



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

**Issue No. 868, 17 December 2010**

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <a href="#"><u>Votes are Lined up to Ratify Nuclear Treaty, Kerry Says</u></a>        | <a href="#"><u>N.Korea Says War with South would Go Nuclear</u></a>                                     |
| <a href="#"><u>GOP Senators-Elect: Don't START Without Us</u></a>                     | <a href="#"><u>Af-Pak Report Shows 'Two-Faced' Pakistan Remains Obama's 'Biggest Nightmare'</u></a>     |
| <a href="#"><u>US Senate Agrees to Debate START Treaty with Russia</u></a>            | <a href="#"><u>Bulava Missile Test Delayed to 2011</u></a>  |
| <a href="#"><u>Senate Argues Merits of Nuclear Treaty with Russia</u></a>             | <a href="#"><u>Russia Adds 2 Topol-M Ballistic Missiles to Nuclear Deterrent</u></a>                    |
| <a href="#"><u>Reid Presses Senate to Complete START Next Week</u></a>                | <a href="#"><u>US Missile-Defence Test Fails over Pacific</u></a>                                       |
| <a href="#"><u>'Stuxnet Virus Set Back Iran's Nuclear Program by 2 Years'</u></a>     | <a href="#"><u>Nunn-Lugar Update</u></a>  |
| <a href="#"><u>Israel Rejects Rudd's Call for Nuclear Inspections</u></a>             | <a href="#"><u>Stuxnet's Finnish-Chinese Connection</u></a>   |
| <a href="#"><u>Report: N. Korea Set for 3rd Nuke Test by March</u></a>                | <a href="#"><u>AMB. JOHN BOLTON: Senators, Think Long and Hard Before You Rush to Vote on START</u></a> |
| <a href="#"><u>US Believes N Korea Has More Nuclear Expertise</u></a>                 | <a href="#"><u>Nevsky and Novomoskovsk: Two Submarines for Putin</u></a>                                |
| <a href="#"><u>N. Korea Says It Supports Dialogue but will Never "Beg" for It</u></a> | <a href="#"><u>Reagan Would Put a Stop to START</u></a>   |

---

*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.*

Boston Globe

## Votes are Lined up to Ratify Nuclear Treaty, Kerry Says

By Mark Arsenault, Globe Staff

December 15, 2010

WASHINGTON — Senator John F. Kerry and other top Democrats said yesterday they have secured enough bipartisan backing to ratify the START nuclear arms treaty with Russia, a vote that would be a substantial foreign policy victory for President Obama.

START supporters say backing for the milestone vote is outweighing objections from a core group of Republicans who contend Democrats are moving too quickly. Debate on the pact — which requires a supermajority of 67 senators to win ratification — is likely to begin today, senators said.

“We absolutely have the time to debate it thoroughly and I believe we have the votes to approve this important agreement,” said Kerry, a Massachusetts Democrat who chairs the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and has been working for months to round up enough support.

Asked directly yesterday if at least 67 senators will vote to ratify START, Senate majority leader Harry Reid was definitive: “Yes.”

Although a handful of Republicans have signed on to the treaty, Senator Scott Brown, Republican of Massachusetts, remains noncommittal, according to his office.

The arms control deal, signed by Obama and President Dmitry Medvedev in April, reduces by one-third each country’s deployed nuclear warheads, to 1,550, and sets up a process to restore inspections of each side’s arsenal. The treaty replaces a 1991 pact that expired in 2009.

Obama has called the treaty essential for national security.

As the floor debate unfolds, several Republicans are expected to question terms of the pact, such as whether it could limit missile defense plans. They are also expected to complain that the process of ratification is being rushed.

Senator Jon Kyl of Arizona, who has led the opposition, suggested that Reid’s ambitions are too grand for the lame-duck session, which had been scheduled to end this Friday. “It is impossible to do all of the things that the majority leader laid out . . . without disrespecting the institution and without disrespecting one of the two holiest of holidays for Christians and the families of all of the Senate, not just the senators themselves but all of the staff,” Kyl said yesterday.

Kyl, the number two Republican in the Senate, has consistently pressed for more time, saying the treaty deserves a thorough and unhurried discussion. He has also called on the Obama administration for more funding to modernize the nation’s existing nuclear arsenal. Twenty-two GOP senators signed a letter Dec. 2 calling for consideration of the treaty to be delayed until next year.

Reid, however, insisted yesterday there should be no delay. “Christmas is a week from Saturday. I understand that,” he said at a press conference. “But I hope the Republicans understand it also, because we are going to complete our work no matter how long it takes in this Congress.”

Obama and Kerry have pushed hard for ratification of New START, which has the backing of former presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton and top officials from past Republican and Democratic administrations.

That effort has been boosted over the past week by several Republicans indicating their support. Maine’s two Republican senators, Olympia Snowe and Susan Collins, said they would back the pact, while Arizona Republican John McCain said in a speech that the Senate was “very close” to a deal on the treaty.

At least a handful of other Republicans have signaled backing for New START, although with some qualifications. All 58 senators in the Democratic caucus are expected to back the treaty.

Waiting until January would make ratification more difficult: When the new Congress takes office next month, the Democrats’ majority in the Senate shrinks from 58, including two independents who frequently side with them, to 53.

Brown is among the moderate Republicans targeted by Kerry. “Senator Brown continues to review the START Treaty and is hopeful that some flaws, such as the modernization of our own existing weapons and assurances that it will not affect our missile defense, are worked out before the vote,” his office said.

Kerry, in an interview, said the treaty would not restrain US missile defense and any questions about that matter have been “completely addressed.”

“We don’t need to spend days over a phony debate,” said Kerry, who believes the floor debate on START could be completed in two or three days, “as long as it isn’t politicized.”

To address GOP concerns about the state of the existing US nuclear arsenal, the Obama administration has committed \$85 billion over 10 years toward modernization, said Matthew Bunn, an associate professor at Harvard University’s John F. Kennedy School of Government, who studies nuclear issues.

The START vote is just one of several important items on the Senate’s to-do list for the rest of the congressional session.

That list includes a vote on a tax and stimulus compromise negotiated between Republicans and Obama, which is expected to win final passage this morning; the DREAM Act, which would provide a path to citizenship to certain young illegal immigrants; and a repeal of the ban on openly gay people serving in the US military.

The debate on START would have to share time in the Senate with a bill to continue to fund the government, said Reid. That \$1.2 trillion bill was unveiled yesterday. “We’re going to move back and forth a little bit,” he said.

*Material from the Associated Press was used in this report.*

[http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/12/15/votes\\_lined\\_up\\_to\\_ratify\\_nuclear\\_treaty\\_kerry\\_says/?rss\\_id=Boston.com+%2F+Boston+Globe+--+National+News](http://www.boston.com/news/nation/articles/2010/12/15/votes_lined_up_to_ratify_nuclear_treaty_kerry_says/?rss_id=Boston.com+%2F+Boston+Globe+--+National+News)

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

The Atlantic  
By Chris Good

## **GOP Senators-Elect: Don't START Without Us**

December 15, 2010

Adding to the chorus of GOP voices who say there is no time in this ever-shortening lame-duck session to ratify Obama's New START arms-reduction treaty with Russia, 10 of the incoming Republican senators-elect asked the president today not to push ahead until they get sworn in.

From a letter, sent today by the senators-to-be:

On Election Day we were elected to represent the constituents of our respective states in the Senate. One of the most important tasks of the 112th Congress will be to carefully consider measures that protect the national security of the United States. And few matters will more directly impact our security than arms control agreements like New START that would dramatically reduce the U.S. nuclear deterrent in a strategic environment that is becoming ever more perilous.

Article I of the Constitution grants the Senate the exclusive responsibility of giving advice and consent to the President on treaties. Out of respect for our states' voters, we believe it would be improper for the Senate to consider the New START Treaty or any other treaty in a lame duck session prior to January 3, 2011. Indeed, no bilateral strategic arms reduction treaty with the Soviet Union or Russia has ever been ratified during a lame duck session.

Additionally we are hopeful to have the opportunity, along with the full Senate, to review the treaty's negotiating record, which is a critically important component in putting the pact in full context.

The signers are: John Boozman (AR), Rob Portman (OH), Jerry Moran (KS), Mike Lee (UT), Ron Johnson (WI), John Hoeven (ND), Kelly Ayotte (NH), Rand Paul (KY), Marco Rubio (FL).

