



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 844, 17 September 2010**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Munger: Separating New START from 'Abolition Agenda'](#)

[New Intel Leads Senators to Oppose START Ratification](#)

[Senate Panel Passes New START](#)

[Moscow Believes U.S. Lawmakers Will Ratify Arms Reduction Treaty](#)

[US Says Iran Determined to Build Nuclear Bomb](#)

[NAM Urges Full Report on Israeli Nukes](#)

[IAEA Not the Place to Debate Israel's Nuclear Status](#)

[US: Time May Come for Special Nuke Probe of Syria](#)

[China Supports Building Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone](#)

[North Korea Wants to Revive Nuclear Talks, Says Jimmy Carter](#)

[Speculation over North Korea's Delay in Anointing Kim Jong-il's Son Kim Jong-un](#)

[U.S. Not to Accept N. Korea as Nuke Weapons Power: Campbell](#)

[Russia to Overhaul Bulava Production if Tests Fail Again – Serdyukov](#)

[Russia, U.S. Still Disagree on Missile Shield - Russian Defense Min.](#)

[Decision on £20bn Trident Renewal 'to be Delayed Until After the Next Election'](#)

[Armed Forces Head Warns Against Downgrading Trident](#)

[Panel Seeks Pentagon WMD Response Reforms](#)

[US Conducts Non-nuclear Underground Test in Nevada](#)

[Couple Charged in Nuclear Weapons Secrets Case](#)

[FISHER: China and START](#)

[Trident Procrastination Weakens Britain's Deterrent](#)

[The No-Show North Koreans](#)

---

*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.*

Knoxville News Sentinel

## **Munger: Separating New START from 'Abolition Agenda'**

By Frank Munger

Wednesday, September 15, 2010

Ambassador Linton Brooks was in town last week for an appearance at the Howard Baker Center for Public Policy, and he was drumming up support for New START.

Brooks knows a lot about nuclear weapons, and he knows a lot about treaties. He was administrator of the National Nuclear Security Administration, which runs the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, from 2003 to 2007. And he was chief U.S. negotiator for the START I arms control agreement, which was reached with the Soviet Union in 1991.

The New START Treaty would further reduce the world's largest nuclear arsenals. It is awaiting ratification in the U.S. Senate (and similar approval in Russia). The Senate Foreign Relations Committee is expected to act on a resolution later this week, and U.S. Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn., a member of that committee, will help decide whether the treaty goes before the full Senate and with what instructions.

Brooks, of course, supports ratification, and he recently lent his name to Partnership for a Secure America ads endorsing the treaty - along with such luminaries as former Sens. Howard Baker and Sam Nunn; former Secretaries of State George Shultz, Madeline Albright, Warren Christopher and Colin Powell; and former Secretaries of Defense Harold Brown, Frank Carlucci, William Cohen and William Perry.

Brooks' support for the treaty isn't quite as frothy as some, and he doesn't believe its defeat would be disastrous or short-circuit the future of the Western World.

"It isn't like a 'no' vote is a vote to go buy bomb shelters because the war is coming. I think you don't want to over-hype this," he said in an interview.

On the other hand, he wants to make sure that Senate Republicans and others hanging on the fence don't mistake support for New START with support for President Barack Obama's stated plan to move toward abolition of all nuclear weapons.

"Here's where I part company with the administration," Brooks said, calling himself an abolition skeptic. "I don't think it's possible, and I'm not absolutely sure it's desirable," he said.

Brooks said he believes there's at least one more bilateral treaty with Russia in the future to reduce the nuclear stockpiles. After that, reductions would require complex negotiations with multiple nations wielding nuclear arsenals, he said.

"I don't think we have a good model yet. We just don't know how to do that," Brooks said. "Which is one of several reasons why I don't think abolition is a realistic goal."

Asked about the politics of nuclear disarmament, Brooks said, "First of all, I take the president at his word. I think he believes it. But you have to read carefully what he says. Probably won't happen in his lifetime. Now the president's 25 years younger than I am, so if it won't happen in his lifetime, it probably won't happen in my lifetime."

He added: "One of the things that I'm anxious for people to understand is that's a separate question from New START. OK? Voting for New START is not signing up for the abolition agenda. If you believe in the abolition agenda, it's one more reason for New START. But you don't have to believe in that agenda for New START."

<http://www.knoxnews.com/news/2010/sep/15/separating-new-start-from-abolition-agenda/>

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

Washington Times

## **New Intel Leads Senators to Oppose START Ratification**

By Eli Lake - The Washington Times

Thursday, September 16, 2010

Two senior Senate Republicans expressed new concerns about a strategic arms pact with Russia that could imperil formal ratification as the pact was voted out of committee on Thursday.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted by 14 to four to approve what is being called New START, or Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty.

Full Senate debate and a vote could be held later this year although senators have said the vote could be delayed until next year.

Sen. Christopher "Kit" Bond on Wednesday evening sent a classified letter to the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee laying out a series of objections to the treaty.

In a statement Thursday, Mr. Bond, Missouri Republican and vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, stated: "In their rush to pass a treaty before Congress can evaluate the intelligence community's assessment on its impact and the treaty's lack of verification necessary to detect Russian-cheating, the administration is taking us down a dangerous path."

Sen. James Risch, Idaho Republican and member of the Foreign Relations Committee, tried to stop the vote on New START on Thursday saying he had received new information from the intelligence community that should force senators to reconsider their votes, according to Foreign Policy magazine's blog, The Cable.

Sen. John Kerry, Massachusetts Democrat and committee chairman, said he took the matter seriously, but urged the senator not to discuss the matter in open session.

The classified concerns of the two Republicans could imperil a final vote on New START that has now been pushed off until after the November mid-term elections. Ratification of the treaty has been a high priority for the Obama administration that has said New START is a centerpiece of its reset with Russia.

The treaty, signed in April, calls for both Russia and the United States to reduce their stockpiles of deployable nuclear warheads to 1,550.

In an op-ed article published Thursday in Politico, Ellen Taucher, undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, and Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy James Miller stated that passage of the arms control treaty is crucial to enhancing the U.S. understanding of the Russian arsenal.

"Without New START, our knowledge of Russia's nuclear forces is likely to erode and the risks of misunderstandings and miscalculations will grow. Worst-case assumptions are then likely to fuel military planning in both countries, increasing costs and decreasing trust," the two wrote.

Republicans have conditioned their support for treaty ratification on two issues. First, Republicans have sought language in the ratification resolution clarifying that a bilateral committee set up under New START cannot discuss U.S. missile defenses except where for the singled issue covered in the treaty. The treaty prohibits using any more offensive missile silos for new defensive anti-missile interceptors.

Second, some senators like Sen. Jon Kyl, Arizona Republican, have conditioned support for the treaty on the administration's commitment to both spending and programs to modernize the U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal over the next 10 years.

Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, Kentucky Republican, has said Republicans will follow the lead of Mr. Kyl and Sen. Richard Lugar, Indiana Republican and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The committee passed Thursday a new resolution addressing these Republican concerns drafted by Mr. Lugar by voice vote. The resolution contains a provision require reports from the Obama administration on the progress of the nuclear arsenal modernization, with language noting that the United States withdraw from the treaty if the failure to upgrade the nuclear weapons system endangers U.S. security.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/sep/16/new-intel-leads-senators-to-oppose-start-ratificat/>

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

Washington Post

## **Senate Panel Passes New START**

By Mary Beth Sheridan, Washington Post Staff Writer

Friday, September 17, 2010

Page - A6

One of President Obama's key foreign policy priorities got a boost Thursday as a Senate committee approved a nuclear arms-reduction treaty with Russia, sparking hope among supporters that the pact may win final approval this year.

But a wild card emerged when Sen. Jim Risch (R-Idaho) told the hearing that intelligence agencies had, at the last minute, produced "some very serious information that directly affects what we're doing here."

He did not reveal the information, but later told the blog the Cable that it involved Russian cheating on arms-control agreements.

Senate Foreign Relations Chairman John F. Kerry (D-Mass.) warned Risch twice that it was "inappropriate" to discuss secret intelligence in public.

