



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER

CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Issue No. 725, 30 June 2009

Articles & Other Documents:

[Russia, U.S. to Sign Military Cooperation Deal during Obama Trip](#)

[U.S. SouthCom Head Warns of Iranian Influence in Region](#)

[Defence Black Hole 'May Finish Trident'](#)

[West Hopes for Restart of Multilateral Talks with Iran on Nuke Issue Soon: Solana](#)

[£20billion Plan to Replace Britain's Nuclear Missile System Faces the Axe](#)

[Ahmadinejad Role Downplayed](#)

[US-Russia Report on Scrapping Nuclear Weapons to Be Unveiled](#)

[Britain Gets Ready for Cyber-War](#)

[Mullen "Encouraged" by Progress in START Negotiations](#)

[New Cyber-Security Unit for GCHQ, Young Ex-hackers to be Staff](#)

[S. Korea to Bolster Assets against N. Korean Nuclear, Missile Threats](#)

[U.S. and Russia Differ On a Treaty for Cyberspace](#)

[N. Korea yet to Change Behavior despite Pressure: U.S. Official](#)

[Documents Back Saudi Link to Extremists](#)

[N. Korea Threatens to Shoot Down Japanese Surveillance Planes](#)

[Obama Officials Fight Saudi-Qaida-9/11 Revelation](#)

[Uranium Gives N Korea Second Way to Make Bombs](#)

[N. Africa Qaeda Says it shot American in Mauritania](#)

[DPRK's Nuclear Weapons Not to Threaten Others: Newspaper](#)

[Turks Increasingly Turn to Islamic Extremism](#)

[South Korea Getting U.S. Missiles to Boost Defences: Report](#)

[Nuclear Hide and Seek](#)

[N Korea Criticizes US Missile Defense for Hawaii](#)

[Our Decaying Nuclear Deterrent](#)

[N. Korea Enriching Uranium as Leader's Health May be Relapsing: S. Korea](#)

[Target: Hawaii](#)

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
26 June 2009

Russia, U.S. to Sign Military Cooperation Deal during Obama Trip

MOSCOW, June 26 (RIA Novosti) - A Russian-U.S. military cooperation agreement will be signed during President Barack Obama's visit to Moscow in early July, the chief of the Russian military's General Staff said on Friday.

Army Gen. Nikolai Makarov said a draft had been finalized with Adm. Michael Mullen, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, currently on a three-day visit to Russia.

"We discussed a number of very serious and important matters related both to international and regional security. The main emphasis was laid on European security," Makarov said.

Adm. Mullen is to meet with Russian Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov, with U.S. missile defense in Europe expected to top the agenda according to media reports.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev said last week that any strategic arms cuts would only be possible if the United States eased Russia's concerns over Washington's plans for a missile shield in the Czech Republic and Poland.

The U.S. military has recently reiterated its commitment to missile defense, citing a growing threat from North Korea and Iran, but suggested plans for a European site may change.

U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates has suggested that Russian facilities could be part of the missile defense system, but Moscow has rejected this idea, saying there could be no partnership "in building facilities that are essentially designed to counter Russia's strategic deterrence forces."

Meanwhile, Russia and the U.S. are involved in talks on a new strategic arms reduction deal to replace the START I treaty, which expires in December.

Moscow, which proposed a new arms reduction agreement in 2005, expects Washington to agree on a deal that would restrict not only the numbers of nuclear warheads, but also place limits on all existing kinds of delivery vehicles.

However, Russia has insisted that the deployment of a planned U.S. missile defense system in Europe would greatly impede progress on strategic arms reductions.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20090626/155360533.html>

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

London Guardian
The Observer,
28 June 2009

Defence Black Hole 'May Finish Trident'

Gaby Hinsliff and Mark Townsend

Defence projects worth billions of pounds, such as replacing the Trident nuclear deterrent, could have to be axed to help fill a "black hole" in the defence budget, senior military and political figures will warn tomorrow.

Overstretch of the armed forces must be ended, according to a report whose authors include the former Nato secretary general, Lord Robertson, ex-Marine Lord Ashdown and former chief of the defence staff Lord Guthrie.

They argue that Britain should no longer struggle to maintain a full range of defence capability like the US and instead consider scrapping up to £24bn of future "big ticket" projects - including two new aircraft carriers, the F35 joint strike fighters designed to fly from them, six new Type 45 destroyers, four new Astute hunter-killer submarines and the replacement of the Vanguard submarines carrying Trident.

The report from the National Security Commission, convened by the thinktank the Institute for Public Policy Research, argues Britain still needs a nuclear deterrent but should seek cheaper alternative or patch up the Vanguards.

However, it makes clear that even if unjustifiable spending is axed the defence budget may still need more public money. It calls for boosting the armed forces from 98,000 to 120,000 personnel and the creation of a new stabilisation force to tackle situations like postwar Afghanistan and Iraq.

Yesterday Des Browne, who as Labour 's defence secretary pushed the Trident decision through parliament, welcomed the report, telling the Observer that while it was the right choice at the time to upgrade the system, possible alternatives were now emerging.

"I never, ever thought that the decision about Trident closed the debate down," he said. He also confirmed claims of a black hole, adding: "There is an order book which outstrips the department's capacity to pay for it - that's no secret."

The report is embarrassing for Gordon Brown, who yesterday marked Britain's first Armed Forces Day at a ceremony in Kent. He has refused to discuss possible public spending cuts despite the recession and denied that overstretch hampers Britain's defence capability.