Absent from the list is Illinois' Mark Kirk, who has served as a naval intelligence officer and whom the Obama administration has lobbied on START.

And on the other side, the administration is quite unlikely to assent to this request, having faced it down before. Their argument that START should get ratified now: It's been on the table for months, and inspections of Russian nukes won't resume until the Senate approves it, plus it makes Obama look bad to the Russians and could set back improved relations if the Senate holds it up any longer.

<http://www.theatlantic.com/politics/archive/2010/12/gop-senators-elect-dont-start-without-us/68083/>

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

# US Senate Agrees to Debate START Treaty with Russia

Agencies

December 16, 2010

WASHINGTON - The US Senate agreed on Wednesday to begin debate on the New START nuclear arms treaty with Russia, averting a Republican delaying tactic that would have forced officials to read the text out loud for hours.

The Senate voted 66-32 to open debate, with 9 Republicans joining 55 Democrats and two independents in supporting the move. Republican backers included Richard Lugar, the top Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, and John McCain, the 2008 Republican presidential nominee.

The 66 votes were one shy of the two-thirds ultimately needed to ratify the treaty in the 100-member chamber. Democratic Senator Evan Bayh missed the vote but would provide the 67th needed for ratification, an aide said.

US President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed the agreement in April, committing the former Cold War rivals to cut deployed nuclear weapons to no more than 1,550 each within seven years.

Obama made the treaty's ratification one of his top priorities for the final days of Congress' current legislative session.

The accord is a centerpiece of his bid to improve relations with Russia, whose cooperation on issues like Afghanistan and curbing Iran's nuclear program has become increasingly important to US policymakers.

Senate Democratic leaders planned several days of debate before a final vote early next week. But key Republicans said that time was inadequate to address fully their concerns about nuclear modernization, verification and other issues.

"The START treaty is a very important document, and there are very important ramifications that need to be thoroughly considered with appropriate amendments and sufficient time to consider them," said Senator Jon Kyl, who has taken the Republican lead in talks with the White House on the treaty.

He said it was "quite inappropriate" for Senate Democratic leader Harry Reid to suggest there was ample time for debate before the Christmas holiday next week.

Senator John Kerry, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that had primary responsibility for reviewing the treaty, said the accord had been delayed repeatedly to give Kyl and other Republicans time to have their questions answered.

## 'Fish or cut bait'

"We kept the door open until we finally are at a point where obviously we had to fish or cut bait," Kerry told a news conference.

"This is the time and this is the moment when the United States Senate needs to stand up and be counted on an issue of national security for our country," he added.

The previous START treaty expired a year ago. Since that time, Russia and the United States have not been able to conduct inspections of each other's nuclear stockpile, leading to uncertainty about what is happening with their arsenals.

Republican Senator Jim DeMint, a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who threatened to use delaying tactics to try to block passage of the accord until the new year, called on Wednesday for a full reading of the pact.

That effort fizzled, with Republican leader Mitch McConnell saying it was "not essential" after Democrats agreed that formal debate would begin on Thursday and no amendments to the treaty resolution would be introduced until then.

The treaty itself is only 17 pages but an accompanying protocol runs to 165 pages and three additional annexes add 174 more. Democrats estimated it could have taken 12 to 15 hours to read the documents into the Senate record.

With Republicans complaining about the lack of time for debating the treaty, Democratic leaders and the White House sharply criticized the threat to delay.

"This is a new low in putting political stunts ahead of our national security, and it is exactly the kind of Washington game-playing that the American people are sick of," White House spokesman Robert Gibbs said in a statement.

The New START treaty would also limit the number of deployed ballistic missiles and nuclear bombers to no more than 700 each and implement a new inspection regime for verifying the two sides are living by the terms of the agreement.

[http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2010-12/16/content\\_11710892.htm](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2010-12/16/content_11710892.htm)

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

Miami Herald

Thursday, December 16, 2010

## **Senate Argues Merits of Nuclear Treaty with Russia**

By DESMOND BUTLER, Associated Press

WASHINGTON -- President Barack Obama took a step toward a major foreign policy accomplishment as the Senate began debate on a U.S.-Russia nuclear pact.

The move by Senate Democrats to bring the New START treaty up for debate reflected confidence that they could deliver approval after it had appeared stalled for weeks.

Ratification of the treaty, along with a tax deal with Republicans that's nearing approval, would represent victories for Obama on his top foreign and domestic legislative priorities, just weeks after his Democratic Party suffered steep losses in congressional elections.

The White House and senior Democrats believe they can muster the two-thirds majority needed for ratification in the Senate. In a fresh sign of momentum, Democrats easily prevailed, 66-32, to move forward on the pact, winning the support of nine Republicans. Among the GOP senators was Sen. John McCain of Arizona, Obama's 2008 presidential rival and a top lawmaker on national security issues.

Still, several Republicans led by Sen. Jon Kyl objected to considering the treaty in the waning days of Congress' lame-duck session, insisting the Senate should wait until next year. Sens. Lamar Alexander and Saxby Chambliss said they could support the treaty but not under the current timetable. Alexander told reporters that rushing the deal was "reckless."

In a positive sign for the treaty's prospects, Republicans backed down on a threat to have it read in its entirety on the Senate floor, a move that could have caused significant delay.

Obama has said he is prepared to put off his holiday vacation travel until the treaty is completed, elevating the measure to year-end, must-do status along with the tax deal. Democrats are determined to push the treaty through the Senate in hopes of giving Obama a foreign policy victory before the GOP grabs more power next year.

"We believe we should stay here as long as it takes to get this treaty ratified, and we are prepared to do so," said the Foreign Relations Committee chairman, Democrat John Kerry.

Speaking for the treaty before Democrats took their turn, Republican Sen. Richard Lugar of Indiana said it "will enable American teams to return to Russia to collect data on the Russian arsenal and verify Russian compliance. These inspections greatly reduce the possibility that we will be surprised by Russian nuclear deployments or advancements."

U.S. weapons inspections ended a year ago with the expiration of the 1991 arms control treaty.

Angry accusations marked the hours before the vote as some Republicans threatened to force the treaty to be read aloud in the Senate. The White House called the GOP out on the maneuver, with press secretary Robert Gibbs assailing it as a "new low in putting political stunts ahead of our national security." But Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, a Republican, said reading the treaty was not essential.

Several Republicans had argued that the limited time available in the lame-duck session made it difficult to give the treaty the consideration it deserved. Twenty-two Republican senators signed a letter Dec. 2 calling for debate on the treaty to be delayed until next year.

Proponents of the treaty say that, besides renewed weapons inspections, it would keep the two biggest nuclear powers on the path to reducing their arsenals. Opponents have asserted it would limit U.S. missile defense options and argued that it has insufficient procedures to verify Russia's adherence to the treaty.

The issue has pitted moderate Republicans against hard-line conservatives, with potential 2012 challengers to Obama making opposition a requirement for anyone weighing a bid for the GOP presidential nomination. Lining up in opposition are Sarah Palin, Mitt Romney, Newt Gingrich, Minnesota Gov. Tim Pawlenty and Sen. John Thune of South Dakota.

Backing the treaty are former Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton and several secretaries of state and defense from Republican and Democratic administrations, including Condoleezza Rice.

Supporters are pushing for ratification in this legislative session because prospects for passage will dim when the Democrats' majority shrinks by five senators in January.

Obama signed the treaty with Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April. The treaty would allow each country 1,550 strategic warheads, down from the current ceiling of 2,200.

<http://www.miamiherald.com/2010/12/16/1975807/senate-argues-merits-of-nuclear.html>

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

Post Chronicle

## **Reid Presses Senate to Complete START Next Week**

By David Alexander, Reuters

Friday, December 17, 2010

Senate Democratic leader Harry Reid said on Friday debate on the New START nuclear treaty with Russia could extend through Tuesday but insisted Congress finish work on the accord before its Christmas break.

The treaty, one of President Barack Obama's top priorities for the current legislative session, would commit Russia and the United States to cut deployed nuclear weapons to 1,550 within seven years.

"We've done some very, very important things during this Congress, but there is nothing, nothing more important than the START treaty because it has ramifications far greater than our own country," Reid said in opening remarks as the Senate debated the treaty for a third day.