Kerry said he had consulted Vice President Biden and intelligence experts about the new information. "The conclusion of the intelligence community is [that] it in no way alters their judgment already submitted to this committee with respect to the START treaty," he told the hearing.

The senators approved the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START) on a vote of 14 to 4. A senior Democratic aide said it is likely to go to the full Senate during a lame-duck session in November.

"The administration is still going to have to work on these votes" to get the two-thirds majority required for passage, the aide said, speaking on the condition of anonymity.

The treaty won the support of all 11 Democrats on the committee, as well as that of Sen. Richard G. Lugar (Ind.), a longtime arms-control proponent, and two other Republicans the administration had wooed - Sens. Bob Corker (Tenn.) and Johnny Isakson (Ga.).

Diplomats consider passage of the treaty crucial to Obama's ambitious nuclear-reduction plans and to his credibility internationally.

New START trims the Cold War foes' long-range deployed nuclear warheads to 1,550 and limits their launchers to 700, a modest reduction from current levels.

The treaty would also allow the nuclear giants to resume inspections of one another's stockpiles, which they had done for 15 years under the START treaty that expired last December.

"This treaty is essential for our own security," Lugar told reporters, noting that it puts "American boots on the ground" in Russia to make sure they are keeping their nuclear promises.

The resolution on ratification that was approved Thursday was crafted by Lugar and sought to assuage some senators' doubts on issues such as missile defense and modernization of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Risch, who voted against the treaty, said the intelligence community "thought this serious enough that they knocked on the doors" of key senators "and said, 'Look, folks, you need to know this before you move ahead.' "

A classified State Department report produced this year determined that New START was "effectively verifiable." Another State Department report said that Russia had observed the "central limits" of the first START treaty, although it noted there were disputes over compliance.

The new intelligence "clearly impacts your view of whether Russia would violate the treaty," said a congressional official who spoke on the condition of anonymity because of the sensitivity of the subject. The official declined to describe the intelligence.

Administration officials, speaking on the condition of anonymity, played down the significance of the new information, with some suggesting treaty opponents were using it for their own ends.

In an interview, Kerry said the new intelligence "is not really bearing directly on the treaty." He described it as "a piece of information that's not yet fully ripened," declining to elaborate.

*Staff writers Greg Miller and Walter Pincus contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/09/16/AR2010091606694.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Moscow Believes U.S. Lawmakers Will Ratify Arms Reduction Treaty**

17 September 2010

Russia hopes that U.S. lawmakers will consider a new strategic arms reduction treaty with Russia "coherent and mutually-beneficial" and speed up its ratification, a Foreign Ministry spokesman said on Friday.

On Thursday the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended that the Senate ratify a new strategic arms reduction treaty with Russia signed by the U.S. and Russian presidents on April 8 in Prague as a replacement for the START 1 treaty that expired in December 2009.

U.S. President Barack Obama and other top officials also urged the Senate to speed up the ratification of the Russian-U.S. pact.

Andrey Nesterenko said the U.S.-Russian pact would have a positive influence on international stability and security.

"Its ratification will contribute to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime," Nesterenko said.

Nesterenko added that the document contains a unilateral get-out clause to be made use of if either of the countries believes its national interests are threatened.

MOSCOW, September 17 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20100917/160623133.html>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

## **US Says Iran Determined to Build Nuclear Bomb**

Wednesday, September 15, 2010

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

UNITED NATIONS (AFP) – The United States said Wednesday that Iran is determined to build a nuclear bomb as a UN committee asked more countries to report on how they are carrying out sanctions on the Islamic Republic.

Western powers expressed new concerns over the Islamic Republic's failure to cooperate with international inspectors. The US and British ambassadors to the United Nations both accused Iran of committing "serial violations" of UN resolutions which have imposed four rounds of sanctions.

Highlighting a new report by the UN atomic watchdog, US ambassador Susan Rice told a Security Council debate on the UN sanctions committee that "Iran is refusing to address our proliferation concerns and appears determined to acquire a nuclear weapon."

The Security Council and the sanctions committee "will need to consider an appropriate response to Iran's serial violations of Security Council resolutions."

A sanctions committee report said that only 36 countries have so sent in reports on how they are implementing the sanctions. The United States, Britain and France said more countries have to report on their actions.

Rice said there is an "urgent need to redouble our efforts to implement the UN sanctions."

"Already we have seen unprecedented efforts to respond to Iran's defiance of pressure in line with the dual track approach. Member states should move quickly to carry out their obligations to implement the new sanctions," she said.

Iran denies that it seeks a nuclear bomb but the latest International Atomic Energy Agency report on the Iran standoff said that the Islamic Republic has increasing amounts of low enriched and 20 percent enriched uranium.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/international/2010/September/international\\_September763.xml&section=international](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/international/2010/September/international_September763.xml&section=international)

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

Tehran Times – Iran

Thursday, September 16, 2010

## **NAM Urges Full Report on Israeli Nukes**

TEHRAN (Press TV) -- The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) has called on the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to provide a comprehensive report on Israel's nuclear activities.

The Egyptian government, on behalf of NAM member states, demanded on Tuesday that IAEA Chief Yukiya Amano issue an exhaustive report on Israel's nuclear arsenals, IRNA reported.

The development came after Amano submitted a report to the IAEA Board of Governors on Friday concerning Tel Aviv's controversial nuclear program.

The report acknowledged that the agency cannot monitor and assess Israel's undisclosed nuclear sites due to measures by the Tel Aviv regime restricting the agency from examining its nuclear facilities and potentials.

It also expressed “concern about the Israeli nuclear capabilities” and linked it to “concern about the threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons for the security and stability of the Middle East.”

In his visit to Israel last month, Amano called on Tel Aviv to join the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, also known as the NPT.

Israel has been refusing to confirm or deny its possession of nuclear warheads. Widely considered to be the only nuclear power in the Middle East, the Israeli regime is widely believed to have over 250 atomic warheads.

Having endorsed Israel's policy of “nuclear ambiguity” over the past 40 years, the United States warned Arab states on Saturday against renewing efforts to focus attention on Israel at an upcoming IAEA meeting.

[http://www.tehrantimes.com/index\\_View.asp?code=226722](http://www.tehrantimes.com/index_View.asp?code=226722)

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

## **IAEA Not the Place to Debate Israel's Nuclear Status**

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

16 September 2010,

WASHINGTON — The International Atomic Energy Agency is not the forum to discuss Israel's possible accession to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), a senior US official said on Wednesday after the IAEA asked the Jewish state to join.

“Israel has fully cooperated with the IAEA,” and “we believe there is really no basis for a debate at the IAEA,” said State Department spokesman Philip Crowley, adding that the issue had been discussed at the NPT Review Conference in the spring, and that a conference on a nuclear-free Middle East was set for 2012.

The IAEA revealed on September 3 that UN atomic watchdog chief Yukiya Amano traveled to Jerusalem last month to invite Israel to join the NPT.

Amano, in the IAEA report, said he conveyed to top Israeli officials the IAEA general conference's “concern about the Israeli nuclear capabilities and invited Israel to consider acceding to the NPT and placing all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive IAEA safeguards.”

Crowley said Washington believed such an IAEA step was unnecessary.

“We certainly agree that it has the potential, just as the Goldstone report did a year ago, to interrupt the progress that we think is possible now that we're back at direct negotiations” between Israel and the Palestinians, Crowley said.

A UN-commissioned report earlier this year by Justice Richard Goldstone, who headed a UN fact-finding panel, accused both Israel and Palestinian groups of war crimes during Israel's military operation in the Gaza Strip in late 2008.

Crowley said Washington was in agreement with the principles of accession of all countries in the NPT and for a nuclear-free Middle East.

But President Barack Obama warned in July that any efforts to single out Israel over its undeclared nuclear program could scupper a Middle East regional nuclear conference planned for 2012.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/September/middleeast\\_September362.xml&section=middleeast](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle08.asp?xfile=data/middleeast/2010/September/middleeast_September362.xml&section=middleeast)

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

Seattle Times

Friday, September 17, 2010

## **US: Time May Come for Special Nuke Probe of Syria**

By GEORGE JAHN - Associated Press Writer

A U.S. envoy on Thursday suggested time was running out for Syria to cooperate with a U.N. atomic agency probe of alleged secret nuclear activities before the agency invokes its seldom-used authority to call for a special inspection - a possible prelude to U.N. Security Council involvement.