But Guthrie insisted the human costs of underfunding were high: "My concern is that we have soldiers who are dying because of inadequate equipment."

A spokesman for the MoD said its budget was in the longest period of sustained real growth for over two decades. "Of course, there are always things we could spend a bigger budget on, but our job is to manage within our allocation, recognising that the financial situation is now difficult right across the UK." The nuclear deterrent was an investment "that as a nation we can and should afford".

- Scottish secretary Jim Murphy yesterday hit out at "sickening" protests which disrupted an Armed Forces Day parade in Glasgow. Several people were arrested and one person was injured. The protesters, believed to have been an Irish republican group, began chanting during a service in George Square. Murphy said: "These people stand against every value the veterans we celebrated today fought - and died - for and they must know that the majority of Scotland has no time or patience for their vile views."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2009/jun/28/defence-projects-axed-save-money>

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

Daily Mirror – U.K.

28 June 2009

£20billion Plan to Replace Britain's Nuclear Missile System Faces the Axe

By Vincent Moss

Gordon Brown has ordered a major review of a £20billion plan to replace Britain's ageing Trident nuclear missile system.

Instead of replacing the warheads, one option under consideration is to extend the life of the existing ones.

The move - which could save more than £10billion - follows demands for the programme to be scrapped to save taxpayers' cash as the recession bites deeper.

Ministers are now looking at alternatives to the plan - pushed through in 2006 by Tony Blair - to replace our four nuclear submarines with new boats from 2024. A senior Ministry of Defence source said: "All spending will be reviewed next year and that includes Trident."

One option being considered would still see the new subs built at Barrow in Cumbria at a cost of up to £4billion.

But the Government would save cash by working with US President Barack Obama to almost double the lifespan of the existing nuclear warheads from 25-35 years to up to 60.

The MoD source said: "We could work with Obama on this - piggybacking on the Americans."

Any move to delay or scale down a replacement for Trident would delight leftwing Labour MPs.

Government sources believe Mr Brown could confirm the review later this year.

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/top-stories/2009/06/28/trident-115875-21477554/>

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

London Guardian

June 29, 2009

US-Russia Report on Scrapping Nuclear Weapons to Be Unveiled

By Nick Mathiason and Ian Traynor

A three-step process for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons will be unveiled by a powerful group of former policy makers in Washington today.

The report by the Global Zero Commission, formed in response to Barack Obama and Dmitry Medvedev's pledge earlier this year to rid the world of nuclear weapons, is released ahead of a summit in Moscow between the two leaders next weekend.

The US-Russia summit, Obama's first as US president, is expected to see a bilateral agreement cutting nuclear stockpiles through a pact to replace the 1991 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (Start-1), which expires this year. A new treaty is seen as crucial to head off a new nuclear arms race drawing in other countries.

The US and Russia possess 95% of the world's strategic nuclear warheads – about 5,000 each. Next weekend could see agreement to cut the number to 1,500 each.

Ahead of the summit, Nato and Russian foreign ministers met in Corfu in Greece yesterday for the first time in more than a year. The meeting of the Nato-Russia Council, whose work was frozen last year in western protest at Russia's invasion and partition of Georgia, was the first under a new American administration that has promised to "press the reset button" in relations with the Kremlin.

The two sides agreed to disagree over Georgia, while resuming military co-operation and seeking deals on Afghanistan and Iran.

A new nuclear disarmament treaty will be among five urgent issues discussed by Obama and Medvedev next weekend.

Two of the others – Iran and the deployment by the US of nuclear weapons in Poland – are related to the Global Zero initiative.

The three-step disarmament process will be outlined in Washington DC today by the 100 Global Zero commissioners including Richard Burt, the former chief US negotiator for Start-1 and a former ambassador to Germany, and Igor Yurgens, a senior adviser to Medvedev.

The Global Zero report warns: "The world is nearing a proliferation tipping point when nuclear weapons spread beyond the capacity of any effort to rein them in and the chances increase that they will be used by a country in conflict or by accident, or by a terrorist group." The US and Russia each have about 5,000 nuclear warheads – 95% of the world's stockpile. They aim to cut that to 1,500 each

Nine states have admitted they have nuclear weapons, but there are fears that if Iran presses ahead with its nuclear ambitions, it will set off a damaging chain reaction with countries such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt following suit.

Key elements of the commission's plan include the negotiation of a US-Russia accord for bilateral deep reductions going far beyond expected commitments, the negotiation of a multilateral global zero accord for the phased reduction of all nuclear arsenals, and the establishment of a comprehensive system of safeguards on the use of nuclear energy.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2009/jun/28/nuclear-weapons-summit-disarmament>

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

Global Security Newswire

June 29, 2009

Mullen "Encouraged" by Progress in START Negotiations

The chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff expressed optimism Saturday about U.S. and Russian progress toward replacing a key arms control treaty, Agence France-Presse reported (see *GSN*, June 25).

"It's really up to the two presidents to make the final decision and to sign it. But I am encouraged by the progress that I am aware of from the negotiations viewpoint," Adm. Michael Mullen said of a potential successor to the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, a 1991 agreement set to expire in December.

Negotiators from Moscow and Washington have met three times to hash out a new pact, which could mandate further reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the former Cold War rivals. U.S. President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev are expected to discuss the matter during their upcoming summit.