Reid said some lawmakers were seeking a total of six to seven days for debate on the treaty and he was trying to clear the calendar to permit that. Previous strategic arms control treaties have taken between two and five days of debate.

Democratic Senator John Kerry, who as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is leading floor debate on the accord, noted that Republican opponents of the treaty had yet to propose any amendments and appeared to be trying to drag out the discussions.

He warned that treaty supporters would move to cut off debate and bring the issue to a vote if opponents continued to talk without proposing formal changes to the treaty and its accompanying resolution.

"At some point here, particularly in the absence of amendments, there will be a higher motivation to move to ... bring this to a close if that's what it's going to take," Kerry said. A move to cut off debate would force lawmakers to submit their amendments quickly.

Republicans have expressed concern that the treaty would impede U.S. efforts to build missile defense systems and have questioned whether the verification regime would be adequate.

Democrats are under pressure to approve the treaty in the remaining days of the current Congress after seeing their majority cut significantly in the November elections.

If the treaty is delayed until next year, it would need to win additional Republican support and would face delays as the newly elected senators take the time they need to learn about the pact.

The treaty, signed by Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April, is viewed as a centerpiece for improving U.S.-Russian relations as well as a foundation for further steps in Obama's push to ultimately eliminate nuclear arms.

In addition to cutting deployed nuclear warheads, the pact calls for each side to reduce deployed nuclear missiles and bombers to no more than 700. It also creates a system for on-the-ground inspections and data exchanges to verify the two sides are abiding by the accord.

Administration officials say the New START treaty would be the foundation for any future arms control effort with Russia, including reducing the number of strategic nuclear weapons held in storage and the number of tactical nuclear weapons.

Some lawmakers have expressed concern about the disparity between Russia and the United States on tactical nuclear weapons. The exact number of weapons is unclear, but the Federation of American Scientists puts the U.S. total at 500, versus about 2,000 deployed Russian weapons.

"If we don't have New START in place, then going forward to reduce tactical nuclear weapons and non-deployed weapons over time, which the president has said we'd like to do, is just not going to be possible," said Jim Miller, the principal deputy undersecretary of defense for policy.

*Editing by Eric Beech*

[http://www.postchronicle.com/news/breakingnews/article\\_212338893.shtml](http://www.postchronicle.com/news/breakingnews/article_212338893.shtml)

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

Jerusalem Post – Israel

## 'Stuxnet Virus Set Back Iran's Nuclear Program by 2 Years'

*Top German computer consultant tells 'Post' virus was as effective as military strike, a huge success; expert speculates IDF creator of virus.*

By YAAKOV KATZ

December 15, 2010

The Stuxnet virus, which has attacked Iran's nuclear facilities and which Israel is suspected of creating, has set back the Islamic Republic's nuclear program by two years, a top German computer consultant who was one of the first experts to analyze the program's code told *The Jerusalem Post* on Tuesday.

"It will take two years for Iran to get back on track," Langer said in a telephone interview from his office in Hamburg, Germany. "This was nearly as effective as a military strike, but even better since there are no fatalities and no full-blown war. From a military perspective, this was a huge success."

Langer spoke to the *Post* amid news reports that the virus was still infecting Iran's computer systems at its main uranium enrichment facility at Natanz and its reactor at Bushehr.

Last month, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the United Nation's nuclear watchdog, said that Iran had suspended work at its nuclear-field production facilities, likely a result of the Stuxnet virus.

According to Langer, Iran's best move would be to throw out all of the computers that have been infected by the worm, which he said was the most "advanced and aggressive malware in history." But, he said, even once all of the computers were thrown out, Iran would have to ensure that computers used by outside contractors were also clean of Stuxnet.

"It is extremely difficult to clean up installations from Stuxnet, and we know that Iran is no good in IT [information technology] security, and they are just beginning to learn what this all means," he said. "Just to get their systems running again they have to get rid of the virus, and this will take time, and then they need to replace the equipment, and they have to rebuild the centrifuges at Natanz and possibly buy a new turbine for Bushehr."

Widespread speculation has named Israel's Military Intelligence Unit 8200, known for its advanced Signal Intelligence (SIGINT) capabilities, as the possible creator of the software, as well as the United States.

Langer said that in his opinion at least two countries – possibly Israel and the United States – were behind Stuxnet.

Israel has traditionally declined comment on its suspected involvement in the Stuxnet virus, but senior IDF officers recently confirmed that Iran had encountered significant technological difficulties with its centrifuges at the Natanz enrichment facility.

"We can say that it must have taken several years to develop, and we arrived at this conclusion through code analysis, since the code on the control systems is 15,000 lines of code, and this is a huge amount," Langer said.

"This piece of evidence led us to conclude that this is not by a hacker," he continued. "It had to be a country, and we can also conclude that even one nation-state would not have been able to do this on its own."

Eric Byres, a computer security expert who runs a website called Tofino Security, which provides solutions for industrial companies with Stuxnet-related problems, told the *Post* on Tuesday that the number of Iranians visiting his site had jumped tremendously in recent weeks – a likely indication that the virus is still causing great disarray at Iranian nuclear facilities.

"What caught our attention was that last year we maybe had one or two people from Iran trying to access the secure areas on our site," Byres said. "Iran was never on the map for us, and all of a sudden we are now getting massive numbers of people going to our website, and people who we can identify as being from Iran."

Byres said that some people openly identified themselves as Iranian when asking for permission to log onto his website, while others were impersonating employees of industries with which he frequently works.



“There are a large number of people trying to access the secure areas directly from Iran and other people who are putting together fake identities,” he said. “We are talking about hundreds. It could be people who are curious about what is going on, but we are such a specialized site that it would only make sense that these are people who are involved in control systems.”

<http://www.jpost.com/IranianThreat/News/Article.aspx?id=199475>

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

The Australian – Australia

## Israel Rejects Rudd's Call for Nuclear Inspections

By John Lyons, *The Australian*

December 16, 2010

**Israeli Foreign Minister Avigdor Lieberman yesterday rejected Kevin Rudd's call that its nuclear facility should be subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency.**

Standing alongside Mr Rudd during a press conference in Jerusalem, Mr Lieberman said what was important was not whether any country was a member of the Non- Proliferation Treaty but that it was responsible.

He made it clear Israel did not regard any such inspection as necessary as it was a responsible country "and we have proved this for many years".

Mr Rudd, in an interview with The Australian this week, had said Israel's nuclear facility should be subject to inspection by the IAEA.

The comment shocked Israeli officials, who could not recall an Australian minister suggesting that their facility at Dimona should be subject to inspection.

Mr Rudd had said: "Our view has been consistent for a long period of time, and that is that all states in the region should adhere to the NPT, and that includes Israel. And therefore their nuclear facility should be subject to IAEA inspection."

But Mr Lieberman said yesterday: "I think that we have a very clear position -- we are a very responsible country and a responsible government and we have proved this for many years."

He said in his view, the question was not the NPT but whether a country and its government was responsible or not.

"Iran joined with the NPT and is part of the NPT and we see every day cheating and many attempts to waste time (allowing in inspectors) and, of course, they're part of the NPT but the reality is completely different."

While Mr Rudd had made his comment in an interview in Cairo, in Jerusalem yesterday he softened his position, saying Australia recognised Israel's "unique security circumstances".

He concentrated much more on Iran's nuclear program than Israel's. Mr Rudd said Australia was "deeply concerned" about Iran's nuclear weapons program and while its stated aim was nuclear energy for civilian purposes, it found itself in defiance of provisions of the NPT.

"Therefore Iran has obtained from us and from other countries . . . universal condemnation, secondly sanctions and thirdly, in the case of Australia, autonomous sanctions over and above those which are required under the UN Security Council," he said.

"Iran's nuclear weapons program and nuclear program in general represents a fundamental threat to security across the wider region.

"On the question of other regional states, including Israel, the position of the Australian government has long been reiterated by governments of both political persuasions in Australia that all states, including Israel, should become accessories to the NPT and its associated obligations.

"We recognise . . . Israel's unique security circumstances . . . but in terms of our fundamental position on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, as it applies to this region . . . all states should be in, including Israel."