Rising to Syria's defense, a senior Iranian diplomat accused the organization, the International Atomic Energy Agency, of harassing Syria by leveling false allegations in collusion with Israel and its allies.

The two officials spoke as the 35-nation atomic agency board meeting turned its attention from the agency's probe of Iran's nuclear activities to suspicions that Syria has a hidden nuclear program.

Israeli warplanes bombed what the U.S. says was a nearly finished nuclear reactor three years ago, launching an agency investigation. After an initial visit to the site, agency inspectors have not been allowed to return or visit other suspect sites. The agency's chief, Yukiya Amano, says Syria's lack of cooperation could mean that information sought by the agency could be lost with the passage of time.

Iranian envoy Ali Asghar Soltanieh told the board that Israel's attack is the real issue and Syria has become targeted by a "vicious circle of endless questions and allegations."

Syria denies hiding nuclear activities. It, Iran and other Islamic nations say Israel is the main nuclear problem in the Mideast.

They plan to push for a vote at a 151-nation IAEA conference next week on a resolution criticizing Israel's undeclared nuclear capabilities and urging the Jewish state - commonly considered to have nuclear weapons - to open up its program to IAEA perusal.

But Glyn Davies, the chief U.S. delegate to the agency, warned such a move could "undercut" ongoing Israeli-Palestinian peace talks, telling reporters that "now is not the time (and) the IAEA is not the place for this resolution."

Diplomats told The Associated Press that same message was delivered Tuesday by Gary Samore, President Barack Obama's special nuclear envoy to Arab ambassadors accredited to the IAEA.

In Washington, State Department spokesman P.J. Crowley confirmed that the U.S. is concerned that the Arab move, should it happen, could jeopardize the Mideast talks.

"First of all, let's state a fact," Crowley said. "Israel has fully cooperated with the IAEA and that is in contrast to one or more governments, Iran and Syria being two that come to mind, who have not cooperated with the IAEA."

Israel, as well as the U.S. and other close allies consider the discussion about Israel's nuclear capacities a serious distraction from what they consider the main Mideast nuclear threats - Iran and Syria - a point underlined by Israel's chief delegate to the board.

"It is Iran which represents the greatest threat to peace and security in the Middle East and beyond," Ehud Azulay said, in comments to the closed meeting made available to the AP.

For his part, Davies told the board that, unless Syria ends its stonewalling, the IAEA must increasingly "consider all available measures and authorities to pursue the verification assurances the international community seeks" - diplomatic language for a special inspection.

Only twice has the atomic agency ever called for or carried out a special inspection, which gives it authority for countrywide probes of known or suspect nuclear activities.

Romania asked to be inspected in 1992 to show that the post-communist government had no nuclear-weapons aspirations. A year later, the agency asked for a special inspection in North Korea - a request turned down by the country, which continued with its secret development of nuclear weapons.

Refusal by Syria to allow a special inspection would allow the board to refer the issue to the U.N. Security Council, which then could issue a reprimand, pass a resolution demanding compliance and ultimately pass the kind of sanctions Iran is now under for refusing to heed demands to curb nuclear activities that could be used both to generate energy or make weapons.

<http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/text/2012910539.html>

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

People's Daily – China

## **China Supports Building Middle East Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone**

September 17, 2010

China supported the proposal of establishing a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone, a senior Chinese diplomat said in Vienna Thursday.

China had always stood by strengthening the international non-proliferation regime, and committed to advancing the universality, effectiveness and authority of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), said Hu Xiaodi, China's permanent representative and ambassador to the United Nations and Other International Organizations in Vienna.

To this end, China supported building a Middle East nuclear-weapon-free zone, maintained Israel should join the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon state at an early date, and put all its nuclear facilities under comprehensive safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), said Hu, who was addressing the IAEA board meeting, which started Monday.

"Meanwhile, all countries in the region should conscientiously fulfill NPT obligations, as well as sign and ratify the IAEA safeguards agreements and its Additional Protocols," Hu added.

He went on to say China welcomed the proposal endorsed in the final document of the NPT Review Conference this May, which calls for convening an international conference in 2012 on the establishment of a zone free of nuclear weapons and all other weapons of mass destruction in Middle East.

Hu also stressed the willingness of the Chinese to work with the international community for a non-nuclear-weapon area in the Middle East, and achieving peace and stability in the region.

*Source: Xinhua*

<http://english.peopledaily.com.cn/90001/90776/90883/7142731.html>

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

London Guardian

## **North Korea Wants to Revive Nuclear Talks, Says Jimmy Carter**

*Former US president brings back news of apparent softening after negotiating release of American who entered illegally*

By Justin McCurry

Thursday, 16 September 2010

North Korea has sent "strong and clear signals" that it is prepared to abandon its nuclear weapons programme if the US guarantees it will not attack the communist state, according to Jimmy Carter.

The former US president said senior officials wanted to resume stalled nuclear talks and formalise a peace treaty with the US and South Korea. Carter was in Pyongyang last month to negotiate the release of an American man who had entered the country illegally.

Writing in the New York Times, Carter said there were "clear signals of eagerness from Pyongyang to resume negotiations and accept the basic provisions of the denuclearisation and peace efforts".

Stephen Bosworth, the US special envoy on North Korean issues, did not share Carter's optimism over the resumption of talks, which involve the two Koreas, the US, China, Japan and Russia.

"It is clear that the six-party process does not just depend on the five," said Bosworth, visiting Beijing to try and revive negotiations. "It also depends on what we hear and see [from North Korea]."

"On the one hand we continue to enforce the sanctions which have been put in place over the last year or more, but simultaneously we remain open to dialogue and constructive engagement."

Bosworth was speaking as reports emerged that a meeting of North Korea's ruling party may have been held up by a power struggle. It was supposed to take place in the first half of this month.

North Korea's leader, Kim Jong-il, had been expected to use the meeting to anoint Kim Jong-un, his youngest son, as the country's next leader.

Korea watchers initially thought floods or Kim's failing health had held things up, but speculation is mounting that at least one faction inside the ruling elite is unhappy with Kim's choice of successor and other senior officials.

Under a 2005 deal, Pyongyang agreed to end its nuclear weapons programme in return for economic and energy assistance, as well as security assurances from the US.

Washington has refused to consider returning to talks unless North Korea vows to abide by the 2005 agreement and apologises for the March sinking of a South Korean warship. Pyongyang denies carrying out the attack, in which 46 sailors died.

North Korea walked away from nuclear talks in April last year in protest at UN sanctions imposed after the regime conducted long-range missile tests.

Carter said he had been invited to Pyongyang to oversee the release of Aijalon Gomes, who had crossed into North Korea from China in January. He said North Korean officials also "wanted me to come in the hope that I might help resurrect the agreements on denuclearisation and peace".



Kim Yong-nam, the regime's second in command, and Kim Kye-gwan, its chief nuclear negotiator, had voiced concern, however, at "unwarranted sanctions" and "provocative" military exercises with South Korea, Carter said.

They had described the nuclear talks as "sentenced to death but not yet executed".

The message passed on to Carter is one of several signs that attitudes are softening in North Korea. The regime recently released the crew of a South Korean fishing boat it claimed had strayed into its waters, and suggested a resumption of reunions among families separated at the end of the 1950-53 Korean war, which ended with a truce but no peace treaty.

Reports say Pyongyang has proposed working-level military talks with its neighbour next week to discuss their maritime border and moves by South Korean activists to float propaganda leaflets to North Korea.

Seoul has agreed to send aid to flood victims in North Korea – the first major aid package to have crossed the border for more than two years.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/sep/16/north-korea-wants-nuclear-talks>

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

The Australian – Australia

## **Speculation over North Korea's Delay in Anointing Kim Jong-il's Son Kim Jong-un**

Rick Wallace, Tokyo correspondent

September 17, 2010

NORTH Korea appears to have failed to hold its conference to anoint Kim Jong-un as the next leader, triggering speculation over the health of Kim Jong-il.

