stance if it truly wanted talks, as otherwise the United States feared legitimizing its claim as a nuclear power.

"The United States does need some kind of fig leaf," said Flake, who advised Obama when he was a presidential candidate.

But few expect breakthroughs at a delicate moment in North Korea, where experts say Kim Jong-Il is preparing a power transfer to his young son Kim Jong-Un and an already dire economy has been thrown into havoc by a ham-fisted currency revaluation.

Michael Green, who served as the top Asia adviser to former president George W. Bush, expected that talks would begin within months but that the Obama administration would insist on a broad agenda.

"The consensus that's probably emerged is that we need contact with North Korea," said Green, now a scholar at Georgetown University and the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

"If we have a policy that is only made up of sanctions, military exercises and pressure," Green said, "you do run some risk of pushing Pyongyang into a corner."

"At a time of potentially profound change within North Korea, you lose some opportunities to gauge and test where things are headed," Green said.

He added that the administration appeared determined not to accept North Korea's demands to ease sanctions in exchange for talks.

But Green said the United States has also sidestepped calls from hawks in South Korea for a more robust response to the March sinking of the Cheonan corvette, which killed 46 sailors.

"Like Goldilocks and the Three Bears, the administration got it about right -- not too hot, not too cold," he said.

<http://www.bangkokpost.com/news/asia/194058/skeptical-us-lays-ground-for-n-korea-talks-analysts>

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

The Star – Malaysia

Wednesday, September 1, 2010

## **FACTBOX - What Do The Six Parties Want From North Korea Talks?**

REUTERS - China is lobbying regional powers to restart six-party negotiations on ending North Korea's nuclear weapons programme, but the participants have differing views on how to get the denuclearisation talks back on track.

Here is brief outline of what each party wants:

### **UNITED STATES & SOUTH KOREA**

The allies say the North must follow up on its own pledge to disable key parts of its Yongbyon nuclear installations and agree to a verification mechanism to show it is genuinely committed to the six-party process.

They are mindful of the vow by the North never to return to the six-party table, accusing Washington of harbouring hostility against it and declaring the forum dead.

South Korea is also demanding an apology from Pyongyang and a pledge to not repeat armed provocations after the sinking of one of its navy ships in March that it says was the result of a North Korean submarine attack.

### **NORTH KOREA**

North Korea has demanded negotiations for a peace treaty with the United States to formally end the 1950-53 Korean War so that it can be on equal footing with Washington to discuss nuclear disarmament.

The United States and South Korea have said peace treaty talks can take place at a separate forum once the North ends its nuclear programme.

Pyongyang wants recognition as a nuclear state after twice testing nuclear devices. It has also said sanctions must be lifted and Washington must drop "hostile policies".

### **CHINA**

China says it supports the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula, and -- reflecting its desire to avoid choosing sides between North Korea and the U.S. and its allies -- has avoided offering clear definitions of what that means.

China has condemned North Korea's nuclear tests and pressed it to abandon its atomic arsenal. But it has also said that Washington should do more to open negotiations with Pyongyang and offer it diplomatic and security assurances that China says would make North Korea more willing to pursue nuclear disarmament.

### **JAPAN**

Japan, which sees Pyongyang's nuclear programme as a direct threat, thinks it is premature to resume the six-way talks as North Korea has made no progress towards denuclearisation.

It also wants other members to recognise the importance of resolving the issue of Pyongyang's abduction of Japanese citizens decades ago.

## **RUSSIA**

Russia has joined China in warning against cornering North Korea with harsh sanctions. It backs China's call for an early resumption of dialogue.

*Reporting by Jeremy Laurence and Jack Kim; Editing by Nick Macfie*

[http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/9/1/worldupdates/2010-09-01T115634Z\\_01\\_NOOTR\\_RTRMDNC\\_0\\_-512098-1&sec=Worldupdates](http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2010/9/1/worldupdates/2010-09-01T115634Z_01_NOOTR_RTRMDNC_0_-512098-1&sec=Worldupdates)

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

Edmonton Journal – Canada

## **Doubt Grows As N.Korea Prepares For Succession**

By Lim Chang-Won, Agence France-Presse (AFP)  
September 1, 2010

SEOUL — Skepticism is growing about the prospect of a second dynastic succession as North Korea prepares for a rare meeting expected to endorse the process, a welfare group with cross-border contacts said Wednesday.

The North's ruling communist party is expected to start a four-day conference on Saturday, South Korea's Good Friends group cited its sources in the hardline state as saying.

The conference of key delegates, the first of its kind since 1966, is widely expected to anoint leader Kim Jong Il's youngest son Jong-Un as eventual successor, even though a formal announcement is unlikely.

The 68-year-old ailing leader stressed the need to prepare for the "rising generation" and visited sites linked to his own late father and founding president Kim Il-Sung during a five-day trip to ally China that ended Monday.

Analysts saw the site visits as a bid to confer legitimacy on another father-to-son succession.

The party meeting is scheduled for the first half of September but no date has been announced. The South's unification ministry said it may be held next week.

Good Friends quoted party officials as saying the meeting would focus on shaping new policies and electing new party delegates who may include the son.

Delegates may swear an oath of allegiance to Jong-Un, it said.

The group's director Lee Seung-Yong said the elder Kim may reshuffle the party hierarchy or set out new policies in a bid to ease widespread public anger at worsening economic problems including severe food shortages.

