



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 849, 4 October 2010

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[Medvedev, Obama Discuss Process of New START Ratification](#)

[Lavrov Says 'Hot Potato' Deal is Near](#)

[GOP to Obama: START Treaty Still Far from Votes Needed for Ratification](#)

[Ahmed Chalabi: WMD Were 'Marginal' to Iraq Invasion](#)

[Iran Says It Arrested Computer Worm Suspects](#)

[Ahmadinejad Calls for US Leaders to be 'Buried'](#)

[Woodward Book Has Echoes for Iran Policy](#)

[Iran: Nuclear Delay Due to Leak, Not Computer Worm](#)

[China Vows to Enhance Ties with New NK Leadership](#)

[Japan to Probe Claims it Sought Nuclear Arms in 1960s](#)

[Russia's Nuclear Subs to Continue Arctic Navigation](#)

[Russia Increases Combat Capabilities in Arctic](#)

[Global Strike Command Reaches Full Operational Capability](#)

[Homeland Security Says Radiation Detector Decision Coming Within Year](#)

[Nuclear Funding gets Boost](#)

[9/11 Conspiracy Theories Rife in Muslim World](#)

[British Nukes vs. British Troops](#)

[India's Hegemonic Designs & Regional Peace](#)

[Trouble with the New Kim on the Block](#)

[A New START in Different Times](#)

[A Nuclear Venezuela?](#)

---

*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

## Medvedev, Obama Discuss Process of New START Ratification

1 October 2010

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and his U.S. counterpart Barack Obama discussed the process of ratifying the new strategic arms reduction treaty during a telephone conversation on Friday, the Kremlin's press service said.

"Medvedev and Obama praised the process made in the ratification of the new START treaty and confirmed their interest in continuing to synchronize work on bringing into force this strategically important agreement, which is in the interests of both countries and global security," a statement said.

The treaty was signed by the U.S. and Russian presidents on April 8 in Prague as a replacement for the START I treaty that expired in December 2009.

The agreement is yet to be ratified by both chambers of the Russian parliament and the U.S. Senate. The Russian and U.S. presidents earlier agreed that the ratification processes should be carried out simultaneously.

Earlier on Friday, U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton urged the Senate to ratify the treaty after the November 2 mid-term elections.

During the telephone conversation, the presidents also confirmed that they had concluded bilateral talks on Russia's accession to the World Trade Organization and exchanged views on a number of topical international issues.

"The U.S. and Russian presidents reaffirmed their readiness to coordinate steps to strengthen international and regional stability," the press service said.

MOSCOW, October 1 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20101001/160797384.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20101001/160797384.html)

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

The Moscow Times – Russian Federation

## Lavrov Says 'Hot Potato' Deal is Near

04 October 2010

By Bloomberg

Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov said the United States and Russia are close to reaching an agreement on missile defense, the "hot potato" issue that has held up the New START nuclear arms reduction treaty between the two countries.

Presidents Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev, who last met in June, agreed to come up with a joint expert review on the risks of missile proliferation, Lavrov said Friday in an interview published in Rossiiskaya Gazeta, the government's official newspaper.

"The paper should be ready soon," Lavrov said.

The next step will then be to examine common responses, together with the Europeans, beginning with diplomacy and not excluding military force, the foreign minister said.

U.S. missile defense plans were a cause for the deterioration of relations under former President George W. Bush, and Senate opposition to New START centers on concern that the treaty will cripple America's ability to develop a missile shield. The Obama administration has dismissed the criticism as unfounded as it seeks to win greater Russian cooperation on Iran and Afghanistan.

While Lavrov said missile defense remains a "hot potato," he praised the improvement in ties since the Obama administration called for a "reset" in relations last year.

Russia has welcomed the rapprochement, avoiding a harsh reaction to a summer spy scandal, in which 10 Russian agents were deported from the United States, and glossing over Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's reiteration in July of plans to speed up a missile defense system in Poland. Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov paid his first visit to the Pentagon in September, pledging closer cooperation with his U.S. counterpart, Robert Gates.

"You need to present your positions in talks, not through the microphone as was so often the case with the previous administration," Lavrov said. "The more we strengthen the fabric of our trade, investment and innovation relations, the firmer the Russian-American partnership will become."

Medvedev, who is seeking U.S. experience and capital to build a Russian “Silicon Valley” outside Moscow, has been willing to support U.S. policies on Iran and Afghanistan in return. Russia’s support for tighter UN sanctions against Iran because of its nuclear program this summer was “not an isolated action,” Lavrov said.

“I think Iran clearly heard the opinion of the international community,” said Lavrov, adding there’s “reason to believe” that Iran will soon return to talks in the “P5 Plus One” format comprising the United States, Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/lavrov-says-hot-potato-deal-is-near/418270.html>

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

The Hill

## **GOP to Obama: START Treaty Still Far from Votes Needed for Ratification**

By J. Taylor Rushing

October 4, 2010

Senate Republicans are warning the Obama administration that it still has work to do to ensure a successful ratification vote on the START treaty in a lame-duck session after the November elections.

GOP senators left the capital on Wednesday and Thursday repeatedly stating that the 14-4 bipartisan vote by the Foreign Relations Committee this month was no guarantee that the full Senate will follow suit.

Democratic leaders are eyeing a floor vote on the treaty sometime after Nov. 15, when the chamber convenes for a few weeks before adjourning for the Christmas holiday. But several other priorities are jockeying for space on the agenda, such as a showdown vote on extending the 2001 and 2003 tax cuts pushed through by the George W. Bush administration. That leaves a short window for action on the controversial treaty signed by President Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in Europe this spring.

The treaty aims to reduce missiles, warheads and launchers in both countries and would replace a previous agreement that expired in December. But ratification will require 67 votes by the Senate — the House does not vote on treaties — and Republicans have been vocal critics of the treaty for months, led by GOP Whip Jon Kyl (Ariz.).

Criticism has mostly centered around fears that the treaty endangers the U.S. by not taking strong enough steps to “modernize” the country’s existing arsenal of missiles. Produced and maintained with outdated technology, current missiles are too vulnerable to malfunction, Republicans claim.

“Things depend entirely on the administration’s commitment to nuclear modernization,” said Senate Republican Conference Chairman Lamar Alexander (Tenn.). “There are a number of us on the Republican side, led by Sen. Kyl, who want to make sure that we continue this path to make sure our nuclear weapon force is up to date.

“What we’ve seen, and the facilities that we have today, is really very appalling. It’s like building a Corvette in a Model T plant. So we’re withholding judgment.”

Kyl himself was tight-lipped when asked about the treaty on Wednesday, simply saying he didn’t know how he would vote on it.

Foreign Relations Committee Chairman John Kerry (D-Mass.), who has held months’ worth of hearings on the treaty, hedged last week when asked for a vote prediction but said he was optimistic that White House officials will persuade enough Republicans.

Lugar, the panel’s ranking Republican, was also optimistic.

“I think we’ll have a debate and ratify the treaty during this calendar year,” he said. “But I would be completely off-base on trying to predict the final vote.”

Besides Lugar, other leading Republicans said they still need convincing.

“Modernization is a significant issue,” said Sen. John McCain of Arizona, the party’s 2008 presidential nominee. “They’ve got to satisfy those concerns.”

There is some Republican support — Sens. Bob Corker of Tennessee, Johnny Isakson of Georgia and Lugar voted for the treaty in this month’s committee vote, as did all of the panel’s Democratic members.

Isakson said many Republicans will follow the lead of Lugar, who has spent years on the committee and is well-respected by the GOP caucus. But Isakson also said the administration will have to follow through on its pledge to assure Republicans that the country's missile arsenal is safe.

"The administration is going to have to live up to the commitment they made to us," Isakson said. "I think they will."

Corker also told The Hill his committee vote is no indication of his vote when the treaty comes up for a floor vote.