The setback has been blamed on floods by sources in Beijing and Pyongyang, although no official postponement of the Korean Workers' Party conference - the first to be held since 1966 - has been announced.

South Korean Unification Minister Hyun In-taek said it had been pushed back. "It could be floods, or any other various reasons, but there seem to be internal reasons," Mr Hyun said.

Doubts have grown over Kim Jong-il's health since 2008, when he is believed to have suffered a stroke,

He is understood to be orchestrating a transfer of power to Kim Jong-un, aged between 27 and 29, to come into effect on his death.

The postponement of the conference could indicate resistance to the transfer or a fresh health setback for North Korea's reclusive leader, although Australian National University North Korea expert Leonid Petrov put it down to logistical problems.

Dr Petrov said he suspected the conference had been postponed because the bureaucracy and state apparatus had been overwhelmed with Mr Kim's recent China visit and founding day celebrations on September 9.

Dr Petrov downplayed the prospect of more sinister developments, saying Mr Kim was reported to have visited military units in recent days and had led the China delegation with no apparent difficulties.

He told The Australian he expected the conference to be held soon, with Kim Jong-un to perhaps be given a role in reviving the almost defunct KWP.

"The army won't be happy, but sooner or later the army has to be pushed back and the party pushed forward," Dr Petrov said.

Typhoon Kompasu, which hit the Korean Peninsula this month, is believed to have caused significant destruction of infrastructure in North Korea, although sources doubt this is the real reason for the postponement.

"They must have some ulterior motive in belatedly reporting a typhoon that hit two weeks ago.

"It seems that they're blaming the floods but really have some other reason to delay the congress," one source said.

Good Friends, an activist group for human rights in the North, quoted a North Korean source as saying the party congress was delayed because some party delegates had difficulties gathering in Pyongyang because of flooding.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/speculation-over-north-koreas-delay-in-anointing-kim-jong-ils-son-kim-jong-un/story-e6frg6so-1225925046205>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
September 17, 2010

## **U.S. Not to Accept N. Korea as Nuke Weapons Power: Campbell**

By Hwang Doo-hyong

WASHINGTON, Sept. 16 (Yonhap) -- The United States Thursday reiterated it will not accept North Korea as a nuclear weapons state, urging the North to cease provocations and abide by its denuclearization pledge.

"The U.S. position on the DPRK has remained constant: we will not accept North Korea as a nuclear weapons power," Kurt Campbell, assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific affairs, told a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing. DPRK stands for North Korea's official name, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

"The United States has underscored numerous times that North Korea can only achieve the security and international respect it seeks by ceasing its provocative behavior, improving its relations with its neighbors, complying with international law, and taking irreversible steps toward fulfilling its denuclearization commitments under the September 2005 Joint Statement," Campbell said.

The six-party deal signed in 2005 calls for North Korea's denuclearization in exchange for a massive economic aid, diplomatic recognition by Washington and Tokyo and a peace regime to replace the armistice that ended the 1950-53 Korean War. Signatories are the two Koreas, the U.S., China, Japan and Russia.

Talks for implementation of the agreement faltered early last year as the North launched a rocket and detonated a nuclear device, the second of its kind after one in 2006, inviting U.N. sanctions.

The North's torpedoing of the South Korean warship Cheonan in March aggravated the conditions for the resumption of the six-party nuclear talks, as Seoul and Washington seek Pyongyang's apology before any reopening of the talks. The North denies any responsibility for the sinking, which killed 46 sailors.

"The attack on the Cheonan served as a stark reminder of the importance of our alliance in the face of continued North Korean provocations and raised tensions to a level not seen in many years," Campbell said. "North Korea poses the most immediate risks to both South Korea and the stability of East Asia."

Wallace Gregson, assistant secretary of defense for Asian and Pacific security affairs, warned of further provocations from the North.

"North Korea may become emboldened to pursue even more provocative activities than we have witnessed in recent years, if it makes significant strides in its development of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technology," Gregson told the hearing. "Although North Korea's Taepodong-2 intercontinental ballistic missile has not yet reached the requisite level of technological refinement, the missile is theoretically capable of striking U.S. territory."

North Korea's rocket launch early last year is widely seen as a partial success, but Gregson noted the North's test firing of the Taepodong-1 over Japan in 1998 demonstrated "that at a minimum, it is capable of striking U.S. interests and allies in the Asia-Pacific."

The official also said he was concerned about North Korea's weapons technology transfer to Iran, without elaborating. "North Korea has demonstrated frequently their intent to violate a number of international norms, sanctions and resolutions to transfer forbidden military technology to more than one other party."

Gen. Walter Sharp, commander of the U.S. Forces in Korea, meanwhile, rebuffed North Korea's claim it has nothing to do with the Cheonan's sinking.

"North Korea launched a premeditated and unprovoked attack on the Republic of Korea navy ship, the Cheonan," Sharp told the hearing.

Sharp endorsed the outcome of the international probe, saying, "A shockwave and bubble effect generated by an underwater explosion of a North Korean-launched torpedo, at a depth of six to eight meters and three meters left of the center of the ship, caused the ROK ship the Cheonan to split apart and killed 46 sailors."

The United Nations Command in South Korea also established its own investigation team, and "concluded that North Korea attacked the Cheonan and it was a major armistice violation," said Sharp, who doubles as the UNC commander.

Gregson said the Cheonan incident might be "somehow tied into the mysterious succession politics inside North Korea."

There are rumors of an imminent meeting of the North's ruling Workers Party for the first time in three decades to anoint ailing leader Kim Jong-il's youngest son, Jong-un, as heir. The theory is that the junior Kim instigated the Cheonan attack to seek the military's support.

Similarly, Kim Jong-il is believed to have been behind the downing of a Korean Air plane that killed all 115 passengers aboard in 1987 while being groomed to succeed his father, Kim Il-sung.

Noting that the Korean Air flight's downing took place a year before Seoul hosted the Summer Olympics in 1988, Campbell linked the Cheonan incident to South Korea's hosting of the G-20 economic summit in November.

"The upcoming G-20 is a very big deal, very big deal for the South Koreans," he said. "It's the arrival of South Korea on the global stage; probably, again, the biggest diplomatic achievement in their history. And one could imagine that this would play into part of the dynamic that we've seen in North Korea."

Campbell also discussed China's reluctance to directly blame North Korea for the Cheonan's sinking.

"I think they believe that this is an incredibly critical period, perhaps a somewhat uncertain period in North Korea," he said. "They have told us that they believe that certain steps could drive North Korea to the wall. And that was not in their strategic interests."

The hearing came as Stephen Bosworth, U.S. special representative for North Korea policy, concluded a tour of Seoul, Tokyo and Beijing Thursday to discuss how to restart the nuclear talks.

Bosworth said in Beijing earlier in the day that he sees "no indication" that North Korea will apologize for the Cheonan's sinking, but is still optimistic.

"One of the things that we believe quite strongly is that as part of the process of re-engagement there has to be a re-engagement on the South-North axis as well, and I think there is some reason to be somewhat optimistic that at least part of that has begun," he said.

The U.S. envoy was discussing a series of conciliatory gestures Pyongyang has made in recent weeks.

The North has proposed a military dialogue with South Korea to defuse tensions, a new round of reunions of the families separated by the division of the Korean Peninsula at the end of World War II and the ensuing 1950-53 Korean War, returned seven crewmembers of a South Korean fishing boat caught along the sea border last month and requested aid to recover from recent flooding.

Bosworth said the U.S. will "continue to pursue basically a two-pronged strategy: On the one hand we continue to enforce the sanctions which have been put in place over the last year or more on the DPRK, but simultaneously we remain open to dialogue and constructive engagement."

He said that U.S. President Barack Obama will meet with Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao in New York next week on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly to discuss North Korea and other issues.

"It is clear that this area, this question of North Korea and the North Korean nuclear program, is seen by both governments as fundamental to our partnership and our relationship," he said.

Bosworth, former U.S. ambassador to South Korea, is visiting Seoul again Friday, Seoul officials said.