Mullen met last week with Gen. Nikolai Markarov, his Russian counterpart. They were expected to discuss a Bush administration proposal to deploy missile interceptors in Poland and a radar station in the Czech Republic. Moscow, which has long opposed the missile shield plan, has hinted that it would curtail its nuclear arsenal reductions if Washington moved to deploy the defenses.

"There is a review [of the missile shield proposal] going on in the U.S. right now under the auspice of President Obama's new administration. So there's no final decision which has been made," Mullen told the Russia Today television channel. "Certainly we recognize the sensitivity of the issue" (Agence France-Presse/Spacewar.com, June 27).

Russia and the United States should agree to pursue significant nuclear arsenal cutbacks, said Arms Control Association head Daryl Kimball.

"The United States deploys about 2,200 strategic warheads -- the Russians somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000. Many of these weapons are on a high state of alert, they can be launched within minutes and it simply is a posture, a nuclear posture that's out of step with current day realities," Kimball told Voice of America.

The two governments will have to overcome certain differences to reach an agreement, another observer said.

"The differences on START have to do with what one does with warheads once they are removed -- and the storage of missiles," said David Kramer, a former State Department official who served under former President George W. Bush. "There is no debate any more about the treaty being legally binding -- there's agreement on that. But it's a question of counting, and what qualifies as a warhead, and what one does with them after: whether they should be destroyed or held in storage somewhere."

"There is some discussion back and forth about the numbers," Kramer added. "It is an issue about how low the two sides can go. Under the [2002] Moscow Treaty, the two sides could go as low as 1,700 [deployed strategic warheads]. The talk now in this post-START agreement is for something around 1,500 -- some have been pushing for a lower number."

Significant nuclear reductions, though, are ultimately more important to Russia than the United States, he added: "Their nuclear weapons infrastructure is deteriorating and they aren't able to maintain their current levels -- No. 1. No. 2, if -- and no one is advocating this -- if somehow there were a renewed arms race, Russia couldn't compete. And so Russia has every interest in lowering the levels between the two sides" (Andre de Nesnera, Voice of America, June 26).

http://www.globalsecuritynewswire.org/gsn/nw_20090629_8086.php

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

Yonhap News
26 June 2009

S. Korea to Bolster Assets against N. Korean Nuclear, Missile Threats

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, June 26 (Yonhap) -- South Korea on Friday unveiled a set of defense policy guidelines that would enable it to scrutinize every North Korean nuclear and missile base independently by 2020 and strike it if necessary.

The guidelines, effective between fiscal 2009 and 2020, were announced as tension heightened on the Korean Peninsula following the second nuclear test by North Korea on May 25.

"National Defense Reform 2020" was first introduced in 2005, a year before North Korea conducted its first underground nuclear explosion and test-fired a long-range ballistic missile.

The reform plan came under scrutiny early last year, when President Lee Myung-bak took office in Seoul with a pledge to press harder for the nuclear disarmament of North Korea.

The relations between the Koreas have since hit one of their lowest points in modern history. The two remain technically at war across a heavily armed border after their 1950-53 Korean War ended in a truce.

Following the latest atomic test, North Korea test-fired a series of short-range missiles and declared the armistice void. It is also believed to be making preparations to test-fire a long-range ballistic missile that can theoretically hit Alaska.

"Following the second nuclear test and missile tests by North Korea, we have re-assessed the North Korean threats and our capabilities to respond," South Korean Defense Minister Lee Sang-hee said in a briefing.

Approved Friday by President Lee, Reform 2020 prioritizes the expansion of high-tech military assets capable of monitoring and hitting North Korean nuclear and missile sites wherever they are.

South Korea's ability to scrutinize North Korean bases north of Pyongyang has been limited because of its lack of advanced intelligence equipment, according to South Korean defense sources.

The reform plan is aimed at redressing the shortfall and therefore reduce the reliance on U.S. intelligence by 2020 through the acquisition of drones and a satellite, according to officials.

The South Korean military "should reinforce its capacity to perform surveillance and reconnaissance, conduct precision-guided strikes and make interceptions," the reform plan said.

The reinforcement is aimed at "stemming and eliminating to a maximum degree" what the Ministry of National Defense described as the North's "asymmetrical threats" -- nuclear and missile programs.

"If it becomes clear that North Korea is moving to hit us with its nuclear and missile arsenal, we will hit its bases as quickly as possible to prevent launches no matter where they are," a senior official, who took part in creating the guidelines, said.

"But we don't by any means have any intention to consider a preemptive strike on North Korean bases when there is no clear evidence of an imminent attack," the official said, speaking on condition of anonymity because he is not allowed to reveal his identity to the public.

The reform plan, which estimated about 599.3 trillion won (US\$466 billion) will be needed to meet the goals, said North Korea's special forces and its long-range artillery deployed along the border represented the other areas where the South remained under-strength.

"A fierce and large-scale engagement between ground troops is inevitable upon the start of a war," the document said, noting that U.S. and South Korean air forces would have difficulties navigating the rugged topography to provide close air support in war.

The U.S. has 28,500 troops and about 80 non-rotational fighter aircraft stationed here as a deterrent against North Korea.

The reform plan stipulated that the number of South Korean troops will be reduced from 655,000 to 517,000 by 2020.

"The reform is based on a plan that seeks not to reduce troops but to streamline the army and enable it to dominate the battlefield," Defense Minister Lee said.

The number of army divisions will be reduced from 47 to 28 as part of the streamlining push, according to the reform plan, which suggests that South Korea should increase its naval missile interceptors.