"I still have questions, and I still want them answered," Corker said. "We'll see, but I'm still undecided for now."

But several Republicans said their opposition is final. Sen. Jim DeMint (R-S.C.), who voted against the treaty during the committee vote, said he did not believe the administration could present a convincing case for modernization.

"The treaty is built on a platform that assumes parity with Russia," DeMint said. "It creates this impression that we're going to be safer when in fact I think it makes the world more dangerous. It is also built on the assumption that we will continue this strategy of mutually assured destruction. I think it's fundamentally flawed. I don't think I'm 'swing-able.'"

<http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/122289-gop-to-obama-start-treaty-still-far-from-ratification>

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

The Atlantic

## Ahmed Chalabi: WMD Were 'Marginal' to Iraq Invasion

October 1, 2010

By Max Fisher

Former Iraqi leader Ahmed Chalabi, who served as President of the Governing Council of Iraq immediately after the U.S. invasion he helped organize, said at the Washington Ideas Forum that he still feels the 2003 invasion was worthwhile.

"Getting rid of Saddam was certainly justified," he told Washington Post columnist Sally Quinn in their conversation at the Newseum in Washington, D.C. He said of his famously influential support for the war, "We were concerned about Saddam's oppression." He added when Quinn asked about the alleged weapons of mass destruction that never materialized, "The weapons of mass destruction was to our view a marginal issue."

Quinn introduced Chalabi, whom she famously profiled as "The Man Who Would Succeed Saddam" in 2003, as "rejected by your political system, rejected by the American political system." In the years after working closely with the Bush administration in support of the invasion and then briefly serving as president of the country's U.S.-dominated provisional government, Chalabi has been vilified in both countries for his role. His many critics accuse him of misleading the U.S. into war by providing intelligence that Saddam Hussein's Iraq aided al-Qaeda and possessed weapons of mass destruction, both central rationales for the invasion for which evidence has never materialized.

Discussing his fall from favor in the U.S., Quinn suggested, "You have been essentially blamed by the CIA." Chalabi responded that "There was a great game of blame-shifting" after the invasion and occupation of Iraq fell apart. He said that he no longer has a relationship with the CIA. Chalabi, asked by Quinn about the alleged weapons of mass destruction, carefully refused to admit fault or to say that he stood by his 2003 claims.

Quinn also noted that Chalabi has been besieged by accusations that he is an Iranian agent sent to Washington to facilitate the removal of Saddam Hussein, then Iran's worst enemy. Chalabi denied the charge when Quinn, laughing at the question, asked him if he worked for Iran. However, when Quinn pushed for Chalabi to denounce Iran's behavior, he replied, "My relationship with the Iranians is close and they are our neighbors." He said he wanted to avoid conflict and promote cooperation between Iran and Iraq. Chalabi resisted when Quinn prodded him to criticize Iran, pushing against her suggestion that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is a "crazy person." He responded, "I don't think he's a crazy person. I think he's a smart man." Chalabi deflected Quinn's criticism of Ahmadinejad's recent accusation at the United Nations General Assembly that the U.S. caused Sept. 11, a view that Chalabi called "nonsense" but "prevalent in the region."

When asked about Turkey's recent turn towards a democratically elected but more strongly Islamic government, Chalabi said, "Turkey is a good model to follow." When Quinn protested, he countered, "The Turkish people are opting for an identity that does not deny their Islamic roots."

<http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2010/10/ahmed-chalabi-wmd-were-marginal-to-iraq-invasion/63919/>

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

New York Times  
October 3, 2010

## **Iran Says It Arrested Computer Worm Suspects**

By WILLIAM YONG  
Page – A10

TEHRAN — Iran has arrested an unspecified number of “nuclear spies” in connection with a damaging worm that has infected computers in its nuclear program, the intelligence minister, Heydar Moslehi, said Saturday.

Mr. Moslehi also told the semiofficial Mehr news agency that the ministry had achieved “complete mastery” over government computer systems and was able to counter any cyberattacks by “enemy spy services.”

Iran confirmed last week that the Stuxnet worm, a malicious self-replicating program that attacks computers that control industrial plants, had infected computers in its nuclear operations. Officials said it had been found in personal computers at the Bushehr nuclear plant, a power generator that is not believed to be part of a weapons program, and that it had not caused “serious damage” to government systems.

While the origins of the worm remain obscure, many computer security experts believe it was created by a government with the intent of sabotaging Iran’s nuclear program, which Western countries believe is aimed at creating a nuclear weapon. The United States and Israel have cyberwarfare programs and both countries have sought to undermine Iran’s nuclear enrichment program, but neither has commented on the Stuxnet worm.

Iran has portrayed the worm as a cyberattack by Western powers and Israel intended to derail the country’s nuclear program, which the government says is for peaceful purposes.

“All of the destructive activities perpetrated by the oppressors in cyberspace will be discovered quickly and means of combating these plans will be implemented,” Mr. Moslehi said. “The intelligence Ministry is aware of a range of activities being carried out against the Islamic Republic by enemy spy services.”

He provided no further details on the arrests, which could not be independently verified.

Hamid Alipour, an official at the state-run Iran Information Technology company, has said that the worm is spreading. “This is not a stable virus,” he said last week. “By the time we started to combat it three new variants had been distributed.” He said his company hoped to eliminate it within “one to two months.”

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/03/world/middleeast/03iran.html>

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

Washington Post

## **Ahmadinejad Calls for US Leaders to be 'Buried'**

By ALI AKBAR DAREINI, Associated Press  
Sunday, October 3, 2010

TEHRAN, Iran -- Iran's president Sunday called for U.S. leaders to be "buried" in response to what he says are American threats of military attack against Tehran's nuclear program.

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is known for brash rhetoric in addressing the West, but in a speech Sunday he went a step further using a deeply offensive insult in response to U.S. statements that the military option against Iran is still on the table.

"May the undertaker bury you, your table and your body, which has soiled the world," he said using language in Iran reserved for hated enemies.

Several top U.S. officials including Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff have said in recent months that the military option remains on the table and there is a plan to attack Iran, although a military strike has been described as a bad idea.

The crowd of military men and clerics in the town of Hashtgerd just west of the capital chuckled at the president's insult and applauded.

The speech was broadcast by both state television and the official English-language Press TV, but the latter glossed over the insult in the simultaneous translation.

Ahmadinejad's remarks come in sharp contrast to ones he made to Al-Jazeera Arabic news channel in August in which he offered the U.S. Iran's friendship.

In Sunday's speech, Ahmadinejad also questioned once more who was behind the Sept. 11 attacks in the U.S. and said they gave Washington a pretext for seeking to dominate the region and plunder its oil wealth.

During his speech in front of the United Nations General Assembly in New York, he said a majority of people in the U.S. and around the world believe the American government staged the attacks, drawing a strong rebuke from President Barack Obama.

Ahmadinejad often resorts to provocative statements to lash out enemies. He has already compared the power of Iran's enemies to a "mosquito," saying Iran deals with the West over its nuclear activities from a position of power and he has likened the United States to a "farm animal trapped in a quagmire" in Afghanistan.

Iran also condemned the latest U.S. sanctions slapped on eight Iranian officials Wednesday, saying they show American interference in Tehran's domestic affairs.

Washington this week imposed travel and financial sanctions on the eight Iranians, accusing them of taking part in human rights abuses during the turmoil following Iran's June 2009 presidential election.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/03/AR2010100301027.html>

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

New York Times  
October 4, 2010

## **Woodward Book Has Echoes for Iran Policy**

By JOHN VINOCCUR

PARIS — Two days after he was elected president in November 2008, Barack Obama met with Mike McConnell, the director of national intelligence, for a briefing on America's most highly classified operations and capabilities.