North Korean Vice Foreign Minister Pak Gil-yon is visiting New York next week to attend the U.N. General Assembly. State Department spokesman Philip Crowley said Wednesday that he knew nothing about any planned meeting between U.S. and North Korean officials in New York.

Talks were under way in March for a visit to New York by North Korea's chief nuclear envoy, Kim Kye-gwan, as a prelude to the resumption of the six-party talks, but they collapsed after the Cheonan's sinking.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2010/09/17/52/0301000000AEN20100917000400315F.HTML>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia to Overhaul Bulava Production if Tests Fail Again - Serdyukov**

17 September 2010

Russia will have to overhaul the whole production and manufacturing system of its troubled Bulava ballistic missile if this autumn's tests fail again, the defense minister said on Friday.

Anatoly Serdyukov said that if failures continue and their causes prove to be different, "then we will have to overhaul the whole system of production and [manufacture] control of these missiles."

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.

Bulava test launches were put on hold after the most recent failed launch, from the Dmitry Donskoy nuclear submarine in the White Sea on December 9, 2009, pending the results of a government investigation.

The failure was caused by a defective engine nozzle. A source close to state commission, which investigated the failure, said the malfunction was caused not by the design but by a manufacturing fault.

The next test launches, initially scheduled for mid-August, have repeatedly been postponed.

"The next three launches of the Bulava missile will be held until the first ice appears. We will definitely launch [the missiles]," Serdyukov said.

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.

The future development of the Bulava has been questioned by several lawmakers and defense industry officials, who suggest that all efforts should be focused on the existing Sineva SLBM.

WASHINGTON, September 17 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20100917/160619849.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20100917/160619849.html)

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

Turkish Weekly - Turkey

## **Russia, U.S. Still Disagree on Missile Shield - Russian Defense Min.**

17 September 2010

Russia and the U.S. still have some major disagreements on the missile defense issue, Russian Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov said on Friday.

The planned placement of U.S. missile defense elements in Eastern Europe, close to the Russian borders, remains a bone of contention in bilateral relations.

"The principal disagreement is that they [the U.S.] tell us: "our missile defense program is not aimed against you," while we say: "no, according to our calculations it actually is," the minister said during his visit to the U.S.

He said the Russian side proposed the U.S. to jointly evaluate present missile threats.

"Let's analyze them together and find out where they come from. After that we will be able to decide on how to counteract these threats and is it really necessary to deploy missile defense elements in the regions where [the deployment] is currently planned. Maybe, some other locations are possible," Serdyukov said.

He said that Russia was interested in joining missile defense efforts in Europe.

"We indeed want to take the most active part in this project. As missile defense elements are being deployed on the territory of Europe, we should not be left aside," the minister added.

NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen said Wednesday that leaders of the 28 NATO countries should invite Russia to take part in a project to create a missile defense system in Europe and that the invitation should be made at November's NATO summit in Lisbon.

For discussions on the missile defense issue, Russia and the U.S. are setting up a system of cooperation to involve experts, chiefs of general staffs and defense ministers, similar to the one used while negotiating the new strategic arms reduction treaty.

Serdyukov said that all disagreements would initially be discussed at the expert level, and if the talks fail, chiefs of general staffs will meet for debates. If disagreements remain, the foreign ministers will consider the matter.

"If we [defense ministers] also fail, then the issue will be raised to the presidential level, where political decisions will be made," the minister added.

*RIA Novosti*

<http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/107566/russia-u-s-still-disagree-on-missile-shield-russian-defense-min-.html>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.

## **Decision on £20bn Trident Renewal 'to be Delayed Until After the Next Election'**

By Daily Mail Reporter  
16th September 2010

- Decision on Trident replacement 'put off until 2015'
- Defence chief's warns - full trident replacement or zero
- Any delay to Trident 'would be unacceptable to Tories'

Senior Conservatives expressed alarm today after it was revealed the replacement of the UK's Trident nuclear deterrent could be put off until after 2015.

Ministers are considering delaying the planned 2014 date in a bid to reduce short-term costs and head off a pre-general election political row.

The Ministry of Defence said no decisions had yet been taken on the future of the submarine-based missile system - which is the subject of a value-for-money review.

It has been formally excluded from the ongoing strategic defence and security review but the Treasury has made clear the under-pressure Ministry of Defence budget will have to pay for it.

But Conservative MP Bernard Jenkin, a former defence spokesman and chairman of the Commons Public Administration Committee, warned that any delay would be unacceptable to Tories.

He said that putting off the 'main gate' decision - when the main spending on the project begins - would actually increase the long-term costs while casting doubt on the Government's commitment to maintain the nuclear deterrent.

'I don't think this will happen because it would disturb the Conservative Party very, very deeply,' he told BBC Radio 4's Today programme.

'This would be the maddest decision of them all. It would immediately cast doubt on whether the Government has actually got the resolve to follow through with the programme at all.

'If you delay, you reopen the whole question, you create uncertainty about how viable our existing deterrent would be and you raise questions about whether we actually resolve to remain the power with global reach and influence throughout the world that we are today.

'It is about what sort of country you want to be.'

The outgoing head of the armed forces also warned today that the Government might as well scrap the nuclear deterrent if the decision is taken to downgrade it.

Air Chief Marshal Sir Jock Stirrup said any lesser replacement for Trident would not be 'credible'.

But the prospect of a delay was welcomed by former Lib Dem leader Sir Menzies Campbell, who said it would provide an opportunity to look again at other weapons systems.

'We are in the midst of a wholesale defence review. You simply cannot proceed upon assumptions that had their origin in the Cold War,' he said.

'It seems to me that it makes a great deal of sense to allow us a breathing space to consider whether a like-for-like replacement - four boats, 192 warheads - is what is necessary for Britain's defence when we know there are other alternatives available.'

The news comes after it was claimed the huge costs involved may lead to Britain being without a constant nuclear threat for weeks at a time.

David Cameron's spokesman refused to rule out the rumoured plan which would see all four submarines in the nuclear fleet in port at certain times to cut costs.

The Prime Minister had previously given assurances that the deterrent would retain its year-round capabilities.

An influential committee of MPs yesterday warned that a decision to defer Trident's replacement would have 'very significant' consequences for future defence spending.

The Commons' Defence Select Committee expressed concern that the Strategic Defence and Security review is being carried out so quickly that 'serious mistakes' will be made.

This could undermine the Armed Forces, threatening the future defence of the realm, the MPs said.

Forcing the MoD to foot the bill for updating the Trident nuclear deterrent would also lead to 'very significant' cuts to the Army, Royal Navy and RAF, the committee warned.

The coalition agreement between the Tories and Lib Dems committed the Government to renewing Trident, but agreed that it should be scrutinised to ensure it offered value for money.

The deal allows the Lib Dems - who went into the general election opposing a like-for-like replacement of the missile system - to 'continue to make the case for alternatives'.

An MoD spokesman said: 'The Government remains committed to maintaining the UK's minimum and credible submarine-based nuclear deterrent, based on the Trident missile system.'

'Within the framework of the Strategic Defence and Security Review, a review is ongoing to ensure that the renewal of the deterrent provides value for money.'

'It will consider the programme timetable, numbers of submarines, missiles, missile tubes and warheads, infrastructure and other support costs, and the industrial supply chain.'

'Once the review has concluded, ministers will discuss and agree the optimum balance of capability and cost.'

Bernie Hamilton, national officer of the Unite union, which has members in the defence industry, said: 'If this report is correct the Tories stand accused of dereliction of duty and a failure to learn from the mistakes their party made in the past. More importantly their failure is threatening thousands of jobs.'

Labour leadership candidate Ed Miliband said: 'I believe the right approach is to include the decision about the replacement of Trident in the strategic defence review, so that we can make an informed decision about how best to maintain the minimum nuclear deterrent that Britain requires.'

'I think it's right that we seek to make savings where possible, but this decision by the coalition looks worryingly like a Government putting off the difficult political choices because they are too weak and too divided to take them, rather than showing the leadership and strength to make tough choices in the long-term interests of our country.'

Professor Malcolm Chalmers, of the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), said the significance of putting off the 'main gate' decision to go ahead and start building the new submarines depended on the length of the delay.