Refurbishment of defense facilities against electromagnetic pulses emitted from a nuclear explosion is also one of the reforms the document proposed. The pulses, weapons experts say, can paralyze defense systems outside the range of a blast.

The reform plan also calls for the establishment of an independent cyber warfare command by 2012 to deal with the increasing threat of North Korean hacking into its defense networks.

According to South Korean defense officials, North Korea operates a cyber warfare unit that specializes in hacking South Korean and U.S. military networks.

Reform 2020 also mandated the creation of a 3,000-strong military unit that can readily be deployed to assist peacekeeping operations around the world.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/06/26/23/0401000000AEN20090626007100315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News
26 June 2009

N. Korea yet to Change Behavior despite Pressure: U.S. Official

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, June 26 (Yonhap) -- A senior U.S. defense official said Friday she has yet to see "any definitive signs of change" in North Korean behavior despite pressure on the communist state to change course on its nuclear and missile programs.

"Their actions have been very provocative. Their rhetoric has been very provocative. We have not yet seen any definitive signs of change," Michele Flournoy, undersecretary of defense for policy, said.

Flournoy's visit to South Korea -- part of her Asia trip that also took her to China and Japan this week -- came as a U.S. Navy destroyer was tracking a North Korean ship suspected of carrying weapons banned under a U.N. Security Council resolution.

The resolution was adopted after North Korea conducted its second nuclear test on May 25. Flournoy said she met earlier Friday with South Korea's top diplomatic and security officials on ways to implement the resolution that has tightened sanctions on North Korea.

"The more the international community remains unified and firm in calling for North Korea to denuclearize and change its course," the likelier it is to change, she told reporters in Seoul.

Flournoy said she had "a good exchange of views" with officials during her visit to China -- a North Korean ally considered to hold the key to the successful implementation of the resolution.

But she said her country and China have yet to reach an agreement on a common avenue to tackle North Korea, which also appears to be preparing to test-fire a long-range ballistic missile.

"We had a good exchange of views on how best to deal with that threat, but those conversations have yet to yield a common strategy. So we have to keep working on that," she said.

Flournoy noted that the U.S. still has "incentives and disincentives that will get North Korea to change course."

"Everything remains on the table, but we're focused on implementing the resolution fully, responsibly and with our international partners," she said.

Flournoy ruled out the possibility of using military force to inspect the North Korean ship, Kang Nam, which is believed to be traveling along the Chinese coast.

"The U.N. resolution lays out a regime that has a very clear set of steps," she said. "I want to be very clear ... This is not a resolution that sponsors, that authorizes use of force for interdiction."

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/06/26/10/0401000000AEN20090626007000315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News

27 June 2009

N. Korea Threatens to Shoot Down Japanese Surveillance Planes

SEOUL, June 27 (Yonhap) -- North Korea threatened Saturday to shoot down any Japanese aircraft entering its air space, accusing Tokyo of spying on the country earlier this week.

"An E-767 made a long shuttle flight from air above the waters east of Wonsan to the air above the waters east of Musudan after taking off from its base in Japan about 8:30 a.m. on June 25," the North's Korean People's Army (KPA) said in a report carried by the country's Korean Central News Agency.

Musudan was the site used for North Korea's long-range rocket launch in April that it claims was for a satellite but is believed by neighbors to have been a disguise for a ballistic missile test.

The KPA report claimed a Japanese surveillance aircraft had also conducted an aerial espionage mission on Wednesday.

"The air force of the Korean People's Army will not tolerate even a bit the aerial espionage by the warmongers of the Japanese aggression forces but mercilessly shoot down any plane intruding into the territorial air of the DPRK even 0.001 mm," the report said. DPRK stands for the North's official name, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

North Korea is believed to be preparing to test launch yet another long-range missile from its east coast following its nuclear test on May 25.

The communist nation has been severely condemned for its rocket and atomic tests by the United Nations, but Pyongyang is continuing to raise tension with threats to reinforce its nuclear arsenal.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/06/27/69/0401000000AEN20090627001300315F.HTML>

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

Washington Post

June 28, 2009

Uranium Gives N Korea Second Way to Make Bombs

By KWANG-TAE KIM

SEOUL, South Korea -- After repudiating negotiations on dismantling its plutonium-based nuclear program, North Korea admitted this month to having an even more worrying way to make bombs.

Following nearly seven years of adamant denials, North Korea announced it can enrich uranium - a simpler method of building nuclear weapons than reprocessing plutonium. Uranium can be enriched in relatively inconspicuous factories that can better evade spy-satellite detection, and uranium bombs may work without test explosions.

The admission - made in a threatening response to a June 12 U.N. Security Council resolution punishing Pyongyang for an underground plutonium bomb test last month - poses a new challenge to the U.S., China, South Korea, Russia and Japan as they seek to stem the reclusive country's atomic ambitions.

Since 2003, they have focused on persuading the North to disable a nuclear reactor north of Pyongyang, where the communist regime had been laboriously extracting plutonium, not a naturally occurring material, from spent fuel rods.

Natural uranium, on the other hand, is readily available. North Korea has said it has an estimated 26 million tons of natural uranium deposits, of which about four million tons can be economically extracted. The Washington-based Federation of American Scientists also said an estimated 4 million tons is high-quality uranium ore.

That doesn't mean North Korea can make a uranium bomb overnight. The uranium must be highly enriched first, and making enough for a bomb requires operating 1,000 to 3,000 centrifuges for a year, said Lee Choon-geun, an expert at South Korea's state-funded Science and Technology Policy Institute.

But its recent announcement suggests the country has begun heading in that direction.