Among other things, Mr. McConnell told the president-elect that Iran's nuclear program had been penetrated, in part, by U.S. intelligence. He said he held the conviction that Iran was going to get a nuclear weapon that it would detonate, presumably as a test, in the period between 2010 and 2015, and that this would "create an incredibly unstable situation in the Middle East."

Several days later, at a meeting with Adm. Mike Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Mr. Obama told the admiral he planned to open a dialogue with the Iranians.

These accounts are contained in Bob Woodward's new book, "Obama's Wars." Over 441 pages, they stack up as relatively marginal details alongside the author's often verbatim reporting of the Obama administration's continuing struggle to come up with a consistent policy for the war in Afghanistan.

But in describing how the administration's goals became fixated on finding a date when U.S. forces would begin to leave the country, and how the original objective of "defeating" the Taliban became "disrupting" them, and then "degrading" the insurgents, the book's essential meaning for allied governments is likely to be in the indications it provides of a United States for which "winning" has become a soft notion, open to interpretation.

Today, this concern — notably in France — often relates to Iran because the allies, as the book asserts, play a minor fighting role in the war in Afghanistan that is without constant impact on their domestic politics. Because the French, and many Americans in an election year, are emphasizing that a nuclear-armed Iran is an ultimately greater concern, the book tends to reinforce the questions of some of the allies about the Obama administration's resolve to stop the mullahs' drive.

On one hand, the United States acknowledged estimates this summer that Iran is now in possession of enough low-enriched uranium to produce, with further enrichment, two nuclear weapons, and can manufacture one in about a year. (The administration has said nothing thus far about whether current cyberattacks from unknown sources on the Iranian nuclear program's computers would lengthen these estimates.)

On the other, an informed source said that Gary Samore, a special assistant to the president and White House director for nuclear issues, was in Europe telling experts last week that there was time for diplomacy involving Iran — up to 24 months.

Such a seemingly lengthy period of time could be based on a U.S. assessment of how close the mullahs' regime is to a concession, or even collapse, under the pressure of sanctions and internal Iranian political dissent.

But a notion of nonurgency concerning Iran — while “Obama’s Wars” quotes Mr. Obama’s maxim for Afghanistan as being “Faster in, faster out” — has not gone down easily with countries like France, Britain and Israel who rely on their own estimates of a narrower time frame for confronting Tehran.

Indeed, it contrasted with a statement from a high official of a European allied nation three weeks ago that, in relation to Iran’s nuclear plans, any “further loss of time will be disastrous.”

As for the book, it goes to doubts — expressed semi-privately by President Nicolas Sarkozy of France — about the U.S. president’s basic views of the world and America’s concept in 2010 of victory and defeat.

Three examples:

Mr. Woodward, reporting on a conversation with Gen. James L. Jones, the president’s national security adviser, three weeks after Mr. Obama’s Cairo outreach speech to the Islamic world in 2009, has General Jones defining the fight against international terrorism with the phrases: “It’s certainly a clash of civilizations. It’s a clash of religions. It’s a clash of almost how to live.”

As for the supposed problems of some allied leaders in getting an intimate sense of Mr. Obama’s personal convictions, John Podesta, who ran the president’s White House transition team, seemed to confirm the difficulty. Mr. Woodward wrote, “Podesta was not sure that Obama felt anything, especially in his gut.”

Most remarkably, the author told of asking the president directly, “You can’t lose a war or be perceived to lose one, can you?”

Mr. Woodward said Mr. Obama replied: “I think about it not so much in the classic, do you lose a war on my watch? (sic) I think about it more in terms of, do you successfully prosecute a strategy that results in the country being stronger rather than weaker at the end of it?”

The remark might sound vague in relation to America’s presumed instincts. It is neither the omnipresent win or lose of American sports, nor the profit-and-loss, black-ink, red-ink ledgers of American business and American life.

I asked someone who might be called a European defense intellectual with close ties to the French government about that. The reply: “An America that debates whether it should win a war it’s in is a very frightening prospect.”

Readers of Mr. Woodward’s book will also note that it does not prophesy less ambiguity soon about the United States’ level of military determination.

If that is the immediate lesson concerning Iran coming out of “Obama’s Wars,” Israel is very unlikely to wait for a less hesitant U.S. policy on Tehran’s nuclear ambitions, or shy from a determined response if its own red lines are crossed by the mullahs.

Supplemental detail: according to a trans-Atlantic German Marshall Fund poll last month, both American (68 percent) and French (58 percent) public opinion say “yes” to the use of military force against Iran rather than accepting it as a nuclear weapons state should all nonmilitary preventive efforts fail.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/05/us/05iht-politicus.html?partner=rss&emc=rss>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

## **Iran: Nuclear Delay Due to Leak, Not Computer Worm**

By ALI AKBAR DAREINI, Associated Press Writer

Monday, October 4, 2010

TEHRAN, Iran (AP) -- A months-long delay in starting up Iran's first nuclear power plant is the result of a small leak, not a computer worm that was found on the laptops of several plant employees, the country's nuclear chief said Monday.

The leak occurred in a storage pool where the plant's fuel is being held before being fed into the reactor core, and it has been fixed, said Ali Akbar Salehi, who is also Iran's vice president. He did not specify whether it was nuclear fuel or another material that leaked. He first announced the delay on Thursday but without giving a reason.

Iranian officials say they are vigorously battling the Stuxnet computer worm, which they suspect is part of a covert plot by the West to damage Iran's nuclear work. The United States, Israel and others accuse Iran of seeking to use the Bushehr power plant and other civil nuclear sites as a cover for a secret program to develop atomic weapons.

Iran denies any nuclear weapons ambitions and says its program is only for peaceful purposes like power generation and medical research.

The malicious computer code, designed to take over industrial sites like power plants, has also emerged in India, Indonesia and the U.S. But it has spread the most in Iran.

Though it infected several personal computers of workers at the Bushehr plant, Iran says the facility's main systems were not affected. Still, that was the first public sign to emerge that the code has hit computers linked to Iran's nuclear program.

The delay at Bushehr has no connection with Stuxnet, Salehi said, according to a report in the official IRNA news agency.

"During a washing process prior to loading the actual nuclear fuel, a small leak was observed in a pool next to the reactor and was fixed. This leak delayed activities for a few days," IRNA quoted Salehi as saying.

At the plant's inauguration on Aug. 21, Salehi had said loading the fuel into the reactor core would take place over two weeks and the plant would then produce electricity two months later in November.

Now, he says, fuel will be transferred to the core in mid-October and that the plant will produce electricity in early 2011.

Iran's Intelligence Minister Heidar Moslehi said Saturday that experts in the country have determined how to fight off the Stuxnet computer worm. In the same statement, he announced the arrests of several nuclear spies but he gave no details and did not clearly link them to the investigation into Stuxnet.

Who created the Stuxnet code and what its precise target is, if any, remains a mystery. Some foreign experts have speculated it was designed to target Tehran's nuclear program.

The web security firm Symantec Corp. says the computer worm was likely spawned by a government or a well-funded private group. It was apparently constructed by a small team of as many as five to 10 highly educated and well-funded hackers, Symantec says.

The Bushehr plant has stood outside the current controversy over Iran's nuclear program since Russia will be providing the fuel for the plant and supervising its disposal.

But other aspects of Iran's nuclear work, especially its enrichment of uranium, are of concern to the United States and other world powers. Enrichment can be used to produce weapons as well as make fuel for power plants.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2010/10/04/international/i055132D69.DTL>

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

Seattle Times

## **China Vows to Enhance Ties with New NK Leadership**

By The Associated Press

October 2, 2010

BEIJING --China's president on Saturday welcomed North Korea's election of a new slate of communist party leaders and promised to continue close ties -- an expected but important affirmation of the two countries' relationship from the North's closest ally.