"Ordinary people in the country are not interested in the father-to-son transfer of power. They think their living standards will not improve even if the son inherits power," he told AFP.

Many senior party officials are also skeptical about Jong-Un, given his youth and inexperience, Lee said.

The Swiss-educated son is believed to be aged around 27 but little is known about him outside the reclusive country. No adult photograph of him has been seen overseas.

Good Friends said in its newsletter that Kim may formalize the power transfer on the party's 65th anniversary on October 10 by allowing his son to make a public speech.

"But it's difficult for senior party officials to nod their consent if the inexperienced son is upheld as the next leader only because of his family line," an unidentified party official was quoted as saying.

Dongguk University professor Kim Yong-Hyun predicted the meeting may take place next week, around the time when the North celebrates the anniversary of its founding on September 9, 1948.

He said Jong-Un could be named to a senior post but may join the party's top decision-making body only later, possibly in 2012.

Kim Jong-Il was named in 1980 as successor to Kim Il-Sung but did not formally assume his father's posts until 1997, three years after his father's death.

He suffered a stroke in August 2008 and has since then reportedly been speeding up plans for another succession.



Kim has set 2012, the 100th anniversary of his late father's birth, as the year for the North to become a "great, powerful and prosperous" nation.

But failed policies, including a botched currency revaluation last November, have aggravated a dire economic situation and food shortages.

<http://www.edmontonjournal.com/life/Doubt+grows+Korea+prepares+succession/3468270/story.html>

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

Airang News – South Korea

## **"N.Korea Likely To Conduct Another Nuclear Test In Coming Months**

September 2, 2010

A Korean professor of international relations at America's Tufts University has projected a possible nuclear test by North Korea as early as this month considering Pyeongyang's methods which have been consistent since the early 1960s.

A US journal of global current events, Foreign Affairs, published an article entitled "The Pyeongyang Playbook" with Professor Lee Sung-yoon writing that the North's strategy has been to "lash out at its enemies" when they seem weak or distracted fuel international condemnation and then, negotiate for concessions in return for peace.

Based on this formula Lee speculated that the communist state will likely conduct another nuclear test possibly on September 8th, the eve of North Korea's National Foundation Day or October 10th, the Party Founding Day and will likely attempt to start afresh with peace talks early next year.

[http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News\\_View.asp?nseq=106531&code=Ne2&category=2](http://www.arirang.co.kr/News/News_View.asp?nseq=106531&code=Ne2&category=2)

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

Korea Times – South Korea

September 2, 2010

## **US Won't Be Duped Again By The North: Experts**

By Kang Hyun-kyung

It won't be an easy task for North Korea to meet the strict standards outlined by the United States for the resumption of dialogue, even though it may make conciliatory gestures in the next few weeks, experts said Thursday.

Several North Korea watchers here echoed the dim prospects for the coming months saying the United States has learned from the past when dealing with the North.

The skeptical views erupted hours after Washington urged Pyongyang again to take action demonstrating that there has been a fundamental change in their behavior as a precondition for engagement.

During a daily press briefing, Philip Crowley, spokesman of the U.S. State Department, specified what kinds of measures could be viewed as sincere efforts that North Korea could make.

"A first step that North Korea can take is to cease its belligerent and provocative actions ... There are some specific actions that North Korea has committed (in 2005 during the six-party talks)," he said.

Asked how North Korea would react to the U.S. government's call, Cheong Seong-chang, a senior research fellow of the Sejong Institute, speculated that the North may issue a statement declaring its willingness to stop any acts that could raise tensions on the Peninsula.

"To send a signal showing its willingness to talk, North Korea may also consider announcing that it will allow nuclear inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to visit its nuclear site," the North Korea watcher told The Korea Times. The North kicked out of IAEA inspectors from the nuclear site last year.

Sohn Kwang-joo, chief editor of North Korea news outlet the Daily NK, stressed that it was a separate issue whether the North's possible conciliatory gestures, such as releasing a statement or inviting IAEA inspectors back to the North as Cheong exemplified, would meet the U.S. standards to consider engagement.

He was skeptical about the prospects of the U.S. government's engagement with the North in the near future.

Sohn noted that there has been a vicious circle of empty talk and North Korea's breaking its commitments in the multilateral agreements.

“In the North, the same leader has been in power since the mid 1990s, whereas those in the top job in the U.S. have been replaced during the same period,” he said.

“Former U.S. presidents would have known that the North was not sincere, when North Koreans offered overtures after committing provocations. Despite their awareness, they were duped because the years they could stay in office were limited and they might have felt that they had to engage with the North before their terms ended,” he said.

Sohn pointed his finger at the fundamental difference—the democratic government in the United States and the dictatorship in the North— as a source of the vicious circle of empty talks and North Korea breaking its commitments.

Wi Sung-lac, South Korea’s chief nuclear envoy, left for Washington Thursday for policy consultations with U.S. officials.

His heading to Washington came hours after Chinese nuclear envoy Wu Daewei had met with the U.S. officials.

The gatherings came amid a North Korea’s Workers Party meeting to be held soon.

Speculations are that North Korean leader Kim Jong-il may appoint his third son, Jong-un, to a key party post during the major event as part of the succession plan.

North Korea watchers here opine that chances for the resumption of the six-party talks were slim as the U.S. government has already learned its lesson that talk for the sake of talking has not advanced denuclearization.