And once the weapons-grade enriched uranium is in hand, it is "significantly easier" to build a bomb from it than from plutonium, said Ivan Oelrich, vice president of the Federation of American Scientists.

Uranium also can be enriched in a facility like an ordinary factory and doesn't release much heat compared with the plutonium-producing reactor at Yongbyon, north of Pyongyang. That makes it difficult for spy satellites to detect, according to South Korea's Institute of Nuclear Nonproliferation and Control.

And testing is not as essential for bombs built from uranium as for plutonium bombs. The North has conducted two nuclear tests of plutonium-made bombs, in 2006 and in May, which drew international condemnation and garnered U.N. sanctions.

Daniel Pinkston, a Seoul-based analyst for the International Crisis Group think tank, noted that the United States' first uranium bomb wasn't tested until it was dropped on Japan in August 1945.

In contrast, "a plutonium bomb generally is more sophisticated and needs to be tested before it can be used with confidence," he said.

Little concrete information is available about North Korea's uranium program and how far they've come in developing it. Oelrich estimated it is "in its infancy."

One senior South Korean official said he suspects the North has already embarked on uranium enrichment with the ultimate purpose of building bombs. He spoke on condition of anonymity, citing the sensitivity of the issue.

"I don't believe they have a commercial-scale plant up and running, and it will take them some time," Pinkston said. "However, they could cooperate with Iran and reduce the time required to build and operate a large-scale facility since Iran has made significant progress and is already operating a large facility."

North Korea and Iran are believed to be trading information about nuclear and missile technology, making proliferation a key concern.

"The more fissionable materials they have ... the more dangerous is the situation," said James Kelly, a former assistant U.S. secretary of state who confronted North Korean officials about uranium enrichment during a 2002 visit to Pyongyang.

North Korea claimed earlier this month it was "compelled to go nuclear" because of hostility from Washington.

"It has become an absolutely impossible option for the DPRK to even think about giving up its nuclear weapons," the Foreign Ministry said in a statement carried by state media, using the initials for the country's official name, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

The statement did not make clear whether the regime has secretly built up the program over the past seven years that it has denied its existence - or started it recently.

"The process of uranium enrichment will be commenced," the June 13 statement said. "Pursuant to the decision to build its own light-water reactor, enough success has been made in developing uranium enrichment technology to provide nuclear fuel to allow the experimental procedure."

Building a light-water reactor, ostensibly for civilian energy purposes, would give the North Koreans a premise for enriching uranium. Uranium enriched to low levels is used in power reactors; left spinning, centrifuges will enrich uranium to the high levels needed for bombs.

Suspicious about a North Korean uranium enrichment program date back years.

North Korea worked with A.Q. Khan, creator of Pakistan's atomic bomb, to obtain the centrifuges needed for uranium enrichment before his operation was disrupted in 2003, former Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf said.

He wrote in his 2006 memoir that Khan transferred nearly two dozen centrifuges - the main equipment used for uranium enrichment - to North Korea, as well as nearly 18 tons of materials, including centrifuges, components and drawings, to Iran and Libya.

Khan also "provided North Korea with a flow meter, some special oils for centrifuges, and coaching on centrifuge technology, including visits to top-secret centrifuge plants," Musharraf wrote in "In the Line of Fire."

In addition, North Korea bought 150 tons of aluminum tubes from Russia, another material used to build the centrifuges required to enrich uranium, said Lee, of the Science and Technology Policy Institute.

In 2007, then-U.S. nuclear envoy Christopher Hill said Washington knew Pyongyang had purchased equipment only used for uranium enrichment.

The future of nuclear disarmament negotiations with North Korea - known as the six-party talks and involving the two Koreas, the U.S., Russia, China and Japan - remained unclear weeks after North Korea abandoned the process and vowed to restart its plutonium reprocessing plant.

The decision to reveal its capability to enrich uranium now is most certainly tied to the succession campaign believed under way in North Korea, said Cheong Seong-chang, a senior analyst at Sejong Institute security think tank.

The country is in the middle of a "150-day battle" to build up the country's economy; many see it as a political campaign for Kim Jong Un, the 26-year-old reportedly slated to succeed his father, 67-year-old leader Kim Jong Il.

"Uranium enrichment can be used as a propaganda campaign to show Kim Jong Un's boldness as well as the North's determination not to buckle under pressure and solve its energy shortages, Cheong said.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/28/AR2009062801020.html>

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

China View
28 June 2009

DPRK's Nuclear Weapons Not to Threaten Others: Newspaper

PYONGYANG, June 28 (Xinhua) -- The nuclear weapons of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) were "neither threatening other countries, nor be used for preemptive attacks," said a commentary carried by the Rodong Sinmun daily on Sunday.

The DPRK's nuclear deterrent is, to all intents and purposes, of self-defensive nature and has an aim and mission to champion peace, the commentary said.

The article accused the United States of using the nuclear programs as a pretext to isolate and choke off the DPRK.

The nuclear crisis on the Korean Peninsula was the outcome of confrontation between the DPRK and U.S., and should be resolved by the two countries, it said.

The DPRK took the "denuclearization" as a means to defend national independence and dignity, not to "submit to the U.S.'s nuclear deterrence to dismantle its arms," the article added, vowing to bolster up its "nuclear deterrence" in the future.

The UN Security Council on June 12 unanimously approved wider sanctions against the DPRK over its May 25 nuclear test. The resolution bans all weapons exports from the DPRK and most arms imports into the country.