The comments were Hu Jintao's first on the new leadership since a key ruling party conference in North Korea at which the youngest son of ruler Kim Jong Il was introduced to the world and given key posts that confirmed speculation he was being groomed to eventually succeed his ailing 68-year-old father.

Hu said China's Communist Party will work with North Korea's ruling party to "strengthen communication and coordination in regional and international affairs, and continue endeavors for the region's peace, stability and common development," according to the state-run Xinhua News Agency. He was speaking during a meeting with a North Korean delegation.

During the recent Workers' Party convention, Kim's son, Kim Jong Un, was given key party positions after being elevated to four-star general the day before the meeting.

China is North Korea's most important ally, so it's unsurprising that Hu congratulated the regime's new leaders -- saying they would bring about "new achievements." But the message affirmed that China stands behind the impoverished and increasingly isolated country as a transition is made -- support that is vital to its survival.

"The Chinese backing will empower Kim Jong Un in the succession process," said Kim Yong-hyun, an expert on North Korea at Seoul's Dongguk University.



In August, when Kim Jong Il visited China, there were reports that he brought along his 20-something son, though that has not been confirmed. The trip led to speculation that Kim may have introduced his son to Chinese officials to win their understanding on the succession.

It's not clear if the new leadership in North Korea -- which continues to develop its missile and nuclear programs in defiance of U.N. and other sanctions -- will change its combative stance toward the international community. Only hours after the party conference ended, the regime again threatened to expand its nuclear arsenal.

While North Korea has expressed willingness to rejoin international talks aimed at dismantling its nuclear programs, Washington has said the North must first take specific moves to demonstrate its sincerity. North Korea pulled out of the negotiations last year after an uproar over a suspected missile test.

[http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2013053387\\_apaschinanorthkorea.html?syndication=rss](http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2013053387_apaschinanorthkorea.html?syndication=rss)

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

Spacewar.com

## **Japan to Probe Claims it Sought Nuclear Arms in 1960s**

Monday, October 4, 2010

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

TOKYO - Japan is to investigate a report that it considered arming itself with nuclear weapons in the late 1960s despite its pacifist vow to shun them, a senior government official said Monday.

Public broadcaster NHK reported that Japan secretly considered going nuclear and sought advice from what was then West Germany in meetings with foreign ministry officials in February 1969 in the Japanese resort of Hakone.

The report cited confidential West German foreign ministry documents.

Japanese Foreign Minister Seiji Maehara has ordered his ministry to investigate the report, State Secretary for Foreign Affairs Takeaki Matsumoto told a news conference.

Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshito Sengoku, the top government spokesman, said details of the allegation needed to be clarified, including which "chain of command" was responsible for such talks.

Japan, the only nation to be attacked with nuclear weapons, was hit with two atomic bombs by the United States in the closing days of World War II.

It has maintained its policy against the possession, production and presence of nuclear weapons in its territory since 1967.

The non-nuclear principles were first declared by then-prime minister Eisaku Sato in 1967 and a resolution to abide by them was adopted in parliament in 1971.

In the secret talks, the Japanese side said it had sufficient technology to produce nuclear weapons to guard itself against the nuclearisation of the region after China conducted a nuclear test in 1964, NHK reported.

But Germany, divided after World War II, responded that it would be difficult to cooperate with any Japanese nuclear ambitions.

<http://www.spacewar.com/afp/101004103323.evfaikfd.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia's Nuclear Subs to Continue Arctic Navigation**

1 October 2010

Russia's nuclear-power submarines will continue under-ice navigation in the Arctic, a senior Navy official said on Friday.

"Russia's nuclear-powered submarines will maintain an operative regime in the Arctic waters to ensure security" the official said.

Russia's military presence in the Arctic is crucial to the "implementation of the country's foreign policy priorities," he said.

Russia and other countries with an Arctic coastline all lay claims to the region's seabed, said to contain one quarter of the world's mineral resources. The untapped riches are becoming more accessible due to melting ice.

Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin told a recent international conference in Moscow that the Arctic would not become a battleground as potential territory disputes could be resolved through negotiation.

MOSCOW, October 1 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20101001/160795467.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20101001/160795467.html)

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Increases Combat Capabilities in Arctic**

2 October 2010

Russia is currently increasing its combat potential in the Arctic with new ships and additional station sites, Navy Commander Adm. Vladimir Vysotsky said on Saturday.

Russian naval ships and submarines have already conducted over ten military patrols of the Arctic in 2010, Vysotsky said.

"In accordance with the Russian Armed Forces' plan of strategic deterrence we take measures aimed to demonstrate military presence in the Arctic," the navy commander said.

The Russian Navy is currently taking measures to integrate the Glonass satellite system with the RSDN-20 radio-technical navigation system, he added.

The RSDN-20 is a navaid used to determine positions of aircraft, vessels and submarines; however its effectiveness is low. Integration with Glonass will allow the system to determine positions of objects with the accuracy of 1-5 kilometers.

Glonass - the Global Navigation Satellite System - is the Russian equivalent of the U.S. Global Positioning System, or GPS, and is designed for both military and civilian use. Both systems allow users to determine their positions to within a few meters.

Russia and other countries with an Arctic coastline all lay claims to the region's seabed, said to contain one quarter of the world's mineral resources. The untapped riches are becoming more accessible due to melting ice.

Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin told a recent international conference in Moscow that the Arctic would not become a battleground as potential territory disputes could be resolved through negotiation.

MOSCOW, October 2 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20101002/160804543.html>

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

Air Force News Service

## **Global Strike Command Reaches Full Operational Capability**

1 October 2010

Courtesy of Air Force Global Strike Command Public Affairs

BARKSDALE AIR FORCE BASE, La. (AFNS) -- Officials declared Air Force Global Strike Command to be at full operational capability Sept. 30, on schedule, and less than 14 months after its initial activation as a command.

To reach that milestone, the command accomplished more than 700 action items identified by the secretary and chief of staff of the Air Force in 2009, when they chartered Global Strike Command to strengthen the nuclear enterprise by aligning all Air Force long-range nuclear-capable forces under a single command.

Lt. Gen. Frank G. Klotz, the Global Strike Command commander, reported full operational capability status in a memorandum to the secretary and the chief of staff of the Air Force today.

Full operational capability status is the final step in any military unit's stand up. Air Force Global Strike Command is the first completely new major command the Air Force has activated in more than 27 years.

"Our successful stand up was possible because of the commitment, innovative spirit, and sheer hard work of Global Strike Command Airmen," General Klotz said.

"This talented team of professionals put in place all the functions of a major command while simultaneously executing those functions," he said. "This unique challenge was a lot like building an aircraft while actually flying it."

Prior to activation as a major command, what was then Air Force Global Strike Command, Provisional was launched in January 2009, at Bolling Air Force Base, Washington D.C., under the leadership of then-Brig. Gen. James M. Kowalski, now a two-star general and the command's vice commander.

General Kowalski has been nominated by the president, and confirmed by the Senate, for a third star and to become the next AFGSC commander when General Klotz retires next year.

The command was formally activated at Barksdale AFB on Aug. 7 2009, on the premise that no mission is more important than operating, maintaining, securing and supporting the nuclear enterprise, officials said.

Since then, according to General Klotz's official memo, the command has established and manned a fully-functional headquarters. It also assumed responsibility for all units of both 20th Air Force, headquartered at F.E. Warren AFB, Wyo., and 8th Air Force, headquartered at Barksdale AFB.

The command is fully engaged in long-range planning for the nuclear deterrence and global strike mission, now having in place a strategic master plan that aligns AFGSC with the larger Air Force strategic plan.

Global Strike Command assumes full responsibility for planning, programming and financial management activities Oct. 1, and will be lead for both sustainment and modernization of the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles operated out of F.E. Warren AFB; Minot AFB, N.D.; and Malmstrom AFB, Mont.; the B-52 Stratofortress nuclear-capable bombers here and at Minot AFB; and the B-2 Spirit nuclear-capable bombers at Whiteman AFB, Mo.; as well as UH-1N Huey helicopters.