[http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/09/116\\_72425.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2010/09/116_72425.html)

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

Japan Times – Japan  
Friday, September 3, 2010

## **Destruction Of Discarded Arms Begins In China**

BEIJING (Kyodo) Japan has begun destroying chemical weapons abandoned in China by the Imperial Japanese Army at the end of World War II, Hideo Hiraoka, senior vice minister of the Cabinet Office, announced Wednesday in Nanjing.

Hiraoka, a Democratic Party of Japan lawmaker, said during a ceremony that the Japanese government will continue taking measures to speed up the destruction of abandoned munitions, the state-controlled Xinhua news agency reported.

"Today's move marks a new phase in the disposal of abandoned chemical weapons in China, in which the work has shifted from excavation and recovery to destruction," he said. "This is the result of years of efforts made by Japanese and Chinese authorities, and will have far-reaching effects on the bilateral relationship."

The project began in accordance with a bilateral agreement in July 1999 that Japan would provide money, technology and facilities to dispose of the weapons.

Under the international Chemical Weapons Convention, Japan is required to excavate and destroy all chemical weapons left in China by 2012, a deadline extended from 2007.

At Wednesday's ceremony, Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Zhang Zhijun said the abandoned chemical weapons were one of the "serious crimes" committed during Japan's invasion and their destruction will remove a threat to the environment, lives and property, and promote the development of bilateral ties.

"(China) hopes Japan will take this start of the destruction phase as an opportunity to continue increasing manpower and resources to further accelerate the progress of destruction," Zhang was quoted as saying on the People's Daily website.

According to the Chinese Foreign Ministry website, China and Japan have conducted more than 120 bilateral investigations and excavation operations, and more than 40,000 abandoned chemical weapons have been recovered so far.

The exact number of chemical munitions buried underground or abandoned in rivers and lakes has been disputed by both sides, with estimates ranging from hundreds of thousands to millions.

Chinese victims of poisoning from abandoned chemical weapons have filed damage suits against the Japanese government in recent years.

<http://search.japantimes.co.jp/cgi-bin/nn20100903b2.html>

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

United Press International (UPI.com)

## **India Prepares Laser-Guided Missiles**

August 31, 2010

NEW DELHI, Aug. 31 (UPI) -- Bent on becoming a regional superpower, India is pursuing ways to develop laser-guided anti-ballistic missiles.

Dubbed direct energy weapons and developed by the Defense Research and Development Organization, the new weapons are intended to kill incoming, hostile ballistic missiles "by bombarding them with subatomic particles or electromagnetic waves," the Defense News Web site reported.

In a planning document written earlier this month, India's Defense Ministry said it would place what it called its highest priorities on direct energy weapons for the next 15 years. Trials of the weapons are expected within the coming years should scientists stay on schedule with the development program.

Indian scientists say they have already begun testing. The defense dazzler was reported to be one of the first weapons put to test, engaging enemy aircraft and helicopters within a range of 6 miles.

This system alone, Defense News reported, will be inducted into the country's defense apparatus by 2012.

"Lasers are weapons of the future. We can, for instance, use laser beams to shoot down an enemy missile in its boost or terminal phase," The Times of India recently quoted Anil Kumar Maini, who heads the Indian Defense Research and Development Organization's Laser Science and Technology Center.

The direct energy weapons are capable of producing 25-kilowatt pulses that can destroy intruding missiles. They are said to be considered by the Indian navy for deployment on submarines and destroyers. They may also be mounted on combat aircraft and transport planes.

India's designs come amid efforts to establish a defense shield capable of knocking down hostile ballistic missiles.

Should India succeed, it will join Israel, Russia and the United States in both developing and owning such defense technology.

Although manufactured domestically, the system's tracking and fire control radars have been developed with Israel and France.

Bent on bolstering its military might, India announced plans recently to spend up to \$30 billion on its military by 2012.

In recent months, for example, it inducted a long-range nuclear-tipped missile into its armed forces, unveiling, also, a defense spending budget spiked by 24 percent since last year.

The moves have Pakistan fretting, with leading officials billing India's drive a "massive militarization."

The Times of India reported that laser-based weapons would comprise one component of a wider India missile defense network now under development. The newspaper noted, however, that the country's Defense Research and Development Organization is known to make claims regarding technology that it cannot ultimately produce.

[http://www.upi.com/Business\\_News/Security-Industry/2010/08/31/India-prepares-laser-guided-missiles/UPI-89391283260404/](http://www.upi.com/Business_News/Security-Industry/2010/08/31/India-prepares-laser-guided-missiles/UPI-89391283260404/)

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

Hindustan Times – India

## **West Did Not Oppose Pak N-Programme Due To Afghan War: AQ Khan**

Press Trust Of India

Washington, September 01, 2010

Western countries did not "actively oppose" Pakistan developing its nuclear weapon in late 1980s as they were "too scared" and pre-occupied with the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and its future consequences, disgraced atomic scientist AQ Khan has said. Khan, who has been slapped sanctions by the US for running a clandestine nuclear network, also said the West ignored Pakistan's nuclear program as it needed the country's support to push the then Soviet Russia out of Afghanistan.

"The Afghan War was a blessing for our nuclear program," Khan said in an interview to the *NewsWeek's* inaugural Pakistani edition.

"It was not that the Western countries actively supported it but that they were too scared and (pre) occupied with the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and its future consequences to actively oppose it," he said.

Khan said neither the Americans nor the British had a clue about the status of Pakistan's nuclear programme until 1990.