It authorizes the UN member states to inspect DPRK's sea, air and land cargo, requiring them to seize and destroy any goods transported in violation of the sanctions.

The DPRK said it "opposed and denounced" the UN resolution, vowing to produce more nuclear weapons.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-06/28/content_11615023.htm

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

Reuters.com
June 28, 2009

South Korea Getting U.S. Missiles to Boost Defences: Report

SEOUL (Reuters) - South Korea is acquiring 40 U.S.-made missiles for an Aegis destroyer this month to boost its defenses amid reports North Korea may soon test-fire missiles, Yonhap news agency on Sunday quoted a military source as saying.

North Korea, which rattled regional security with a May 25 nuclear test, is preparing to test a long-range missile that could hit U.S. territory and mid-range missiles that could hit all of South Korea, a South Korean presidential Blue House official said last week.

The surface-to-air missiles for the Aegis destroyer, designed to track and shoot down objects including missiles, can hit targets up to 160 km (100 miles) away, Yonhap quoted the source as saying.

North Korea has also warned ships to stay away from waters off its east coast city of Wonsan, Japan's Coast Guard said last week, in a possible indication of a missile test.

North Korea launched in April a rocket it said was carrying a satellite. The move was widely seen as a disguised test of its long-range Taepodong-2 missile and a violation of U.N. resolutions barring the reclusive state from ballistic missile testing.

The U.N. Security Council punished it for the missile launch by tightening existing sanctions and imposing new ones after the nuclear test to halt its arms trading, one of the few items the cash-short state with a broken down economy can export.

The U.S. Navy has said it is monitoring a North Korean ship under the new U.N. security resolutions imposed after the nuclear test. A South Korean intelligence source said the ship is likely carrying missiles and parts, and it could be heading to Myanmar, broadcaster YTN said.

At the weekend, the prickly North warned in an official media report it would shoot down any Japanese military plane that breached North Korean air space.

South Korean officials have said the North's recent saber rattling may be a way for leader Kim Jong-il to build internal support as he prepares for succession in Asia's only communist dynasty.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/newsOne/idUSTRE55R08020090628>

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

Washington Post
June 29, 2009

N Korea Criticizes US Missile Defense for Hawaii

By HYUNG-JIN KIM

SEOUL, South Korea -- North Korea criticized the U.S. on Monday for positioning missile defense systems around Hawaii, calling the deployment part of a plot to attack the regime and saying it would bolster its nuclear arsenal in retaliation.

U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates has said he ordered the deployment of a ground-based, mobile missile intercept system and radar system to Hawaii amid concerns the North may fire a long-range missile toward the islands, about 4,500 miles away.

"Through the U.S. forces' clamorous movements, it has been brought to light that the U.S. attempt to launch a pre-emptive strike on our republic has become a brutal fact," the North's main Rodong Sinmun newspaper said in a commentary.

The paper also accused the U.S. of deploying nuclear-powered aircraft and atomic-armed submarines in waters near the Korean peninsula, saying the moves prove "the U.S. pre-emptive nuclear war" on the North is imminent.

The commentary, carried by the official Korean Central News Agency, said the North will bolster its nuclear arsenal in self-defense.

The North routinely accuses the U.S. of plotting to invade the North. But the U.S., which has 28,500 troops in South Korea, has said it has no such plan.

Tensions on the Korean peninsula have been running high since the North defiantly launched a rocket in April and conducted an underground nuclear test last month, prompting U.N. Security Council sanctions.

North Korea responded to the U.N. resolution on the nuclear test with threats of war, and pledged to expand its nuclear bomb-making program.

In what could be the first test of the U.N. sanctions, an American destroyer has been tracking a North Korean ship sailing off China's coast amid suspicions that it is carrying illicit weapons.

The Kang Nam, which left a North Korean port on June 17, is the first vessel monitored under U.N. sanctions that ban the regime from selling arms and weapons-related material. The resolution requires member nations to request permission to inspect the cargo of ships suspected of carrying banned goods.

The U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice, said on CBS television Sunday that Washington is "following the progress of that ship very closely." Rice would not say whether the U.S. would confront the Kang Nam.

North Korea has said it would consider any interception of its ships a declaration of war.

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2009/06/29/AR2009062900307.html>

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

Yonhap News
30 June 2009

N. Korea Enriching Uranium as Leader's Health May be Relapsing: S. Korea

SEOUL, June 30 (Yonhap) -- North Korea appears to be "definitely" pressing ahead with uranium enrichment that would give it another means to build nuclear arms, South Korea's defense chief said Tuesday.

Defense Minister Lee Sang-hee also said in a parliamentary hearing that recent outside observations concerning North Korean leader Kim Jong-il could suggest he is experiencing a relapse in his health.

Kim, 67, reportedly suffered a stroke in August last year but has since recovered enough to reassert control over his secretive regime. Health experts say the risk of a relapse is a threat among stroke patients.

"The military is intensely monitoring (the situation) while bearing in mind the possibilities that Kim's health has degraded," Lee said, citing speculation that North Korea recently used an old photo of Kim to fabricate a report about a recent field inspection.

Lee professed his belief that North Korea is enriching uranium -- a second track to developing a nuclear bomb.

"It seems it is definitely being pursued," he said.

"Uranium enrichment can be conducted in a space as small as 600 square meters," he said. "It is easier to hide than plutonium reprocessing."

North Korea vowed on June 13 to go ahead with uranium enrichment in anger over a U.N. Security Council resolution that expands sanctions on it for its May 25 nuclear test.