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/nation/israel-rejects-rudds-call-for-nuclear-inspections/story-e6frg6nf-1225971760385>

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



# Report: N. Korea Set for 3rd Nuke Test by March

*N.M. governor aims to get Pyongyang to 'calm down a bit' during visit*

December 15, 2010

By msnbc.com staff and news service reports

SEOUL — North Korea appears to be readying for a possible third nuclear test as early as next March, a newspaper reported Wednesday, as New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson headed to Pyongyang on an unofficial diplomatic foray.

U.S. and South Korean intelligence have been watching the North's nuclear sites for any activity.

Analysts say the North could use a test to try to gain leverage in international talks it is seeking and secure aid to prop up its destitute economy.

The New York Times reported Wednesday that the Obama administration has concluded that that North Korea's new plant to enrich nuclear fuel uses technology that is "significantly more advanced" than what Iran has assembled.

North Korea already has the fuel for as many as 12 nuclear weapons, the newspaper said.

South Korea's Chosun Ilbo daily on Wednesday cited an intelligence official from Seoul as saying a tunnel was being dug at the country's nuclear test site that could be completed in March next year, possibly heralding a new nuclear test.

South Korea's foreign ministry said it was closely monitoring the site and said there was no concrete evidence to show the North Koreans were preparing for a third test.

The amount of earth removed from the site in Punggye township, in a northeastern region of North Korea, indicated the tunnel was about 550 yards deep, half the depth needed for a nuclear test, the Chosun Ilbo report said.

"North Korea is digging the ground pretty hard ... at its two major nuclear facilities," a South Korean intelligence official was quoted as saying.

"At this rate, (the Punggye tunnel) will reach (the) 1 km that is needed for a nuclear test by March to May," a separate intelligence source told the newspaper.

North Korea is also speeding up work on new construction at its main Yongbyon nuclear complex, where it revealed a previously unknown uranium enrichment facility last month, the newspaper quoted intelligence sources as saying.

South Korea's foreign ministry declined to confirm the details of the report, but said: "Nothing has been confirmed that would prove the North is preparing to conduct a nuclear test."

The South's nuclear envoy, Wi Sung-lac, was in Moscow meeting with his Russian counterpart, in the same week that Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov met North Korean Foreign Minister Pak Ui-chun and chided him over the North's nuclear program.

## Civil defense drill

The report coincided on Wednesday with South Korea's largest civil defense drill in recent years after North Korea shelled an island near their disputed maritime border, killing four people, last month.

The exercise on a busy week day brought traffic to a standstill nationwide and saw mass evacuations to bomb shelters.

Prime Minister Kim Hwang-shik said the aim was to heighten readiness for a possible North Korean air raid and he also warned the North to expect reprisals if there was another attack.

"The government is ready to demonstrate that there will be due price to pay for any future aggression," he said.

Analysts say North Korea's unveiling of a modern uranium enrichment facility and preparations for another nuclear test were likely to be ploys to pull regional powers back to the negotiating table, where Pyongyang hopes to secure aid.

The impoverished state has in the past won economic assistance and diplomatic attention at six-country talks aimed at persuading it to abandon its nuclear ambitions.

Deputy U.S. Secretary of State James Steinberg was in Beijing to consult with the Chinese on North Korea and Richardson was on his way to the North.

"My objective is to try to get North Korea to calm down a bit, see if we can reduce tension in the Korean peninsula," Richardson said as he arrived at an Albuquerque airport for the first leg of a commercial flight to Beijing and then to North Korea.

The governor will return to New Mexico on Dec. 20.

This will be Richardson's third trip to North Korea since he became governor in 2003.

Richardson served as U.N. ambassador in the Clinton administration and often has played the role of an unofficial diplomatic troubleshooter, including missions to secure the release of hostages in Sudan, Iraq and North Korea.

The State Department has said Richardson isn't delivering a message to North Korea for the U.S. government. However, Richardson's contacts with North Korean officials may provide insights for diplomats trying to persuade North Korea to abandon its nuclear weapons program.

North Korea showed a uranium enrichment facility, which could give it a second route to make nuclear bombs, at the Yongbyon site to a U.S. expert in November and later announced it was operating such a program under a "peaceful" energy project.

South Korea's foreign minister said on Tuesday he suspected there were more facilities in addition to Yongbyon where the North was enriching uranium. A media report said Pyongyang had three to four such plants.

North Korea conducted nuclear tests at the Punggye site in 2006 and 2009, when detonations in tunnels were detected by U.S. and South Korean monitoring.

The U.N. Security Council condemned last year's test and imposed tough sanctions aimed at banning North Korea's arms trade and cutting off funding for such programs.

Analysts say ailing leader Kim Jong-il's plan to transfer power to his son Jong-un is also creating domestic political pressure, as the regime resorts to military grandstanding to try to build legitimacy for the untested and previously unknown successor.

*The Associated Press, Reuters and msnbc.com staff contributed to this report.*

[http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/40672955/ns/world\\_news-asiapacific/#](http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/40672955/ns/world_news-asiapacific/#)

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

Sydney Morning Herald – Australia

## **US Believes N Korea Has More Nuclear Expertise**

By David Sanger and William Broad

December 16, 2010

WASHINGTON: The Obama administration has concluded that North Korea's new plant to enrich nuclear fuel uses technology that is "significantly more advanced" than what Iran has struggled over two decades to assemble, administration and intelligence officials say.

In carefully worded public comments in recent days, US and South Korean officials have also argued that the new plant could not have been built so rapidly unless there was a sophisticated network of other secret sites - and perhaps a fully operating uranium enrichment plant - elsewhere in the country.

These conclusions strongly suggest North Korea has evaded layers of economic sanctions and efforts to intercept sea and air shipments, an effort begun in the Bush administration and accelerated after a United Nations Security Council resolution passed last year after the North's second nuclear test.

The intelligence estimates come at a time of renewed tension with North Korea over its nuclear program and its deadly artillery attack last month.

Fighter jets buzzed Seoul yesterday to simulate an attack by North Korea as the South conducted its biggest emergency drill in response to the deadly shelling of Yeonpyeong island.

Sirens sounded across the country at 2pm, more than 25,000 people were guided to shelters, and pedestrians took cover in office basements and subway stations.

The new assessments greatly complicate the task for US diplomats - including a delegation of State Department and White House officials who left for China on Tuesday - who have been struggling for weeks to fashion a common plan with Asian allies and China to contain North Korea's nuclear advances.

Also on Tuesday, the Governor of New Mexico, Bill Richardson, headed for North Korea on an unofficial diplomatic foray, saying he hoped to persuade the Pyongyang regime to ease regional tensions.

North Korea already has the fuel for six to 12 nuclear weapons and has conducted two nuclear tests, a capability it developed by harvesting plutonium from a nuclear reactor that was recently closed. While the North says the new

uranium enrichment plant will produce fuel for reactors that could produce electricity for the impoverished country - the same argument Iran has made for its enrichment efforts - the North does not possess such reactors today. But if the plant is used to produce highly enriched uranium, it could give the country another path to increasing its nuclear arsenal.

Several Chinese officials and academics who deal with North Korean issues argued a week ago in Beijing that it would be counterproductive to seek more sanctions or resolutions at the Security Council.

US, South Korean and Chinese officials have acknowledged in recent days that despite their intense focus on the North's efforts to obtain uranium enrichment technology, they all missed the assembly of the plant at Yongbyon, the North's main nuclear complex. The area is under intense scrutiny from US satellites, but the plant was built inside an old structure - and satellites cannot see through the roof.

"It is likely that North Korea had been pursuing an enrichment capability long before the April 2009 date it now claims," Glyn Davies, the US ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, said last week. If so, he said, there was a clear likelihood that North Korea "has built other uranium-enrichment-related facilities in its territory."

<http://www.smh.com.au/world/us-believes-n-korea-has-more-nuclear-expertise-20101215-18y9u.html>

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

Yonhap News  
December 16, 2010

## **N. Korea Says It Supports Dialogue but will Never "Beg" for It**

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, Dec. 16 (Yonhap) -- North Korea said Thursday it supports dialogue aimed at defusing regional tensions and denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula, but will "never beg" for it, as New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson landed in the communist state.

North Korea's foreign ministry also accused the United States of breaching trust in the six-nation denuclearization-for-aid deal in 2005, reiterating its claim that its uranium enrichment program serves a "peaceful" purpose.