"After the Afghan War, they (US and UK) slapped sanctions on us to extract concessions from [former Pakistani president] Benazir Bhutto's government, but [former president] Ghulam Ishaq Khan and [former Army chief] Gen Aslam Beg frustrated their nefarious designs," Khan said.

The disgraced atomic scientist alleged CIA chief Leon Panetta was a "liar", when asked about Panetta's statement that Pakistan is now the headquarters of Al-Qaeda.

"The CIA chief—like his bosses and those before him is a liar. There is no headquarters of Al Qaeda in Pakistan. Yes, Pakistan has become very unsafe due to foreign troops in Afghanistan. Our cohesion has been shattered," he said.

He also said the "spineless political leaders" have turned Pakistan -- a nuclear and missile power with 175 million people — into a "beggar state", a third-rate country.

"If there had been any pride left in our leaders, they would have responded appropriately and nobody would have dared to say such things in the first place," he said.

Khan said Pakistan's nuclear weapon is a deterrent against India.

"Our nuclear program has ensured our survival, our security, and our sovereignty...I am proud to have contributed to it together with my patriotic and able colleagues," he said, adding that Pakistan is not a threat to any country.

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/West-did-not-oppose-Pak-n-programme-due-to-Afghan-war-AQ-Khan/Article1-594586.aspx>

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

Times of India – India

## **Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal Has Prevented War With India: A Q Khan**

Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)

September 3, 2010

WASHINGTON: Pakistan's nuclear arsenal has prevented a conventional war with India and made the "nation walk with heads held high", boasts notorious Pakistani scientist AQ Khan, considered the father of Islamabad's clandestine nuclear weapons programme.

"Our nuclear programme has ensured our survival, our security, and our sovereignty ... I am proud to have contributed to it together with my patriotic and able colleagues," the man accused of running a nuclear black market said in a published interview.

"Yes, I fully agree," he said in the interview published in the inaugural issue of "Newsweek Pakistan" when told that most Pakistanis believe Pakistan's being a nuclear state has served as a deterrent to conventional war with India.

Asked to comment on the popular theory that Pakistan is a nation with no sustainable identity, Khan said: "Pakistan was not an artificially created country. We, the Muslims in India, were a separate nation with a distinct culture, history, social order, and heritage."

"By any definition we were a nation. Unfortunately, selfish, narrow-minded leaders broke it into ethnic groups, which led to exploitation. Nuclear weapons made the nation walk with heads held high."

Rejecting fears that nuclear weapons can fall into the wrong hands as "a Western myth and one of their phobias," Khan said: "A nuclear weapon - good or dirty - is a highly complicated and sophisticated device. A large number of parts are needed, and expertise is required to assemble such a device."

"Even scientists and engineers without the relevant experience are not able to do this, let alone to talk of illiterate, untrained terrorists."

Describing the Afghan War as a blessing for Pakistan's nuclear programme, Khan said: "It was not that the Western countries actively supported it but that they were too scared and occupied with the Russian invasion of Afghanistan and its future consequences to actively oppose it."

"Neither the Americans nor the British had a clue about the status of our programme until 1990," Khan claimed. But After the Afghan War they slapped sanctions on Pakistan to extract concessions from Benazir Bhutto's government, but then president Ghulam Ishaq Khan and then Army chief Gen. Aslam Beg "frustrated their nefarious designs."

"The term 'Islamic Bomb' was mischievously coined by the Western world to frighten the rest of the world and to portray Muslims, and Pakistan, as terrorists who should not possess an atom bomb," he said as "The Western world is united in Muslim-bashing and ridiculing Islam and its golden values."

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/pakistan/Pakistans-bomb-has-prevented-war-with-India-AQ-Khan/articleshow/6484275.cms>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia To Resume Test Launches Of Troubled Bulava Missile Sept. 9-12**

3 September 2010

Test launches of Russia's Bulava ballistic missile will resume between September 9 and 12, a defense industry source said on Friday.

"Everything is ready for the resumption of test launches," the source said. "I do not think there will be any postponement this time."

Bulava test launches were put on hold after a failed launch, from the Dmitry Donskoy nuclear submarine in the White Sea on December 9, 2009, which was caused by a defective engine nozzle.

The source also said if the launch is successful, at least another three test launches will be conducted before the end of the year.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30), a three-stage liquid and solid-propellant submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM), has officially suffered seven failures in 12 tests.

But some analysts suggest that in reality the number of failures was considerably larger, with Russian military expert Pavel Felgenhauer suggesting that of the Bulava's 12 test launches, only one was entirely successful.

MOSCOW, September 3 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20100903/160452781.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100903/160452781.html)

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

SIGNAL Magazine

## **Preventing Dirty Bombs**

By Rita Boland, *SIGNAL* Online Exclusive  
September 1, 2010

The Global Threat Reduction Initiative (GTRI) is working to keep U.S. citizens safe from dirty bombs by conducting exercises on the other side of the world. Members representing the initiative recently wrapped up a three-scenario tabletop exercise in Mongolia to help the country prevent terrorists from obtaining its nuclear or radiological material.

Five U.S. officials, including four from Sandia National Laboratories and one specifically affiliated with the GTRI program, traveled to the Asian nation to work with 30 Mongolians who represented interests such as nuclear facility management teams, off-site guard forces, local police, national emergency responders and the military. The partners rehearsed protecting the two facilities in Mongolia that have the high-activity radioactive material attractive to terrorists. "Not every ounce of radioactive material would be useful in a dirty bomb," Ken Sheely, the deputy director of GTRI, explains. "We don't try to protect everything."