The command has also established an inspector general function and has already conducted at least one major inspection at each of the command's six operational wings, the general said.

Additionally, the command formed a crisis action team, as well as a response task force to deal with emergency situations and potential incidents.

Other command missions include targeting analysis at the 625th Strategic Operations Squadron at Offutt AFB, Neb., and the ICBM test launch operations of the 576th Flight Test Squadron at Vandenberg AFB, Calif.

[http://www.af.mil/news/story\\_print.asp?id=123224563](http://www.af.mil/news/story_print.asp?id=123224563)

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Homeland Security Says Radiation Detector Decision Coming Within Year**

Friday, October 1, 2010

By Martin Matishak

WASHINGTON -- The newly installed head of a key U.S. Homeland Security Department office yesterday pledged to wrap up work on the next generation of radiation detection monitors within the coming year (see *GSN*, Sept. 16).

The department's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office will also develop a long-awaited strategy to prevent the smuggling into the country of nuclear-weapon materials and deliver the blueprint to lawmakers before the end of 2010, according to DNDO chief Warren Stern.

"I believe that we are at a turning point and we are beginning to move in the right direction," Stern, who was appointed to the post in August by President Barack Obama last month, told the House Homeland Security technology subcommittee.

The Advanced Spectroscopic Portal detection system has successfully completed a battery of technical tests to determine if it can in fact find radioactive material. The device will soon begin a new round of operational and field validation tests, he said.

That leg of tests should end early next year and, if successful, would be followed by a cost-benefit analysis. That study would then be presented to the department's acquisition board, which could give the effort the green light to go to the homeland security secretary for certification, Stern told the panel. After that it would be fielded as a secondary scanning device at U.S. borders and ports of entry.

The detection office was established by presidential directive in 2005 to coordinate federal efforts to protect the United States against nuclear terrorists and designated to be the lead agency in domestic nuclear detection. Stern took over leadership of the agency in the latest stop on a decades-long career that has included stints at the CIA, the International Atomic Energy Agency and, most recently, the State Department.

He said the DHS office has trained roughly 15,000 state and local law enforcement officials across the country in radiation detection operations. It has also deployed 1,500 radiation portal monitors and 3,000 hand-held detectors to the nation's borders to support Customs and Border Protection and set up 6,500 detectors with the Coast Guard, he said.

The office has also "launched more than 250 research and development projects with National Laboratory, academic, and industrial partners, aimed at advancing detection technologies," according to a July DHS document.

Still, the agency "has had some low-profile successes and high-profile failures" in all areas of its mission, panel Chairwoman Yvette Clarke (D-N.Y.) said in her opening statement.

The detection office has received roughly \$4 billion in funding since its inception, according to a recent Government Accountability Office statement. Some of that money was spent on expanding existing programs at other DHS components, including deploying radiation portal monitors at U.S. points of entry.

The agency spent roughly \$230 million over four years attempting to develop and field the ASP system. The new machines were designed to not only detect radiation but identify the nature of its source. Proponents claimed the devices, each expected to cost approximately \$822,000, would eliminate time-consuming secondary inspections to determine whether a material was in fact dangerous.

Homeland Security officials had hoped to deploy 1,400 of the machines at a cost of roughly \$1.2 billion. However, in March the detection office announced it would end development of the monitors as a primary screening tool after the system was discovered to be susceptible to false alarms.

"We were led to believe that it would be a crucial aspect of primary [inspection,] not only in terms of being able to detect more precisely but also to, in essence, speed up the system," said the panel's ranking Republican, Dan Lungren (Calif.).

Clarke told Stern the program "has morphed from a promising technology offering the hope of improved security and commercial efficiency to a symbol of failure for your office."

"You have to bring that program to a satisfactory conclusion, one way or another, in the very near future. Your credibility, and the future success of DNDO, depends on it," the New York lawmaker warned.

Stern explained that the program's testing is an iterative process, a method for reaching a desired result by a repeated cycle of operations, and that it underwent field validation once before in which operational problems were identified. He did not specify what those glitches entailed.

"I will strongly caution you that proposing several more rounds of testing is not going to go over too well with me, my ranking member, or other members of this subcommittee," Clarke said.

Stern conceded that the then-nascent department moved too aggressively on the ASP effort. He could not guarantee the monitors would pass the next round of field tests.

The new DNDO chief also told the panel that the detection office would end "essentially now" the Cargo Advanced Automated Radiography System, which border guards would have used to detect and identify highly shielded nuclear material in vehicles and cargo containers at U.S. ports of entry.

The department canceled the acquisition phase of the program in 2007 and converted it to a research and development effort after detection office officials found that Customs and Border Protection did not want the devices because they would not properly fit in primary vehicle inspection lanes, leading to significant delays.

Stern said the need for such a technology still exists but that intense cooperation and coordination between the detection office and its potential client agencies must happen earlier in the development process.

He predicted, without elaborating, that some technology developed for the CAARS program would be incorporated into other detection office efforts.

Lungren said the troubles in the ASP and CAARS programs led him to wonder if "we accepted less than the best or the pursuit of the perfect interfered with us trying to deliver usable items that would quantitatively improve the status quo."

The detection office also plans to submit its strategic plan, dubbed the global nuclear detection architecture, before the end of the calendar year, according to Stern.

The Government Accountability Office in 2001 first suggested the program, which is intended to close existing vulnerabilities and alert federal agencies to their roles in preventing terrorists from detonating a nuclear or radiological bomb within the United States.

Congressional auditors in June said a comprehensive strategic plan against nuclear terrorism could involve installing radiation detection equipment at all U.S. border crossings and ports of entry; addressing vulnerabilities and risks; identifying the mix of detection equipment that would be at various entry points and when those devices would be deployed; and determining long-term detection needs.

Yesterday, Stern said the blueprint would outline the agency's vision and objectives for the architecture, as well as performance metrics.

The strategy document would be followed by implementation plans that delve into greater detail about procedures, acquisitions, training techniques and other elements necessary to put the plan into effect, Stern told the panel. He did not say when those documents would be completed.

Stern said that while the monitor systems and strategic plan have received increased congressional and media attention "they should not be seen as a definition of DNDO."

He later added that he could certainly see a day in which most police officers in the United States are equipped with "manageable," hand-held radiation detection devices.

Stern said that goal was not practical today due to the current costs and size of such technology but that the idea "was not an outlandish concept" and could materialize sometime over the next 30 years.

The DNDO chief also pledged to increase the agency's efforts within the country, in addition to its focus on the nation's borders and ports of entry.

"We need to close all of our gaps. We can't assume that we will find materials at the borders, so if we have to assume that material will be in the U.S.," Stern told lawmakers.

[http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw\\_20101001\\_1469.php](http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20101001_1469.php)

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

Alamogordo Daily News

## **Nuclear Funding gets Boost**

Alamogordo Daily News

By Tim Korte, Associated Press Writer

October 2, 2010

ALBUQUERQUE - The budget for United States nuclear weapons programs received a 10 percent increase over funding levels for the 2010 budget year, a boost hailed by Sen. Jeff Bingaman but assailed by the leader of an anti-nuclear group.

Congressional Democrats and Republicans agreed this week, in a continuing budget resolution that funds government for the next two months, to support a \$624 million increase for weapons work by the National Nuclear Security Administration.

The nuclear funding bill needs final approval by Congress, which left Washington this week without approving a federal budget, but its inclusion in the continuing resolution was significant because it reflected increased weapons funding sought for 2011 by the Obama administration.

The emergency appropriation expires Dec. 3.

"This bill is very good for Sandia and Los Alamos national labs because it strongly supports the key stockpile stewardship work they do," Bingaman said in a news release. "It is a sign of how important the labs are and will remain to our national security."