Prof Chalmers, a former adviser to Jack Straw and Margaret Beckett when they were foreign secretary, said: 'If what we are talking about is main gate taking place in 2015, then it's not a very significant slippage but the further it goes beyond that, the more significant it will be.'

'The delay can be as a result of both political and technical factors.'

'The longer you delay the main gate decision, the longer you delay the entry into service of the new generation of submarines.'

'When the decision was taken in 2007 to go ahead with the Trident renewal programme, the working assumption was the first submarines had to enter service in 2024 in order to ensure the existing generation of subs retired when they began to become unreliable.'

He said there was 'a little bit of wiggle room' but a longer delay could raise concerns that submarines would have to be kept in service 'longer than is operationally prudent'.

In a paper published in July, Prof Chalmers said that dropping the requirement that there is always at least one nuclear missile submarine on patrol at sea could make 'significant financial savings'.

He argued that the possibility of dropping this requirement could also provide room to delay the 'main gate' decision.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1312484/Decision-20bn-Trident-renewal-delayed-election.html#>

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

Financial Times – U.K.

## **Armed Forces Head Warns Against Downgrading Trident**

By James Blitz and Alex Barker

September 16, 2010

Sir Jock Stirrup, the head of Britain's armed forces, on Thursday led a strong counter-attack against recent suggestions that the country's independent nuclear deterrent might be downgraded to save money, warning such a move made "no strategic sense at all".

As the future of the nuclear deterrent was pushed to the forefront of political debate at Westminster, Sir Jock, the chief of defence staff, said Britain must retain "continuous at sea deterrence" so that a submarine carrying the Trident missile is at sea at all times.

With David Cameron's government entering the final stages of the Strategic Defence and Security Review, the retention of the doctrine of continuous at sea deterrence – or CASD – is emerging as critical to discussions over the cost and nature of the nuclear weapons programme.

Britain is at present committed to building four submarines to carry the deterrent at a cost of £20bn, with construction beginning in 2014 and the first new boat ready by 2019. The boats are needed because the current four Vanguard class submarines are coming to the end of their lives.

A decision to allow some flexibility to the CASD principle, however, could allow the rebuilding programme for the new submarine platform to be delayed by a number of years.

In that case the government could keep the current Vanguard boats in operation for longer, knowing that the UK would be prepared to tolerate having no boat at sea for short periods of time in the event of any breakdown.

A decision to delay the construction of the new boats would in turn take significant financial pressure off the MoD, which would not need to pay for the construction of a new fleet of submarines until the end of this decade.

Earlier this year, the Royal United Services Institute, a defence think tank, said: "Ending CASD now would further extend the service life of the existing submarines well beyond 2024, with significant savings, estimated at over £5bn."

The idea of risking CASD is being proposed by some Liberal Democrats and is thought to have support in the Treasury. But the notion that the UK might end up having a deterrent which is not at sea at all times is being vehemently opposed by leading government figures, including Liam Fox, the defence secretary, and Sir Jock, the outgoing chief of defence staff.

"We have to have the minimum credible deterrent," Sir Jock said on Thursday. "If you are not going to have that, then you are better off having zero."

Bernard Jenkin, chairman of the Commons public administration committee, also attacked any suggestion of Trident delay. "I don't think this will happen because it would disturb the Conservative party very, very deeply," he told the BBC.

"This would be the maddest decision of them all. It would immediately cast doubt on whether the government has actually got the resolve to follow through with the programme at all."

However, Sir Menzies Campbell, a former Liberal Democrat defence spokesman, said: "It seems to me that it makes a great deal of sense to allow us a breathing space to consider whether a like-for-like replacement – four boats, 192 warheads – is what is necessary for Britain's defence when we know there are other alternatives available."

Mr Fox has already accepted a more modest proposal that there could be a brief delay in the submarine building programme so that no money is spent on submarine replacement in the current spending review.

A delay in what is called the "Main Gate" decision, shifting it from 2014 to 2015, would allow the government to avoid spending an initial few hundred million pounds on the submarine programme in the current spending review.

However, the SDSR also needs to come to a comprehensive decision on what Britain's military posture will be in 2020. As a result, the National Security Council must decide what the structure and doctrine relating to the independent deterrent will be.

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/6afdc0c-c1c0-11df-9d90-00144feab49a.html>

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Panel Seeks Pentagon WMD Response Reforms**

Thursday, September 16, 2010

The U.S. Defense Department should revise numerous elements of its preparations for responding to attacks involving weapons of mass destruction, a congressionally established experts panel warned in a report issued yesterday (see *GSN*, Sept. 10).

The report outlines more than 40 steps Congress and the Obama administration could take to improve the country's WMD response capabilities. The panel, comprised of former high-level U.S. military officials, former lawmakers, National Guard officers and academic experts on disaster response, received support from RAND Corp. in completing the study.

"This is a matter of critical importance because such an incident will happen, and the stakes are too high to delay action," panel Chairman Steve Abbot said in a statement. "In our year of deliberations, we identified a number of findings and recommendations that will allow the Department of Defense to better support the civil authorities that will respond to a domestic disaster" (RAND Corp. release, Sept. 15).

The department wields many of the powers it would need to aid civilian agencies after a biological, chemical, radiological, nuclear or high-yield explosive strike, but the powers "are not widely known and are frequently misunderstood," says the document, prepared by the Advisory Panel on Department of Defense Capabilities for Support of Civil Authorities After Certain Incidents.

To help address the gap in understanding, the Pentagon could work on a handbook that "explains in comprehensive detail -- using scenarios as examples -- how DOD capabilities may be legally employed nationwide for support of civil authorities for CBRNE incidents," according to the panel. Federal and state agencies should also collaborate to "identify and resolve federal-state-local conflicts in authorities for CBRNE incident response," the report states.

"Unified command and control of federal and state military assets for CBRNE response continues to be problematic," adds the document, which calls for designated National Guard officers and certain other commanders to "command in dual status for CBRNE incidents and other defined contingencies."

The panel referred to a "lack of training authority" for WMD response as well as existing training measures that are "often inconsistent, fragmented or lacking fully developed standards." It called for the designation of a specific authority responsible for overseeing such training efforts.

In addition, the defense secretary should "identify and resource multiple regional training centers for CBRNE response training," and "provide the funding necessary for the training and readiness certification of forces with a designated CBRNE response mission," the report states.

To help address shortcomings in WMD response drills involving multiple federal agencies, the Homeland Security Department should "lead a comprehensive interagency evaluation of the adequacy and funding of federal CBRNE exercise programs and recommend changes for their improvement," according to the panel (Diane Barnes, *Global Security Newswire*, Sept. 16).

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20100916\\_3294.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20100916_3294.php)

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

Reno Gazette-Journal

## **US Conducts Non-Nuclear Underground Test in Nevada**

By KEN RITTER - Associated Press Writer  
September 16, 2010

LAS VEGAS (AP) — For the first time in four years, scientists conducted a non-nuclear experiment at the government's Nevada desert proving ground, an official with the federal National Nuclear Security Administration said Thursday.

There was no nuclear reaction and no release of radioactivity from the so-called subcritical test at 5:35 p.m. Wednesday at the recently renamed Nevada National Security Site, NNSA spokesman Darwin Morgan said.

Scientists from the government's Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico detonated explosives around radioactive material in a specially designed sphere in a vault some 1,000 feet beneath the former Nevada Test Site, Morgan said.

The experiment, dubbed Bacchus, was the 24th subcritical test since 1997 at the vast federal reservation 85 miles northwest of Las Vegas. The last was Unicorn on Aug. 30, 2006.

Subcritical experiments test the properties of plutonium but stop short of critical mass, the point at which a self-sustaining nuclear reaction occurs.



Federal officials call the experiments essential to test and maintain the safety and reliability of the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

Anti-nuclear groups criticize the experiments as contrary to the spirit of a 1996 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty on nuclear arms.

The U.S. Senate in 1999 rejected the treaty, but officials have said President Barack Obama plans to resubmit it for ratification.

The test site hosted 928 full-scale nuclear tests involving 1,021 nuclear detonations from 1951 to 1992, when the U.S. agreed to a moratorium on full-scale nuclear testing.