The GTRI wants to ensure security upgrades are in place and responders have the capability to prevent terrorists from accessing radiological and nuclear materials. In the exercise, participants simulated fictional attacks at civilian nuclear sites to enable responders to run through their procedures, including organizations' authorities, response

timelines and tactics. "We want these scenarios to be as real as they can possibly be," Sheely says. "They are fictional, but we try to base them off events we have already seen terrorists perform." The GTRI presented one of the scenarios in the exercise based on what officials already know terrorists do, such as use explosives and automatic weapons. The other two scenarios were designed by the Sandia representatives and Mongolians to align more with specific threats in the nation.

GTRI efforts focus on multiple aspects of the terrorist threat. "We work with countries like Mongolia to actually design and install additional security enhancements," Sheely explains. This includes alarm systems and other measures to form a foundation of increased security around radioactive sources. But prevention is only half the battle. "Security is more than just detection and deterrent and protection; it also involves response," Sheely says. Though preventing terrorists from reaching dirty-bomb sources is the first priority, countries also need to plan and test their procedures to ensure that if the bad guys do get their hands on the materials that they do not remove them from the facility. Sheely explains that allowing responders to exercise in real-world scenarios enables them to gain the experience to carry out well-laid plans.

Though the exercise has concluded, the GTRI will continue to work with Mongolia in the future to ensure nuclear security. It also plans to conduct similar exercises soon with Indonesia, Romania and Moldova. Previously, officials with the initiative ran through scenarios with Serbia, Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, and domestic efforts also have been made. Within the United States, 10 exercises have been completed that included site-level personnel and state and local law enforcement as well as the FBI and other national-level assets. These types of exercises are only part of the GTRI's broader mandate to enhance worldwide nuclear security, and officials are working with more than 100 countries to implement elements of the initiative.

[http://www.afcea.org/signal/articles/templates/Signal\\_Article\\_Template.asp?articleid=2396&zoneid=301](http://www.afcea.org/signal/articles/templates/Signal_Article_Template.asp?articleid=2396&zoneid=301)

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

Las Cruces Sun-News

## **Texas Senator Calls For Border Focus At Domenici Conference**

By Diana M. Alba DALBA

September 1, 2010

LAS CRUCES - Texas' senior senator, Republican Kay Bailey Hutchison, referred to the bullets from Juárez gunfights that have strayed across the international border this summer, when framing her remarks Wednesday to a crowd at New Mexico State University.

And following close behind Hutchison was a look by former U.S. Sen. Sam Nunn, D-Ga., at a more global threat: nuclear arms.

The speakers were part of the first day lineup of the 2010 Domenici Public Policy Conference, meant to honor former U.S. Sen. Pete Domenici of New Mexico.

In addition to the bullets, Hutchison highlighted the murders of 72 migrants killed en masse, the assassination recently of two Mexican mayors and the death toll of 28,000 in Mexico since that country's president began a drug war four years ago.

Juárez, she said, is "ground zero" for that battle.

"We should be alarmed by this escalation," she said.

The U.S. government is taking steps on this side of the border to combat the violence, including boosting Border Patrol agent numbers, technology and equipment; funding a program that intercepts weapons being smuggled into Mexico; and creating "strike forces" of agents who are able to "focus on areas with greater need" along the border.

"When you close down one area, another one pops up," she said.

Hutchison said more and better-trained manpower is the key to tackling the problem of border security. She said she changed her stance because of the increasing violence and now supports stationing the National Guard along the international border to back up the Border Patrol.

In response to a question from the audience, Hutchison said U.S. officials have helped train Mexican law enforcement, but there's only so much they can do to change conditions in that country, considering it's an autonomous nation. Still, she said she believes it's taking the steps needed to solve cartel problems.

"There was a time people thought we'd never lose the organized crime in Colombia," she noted.

NMSU student Max Haake, 22, a sophomore studying accounting, said the speakers were "motivating."

"I was impressed with how knowledgeable the speakers were and how well they conveyed their ideas," he said. "They made it to where everybody understood and everybody felt that something needs to be done."

Nunn, who co-chairs the Nuclear Threat Initiative, a nonprofit seeking to reduce nuclear weapons and other big threats, told attendees that the odds of a global nuclear war have declined greatly since the Cold War. But he said the chances of nuclear terrorism, a mistaken deployment of a nuclear weapon or a regional war have spiked since that time.

"A terrorist nuclear attack on one of our cities could kill hundreds of thousands of people, shatter our economy, begin to erode our civil liberties, give blackmail power to that particular terrorist group," he said. "The most effective way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to secure nuclear materials at their source."

Nunn said the world should work toward a goal of reducing the number of nuclear weapons and their spread, while still allowing countries to use nuclear power. It's a monumental goal, he said, but it should be undertaken.

"I call it a race between cooperation and catastrophe," he said.

Nunn highlighted Domenici's efforts in Congress to reduce nuclear threats globally.

The conference, in its third year, continues today at the Corbett Center Student Union, before wrapping up at 1:30 p.m..

Malcolm Winston, 20, an NMSU junior studying accounting and finance, said hearing about policies firsthand was helpful.

"It's great as a student to get more involved," he said.