Bingaman said almost all other federal agencies received continued funding at 2010 levels. He said the additional NNSA funding would "lend strong support" to stockpile stewardship programs at the New Mexico labs ahead of debate on a proposed START treaty with Russia.

The Obama administration still hopes to get the Senate to consider the Russian arms control deal before a new Congress takes office in January.

The director of the watchdog Los Alamos Study Group, Greg Mello, questioned why Congress and the administration would prioritize the nuclear program over other issues. He criticized the administration for pursuing nuclear funding to obtain a political objective ratification of the treaty.

"These are not the priorities that would put people to work, provide health care or education, protect the environment, or halt what most ordinary people understand to be a continuing economic decline, with no end in sight," Mello said.

[http://www.alamogordonews.com/cj\\_16231814](http://www.alamogordonews.com/cj_16231814)

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

Washington Post

## **9/11 Conspiracy Theories Rife in Muslim World**

By CHRISTOPHER TORCHIA, Associated Press

Saturday, October 2, 2010

ISTANBUL -- About a week ago, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad declared to the United Nations that most people in the world believe the United States was behind the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001.

To many people in the West, the statement was ludicrous, almost laughable if it weren't so incendiary. And surveys show that a majority of the world does not in fact believe that the U.S. orchestrated the attacks.

However, the belief persists strongly among a minority, even with U.S. allies like Turkey or in the U.S. itself. And it cannot be dismissed because it reflects a gulf in politics and perception, especially between the West and many Muslims.

"That theory might be true," said Ugur Tezer, a 48-year-old businessman who sells floor tiles in the Turkish capital, Ankara. "When I first heard about the attack I thought, 'Osama,' but then I thought the U.S. might have done it to suppress the rise of Muslims."

Compassion for the United States swept the globe right after the attacks, but conspiracy theories were circulating even then. It wasn't al-Qaida, they said, but the United States or Israel that downed the towers. Weeks after the strikes, at the United Nations, President George W. Bush urged the world not to tolerate "outrageous conspiracy theories" that deflected blame from the culprits.

However, the subsequent wars in Iraq and Afghanistan provided fodder for the damning claim that the U.S. killed its own citizens, supposedly to justify military action in the Middle East and to protect Israel. A 2006 survey by the Pew Global Attitudes Project found that significant majorities in Egypt, Indonesia, Jordan and Turkey - all among the most moderate nations in the Islamic world - said they did not believe Arabs carried out the attacks.

Two years later, a poll of 17 nations by WorldPublicOpinion.org, an international research project, found majorities in nine of them believed al-Qaida was behind the attacks. However, the U.S. government was blamed by 36 percent of Turks and 27 percent of Palestinians.

Such beliefs have currency even in the United States. In 2006, a Scripps Howard poll of 1,010 Americans found 36 percent thought it somewhat or very likely that U.S. officials either participated in the attacks or took no action to stop them.

Those who say the attacks might have been an "inside job" usually share antipathy toward the U.S. government, and often a maverick sensibility. Besides Ahmadinejad, high-profile doubters include Cuba's Fidel Castro and Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez. Former Minnesota governor and pro wrestler Jesse Ventura has questioned the official account. Conspiracy theorists have heckled former President Bill Clinton and other prominent Americans during speeches.

Controversy over U.S. actions and policies, including the widely discredited assertions that Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction, reinforced the perceptions of conspiracy theorists. Iranians dug deeper into history, recalling the U.S.-backed coup in their country in 1953.

"Initially, I was doubtful about the conspiracy theories. But after seeing the events in later years, I don't have any doubt that it was their own operation to find a pretext to hit Muslim countries," said Shaikh Mushtaq Ahmed, a 58-year-old operations manager in a bank in Pakistan. "It's not a strange thing that they staged something like this in their own country to achieve a big objective."

In March, an editorial in The Washington Post harshly criticized Yukihisa Fujita, a lawmaker with the ruling Democratic Party of Japan, for saying in an interview that some of the Sept. 11 hijackers were alive and that shadowy forces with advance information about the plot played the stock market for profit. Fujita said the article contained factual errors.

The record shows that al-Qaida agents on a suicide mission hijacked four American passenger planes and crashed them into the World Trade Center towers, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania, killing nearly 3,000 people.

The evidence is immense: witness accounts, audio recordings, video and photographic documentation, exhaustive investigations and claims of responsibility by al-Qaida.

Yet every fact and official assertion only feeds into alternative views that become amplified on the Internet, some tinged with anti-Semitism because of the close U.S.-Israeli alliance. They theorize that a knowing U.S. government stood by as the plot unfolded, or that controlled demolitions destroyed the Twin Towers, and the Pentagon was hit by a missile.

"All this, of course, would require hundreds if not thousands of people to be in on the plot. It speaks volumes for the determination to believe something," said David Aaronovitch, the British author of "Voodoo Histories: the role of Conspiracy Theory in Modern History."

"This kind of theory really does have a big impact in the Middle East," he said. "It gets in the way of thinking seriously about the problems in the area and what should be done."

A U.S. State Department website devotes space to debunking conspiracy theories about Sept. 11, in the apparent belief that the allegations must be addressed forcefully rather than dismissed out of hand as the ruminations of a fringe group.

"Conspiracy theories exist in the realm of myth, where imaginations run wild, fears trump facts, and evidence is ignored. As a superpower, the United States is often cast as a villain in these dramas," the site says.

Tod Fletcher of Petaluma, California, has worked as an assistant to David Ray Griffin, a retired theology professor, on books that question the Sept. 11 record. He was cautious about the Iranian president's comments about conspiracy theories, suggesting Ahmadinejad may have been politically motivated by his enmity with the U.S. government.

"It seems like it's the sort of thing that could lead to further vilification of people who criticize the official account here in the United States," Fletcher said.

*Torchia reported from Istanbul. Associated Press Writers Gulden Alp in Ankara, Turkey, and Zarar Khan in Islamabad contributed to this report.*

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/10/02/AR2010100200663.html>

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

New York Times  
OPINION/Editorial  
October 2, 2010

## **British Nukes vs. British Troops**

The pledge by Britain's coalition government to drastically slash spending is bad economics and bad public policy. Budget tightening is needed, but not this much, this fast or this way. The cuts to be announced this month will put recovery at risk, unfairly squeeze poorer Britons, and make it hard for government departments to work. That includes defense — targeted for a 10 to 20 percent reduction over the next five years.

How those cuts are apportioned will make a huge difference in what kind of world role the country will be able to play in the years ahead.

Put simply, the most important choice is between nuclear weapons and troops — specifically, whether to build four new nuclear missile-launching submarines or to preserve an army large enough to contribute to allied missions overseas. Even with painful cuts in other areas, there will not be money enough for both.

Britain's annual military budget is \$58 billion. Replacing all four submarines — as the Conservatives, the lead partner in the coalition government, want — would cost \$30 billion over the next decade, or roughly \$3 billion a year. Eliminating 20,000 army troops will save less than \$2 billion a year. Scaling back the submarine replacement plan — or deferring it, as the junior partner, the Liberal Democrats, urge — could save enough to keep the army at its current strength of 105,000.

There is no reason for Britain to press ahead with the submarines now. The current fleet, built in the 1990s, will remain operational for another decade — longer if Britain relaxes its cold war policy of keeping at least one sub continuously at sea. (United States subs stay in service for 40 years.)

It is also hard to see why — in today's world — Britain needs four new subs, each of which can carry up to 160 nuclear warheads. Only a fraction of that capacity is currently used, roughly 48 warheads per submarine, for a total

of 192. There are, of course, still nuclear dangers out there, most notably North Korea and Iran. But the United States nuclear umbrella plus a smaller Trident force should provide Britain with full deterrence.