Announcing it had achieved "enough success" in the development of uranium enrichment technology, the North also said it will weaponize all new plutonium it produces.

South Korea believes the North has about 40 kilograms of plutonium, enough to produce at least six bombs.

North Korea conducted its first nuclear test in 2006. South and North Korea remain technically at war after the 1950-53 Korean War ended in a truce rather than a peace treaty.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2009/06/30/72/0401000000AEN20090630004400315F.HTML>

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

DefenseNews.com

June 25, 2009

U.S. SouthCom Head Warns of Iranian Influence in Region

By Juan Castro Olivera, Agence France-Presse

MIAMI -- Iran's growing influence in Latin America is a "potential risk" to the region, the newly-appointed head of the U.S. Southern Command has warned.

U.S. Air Force Gen. Douglas Fraser, who took charge of U.S. military operations in 31 countries across Latin America and the Caribbean on June 25, expressed "real concern" about the Islamic Republic's links with "extremist organizations" in the region.

"The real concern is not a nation-to-nation interaction, it is the connection that Iran has with extremist organizations like Hamas and Hezbollah, and the potential risk that that could bring to this region," Fraser told journalists ahead of taking up the post.

Iranian president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has forged close ties with several leftist Latin American leaders in recent years, most notably Venezuela's Hugo Chavez and Cuban leader Raul Castro.

Commenting on Iran's ties to extremist groups in the region, Fraser said: "It is a concern, and it is an issue we will continue to monitor for any increasing activity."

He cited Lebanon-based Hezbollah, which has links to Iran and is accused of being behind a suicide bombing that killed 200 U.S. marines in Beirut in 1983 and the 1996 bombing of the Khobar towers in Saudi Arabia, which killed more than 20 people.

The group has denied playing a role in those attacks and the bombing of Israeli and Jewish targets in Buenos Aires.

Fraser, who was deputy commander at U.S. Pacific Command, said the illicit trade in arms drugs and people was worrying, and indicated it would be the focus of his work.

"The major concern is the illicit trafficking and the impact that that is having in the security and the stability, especially through the northern part of South America through Central America and the Caribbean, and through Mexico and the United States."

He added the U.S. needed to ensure links between narcoterrorism and illicit trafficking do not become more pronounced.

Fraser played down talk of a conventional threat in the hemisphere, but said Venezuela's military stance was concerning.

"I'm concern with the military buildup in Venezuela because I don't understand the threat that they see," he said. "I don't see a conventional military threat in the region. So I don't see why they see a need to build their military to the point that they are pursuing."

Fraser, who lived in Colombia for three years as a teenager, said Southern Command would continue to help that country combat leftist guerillas like the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia - the FARC - and narcoterrorist groups.

"The FARC is not defeated and we need to continued that effort. That's been a focus for a very specific reason," he said.

"But Southern Command has been engaged with all the militaries within the region, with the exception of Cuba," he continued. "My intent is not to focus on one nation or the other because it is together that we build that capacity."

Fraser is the first Air Force officer to take the helm of the Southern Command.

He replaces U.S. Navy Adm. James Stavridis, who has been tapped to become NATO Supreme Allied Commander in Europe.

<http://www.defensenews.com/story.php?i=4157000&c=AME&s=TOP>

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

China View

28 June 2009

West Hopes for Restart of Multilateral Talks with Iran on Nuke Issue Soon: Solana

CORFU, Greece, June 28 (Xinhua) -- European Union (EU) foreign and security policy chief Javier Solana on Sunday said that the West hopes to restart talks with Iran on its nuclear program soon.

"We would like very much that soon we would have the possibility to restart the multilateral talks with Iran on the important issue," Solana told reporters at an informal meeting of foreign ministers of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

The EU will continue to say what it has to say about the Iranian government's behavior vis-a-vis the people, Solana said.

The EU has repeatedly expressed concern about post-election violence against Iranian demonstrators and called on the Iranian authorities to respect freedom of expression.

Solana said the EU would like to see how the situation would finally get stabilized and to seek engagement with the Iranian authorities on the nuclear issue.

He refused to say whether he has had any contacts with the Iranian government since the presidential elections in mid-June.

He said the OSCE foreign ministers will have an informal exchange of views on Iran on Sunday.

The foreign ministers of the Group of Eight (G8) major industrialized nations on Saturday confirmed their commitment to a diplomatic solution to the Iranian nuclear issue.

"We remain committed to finding a diplomatic solution to the issue of Iran's nuclear program and support renewed efforts to that effect, such as the readiness of the United States to enter into direct talks and the invitation from China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States to Iran to restart negotiations, as well as the constructive involvement of other G8 partners in the process," a statement of the G8 foreign ministers said.

They urged Iran to seize the opportunity to give diplomacy a chance to find a negotiated solution to the nuclear issue.

The West suspects that Iran's nuclear program is intended for nuclear weapons. But Iran has claimed that it is for peaceful purposes only.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2009-06/28/content_11614521.htm

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

Straits Times – Singapore

29 June 2009

Ahmadinejad Role Downplayed

WASHINGTON - THE United States on Sunday reiterated its intent to continue discussions with Teheran over its nuclear programme but downplayed any role that Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad would have in formulating policy.

'Whatever Mr Ahmadinejad says, everyone understands that in Iran, he is not the person who makes decisions on foreign policy, on defence policy,' senior White House adviser David Axelrod told the ABC show 'This Week.'