[http://www.lcsun-news.com/las\\_cruces-news/ci\\_15969253](http://www.lcsun-news.com/las_cruces-news/ci_15969253)

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

Montgomery Advertiser

## **HALTING DISASTER: Maxwell's Nuclear Defense Center Works To Prevent Disaster**

By Jenn Rowell

September 2, 2010

Mark Conversino, dean of the Air War College at Maxwell Air Force Base, has a small booklet, "Survival Under Atomic Attack," that was distributed by the Civil Defense Commission during the 1950s, when the Cold War was reaching its height.

The booklet is dated, almost laughable. The topic is neither.

Back then fears were about the Red Scare, preemptive launches and mutually affirmed destruction. A half century later the fear has morphed into something smaller, but no less frightening -- a small rogue country or a small group of terrorists with nuclear weapons.

It's a threat the Air Force takes very seriously -- seriously enough to have the Air Force's Counterproliferation Center at Maxwell. The Air Force is the only single military service with such a school, said Barry Schneider, the center's director.

The Maxwell center was established in 1998 to educate military members and government officials on weapons of mass destruction and counterproliferation efforts. The center's staff currently is acquiring as many documents and other materials on nuclear weapons, with the goal of becoming a clearinghouse for all things nuclear for the Air Force and other government agencies, Schneider said.

Other parts of the U.S. government also are ratcheting up efforts to help the country prepare for a nuclear threat.

Schneider said the National Defense University has a similar center that is a joint operation among the services and that the CIA announced last week that it is opening a counterproliferation center to devise strategies involving weapons of mass destruction.

### **Threat may have grown**

Conversino said the reason is that many believe the nuclear threat now isn't just as dangerous as during the Cold War, but more so.

The difference is that during the Cold War you were dealing with a country or a bloc of countries -- a single rational state actor with nuclear weapons -- and developing those nuclear weapons took such tremendous resources that only a few superpowers were capable of doing it, he said.

But with the spread of technology, smaller countries and terrorist groups are increasingly capable of creating a nuclear threat.

"How do you deter a non-state actor," Conversino said, adding that it is also more difficult to understand the motivations, religious or otherwise, of non-state actors, and thus more difficult to deter them.

There's a saying in the nuclear community, he said: "They only have to be lucky once, we have to be lucky all the time."

### **Effects of nuclear blast**

And even smaller nuclear weapons would have an enormous impact.

The Sept. 11, 2001, attacks weren't even nuclear, but brought about massive changes in the U.S. and beyond concerning transportation, security, economics and more. The attacks had an estimated financial impact of between \$50 billion to \$100 billion, according to one study by the RAND Center for Terrorism Risk Management Policy.

The study looked at the effects that could occur if terrorists set off a small, nuclear bomb. In the scenario, terrorists detonate a 10-kiloton nuclear bomb in a shipping container smuggled into the Port of Long Beach in California. The report's authors chose that size weapon because it's feasible for non-state actors to acquire the nuclear materials necessary to build that weapon. The bomb the U.S. dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 was about 14 kilotons, according to the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

The report postulates that within the first 72 hours, 60,000 people would be killed either from the blast or from radiation poisoning. Another 150,000 people could require emergency care from being exposed to hazardous levels of radioactivity. The explosion and following fires could destroy the port and the nearby Port of Los Angeles, which together account for about 30 percent of U.S. shipping imports.

Millions of people would need to be relocated because of the contamination radius and millions more would try to evacuate the area. If Long Beach's refineries, which are responsible for a third of the gasoline produced west of the Rocky Mountains, also were destroyed, it would have an even more disastrous effect on the nation and its economy.

### **Maxwell conference**

Those are the kinds of issues that scholars, military members and officials in the weapons of mass destruction arenas are trying to prevent.

Those are some of the reasons that recently brought hundreds of scholars, policy experts and students to Maxwell for a recent, two-day conference examining the nuclear threat. The Air Force and the Defense Threat Reduction Agency sponsored the conference.

The entire Maxwell class of 245 people attended the conference. These included international officers from various countries, about half of which have had some direct links to nuclear weapons, Schneider said.

Conversino was one of the speakers. His area of expertise is Russia and the former Soviet Union, and he addressed the group on Soviet nuclear policies and forces.

While terrorism is in the forefront, Conversino makes it clear that the fear of other countries launching a nuclear assault is still a major concern.

Russia continues its nuclear arsenal because the nation views that force as necessary to maintain their sovereignty, Conversino said. But, Russian cooperation, and that of China, is vital to the U.S. in handling nuclear issues with other nations such as North Korea and Iran.

"It's (a nuclear attack) something that we just can't risk happening," he said.

And those issues, which Conversino said are some of the thorniest of our time, likely will be a dominant factor in the careers of the Air War College students.

"Those are issues that we would love to have go away," he said, but he quickly added that's not likely to happen.

In recent years, the conference has focused on a wide range of weapons of mass destruction and associated issues, but this year's theme was "Avoiding a Nuclear Catastrophe."

This year's conference will produce an after-action report for the 450 participants, but the emphasis for organizers was on the discussions and networks being built.



Organizers said the nuclear theme was chosen as nuclear policies and issues have returned to the forefront, especially for the Air Force, which is largely responsible for the American nuclear arsenal.

The U.S. Nuclear triad, according to the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review report, consists of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear capable heavy bombers -- the latter two belong to the Air Force.

Conversino and William O'Donnell of DTRA said that although much of the decision making regarding nuclear issues happens at high levels, it's something all Americans should be concerned about.