<http://www.rgj.com/article/20100916/NEWS07/100916010/-1/CARSON/US-conducts-non-nuclear-underground-test-in-Nevada>

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

Boston Globe

## **Couple Charged in Nuclear Weapons Secrets Case**

By Pete Yost, Associated Press Writer

September 17, 2010

WASHINGTON --A scientist and his wife who both once worked at Los Alamos National Laboratory were arrested Friday after an FBI sting operation and charged with conspiring to help develop a nuclear weapon for Venezuela.

After their arrest, the two appeared in federal court in Albuquerque, N.M.

They were accused of dealing with an FBI undercover agent posing as a Venezuelan agent. The government did not allege that Venezuela or anyone working for it sought U.S. secrets.

The pair were indicted for allegedly communicating classified nuclear weapons data to a person they believed to be a Venezuelan government official.

Accused in a 22-count indictment are Pedro Leonardo Mascheroni, 75, a naturalized U.S. citizen from Argentina, and Marjorie Roxby Mascheroni, 67, a U.S. citizen. Both were formerly contract employees at Los Alamos.

According to the indictment, Pedro Mascheroni told an undercover agent he could help Venezuela develop a nuclear bomb within 10 years and that under his program, Venezuela would use a secret, underground nuclear reactor to produce and enrich plutonium, and an open, aboveground reactor to produce nuclear energy.

In July 2008, the FBI agent provided Mascheroni with 12 questions purportedly from Venezuelan military and scientific personnel.

According to the criminal charges, Mascheroni delivered to a post office box in November 2008 a disk with a coded 132-page document on it that contained "restricted data" related to nuclear weapons. Written by Mascheroni and edited by his wife, the document was entitled "A Deterrence Program for Venezuela" and it laid out Mascheroni's nuclear weapons development program for Venezuela.

Mascheroni stated that the information he was providing was worth millions of dollars, and that his fee for producing the document was \$793,000, the indictment alleges.

Earlier in the investigation, Mascheroni allegedly asked the FBI agent about obtaining Venezuelan citizenship.

He told the undercover agent he should be addressed as "Luke," and that he would set up an e-mail account solely to communicate with the undercover agent, according to the indictment.

Mascheroni used the account to communicate with the agent and to arrange for deliveries of materials at the post office box used as a dead-drop location.

If convicted, the couple face up to life in prison.

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/09/17/couple\\_charged\\_in\\_nuclear\\_weapons\\_secrets\\_case/](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/washington/articles/2010/09/17/couple_charged_in_nuclear_weapons_secrets_case/)

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

Washington Times

OPINION

## **FISHER: China and START**

*Missile buildup may surpass U.S., Russia as they denuclearize*

By Richard D. Fisher Jr. - The Washington Times

Wednesday, September 15, 2010

Might China someday have more nuclear warheads than the United States? Then Russia? Inconceivable as it may sound, this could come to pass, because China may just be starting a period of double- or triple-digit annual growth in its warhead numbers as the Obama administration sets its sights on further U.S. warhead reductions, with little hope that China will join a regime of negotiated nuclear stability. But even if it did, would nuclear "parity" with China be in America's interest?

The new START Treaty signed in May commits the United States and Russia to a "parity" that reduces deployed nuclear warheads from 2,200 to 1,550 and reduces to 700 the number of deployed nuclear delivery vehicles. However, President Obama has made clear his intention to seek further reductions; late 2009 leaks to the press suggested further goals of 1,000 warheads or even fewer.

Since it started deploying intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) in the 1980s, China has refused to join in nuclear weapons negotiations. This did not matter as long as China deployed a small number, about 20 liquid-fueled 13,000-kilometer-range DF-5s with single warheads, until early this decade. Furthermore, China had lulled many analysts by regularly suggesting that it adheres to a doctrine of "minimum deterrence" that abjures U.S.- or Russian-level warhead numbers. But China has also rejected U.S. and Soviet levels of nuclear "transparency" as part of its deterrence calculus, with the result that nobody knows its nuclear force goals.

China began modernizing its nuclear missile forces by mid-decade, replacing early DF-5s with a similar number of improved DF-5A missiles based in stationary silos and deploying the new 7,000-to-8,000-kilometer-range, solid-fueled and mobile DF-31 and the larger 11,200-plus-kilometer-range DF-31A. In its latest report to the Congress on China's military released on Aug. 16, the Pentagon says there are less than 10 DF-31 and "10-15" DF-31A ICBMs, up to five more than reported in the previous year's report, covering 2008. However, in the 2010 issue of "Military Balance," Britain's International Institute of Strategic Studies notes there is one brigade of 12 DF-31s and two brigades or 24 DF-31A ICBMs, indicating a possible increase of one new brigade from 2008 to 2009.

In addition, China may be close to fielding two more long-range nuclear missiles. First is the new 7,200-plus-kilometer-range JL-2 submarine-launched ballistic missile. Though reported to be experiencing developmental challenges, when completed, 12 each will go on the new Type 094 nuclear ballistic missile submarine, which the Pentagon estimates will number at least five, for a potential total of 60 missiles. Then there is a new yet-unknown, larger ground-mobile ICBM which has been revealed in Chinese Internet-source images since 2007, but which the Pentagon did not publicly acknowledge until its latest China report. The distinguishing feature of the "DF-XX" is its use of a large, 16-wheel Russian-style transporter-erector-launcher (TEL), likely derived from Russian-Belarus technology imported in the late 1990s.

But here is where the real danger begins: The Pentagon also notes this new ICBM is "possibly capable of carrying multiple independently targeted re-entry vehicles (MIRV)." Starting in 2002, the Pentagon's China report noted the People's Liberation Army's (PLA) interest in developing multiple warheads, with more explicit language being used in the 2009 and 2010 reports. Might some PLA ICBMs already have multiple warheads? This analyst has been told by Asian military sources that the DF-31A already carries three warheads and that one deployed DF-5B carries five or six warheads. These sources speculate the new "DF-XX" may carry a similar number of warheads.

While it is not possible to confirm these disclosures from open sources, they point to an alarming possibility: China has crossed the multiple-warhead Rubicon and, with the possibility that it can build one brigade of DF-31A and DF-XX ICBMs a year, could be capable of annual double- or triple-digit increases in its deployed nuclear warheads. Chinese sources also suggest interest in developing longer-range versions of the JL-2, which could also be MIRV-capable. While a worst-case estimate, there is good reason to consider that China's warhead numbers could exceed 500 by 2020.

In addition, China may also be on its way to fielding a national missile-defense system by the 2020s. Its recent, successful Jan. 11 missile warhead interception test marks the culmination of China's second anti-ballistic missile (ABM) program; the first was ordered started by Mao Zedong in 1963 and was pursued until 1980. This stands in contrast with years of howling complaints by Chinese diplomats against American missile-defense programs and their fervent campaigning to ban outer-space weapons. Was this merely deception designed to limit American defensive programs while China gathered the capacity to pursue its own ABM and space-warfare programs?

These potential trends would logically cause one to ask: Why not talk to the Chinese about their nuclear strategic plans? Indeed, the administration's April Nuclear Posture Review calls for "strategic assurance dialogues" with China. However, not only has China traditionally rejected any "negotiations" regarding its nuclear forces, it won't even send its main nuclear missile forces commander on a courtesy visit to the United States. Normal military-to-military dialogue is regularly held hostage to Washington ending arms sales to democratic Taiwan.

But there is a deeper basic conflict: China wants to displace U.S. strategic leadership in Asia and is building military forces capable of defending its global interests, even if that means challenging the United States well beyond Asia. So until China achieves its desired level of global power, which may not include concepts of "parity," China may have no interest in "negotiations" that limit or even inform others about its nuclear weapons plans.

But even if the United States and China could agree on nuclear parity, that may come at the cost of America's Asian alliances. A larger and defended Chinese nuclear arsenal could greatly undermine the U.S. ability to extend its nuclear deterrent, accelerating the process of decoupling the United States from key allies like Japan, South Korea and Australia. America's ability to deter China will decline further when the administration implements its Nuclear Posture Review decision to retire U.S. nuclear-armed TLAM-N cruise missiles carried by secure U.S. submarines, replacing them with tactical nuclear bombs carried by more vulnerable U.S. jet fighters. And then one must consider Russia and its increasing political-military cooperation with China. Might Russia someday "tilt" its nuclear forces with China's to dissuade the United States from defending a future vital interest?