"We support all proposals for dialogue such as six-party talks that arise from the desire to prevent war on the Korean Peninsula and achieve denuclearization, but we will never beg for dialogue," an unnamed ministry spokesman said in a statement carried by the official Korean Central News Agency (KCNA).

In a separate dispatch, the KCNA said Richardson landed in the capital, Pyongyang, but did not give details. He is on a private trip aimed at taming regional tensions sparked by the North's deadly bombardment of a South Korean border island on Nov. 23.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2010/12/16/79/0401000000AEN20101216008300315F.HTML>

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

Bangkok Post – Thailand

## **N.Korea Says War with South would Go Nuclear**

Agence France-Presse (AFP)  
December 17, 2010

North Korea warned that another war with South Korea would involve nuclear weapons, as diplomatic efforts continued Friday to ease high tensions over its atomic ambitions and deadly artillery attack.

The military also threatened to strike back if South Korea goes ahead with a planned live-fire drill on a border island, state media reported.

Uriminzokkiri, the official website of the communist state, said in a commentary seen Friday that war on the Korean peninsula is only a matter of time.

"Because of the South Koreans' reckless war policies, it is not about war or peace on the Korean peninsula but when the war will break out," the website said.

"If war breaks out, it will lead to nuclear warfare and not be limited to the Korean peninsula," it said in a posting dated Thursday.

The North frequently claims nuclear war is imminent. But military tensions have risen sharply since it bombarded South Korea's Yeonpyeong border island on November 23, killing two marines and two civilians.

Pyongyang's disclosure last month of an apparently working uranium enrichment plant -- a potential new source of bomb-making material -- also heightened regional security fears.

In a separate commentary, the North's ruling communist party newspaper Rodong Sinmun Friday described the peninsula as the world's most dangerous place.

It reiterated calls for a formal peace treaty with Washington and the withdrawal of 28,500 US troops from South Korea.

"The Korean peninsula remains a region fraught with the greatest danger of war in the world," the paper said. "This is entirely attributable to the US pursuance of the policy of aggression against the DPRK (North Korea)."

Prominent US politician Bill Richardson, a veteran troubleshooter with North Korea, is paying a private visit to Pyongyang to try to ease tensions.

And the US envoy to stalled six-party talks on the North's nuclear disarmament, Sung Kim, held talks in Seoul Friday with his South Korean counterpart Wi Sung-Lac.

In Beijing a US delegation led by Deputy Secretary of State James Steinberg wrapped up three days of discussions on the Korean peninsula situation.

Washington's embassy said the two sides had "useful conversations concerning shared interests in peace and stability in northeast Asia" as well as "the importance of realising the denuclearisation of the Korean peninsula".

The United States, China, the two Koreas, Japan and Russia are members of the denuclearisation forum which the North abandoned in April 2009, a month before its second atomic weapons test.

Host China along with Russia is trying to revive the forum to ease the crisis, and the North says it is willing to talk. But the United States, South Korea and Japan say the North must first mend ties with the South and show genuine seriousness about abandoning its nuclear drive.

The US and South Korea have staged a major naval show of strength to deter the North, and the South is preparing to hold a one-day live-fire artillery drill on Yeonpyeong sometime between Saturday and Tuesday.

A similar firing drill into the Yellow Sea on November 23 was answered by the North's deadly bombardment of villages on the island.

The South's military said its guns would be aimed away from the North as usual but it would respond strongly if provoked.

Members of the US-led United Nations Command will observe the exercise, and about 20 US soldiers will play a supporting role.

But a top US general Thursday voiced concern over a possible "chain reaction".

General James Cartwright, vice chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the drill was being held on a "well-established and well-used" range in a transparent way, but could draw a North Korean reaction.

"What we worry about obviously is... if North Korea were to react to that in a negative way and fire back at those firing positions on the islands, that would start potentially a chain reaction," Cartwright told reporters.

"What you don't want to have happen out of that is for... us to lose control of the escalation."

Amid the continuing tensions, Japan said it would strengthen missile defences against the threat from North Korea. Its major strategic review announced Friday describes the North as an "urgent, grave factor for instability".

<http://www.bangkokpost.com/news/asia/211848/n-korea-says-war-with-south-would-go-nuclear>

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

Sify – India

## **Af-Pak Report Shows 'Two-Faced' Pakistan Remains Obama's 'Biggest Nightmare'**

Asian News International (ANI)  
December 17, 2010

The toned-down, public version of the one-year progress report on Afghanistan and Pakistan released by the White House has made it clear that US President Barack Obama is still in search of the leverage he needs to persuade, or

compel, Pakistan to close down the safe haven for terrorists and insurgents that has let a battered al Qaeda leadership and a vigorous Taliban survive.

The classified version runs more than 50 pages, and the White House is holding it so tightly that it is unlikely to be widely distributed on Capitol Hill, however, senior members of Congress can request classified briefings, officials said.

"The bottom line is that Pakistan is a country where we have little influence, little access and little credibility," the New York Times quoted one of Obama's aides, as saying, as the review was being put into its final form.

"And we're still struggling with re-wiring the place so that their interests and our interests are aligned," the aide added.

Obama offered a more muted version on Thursday, saying, "Progress has not come fast enough," and that the United States would "insist that terrorist safe havens within their borders must be dealt with."

But so far the Pakistanis have brushed off Washington's threats to link military aid to actual performance in counter-terrorism, the paper said, adding that they have been only slightly more impressed when Obama sought to create what he calls a "significant and enduring" level of military and development aid, so the two countries do not lurch from crisis to crisis.

The reality is that, for the foreseeable future, it is the United States that will be dealing with the safe haven on Pakistan's soil, said the paper.

The CIA launched roughly 53 Predator attacks in 2009, which was more than President Bush authorized during his entire presidency.

The figure has more than doubled this year, and while presidential aides will not discuss the program, they make it clear that the pace will be picked up.

It is a strategy to put pressure not only on al Qaeda and the Taliban, but on the Pakistan government, which is enormously sensitive about incursions on its sovereignty, the paper added.

When the Obama administration began to assess its progress in Afghanistan and Pakistan earlier this year, some officials suggested reversing the usual bureaucratic shorthand and calling it the "PakAf review", reasoning that bringing the US military venture in Afghanistan to a successful end depended mainly on the outcome in Pakistan, where at least officially there are no American troops.

To them, Pakistan remains a far more vital strategic concern for the United States than Afghanistan will ever become, said the paper, due to the presence of nuclear weapons in the most volatile country in a volatile region.

According to the paper, the sensitivity arises in part from a major concern that is in the classified report but that Obama, Clinton and Gates, avoided discussing: that even as Pakistan's civilian government teeters on the edge, an insider could slip nuclear fuel out of its laboratories, which was the source of bomb technology a decade ago for Iran, North Korea and Libya.

That fear was palpable in the classified State Department cables revealed by Wikileaks, with one of the leaked memos classified by the former Ambassador to Pakistan, Anne Patterson, saying that "our major concern is not having an Islamic militant steal an entire weapon but rather the chance someone working in GOP [government of Pakistan] facilities could gradually smuggle enough material out to eventually make a weapon."

The review conducted by the White House however did not dwell on that possibility, and concluded that the chances of a deliberate transfer of nuclear material or a weapon from Pakistan to a terror group was very low.

<http://www.sify.com/news/af-pak-report-shows-two-faced-pakistan-remains-obama-s-biggest-nightmare-news-international-kmrmakhdfi.html>

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

The Moscow Times – Russia

## **Bulava Missile Test Delayed to 2011**

15 December 2010

Reuters

The military has delayed the next submarine test launch of its troubled intercontinental nuclear missile Bulava until 2011, Itar-Tass reported Wednesday.

The Bulava missile, which Moscow plans to make the cornerstone of its nuclear arsenal over the next decade, has failed seven of its previous 14 tests, endangering the future of a project estimated to cost at least \$3 billion.

The next test had been scheduled for Friday.

"The White Sea region, from where the Bulava was to be launched, is covered with ice," said a defense industry official who had been due to attend the test launch, Itar-Tass reported.

"The exact date of the next test launch of the Bulava in 2011 is not yet decided, but it will take place in the first half of the year," the unidentified official said.

Test launches have sent the nearly 37-ton missile from Russia's border with Finland to the Kamchatka Peninsula in Russia's Far East.