"The use of a nuclear weapon will change everybody's lives in this country significantly," said O'Donnell, the associate director for strategy and plans enterprise at DRTA. "How they will change I don't know.

"We're working hard to prevent that ... (trying) to work left of boom."

<http://www.montgomeryadvertiser.com/article/20100902/NEWS01/9020308/HALTING-DISASTER-Maxwell-s-nuclear-defense-center-works-to-prevent-disaster>

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

Air Force Times

## **Air Force General Kehler To Head Up STRATCOM**

By John Reed, Staff writer

Friday September 3, 2010

Air Force Gen. Robert Kehler was nominated Thursday to lead the nation's nuclear forces as commander of U.S. Strategic Command.

Fellow Air Force Gen. Kevin Chilton will retire as chief of STRATCOM on Dec. 1 after three years in that role, according to an announcement.

Kehler will take the reins of the Offutt Air Force Base, Neb.-based command that operates the country's nuclear missile, bomber and ballistic missile submarine fleets, as well as its dedicated cyber warfare troops.

Since October 2007, Kehler has led Air Force Space Command at Peterson Air Force Base, Colo., where he was in charge of the service's Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles until December 2009, when they were transferred to the new Global Strike Command.

<http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2010/09/air-force-new-stratcom-commander-090210w/>

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

Daily NK – South Korea

OPINION/EDITORIAL

## **EO Showing Way Forward For Sanctions**

September 1, 2010

On Monday, the U.S. moved to place new pinpoint sanctions on the Kim Jong Il regime.

Among the most eye-catching targets of the new sanctions regime are the General Bureau of Reconnaissance (RGB) and the No. 39 Department of the Central Committee of the Party. Additionally, Green Pine Associated Corporation, a conventional arms dealer under the control of the RGB, and the Director of the RGB Kim Yong Chol also made the list.

Issuing the new executive order to enhance the existing sanctions regime, President Obama clarified that the move is a response to the Cheonan incident as well as a strike against long standing illicit activities undertaken by the North Korean regime, and added that it targets the regime and its leadership, not the people at large.

The new EO can be labeled "pinpoint" because it is aimed right at the core of the Kim Jong Il regime.

Kim Jong Il has maintained his totalitarian dictatorship for so long by holding three groups hostage.

The first is the 23 million North Korean residents. The Kim Jong Il regime has enslaved and used them to reinforce its absolutist Suryeong-centered system.

The second is South Korea. The North has raised tensions in the region in the Military-first era by threatening the South and developing nuclear weapons, while still receiving economic aid. It has not even admitted to the existence of abductees and POWs.

The third hostage is the international community; especially Japan.

However, the international community has never before sanctioned the Kim Jong Il regime properly because they did not know its ins and outs well enough.

But, since the imposition of UN Security Council Resolution 1874, the international community has been heading in the right direction, and now the U.S. has accurately targeted the Kim Jong Il regime's lifeline.

The sources of the regime's energy are, first, the Military-first political line and, second, its finances, both illegal and legally obtained.

Releasing the new EO on Monday, U.S. Treasury Under Secretary Stuart Levey stated, "Additional actions we will take in the weeks and months to come are aimed at disrupting North Korea's efforts to engage in illicit activities and its ability to surreptitiously move its money by deceiving banks and smuggling cash worldwide."

If his expression be any guide, the U.S. administration has figured out exactly the nature of the Kim regime. "Ability to surreptitiously move its money by deceiving banks" implies that the U.S. knows that the Kim regime's slush funds are held and moved in collusion with corrupt powers in China or other countries.

In order to implement the new sanctions, cooperation with China is necessary. Since the EO is only a U.S. domestic order, it primarily deters U.S. banks and enterprises from making deals with the targets of sanctions, but also forces third country financial organs and companies that have contracts with U.S. organizations to pay attention.

The key point is to make banks and companies cut off North Korea, so the cooperation of the governments where the banks are placed can be decisive. As a consequence, the U.S. administration needs to watch closely the targets of the sanctions and other related countries as well, in order for the EO to make a difference.

Japan and the EU, as well as South Korea, should pay close attention to how the U.S. Executive Order works out.

<http://www.dailynk.com/english/read.php?cataId=nk01100&num=6757>

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

REVIEW & OUTLOOK

September 1, 2010

## **Office 39, Call Office 99**

*More useful pressure on North Korea.*

When it comes to sanctioning rogue entities in the North Korean government, the question arises: Does one go after "Office 99," which oversees the regime's illicit arms smuggling? Or is "Office 39," which handles Kim Jong Il's sales of hard drugs and purchases of luxury goods, the better target?

This week the Obama Administration got the answer right when it sanctioned both Orwellian departments as part of a broader effort to punish Pyongyang for torpedoing a South Korean warship in March and killing 46 sailors. Those sanctions, along with this summer's joint U.S.-South Korean naval exercises, send "a signal to the North that provocative behavior will not go unpunished," as the State Department's Robert Einhorn put it on Monday.

Now let's hope the Administration's signal-sending isn't a prelude to another round of diplomacy with Pyongyang, in which the U.S. drops sanctions in exchange for the regime's invariably empty promises and bogus concessions. That's what the Bush Administration did late in its tenure, when it took North Korea off the list of terrorism sponsors and returned \$25 million in frozen North Korean assets in the hope that the North would submit to a vague de-nuclearization process. Instead, Kim conducted his second nuclear test in May 2009.