Britain has vowed that its army strength will not be reduced as long as it has ground forces in Afghanistan. (Prime Minister David Cameron says he expects those forces to be withdrawn by 2015.) That is welcome. But unless other savings are found, that will require even steeper force cuts later in the decade and more drastic reductions in navy and air force equipment purchases.

Britain has been America's most reliable military ally and a backbone of NATO. That is good for Britons — for their security and for their continuing influence. Britain will not be able to deliver if this government decides to sacrifice troop numbers for nuclear symbolism.

[http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/03/opinion/03sun2.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/03/opinion/03sun2.html?_r=1)

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

Pakistan Observer - Pakistan

OPINION

Monday, October 2, 2010

## **India's Hegemonic Designs & Regional Peace**

By Afshain Afzal

US President Barack Hussain Obama has categorically assured New Delhi that Washington will not supply arms to Pakistan against India. This is not the first time that Washington is taking side of India, ignoring the ground realities and India's hegemonic designs and military built-up in Indian Ocean region. It was May 7, 2009 when President Obama told Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari during a meeting at the Oval Office that US do not want to be part of arming Pakistan against India. It is irony that on the other hand US and Israel are arming India to disturb the balance of power in the region. In the scenario, tall claims are once again echoing creating fears and suspicions that may lead to a renewed arm race.

Although much of the Agni series were failure and Indian Armed forces could only confine to Agni I and Agni II but New Delhi did not miss the opportunity to announce Agni-V intermediate range ballistic missile ready for its first test. If everything goes as routine, the actual test of the 5,000-km range weapon is likely to be conducted only sometime in January-March 2011 but Defence Minister AK Antony probably want to impress Islamabad about its military might. It is an open secret that the Agni V could not even reach to the third stage so it would not be possible that the weapon could be ready by March 2011. Reportedly, serious problems have been observed in the missile's heat-shield assemblies. Indian defence ministry officials claims that although New Delhi's claims that the Agni-III has completed its routine of tests and is now ready for induction into India's nuclear force structure but that stage, in fact, is not anywhere near.

In the latest development, the Indian Strategic Forces Command (SFC) has submitted a proposal to the Defence Ministry for setting up two dedicated squadrons of fighter aircraft which will act as "mini-Air Force". The new development in Muslim majority Andaman and Nicobar Command (ANC) on which Pakistan has its claim is not going unnoticed. In other words, SFC would be equipped with aircrafts that are battle proven and have capabilities to deliver nuclear-tipped missiles. These aircrafts aims to strengthen the Indian nuclear delivery system which is presently on land-based ballistic missiles i.e. Agni and Prithvi missiles and nuclear-capable fighters such as the Mirage 2000, Su-30 MKI and Jaguars. It would be interesting to note that under the pressure from US, New Delhi established SFC which is part of the Nuclear Command Authority (NCA) and is responsible for the management and administration of the country's tactical and strategic nuclear weapons stockpile. On the naval side, India is trying to develop Arihant class nuclear submarine and under-sea launched versions of the existing ballistic missile systems. Despite these developments, Lieutenant General B S Nagal, who is heading SFC is not a very happy person as these developments are only on papers and would need couple of years to be certain about progress in the direction. In a yet another development Israel has provided Indian with Unmanned Combat Air Vehicles (UCAV) against Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan. However, DRDO is launched a new project. P.S. Subramanyan, Project Director of Aeronautical Development Agency has reportedly confirmed about the project, claiming that the reverse engineering is in initial stages.

How Islamabad will take the new development is not some difficult riddle to guess. Pakistan is already nuclear power and has the capability to strike in case any attack comes from India. However, India's nuclear weapons would not be very effective as Pakistan lack depth and any nuclear attack from India would mean nuclear attack on Pakistan and at least one other country. With the latest call by the Indian defence strategist in which Pakistan has been invited for an all out nuclear arms race is seen with concern by many in New Delhi and Islamabad. Last week a Pakistani analyst claimed that Hindu extremist are gaining strength in India and if God forbid, these fundamentalist



take over the Indian nuclear weapons then the whole region will face the biggest ever threat one can even imagine. Many times a day, I gave a cool thought to the words of the analyst; what the analyst actually meant? All I could conclude is that either the nuclear weapons should be banned or the Hindus.

Still I am unable to decide what is the ultimate answer to the riddle but one thing is for sure that none of the Pakistanis can never even think of eliminating the whole Hindu fundamentalists, even in the worse case. War with India or Hindus on the question of Jammu and Kashmir state is another thing but to eliminate some one on the grounds of race, religion or creed is criminal. It is Washington and Tel Aviv which are instigating India to behave bigger than its size otherwise what to talk about China, New Delhi even can't dare to carryout prolong war against Pakistan. Pakistan's nuclear deterence has so far forced New Delhi to behave civilized despite western powers efforts to disturb the balance between the two countries. The leaders of India and Pakistan should act mature and should not fall in the trap to make the South Asian region most dangerous spot in the world.

<http://pakobserver.net/detailnews.asp?id=55067>

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

New York Post  
OPINION

## **Trouble with the New Kim on the Block**

By BENNY AVNI  
Saturday, October 2, 2010

The Korean peninsula is entering its most dangerous period since the 1950-53 Korean War.

This week, members of North Korea's ruling Communist Party arrived in Pyongyang for a meeting that would introduce the new Kim on the block -- 27-year-old Kim Jong-un (or is he 28? no one really knows) -- as the heir-in-waiting.

His father, "Dear Leader" Kim Jong-il, is ailing and expected to have no more than a few years left. And Jong-un's older brothers have disgraced themselves, leaving the youngest son to continue the dynasty.

But before the anointing got under way, word came out that while Jong-un learns the tricks of the trade and moves toward assuming the family's hold on power, he'll be assisted by two older family members: his aunt, Kim Kyong-hui, and her husband, the veteran Jang Song-taek, already the second-most powerful man in Pyongyang.

All three were promoted in party and military ranks, although neither the boy nor his aunt (the Dear Leader's trusted sister) has any military experience. Pyongyang watchers assume that if and when the ailing Kim Jong-il loses his capacity to rule, all *three* would run things for a while -- at least until the favorite son is capable of taking over by himself.

Such power-sharing in an absolutist system is a recipe for disaster (history is packed with examples), an invitation both to tension and even strife among the three and, while the dynasty is weakened, bids from elsewhere in the heirarchy.

The hermit tyranny's founder, Kim Il-sung, was kind enough to take his time dying -- giving his son, Kim Jong-il, years to learn the ropes and acquire all the levers of power. This transition is far more likely to become a power struggle.

And in Pyongyang, one sure way of scoring points is to devise some spectacular act of outside aggression. For example, three military officers assumed to be responsible for the March 26 sinking of the South Korean ship, the Cheonan, were promoted at this week's Pyongyang gathering to the high office of the party's Central Military Commission.

Meanwhile, here in New York, North Korea's deputy foreign minister, Pak Kil-yon, revealed a new national goal during his UN speech Wednesday: The regime now calls itself "a responsible nuclear-weapon state" that is "willing to join in international efforts for nuclear nonproliferation," Pak said.

Yes, the Kim dynasty now "wants to be internationally recognized as a nuclear weapons power," as Sue Mi Terry, a North Korea expert formerly with the National Intelligence Council and now at the Council on Foreign Relations, told me. (In fact, the cash-starved regime's long been eager to sell missiles, and probably nuclear technology, to all comers; it's hardly likely to actually turn "responsible" now.)

Then Pak issued the usual threat: If his country *isn't* accepted as a "responsible" member of the nuclear club -- and if the "disruptor of peace" (America) maintains its naval exercises in the region -- Pyongyang would have no choice but to "strengthen further" its nuclear capabilities.

For a carrot, Pak repeated his country's desire to return to the diplomatic round table known as the six-party talks, which Pyongyang abandoned in 2009.