Defense sources have said the 12-meter-long Bulava, which means "mace" in Russian, would not enter service until tests proved it 98 percent to 99 percent reliable.

The missile self-destructed in previous tests, leading to doubts about its reliability. One missile can hold six to 10 nuclear warheads, which would deliver an impact of up to 100 times the atomic blast that devastated Hiroshima in 1945.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/bulava-missile-test-delayed-to-2011/426744.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Adds 2 Topol-M Ballistic Missiles to Nuclear Deterrent**

17 December 2010

Russia's Strategic Missile Forces (SMF) have deployed two additional Topol-M silo-based missile systems, SMF Commander Lt. Gen. Sergei Karakayev said on Friday.

"The new systems, which are part of the new sixth regiment of silo-based Topol-Ms in service with the Tatishchevo Missile Division near Saratov in southwestern Russia, were deployed on December 14," Karakayev said.

With the new addition, the SMF now have 52 silo-based and 18 mobile Topol-M missile systems.

The SMF commander said the Tatishchevo Missile Division would receive eight additional silo-based Topol-M systems in 2011-2012.

The Topol-M missile, with a range of about 7,000 miles (11,000 km), is said to be immune to any current and planned U.S. anti-ballistic missile defense. It is capable of making evasive maneuvers to avoid a kill using terminal phase interceptors, and carries targeting countermeasures and decoys.

It is also shielded against radiation, electromagnetic pulse, nuclear blasts, and is designed to survive a hit from any form of laser technology.

MOSCOW, December 17 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20101217/161823818.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20101217/161823818.html)

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

The Star – South Africa

## **US Missile-Defence Test Fails over Pacific**

December 16 2010

By Reuters

Washington - A test of the sole US defence against long-range ballistic missiles failed on Wednesday, the second failure in a row involving the system managed by Boeing Co, the Defence Department said.

"The Missile Defence Agency was unable to achieve a planned intercept of a ballistic missile target during a test over the Pacific Ocean today," Richard Lehner, an agency spokesman, said in an e-mailed statement. No preliminary explanation of the failure was provided.

The miss brought the so-called ground-based midcourse defence's batting record to eight intercepts out of 15 tries, as reckoned by the Missile Defence Agency.

“This is a tremendous setback for the testing of this complicated system,” Riki Ellison, head of the Missile Defence Advocacy Alliance, a booster group, said in a statement. He said it raised troubling questions about the reliability of the 30 or so interceptor missiles deployed in silos in Alaska and California.

The test was a repeat of a January 31 exercise in which an advanced sea-based radar had not performed as expected.

In the test on Wednesday, an intermediate-range ballistic missile target flew successfully from a test site on Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands, as did a long-range interceptor launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California, the agency said.

The sea-based X-Band radar and all sensors performed as planned, and the interceptor successfully deployed a “kill vehicle” designed to collide with the target, the statement said.

It said officials will conduct an extensive investigation to pin down the cause of the failure to intercept. The next flight test will be determined after the failure's cause is identified, it added.

A Boeing spokeswoman did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

The multi-billion-dollar ground-based bulwark is designed to shoot down a limited number of long-range ballistic missiles that could be tipped with chemical, biological or nuclear warheads. The system is part of a layered hedge against countries such as North Korea and Iran.

It networks systems on land, at sea and sensors in space and is meant to counter ballistic missiles of all ranges. The United States has spent more than \$10 billion a year on a range of missile defense programmes in recent years.

In October, a converted Boeing 747 jumbo jet equipped with a chemical laser failed to knock out a target ballistic missile over the Pacific, marking that system's second such failed intercept test in a row. The flying laser has been scaled back to a kind of science experiment, no longer a development programme aimed at eventual deployment.

Boeing's chief subcontractors on the ground-based midcourse defence include Raytheon Co, Northrop Grumman Corp and Orbital Sciences Corp.

A team led by Lockheed Martin Corp and Raytheon is competing to oust Boeing next year and take over continued development, manufacturing, test, training, operations support and sustainment of the ground-based defence. The contract is worth about \$4.2 billion over seven years.

<http://www.thestar.co.za/us-missile-defence-test-fails-over-pacific-1.1002000>

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

Press Release of Senator Lugar

## **Nunn-Lugar Update**

Thursday, December 16, 2010

*“The Nunn-Lugar program has made possible, through operations of the United States military, United States contractors, working with their counterparts in Russia, the destruction of very sizeable amounts of nuclear weapons. Threats we took very seriously in 1991 and I hope Americans take very seriously currently.”*

U.S. Sen. Dick Lugar took to the floor of the United States Senate for a second day as the Senate works to approve the New START Treaty.

Lugar emphasized the urgency of continued cooperation with Russia, specifically the New START Treaty, as demonstrated through the work of the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.

During the speech, Lugar announced the following progress in the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction program since October.

- 8 submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) destroyed,
- 10 nuclear weapons transport trains shipments and
- 110.9 metric tons of chemical weapons agent neutralized.

In November 1991, Lugar (R-IN) and Sen. Sam Nunn (D-GA) authored the Nunn-Lugar Act, which established the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program. This program has provided U.S. funding and expertise to help the former Soviet Union safeguard and dismantle its enormous stockpiles of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons, related materials, and delivery systems. In 2003, Congress adopted the Nunn-Lugar Expansion Act, which authorized the Nunn-Lugar program to operate outside the former Soviet Union to address proliferation threats. In 2004, Nunn-Lugar funds were committed for the first time outside of the former Soviet Union to destroy chemical weapons in



Albania, under a Lugar-led expansion of the program. In 2007, Lugar announced the complete destruction of Albania's chemical weapons.

The Nunn-Lugar scorecard now totals 7,599 strategic nuclear warheads deactivated, 791 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) destroyed, 498 ICBM silos eliminated, 180 ICBM mobile launchers destroyed, 659 submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) eliminated, 492 SLBM launchers eliminated, 32 nuclear submarines capable of launching ballistic missiles destroyed, 155 bomber eliminated, 906 nuclear air-to-surface missiles (ASMs) destroyed, 194 nuclear test tunnels eliminated, 503 nuclear weapons transport train shipments secured, upgraded security at 24 nuclear weapons storage sites, built and equipped 20 biological monitoring stations, and neutralized 1680.4 metric tons of Russian and Albanian chemical weapons agent. Perhaps most importantly, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, and Belarus are nuclear weapons free as a result of cooperative efforts under the Nunn-Lugar program. Those countries were the third, fourth and eighth largest nuclear weapons powers in the world.

<http://lugar.senate.gov/news/record.cfm?id=300312&&>

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

Forbes.com

OPINION/ANALYSIS

## Stuxnet's Finnish-Chinese Connection

December 14 2010

By JEFFREY CARR

I recently wrote a white paper entitled "Dragons, Tigers, Pearls, and Yellowcake" in which I proposed four alternative scenarios for the Stuxnet worm other than the commonly held assumption that it was Israel or the U.S. targeting Iran's Bushehr or Natanz facilities. During the course of my research for that paper, I uncovered a connection between two of the key players in the Stuxnet drama: Vacon, the Finnish manufacturer of one of two frequency converter drives targeted by this malware; and RealTek, whose digital certificate was stolen and used to smooth the way for the worm to be loaded onto a Windows host without raising any alarms. A third important piece of the puzzle, which I'll discuss later in this article, directly connects a Chinese antivirus company which writes their own viruses with the Stuxnet worm.

Most people who have followed the Stuxnet investigation know that the international headquarters for Vacon is in Finland, but surprisingly, Finland isn't where Vacon's frequency converter drives are manufactured. Vacon's manufacturing plant is actually located in the Peoples Republic of China (PRC) under the name Vacon Suzhou Drives Co. Ltd., located at 11A, Suchun Industrial Square 428# Xinglong Street, SIP Suzhou 215126 China.

Vacon isn't the only company involved with Stuxnet that has a Chinese connection. The first genuine digital certificate used by Stuxnet developers was from RealTek Semiconductor Corp., a Taiwanese company which has a subsidiary in (of all places) Suzhou under the name Realsil Microelectronics, Inc. (450 Shenhu Road, Suzhou Industrial Park, Suzhou 215021 Jiangsu Province, China).