In recent days, Kim has traveled to China to meet with Hu Jintao. The Chinese president reaffirmed his country's ties with the North and urged the resumption of the six-party talks, something the North's Dear Leader also seems eager to do as he engineers the succession of his son to his ungodly throne. China apparently wants to throw a lifeline to its client and encourage another diplomatic dance in which the U.S. and South Korea would bear the costs and risks. We hope the new sanctions signal that the Obama Administration sees U.S. interests differently.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703467004575463934062014778.html>

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

September 2, 2010

## If Saddam Had Stayed

*Saddam would have joined the nuclear bad-boys club with Iran and North Korea.*

By DANIEL HENNINGER

From the vantage point of history, Barack Obama's prime-time speech announcing the Iraq war's end is less important than the speech he gave eight years ago as a state senator in Illinois. This was the October 2002 "dumb war" speech to an anti-Iraq war rally in Chicago's Federal Plaza. Back then, Mr. Obama had a more complex view of the stakes in Iraq than he does now.

Today, the Iraq war has been reduced to not much more than a long, bloody and honorable gunfight between U.S. troops and various homicidal jihadists and insurgents inside Iraq, a war sustained by George Bush, Dick Cheney and some neocon advisers mainly to "impose" democracy on the Iraqis.

I think it is a profound mistake to confine the war's significance to the borders of Iraq. Mr. Obama himself raised the central question about Iraq in that 2002 speech: Did Saddam Hussein pose a danger beyond his borders, or not?

"Let me be clear," State Senator Obama told the Federal Plaza crowd, "I suffer no illusions about Saddam Hussein. . . . He has repeatedly thwarted U.N. inspection teams, developed chemical and biological weapons and coveted nuclear capacity. . . . But I also know that Saddam poses no imminent and direct threat to the United States. . . [H]e can be contained."

This is a widely held view. The Economist's editors this week said Mr. Obama was largely right that Iraq was a dumb war. What the war did, they say, was "rid the Middle East of a bloodstained dictator."

It did a lot more than that.

Let us assume that Mr. Obama's "smarter" view had prevailed, that we had left Saddam in power in Iraq. What would the world look like today?

Mr. Obama and others believe that Saddam and his nuclear ambitions could have been contained. I think exactly the opposite was likely.

At the time of Mr. Obama's 2002 antiwar speech, three other significant, non-Iraqi events were occurring: Iran and North Korea were commencing toward a nuclear break-out, and A.Q. Khan was on the move.

In March 2002, Mr. Khan, the notorious Pakistani nuclear materials dealer, moved his production facilities from Pakistan to Malaysia.

In August, an Iranian exile group revealed the existence of a centrifuge factory in Natanz, Iran.

A month later, U.S. intelligence concluded that North Korea had almost completed a "production-scale" centrifuge facility.

It was also believed in 2002 that al Qaeda was shopping for nuclear materials. In The Wall Street Journal this week, Jay Solomon described how two North Korean operatives through this period developed a network to acquire nuclear technologies.

In short, the nuclear bad boys club was on the move in 2002. Can anyone seriously believe that amidst all this Saddam Hussein would have contented himself with administering his torture chambers? This is fanciful.

Saddam was centrifugal. He moved outward, into war with Iran in 1980 and into Kuwait 10 years later. Saddam was a player, and from 2002 onward the biggest game in his orbit was acquiring nuclear capability.

The definitive account of Saddam's WMD ambitions is the Duelfer Report, issued by the Iraq Survey Group in 2005. Yes, the Duelfer Report concluded that Saddam didn't have active WMD. But at numerous points in the 1,000-page document, it asserted (with quotes from Iraqi politicians and scientists) that Saddam's goal was to free himself of U.N. sanctions and restart his efforts to acquire nuclear weapons and other WMD.

The report: "Saddam wanted to recreate Iraq's WMD capability. . . . Saddam aspired to develop a nuclear capability." The Survey Group described Iraqi plans to develop three long-range ballistic missiles.

Saddam was obsessed with Iran. Imagine the effect on the jolly Iraqi's thinking come 2005 and the rise to stardom of Iran's Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, publicly mocking the West's efforts to shut his nuclear program and threatening enemies with annihilation. That year Ahmadinejad broke the U.N. seals at the Isfahan uranium enrichment plant. In North Korea, Kim Jong Il was flouting the civilized world, conducting nuclear-weapon tests and test-firing missiles into the Sea of Japan. In such a world, Saddam would have aspired to play in the same league as Iran and NoKo. Would we have "contained" him?

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad in Iran and Saddam Hussein in Iraq simultaneously would have incentivized Egypt, Syria, Saudi Arabia and Sudan to enter the nuclear marketplace. Pakistan and India would be increasing their nuke-tinged tensions, not trying as now to ease them.

We ought to be a lot prouder of our troops coming home from Iraq than we are showing this week. They deserve a monument. That war wasn't just about helping Iraq. It was about us. The march across the nuclear threshold by lunatic regimes is a clear and present danger. The sacrifice made by the United States in Iraq took one of these nuclear-obsessed madmen off the table and gave the world more margin to deal with the threat that remains, if the world's leadership is up to it. A big if.

*Daniel Henninger is deputy editor of The Wall Street Journal's editorial page.*

[http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703882304575465721991599994.html?mod=WSJ\\_newsreel\\_opinion](http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703882304575465721991599994.html?mod=WSJ_newsreel_opinion)

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