It's an old pattern. The North follows an act of aggression by conciliatory diplomatic gestures (plus threats of further aggression) -- all with an eye to getting a nice fat foreign-aid bribe.

The West's appetite for diplomatic solutions assures that this game always works. So apply-rinse-repeat.

Much to President Obama's credit, he displayed some gumption by conducting naval exercises in the peninsula along with South Korea, sending an important signal. But the attack on the Cheonan has yet to be seriously punished *beyond* signals.

America and South Korea need to "show that we do have a backbone," Terry says. We must send the signal that "provocative acts such as the Cheonan have serious negative consequences."

It would be interesting to see how Pyongyang reacts to, say, an American test-firing of a missile over North Korea's skies, as the North did to Japan in 2009 -- but that's unlikely to happen under Obama.

On the other hand, even China -- Pyongyang's only benefactor -- is hardly in the mood to legitimize North Korea's nuclear status.

What we can't do is merely sweep the whole problem under the rug. Pyongyang's internal instability renders a perennial problem even more volatile. A secure regime may be adept at limiting its provocations to killing a few dozen innocent sailors, or frightening the odd Japanese city -- but who knows how far some player in a ruthless power struggle might go?

Caution is the wrong approach for America now. Rather than fall into safe old carrot solutions like the six-party talks, we need to be creative in finding some new sticks.

[http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/trouble\\_with\\_the\\_new\\_kim\\_on\\_the\\_M22oxKqm7xN9Vu2diEEixL](http://www.nypost.com/p/news/opinion/opedcolumnists/trouble_with_the_new_kim_on_the_M22oxKqm7xN9Vu2diEEixL)

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

Philadelphia Bulletin

OPINION/Op-Ed

## **A New START in Different Times**

BY WES ROGERS

Sunday, October 3, 2010

The nuclear arms reduction treaty known as START, signed July 31st 1991 between U.S. President George Bush and President of the former Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, is one of the most effective agreements ever signed to prevent nuclear proliferation.

The signing of the START Treaty came just before the collapse of the Soviet Union. At that time, the only other nations possessing nuclear capability in addition to the U.S. and the Soviet Union were China, Great Britain, and France.

The United States and the Soviet Union - which became the Russian Federation - accounted for over ninety percent of the nuclear stockpiles worldwide.

The START Treaty proved to be a good neutralizer as other nations knew any acts of aggression would mean the two "superpowers" could retaliate.

### **Why START Must Be Revised**

Since the collapse of the Soviet Union, other nations have emerged with nuclear capabilities. Several key factors dictate revisions of some of the basic precepts of START.

Other countries now possessing nuclear capability include North Korea, Pakistan, India, Iran, and Israel, while others are in the process of making major strides towards gaining similar capabilities. The possibility of worldwide terrorism poses a serious threat to Russia due to its ethnic makeup as well as the United States as witnessed by the attacks in 1993 and 2001. Intelligence reports indicate that some terrorist factions have acquired nuclear capability and many are financed by hostile entities based in the Middle East.

It should be noted, however, that one of the main reasons for the success of START is that the United States and Russia maintained a fairly high level of nuclear armaments the entire time that START has been intact until it expired at midnight on December 5th, 2009. This was the main deterrent to countries which could pose a threat.

For now, the Moscow Treaty of 2002 is still in effect until a new START is signed. It will remain operative until 2012 and keeps operationally deployed nuclear warheads between 1,700 and 2,200.

Now, though, due to hostile threats worldwide and the ever-changing geopolitical climate, it is essential that the U.S. and Russia ratify START and serve notice to other countries that the two superpowers are still in unison regarding world peace.

However, many still question whether reducing stockpiles of nuclear warheads is actually a deterrent or not.

#### Main Areas Of Concern In New START Treaty

The main areas of concern for Russia is the intent of the United States and NATO allies to set up a missile defense system close to the borders of the Russian Federation. Russia has stated that it considers this an act of intimidation.

The United States is concerned about the ability of Russia to utilize its tactical position militarily (it has numerous Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) facilities near its borders) to launch an offensive on nearby east European nations or even the whole of Europe if it so chose. There is also the ever-pressing issue of monitoring to be sure that Russia and the U.S. keep their word in all aspects of START. Additionally, it is being proposed by both sides that other nations with nuclear capability would be allowed to enter negotiations regarding nuclear warhead verification.

The new START agreement is more political than in 1991 when Russia and the U.S. had been adversaries and the threat of a nuclear attack was more possible.

The hard push by the Obama administration for a new agreement is motivated by political reasons (it would be considered a political coup for the Obama administration), rather than a desire for the prevention of nuclear war and the spread of nuclear technology by other hostile countries.

The new START agreement proposes reducing nuclear warhead delivery vehicles from the current ceiling of 2,200 to approximately 1,500. This breaks down to 700 deployed delivery warhead vehicles and 800 deployable and non-deployable missile warheads which may be either silo-based or from mobile platforms and submarines. It also calls for the reduction of nuclear arsenals to only 500 deployable warheads.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and her staff is strongly urging the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee to approve the new agreement which Russian President Medvedev and President Obama agreed to in Prague last April.

The new START agreement benefits Russia, since it doesn't have the nuclear strength it had before the Soviet Union collapsed. As a result – giving the U.S. the edge – the Russian Duma has indicated a desire to approve the new agreement.

However, Russia has served notice that if the U.S. pursues any missile defense systems, it will back out of the agreement.

In recent months, the U.S. has installed a number of Patriot missiles and U.S. military personnel in Poland, only 64 kilometers from the Russian border.

Although Russia has complained, it is not turning away from inking the new START agreement with the U.S.

The main questions which needs to be asked are: Will the Obama administration be as good a custodian at monitoring the new START agreement as past administrations, and will the incentive of a partnership with the current administration be enough to keep Russia in compliance with the new START?

Much debate in the U.S. Senate is expected.

<http://thebulletin.us/articles/2010/10/03/commentary/op-eds/doc4ca916eddc286805035306.txt>

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

Augusta Chronicle  
OPINION/EDITORIAL

## **A Nuclear Venezuela?**

*Atomic-energy capabilities shouldn't rest with one of the world's worst tyrants*

By the Augusta Chronicle Editorial Staff

Monday, October 4, 2010

We don't know off the top of our heads what the flag of Venezuela looks like, but it might as well be all red.

It seems like whenever its tyrannical leader, Hugo Chavez, spouts off with another pronouncement, a figurative red flag goes up warning the rest of the world that no good possibly can come of what he has planned for his country.

So in case you've been wondering what else could possibly go wrong in Venezuela, now comes this bit of chilling news from the Associated Press: "Chavez said Monday that his government is carrying out initial studies into starting a nuclear energy program."

"We're taking on the project of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and they aren't going to stop us," Chavez said. "We need it and we're carrying out the first studies."

Let's see -- an oil-rich country ruled by a deranged despot is moving forward with a nuclear program that it insists is for solely peaceful purposes -- even though it harbors enough enmity against the rest of the world to presumably construct a nuclear weapon of war within striking distance of its enemies.

We'd ask you if the above sentence describes either Venezuela or Iran, but it would be a trick question. The sentence accurately describes both.

Oh, but Chavez doesn't want you to worry. He's an ally of Iran, and he says he's *positive* that Iran isn't developing atomic weapons -- despite the suspicions of every other nation on the planet that's been even remotely paying attention to global politics.

Venezuela is beset by inflation, power shortages, street violence and property seizures under Chavez's jackbooted socialism. Discontent is growing among its citizens.

Now he wants to go nuclear? It would be like having an Iran dangerously festering here in the Western Hemisphere. That can't be allowed to happen.

<http://chronicle.augusta.com/opinion/editorials/2010-10-04/nuclear-venezuela>

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