The question, of course, is what, if anything, does this say about China's possible role as the source of the Stuxnet worm. There are scenarios under which China would benefit such as the rare-earths scenario that I presented in my white paper, however there's a lack of data on mining failures that can be attributed to Stuxnet. The closest that anyone has come to identifying compromised operations is at Natanz however their centrifuge failures go back several years according to this February, 2010 report by ISIS, while the earliest Stuxnet sample seen by Symantec's researchers was June, 2009 and that's before it had signed driver files or exploited the remote code execution vulnerability that appeared in January, 2010 and March, 2010 respectively. Natanz may very well have been the target of an earlier cyber attack, or even multiple attacks, which had nothing to do with Stuxnet.

### Does China Benefit By Attacking Natanz?

In 2008, China decided to assist the IAEA inspectors after it learned that Iran was in possession of blueprints to shape uranium metal into warheads, according to this article in The Telegraph. That same article discloses that Chinese designs for centrifuges were discovered in Iran, supplied via Pakistan's AQ Khan.

On April 13, 2010, Beijing reiterated its opposition to Iran's goal to develop nuclear weapons capabilities while stating that sanctions against Iran would be counter-productive. In other words, the PRC wanted to support its third largest supplier of oil (after Saudi Arabia and Angola) while at the same time seeking ways to get Iran to stop its uranium fuel enrichment program. What better way to accomplish that goal than by covertly creating a virus that will sabotage Natanz' centrifuges in a way that simulates mechanical failure while overtly supporting the Iranian government by opposing sanctions pushed by the U.S. It's both simple and elegant. Even if the worm was

discovered before it accomplished its mission, who would blame China, Iran's strongest ally, when the most obvious culprits would be Israel and the U.S.?

### **Reviewing The Evidence**

China has an intimate knowledge of Iran's centrifuges since, according to one source quoted above, they're of Chinese design.

China has better access than any other country to manufacturing plans for the Vacon frequency converter drive made by Vacon's Suzhou facility and specifically targeted by the Stuxnet worm (along with an Iranian company's drive). Furthermore, in March 2010, China's Customs ministry started an audit at Vacon's Suzhou facility and took two employees into custody thereby providing further access to Vacon's manufacturing specifications under cover of an active investigation.

China has better access than any other country to RealTek's digital certificates through it's Realsil office in Suzhou and, secondarily, to JMicron's office in Taiwan.

China has direct access to Windows source code, which would explain how a malware team could create 4 key zero day vulnerabilities for Windows when most hackers find it challenging to develop even one.

There were no instances of Stuxnet infections in the PRC until very late which never made sense to me, particularly when Siemens software is pervasive throughout China's power installations. Then, almost as an after-thought and over three months from the time the virus was first discovered, Chinese media reported one million infections, and here's where the evidence becomes really interesting.

That report originated with a Chinese antivirus company called Rising International, who we now know colluded with an official in Beijing's Public Security Bureau to make announcements encouraging Chinese citizens to download AV software from Rising International (RI) to fight a new virus that RI had secretly created in its own lab. Considering this new information, RI's Stuxnet announcement sounds more like a CYA strategy from the worm's originators than anything else.

### **In Summary**

The conventional wisdom on which nation state was responsible for the Stuxnet worm has relentlessly pointed the finger at Israel or the United States almost from day one of the worm's discovery. No other scenarios were discussed or even considered with the exception of my own conjecture about India's INSAT-4b satellite failure and Britain's Heysham 1 nuclear plant shutdown, and then my white paper proposing 4 additional alternative scenarios; all of which were my way of trying (and failing) to expand the discussion beyond Israel and Iran. The appeal of a U.S. or Israeli cyber attack against first Bushehr, then Natanz, was just too good to pass up even though there was no hard evidence and very slim circumstantial evidence to support a case for either country. The best that Ralph Langner, CEO of Langner Communications (and the leading evangelist for this scenario) could point to was an obscure Hebrew word for Myrtus and a biblical reference for a date found in the malware that pertained to Persia; both of which could have been explained in a half dozen alternate ways having nothing to do with either Israel or the U.S.

As far as China goes, I've identified 5 distinct ties to Stuxnet that are unique to China as well as provided a rationale for the attack which fits China's unique role as Iran's ally and customer, while opposing Iran's fuel enrichment plans. There's still a distinct lack of information on any other facilities that suffered damage, and no good explanations for why there was such massive collateral damage across dozens of countries if only one or two facilities in one nation state were the targets however based solely on the known facts, I consider China to be the most likely candidate for Stuxnet's origin.

<http://blogs.forbes.com/firewall/2010/12/14/stuxnets-finnish-chinese-connection/?boxes=Homepagechannels>

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

FOXNews.com  
OPINION

## **AMB. JOHN BOLTON: Senators, Think Long and Hard Before You Rush to Vote on START**

*By Amb. John Bolton*  
December 15, 2010

Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid will do President Obama's bidding, starting debate on ratification of the "New START" arms control treaty today, in the waning hours of Congress's lame-duck session. While the specifics of how he will proceed remain murky, his general strategy is clear.

Reid's decision will push the Senate toward Constitutional irrelevancy, diminishing its role in the treaty-making process into little more than an afterthought. More is at stake here than just the arguments, pro and con, over New START. The Senate's role as an institution is about to be diminished, perhaps permanently. Whatever their views on New START, Senators must think long and hard about their Constitutional obligations before they allow this to happen.

It is entirely understandable why President Obama wants to march through the Senate like General Sherman through Georgia. Why Senators would allow their own institution to be so casually marginalized, however, is much harder to comprehend. There is simply no precedent for Senate approval of so consequential a treaty in the cramped, hurried environment of a lame-duck session, and for good Constitutional reasons.

Senator Jon Kyl and others have worked tenaciously to resolve a number of important questions about New START. For example, Kyl has contested the Obama administration on its plans, or lack thereof, for national missile defense. He has sought to understand why, as a practical political matter, even if not in explicit treaty language, Obama has surrendered the prospects of moving forward robustly on homeland missile defenses to a Russian veto.

Similarly, Kyl has pressed for more funding for our nuclear-weapons programs, to ensure the safety and reliability of the nuclear stockpile, which has suffered gravely in recent years from inadequate resources and a grossly inadequate modernization program.

And Kyl has sought far more information than President Obama has been willing to provide on the meaning and implications of many other crucial New START provisions, which have never been fully explained to the Senate or the American people.

If the Obama administration were truly confident in the merits of its arguments, it would not fear a debate when the new Congress convenes in January. But its obsession with frog-marching the Senate to a vote in December reveals its gnawing insecurity that New START cannot withstand full scrutiny in the light of a real Senate debate, as opposed to the theatrics now about to unfold.

There is simply no possibility for an appropriate debate, let alone adequate consideration of key amendments to the treaty or its accompanying resolution of ratification.

The circumstances are plain. Prior to the November 2 election, New START proceeded almost entirely beneath the public radar screen. Since the November midterm elections, with its devastating results for President Obama, Congress has been locked in debate over tax and spending issues. The entire attention of members of Congress has been on this legislation, and a bucket list of other controversial measures: immigration, repealing the military's "don't ask, don't tell" policy, and a host of other priorities. The general public is far more interested in the upcoming holiday season, and almost certainly wishes the current Congress would simply adjourn.

New START has been an afterthought. Until now.

Supporters of New START contend there is little public interest in the treaty, and therefore no harm in considering it late at night or in the on-gain-off-again fashion of dentists shuttling between patients in various office dental chairs. But, as with Speaker Nancy Pelosi's iconic remark about the health care bill, once people realize what is in New START, they will be acutely interested in its detrimental impact on U.S. national security. Of course, once the treaty is ratified, it will be too late.

That may be exactly what its supporters have in mind. They also advance the brute political argument that they have more than the required 67 Senators prepared to vote for ratification, so there is no reason to wait until the next Congress. Their vote count may or may not be accurate, but their argument proves too much. If valid, why bother with a Senate debate at all? Why trouble Senators to come to Washington? Why not just stay home and vote over the Internet, thus saving everyone the time and trouble of contentious floor debate and amendment?

Even Senators inclined to support New START should weigh very carefully the implications of rushing to ratification. Much more is at stake than merely whether the Senate ratifies this particular treaty. Senators seriously interested in their cherished institution -- and particularly those Senators retiring in just a few weeks -- need to think about the long sweep of Constitutional history before they bend their knee and vote on New START this month.