Countries like Taiwan, South Korea, Japan and India are today facing increased Chinese military pressures. They and the United States are also increasingly pressed to fund conventional military forces needed to deter China. It is indeed legitimate to ask if the current START Treaty gives the United States the ability to deter both Russia and a China just starting its strategic nuclear buildup. Furthermore, might START and intended follow-on agreements bring Asia closer to an era of nuclear proliferation and unforeseen instability?

*Richard D. Fisher Jr. is a senior fellow with the International Assessment and Strategy Center and author of "China's Military Modernization, Building for Regional and Global Reach" (Praeger, 2008).*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/sep/15/china-and-start/>

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

London Guardian – U.K.

OPINION

Comment is free

## **Trident Procrastination Weakens Britain's Deterrent**

*The coalition is understandably hesitant about committing to the cost of replacement – but it does affect our deterrent credibility*

By Lee Willett

Thursday, 16 September 2010

Britain is still a global power. It has worldwide interests (including overseas territories and resource dependencies) and global responsibilities it continues to uphold. Given the fact that nuclear weapons exist and large, upgraded arsenals are retained by several powers with whom the UK does not have any kind of alliance, it is easy to perceive circumstances in which the Britain might need to use the political leverage of its nuclear deterrent. While there may not appear at the moment to be an obvious, direct threat to UK territory, its global dependencies and reliance make it vulnerable to crises elsewhere. And even if Britain found a way to walk away from these dependencies, a deterrent would still be needed to defend the islands.

Existing and emerging nuclear powers provide risks that must be mitigated against, and other states could also seek and gain a nuclear weapons capability. If nothing else, the cold war taught the world that nuclear weapons have significant political leverage.

In the 2006 white paper, the Labour government explicitly denied that the possession of a nuclear deterrent had anything to do with generating global political influence.

Yet later, as prime minister, Gordon Brown showed exactly how nuclear weapons do have influence when offering to trade the UK's nuclear deterrent in the context of multilateral global disarmament. This influence remains so important that, despite fundamental changes in the way the world operates since the dawn of the nuclear age, the five permanent members of the United Nations security council remain the first five nuclear powers. If Britain was to stand down its deterrent, questions would be raised about its continuing right to retain its permanent seat faster than one could say "India".

The UK is the only nuclear power to deploy its deterrent in a single system. With a minimum force level, a submarine-based ballistic missile is the only credible option. (A cruise missile would have insufficient range and speed to provide a viable alternative, and in any case building a wholly new programme from scratch independently would cost more than the current system.) Discussions of numbers of submarines and deterrent postures are something of a red herring. The warheads are, after all, the nuclear weapon: everything else (submarines, missiles, infrastructure) just delivers them. William Hague, the foreign secretary, has already broken the mould by publicly

stating the number of warheads the UK stockpiles. The current operational posture is for the UK to deploy up to 48 warheads on the patrol submarine. The stockpile is large enough to generate 48 warheads for the patrol boat. Yet the scenario of the UK firing such a large number – despite the strategic logic being that this figure allows the UK to address all potential deterrent circumstances – seems so unlikely that there may be scope to reduce warheads, if not on the patrol boat then from the stockpile.

Today's news that the government is considering delaying the building of the replacement submarines by extending the life of the current boats is not new – the possibility was discussed actively during the 2006/2007 white paper debate. Given the UK's financial circumstances and the coalition's agreement to examine the deterrent's value for money, it was inevitable that the government would be examining all options within the strategic defence and security review. With the Liberal Democrat party conference looming, deferring the final decision until the next parliament buys the coalition partners political kudos and breathing space up to the next election. The deterrent is, as it always has been, a political tool, and this latest story is just another political twist in its life.

However, if the coalition government hopes that by deferring a final decision on the building of four new submarines will kick the debate itself into the long grass, it likely will find itself mistaken. One surety in the debate has been that every time a government has tried to avoid discussing the issue, this has only reignited the debate.

All this discussion does have one clear consequence, however. It creates doubt that Britain is committed to its deterrent tomorrow, thus weakening deterrent credibility today.

*Lee Willett is head of the Maritime Studies programme, in the Military Sciences Department at the Royal United Services Institute for Defence and Security Studies.*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2010/sep/16/trident-procrastination-weakens-britain-nuclear-deterrent>

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

Thursday, September 16, 2010

## **The No-Show North Koreans**

*The mysterious case of a missing party conference suggests trouble brewing in Pyongyang.*

By ANDREI LANKOV

For a week the world has awaited news from Pyongyang, where a rare conference of the ruling Korean Workers Party was scheduled to take place. North Korean media had announced the confab in July, and Kim Jong Il was expected to announce plans to transfer power to his third son, Kim Jong Eun. Not a small event, given the North's nuclear status, internal economic upheaval and recent, muscular threats against the South. And then—nothing happened.

Had the state media not made a clear and unequivocal statement about the conference's timing, the delay likely wouldn't have attracted much attention. But official documents gave specific dates for the event, which was to be the party's first conference in 44 years and the first formal gathering of its representatives in 30 years.

An inability to keep its promises on such crucial matters damages the government's standing with the public and worries the North's neighbors, China especially. Beijing wants a buffer authoritarian state between it and South Korea and props up the Kim regime to keep North Korean refugees from pouring over its border. The North's political stability also matters to leaders in Japan, South Korea and the United States, who worry about Pyongyang's nuclear threats. Even if the conference does eventually open, the initial holdup should not be ignored.

So what might have happened? Given the opacity of North Korean politics, nothing is known for sure. It is difficult to believe that the conference was postponed due to logistical problems. Housing a couple thousand representatives and moving them around town for few days hardly constitutes a major challenge, even for a nation as poor as North Korea. For a while it was speculated that the conference met covertly. One should remain skeptical about such rumors, which even intelligence agencies find hard to confirm. Nonetheless, some possibilities should be considered.

First, it is conceivable that factions within the North Korean elite, unhappy with Kim's chosen successor or the expected composition of the new leadership, managed somehow to block the conference. The dispute may have taken place among the regime's top functionaries, or it could easily have been a clash within the ruling family itself. North Korea's regime is far less united than is commonly assumed, and by now even Kim himself may be unable or unwilling to control the infighting.

Alternatively the delay might reflect Kim's growing inability to make reasonable judgments. Strange and apparently irrational decisions out of Pyongyang have grown more frequent over the last two years. There were the diplomatic fumbles that led to a complete halt in certain kinds of aid from South Korea, the regime's bungled attempt at currency reform last year and March's sinking of a South Korean warship in disputed waters—an unprovoked act which killed 46 sailors.

The first signs of erratic behavior appeared in late 2008, shortly after Kim suffered what is presumed to have been a stroke. If this is the case, then it is possible that Kim decided on a whim to hold a conference and then, just as impulsively, cancelled or postponed it. Such swings are not unexpected when dealing with a stroke patient, but this particular stroke patient happens to have complete control over a nuclear-powered nation of 24 million people.

Lastly, the Dear Leader simply may now be too sick to appear in public. North Korean media reported on Sept. 11 that he had taken a trip to a mine in a distant, northern part of the country, but the trip's date was not disclosed, and such reports are often bogus. Kim's health is a subject of intense speculation among South Korea's ruling circles, who are uneasy about the prospect of accepting control over the impoverished area in the event that the regime collapses. A photo of Kim with Chinese president Hu Jintao that was released earlier this month is not necessarily a good guide to his health.

Many other plausible explanations can and with all probability will be suggested over the next few days, but one thing seems fairly certain: Something unusual is afoot in Pyongyang. If the conference does not meet in the next few weeks, then we can be sure that the situation is very dire indeed.

*Mr. Lankov is a professor at Kookmin University in Seoul and a contributor to InLiberty.ru, an Atlas Economic Research Foundation project.*

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748703743504575494864110646700.html>

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