A delay may or may not make it more difficult for the Obama administration to gain ratification of the treaty. We simply do not know. But we do know that a partial, incomplete, poorly prepared and utterly inadequate debate now will have permanent implications for the Senate role in the treaty process. Senators need to look at the portraits and sculptures adorning the hallways and offices of the Capitol building before they decide to proceed with New START.

*Former U.N. Ambassador John Bolton, is a Fox News contributor and a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, is the author of "Surrender Is Not an Option: Defending America at the United Nations" (Simon & Schuster, 2007).*

<http://www.foxnews.com/opinion/2010/12/15/amb-john-bolton-senators-think-long-hard-rush-vote-start/#>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency  
OPINION & ANALYSIS

## **Nevsky and Novomoskovsk: Two Submarines for Putin**

15 December 2010

By Ilya Kramnik, RIA Novosti military commentator

On December 13, 2010, Vladimir Putin visited Sevmash, a major shipbuilding company in Russia. His visit was timed to coincide with a significant addition to Russia's strategic nuclear naval forces.

In the last few days, the company has released two strategic ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) - the overhauled K-407 Novomoskovsk and the newly built K-550 Alexander Nevsky.

The Novomoskovsk is part of Project 667BDRM and the Alexander Nevsky is part of Project 955. These two types of submarines will form the basis of strategic nuclear naval forces in the foreseeable future.

### **The Alexander Nevsky: Continuing a princely series**

The Alexander Nevsky is the second submarine of its project to be built by Sevmash. The first, the Yury Dolgoruky, took 11 years to build, from 1996 to 2007, and is now undergoing the final stage of testing. The Alexander Nevsky was built in six years, starting in 2004. Construction of the Vladimir Monomakh started in 2006 and is currently in progress. It is scheduled to be commissioned in 2012. The St. Nicholas is also being built. Work began on a fourth submarine in 2009 and should take five years to complete.

This trend of shorter submarine construction times has been made possible by the resumption of regular funding of defense contracts and newly established industrial cooperation. Vladimir Putin had also identified minimizing construction times as a goal. Ideally, the construction of SSBNs should take four to five years, and these timeframes appear to be achievable.

The main problem with the Dolgoruky, the Nevsky and similar missile submarines is the missiles themselves. Ongoing tests of the Bulava have not been terribly successful. The next launch of the Bulava will take place in coming weeks on board the Yury Dolgoruky. If it is successful, it will be the third successful launch in a row, which will mean that the major issues involved in the production of Bulava missile can be resolved.

A total of eight Project 955 SSBNs are to be built in the next 10 years. Starting with the hull of the fourth submarine, missile submarines will be based on the improved design of Project 955U. Based on available information, the first submarines manufactured under the project will carry 20 missiles instead of 16.

### **The Novomoskovsk: Proven reliability**

Unlike the modern submarines of Project 955, the upgraded submarines of Project 667BDRM were tested and adopted by the fleet a long time ago - in the second half of the 1980s - and they represent the latest stage in the development of the large Project 667 family. Currently four out of six of the Project 667 submarines have been re-armed with Sineva missiles - an improved version of the previously tested R-29RM missiles. Two more submarines will be re-equipped with Sineva missiles in the next three to four years.

Sineva missiles have a much larger range than the basic R-29RM missile (over 11,000 kilometers versus 8,300), greater accuracy and a more advanced set of tools to penetrate anti-missile defense. The standard version of the missile is equipped with four warheads with a capacity of 100 kilotons each. Additionally, these missiles may be equipped with new generation sub-kiloton warheads having a yield of several dozen tons of TNT, which enables pinpoint targeting.

Project 667BDRM submarines with the new missiles will remain in service for another 15-20 years, making them, along with new Project 955 submarines, the foundation of strategic nuclear naval forces for the near future.

### **Submarines are key to nuclear capability**

By 2020, the Russian Navy will have a total of 14 ballistic submarines from Projects 955 and Project 667BDRM. They will carry 244 ballistic missiles and about 1,000 warheads, which will make up approximately half of Russia's entire strategic nuclear arsenal in terms of the number of delivery vehicles, and two-thirds of the number of nuclear

warheads. This means that for the first time in Russian history, the submarine fleet will form the foundation of Russia's strategic nuclear forces. This imposes a great responsibility on the rest of the fleet's forces, which must ensure the battle-readiness of missile submarines and protect them from possible attacks.

Great responsibility also rests with the Navy's support system - in order for the "strategics" to effectively perform their tasks, they have to regularly sail out to sea and stay there most of the time. In order to keep such a schedule, large-scale investments in infrastructure will be needed, from educational centers to maintenance plants that will keep the submarines in a state of constant readiness.

A base for new SSBNs is being built in Vilyuchinsk, on the Kamchatka Peninsula, where the Pacific Fleet's nuclear submarines are based. Investments in infrastructure may be just as costly as the submarines themselves (the Dolgoruky and Nevsky cost about 25-30 billion rubles each), but due to heavier use of these submarines, the cost will be recouped many times over.

*The views expressed in this article are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of RIA Novosti.*

<http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20101215/161784522.html>

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

Investors.com

OPINION

Investor's Business Daily (IBD) Editorial

## Reagan Would Put a Stop to START

December 15, 2010

**SDI:** Despite claims by this administration, our 40th president would not have agreed to the New START treaty if it meant abandoning U.S. missile defense. He had that choice with the Russians and just said "nyet!"

When Soviet Premier Mikhail Gorbachev met Reagan in Reykjavik, Iceland, in October 1986, he hoped Reagan would be willing to trade his Strategic Defense Initiative in exchange for arms-control agreements and vague promises of making nice with America. But America held all the cards and didn't fold.

Reagan refused to negotiate SDI away. He opposed the proposed nuclear freeze and put Pershing missiles in Europe to counter the Soviet SS-20 threat. He put America's security in the hands of American technology, not the goodwill of its enemies.

That policy may be reversed with the New START treaty that Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid is trying to ram through a lame-duck Senate with little, if any, debate. Despite the record, President Obama himself has claimed Reagan would have supported it.

No fewer than three times during a Nov. 18 meeting on the treaty, Obama took the name of the Gipper in vain, suggesting the man who won the Cold War urging peace through strength would sign on to a treaty that amounts to unilateral disarmament.

At one point in his opening remarks, Obama said his "is a concept of American national security that has been promoted by Ronald Reagan" and a succession of American presidents. At another point, he said: "As Ronald Reagan said, we have to trust, but we also have to verify. In order for us to verify, we've got to have a treaty."

Reagan did say trust but verify, and he also signed the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty with the Soviet Union. He would not, however, sign away national missile defense in a world full of present and future threats from multiple nuclear powers on the basis of a deal with just one of them.

In a letter sent Monday to Reid and Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell, 28 Reagan era officials, including John Bolton, former ambassador to the U.N.; Edwin Meese III, former attorney general and presidential adviser; Judge William Clark, former national security adviser; and Ambassador Henry Cooper, former Strategic Defense Initiative director, warned that New START is dangerous and unnecessary.

Written under the title of the "New Deterrent Working Group," the letter points out that the treaty "would reduce the survivability and flexibility of our forces, which is exactly the wrong posture to be adopting in the uncertain and dynamic post-Cold War strategic environment."

It also notes that allies "have privately warned that the United States must not reduce its strategic force levels so low that they call into question the credibility of the U.S. nuclear umbrella" and that nations such as Japan may be encouraged to go nuclear to counter a growing threat from China.

In eight or nine years, according to the letter, the number of Russian launchers will shrink from the current 680, some of which already are no longer operational, to about 270 without the treaty simply due to attrition and age and lack of modern replacements.

As Meese and Richard Perle, assistant secretary of defense under Reagan, wrote in a recent op-ed: "On this issue, Presidents Obama and Reagan are diametrically opposed. Reagan was adamant that no arms-control agreement be allowed to encumber the pursuit of advanced ballistic missile defense technology."

At Reykjavik, Reagan refused to give up SDI in exchange for the promise of a world without nuclear weapons because he knew the problem was not the weapons, but who had them. He knew that national defense was a constitutional imperative that could not and should not be surrendered to Moscow.

<http://www.investors.com/NewsAndAnalysis/Article.aspx?id=556949&p=1>

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