The arbiter on policy in the Islamic republic is its supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who Washington has openly hinted was the ultimate target of US engagement policies.

Mr Axelrod's comments - and those of Washington's ambassador to the United Nations, Susan Rice - come a day after Mr Ahmadinejad again slammed US President Barack Obama for 'interfering' in Iran, as debate raged over the Iranian president's disputed re-election.

Ms Rice told CBS's 'Face the Nation' that Mr Ahmadinejad is 'not the principal decision-maker when it comes to foreign policy and national security,' and that the supreme leader is.

'That was the case before the election; it is the case now,' she said. 'And we will proceed in pursuit of our national interests, using all elements at our disposal, to try to achieve the goals that are most important to us, which are obviously to prevent Iran from pursuing its nuclear weapons capability, preventing a regional arms race (and) ensuring that our partners and allies in the region and indeed the United States remain safe.'

On Friday, Mr Obama decried Iran's crackdown on demonstrators as 'outrageous' and warned that any direct dialogue with Tehran would be 'affected by the events of the last several weeks.' But he said that talks between Iran and the five veto-wielding permanent members of the UN Security Council (P5) plus Germany over its nuclear programme were likely to continue, a message reinforced Sunday by Mr Axelrod and Ms Rice.

'We will continue to pursue the offer that the P5... plus Germany put on the table two months ago in April to give the Iranians a choice,' Rice said.

'This is up to them. They have one path, which is a path of ending their nuclear weapons programme and acting responsibly, rejoining the community of nations, or another path, which is to face increased isolation and pressure.

That is up to them.' Ms Rice added that US officials 'have not rescinded that prospect' of face-to-face talks between Teheran and Washington.

Mr Axelrod said Teheran's failure to halt its nuclear program would yield 'some very stark consequences.' 'Nuclear weapons in Iran and the nuclearisation of that whole region is a threat to that country, all countries in the region, and the world,' the adviser said. 'And we have to address that. We can't let that lie.' -- AFP

http://www.straitstimes.com/Breaking%2BNews/World/Story/STIStory_396732.html

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

Brisbane Times – Australia

27 June 2009

Britain Gets Ready for Cyber-War

BRITAIN is to build new defences against a "cyber cold war" being launched from China and Russia amid fears that hackers could shut down the computer systems that control the country's power stations, water companies, air traffic and financial markets.

Hackers working from what was once the communist bloc have been attacking government and industry in an attempt to gain military and technological secrets and they are now targeting key elements of the national infrastructure.

The security services fear the technology they are using could fall into the hands of al-Qaeda, who may also try to steal military secrets and launch cyber-attacks that could close down essential services.

The Government has announced a new Cyber Security Operations Centre to counter the threat, bringing together the expertise of MI5, the GCHQ listening centre in Cheltenham and the Metropolitan Police.

Lord West, the Security Minister, said there was a danger that hackers would get into the power grid and "switch things off". He said Britain was developing the capability to strike back by recruiting former hackers at GCHQ.

"You need youngsters who are deep into this stuff. If they have been slightly naughty boys, very often they really enjoy stopping other naughty boys."

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/world/britain-gets-ready-for-cyberwar-20090626-czws.html>

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

Mirror–U.K.

26 June 2009

New Cyber-Security Unit for GCHQ, Young Ex-hackers to be Staff

A new cyber-security operations unit, based at spy central GCHQ, is to be created, the government has announced. The unit will be backed by a policy co-ordination office in Whitehall. And was announced as part of an “updated national security strategy”. Like something out of Spooks: Code 9, Lord Alan West, Home Office security minister, said the unit was looking to recruit young hackers with questionable pasts.

“You need youngsters who are actually deep into this stuff. If they’ve been slightly naughty, very often they really enjoying stopping others,” said West, according to Fox News.

The unit is aimed at stopping cyber-security breaches from “hostile states, terrorists, and criminals.” Gordon Brown said: “Just as in the 19th century we had to secure the seas for our national safety and prosperity, and in the 20th century we had to secure the air, in the 21st century we also have to secure our position in cyberspace.”

West also confirmed that the GCHQ-based unit would not just defend the UK’s cyberspace borders, but potentially could also be used in an offensive capacity: “It would be silly to say that we don’t have any capability to do offensive work from Cheltenham.”

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/technology/2009/06/26/new-cyber-security-unit-for-gchq-young-ex-hackers-to-be-staff-115875-21473422/>

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

New York Times
June 28, 2009

U.S. and Russia Differ On a Treaty for Cyberspace

By John Markoff and Andrew E. Kramer

The United States and Russia are locked in a fundamental dispute over how to counter the growing threat of cyberwar attacks that could wreak havoc on computer systems and the Internet.

Both nations agree that cyberspace is an emerging battleground. The two sides are expected to address the subject when President Obama visits Russia next week and at the General Assembly of the United Nations in November, according to a senior State Department official.

But there the agreement ends.

Russia favors an international treaty along the lines of those negotiated for chemical weapons and has pushed for that approach at a series of meetings this year and in public statements by a high-ranking official.

The United States argues that a treaty is unnecessary. It instead advocates improved cooperation among international law enforcement groups. If these groups cooperate to make cyberspace more secure against criminal intrusions, their work will also make cyberspace more secure against military campaigns, American officials say.

“We really believe it’s defense, defense, defense,” said the State Department official, who asked not to be identified because authorization had not been given to speak on the record. “They want to constrain offense. We needed to be able to criminalize these horrible 50,000 attacks we were getting a day.”

Any agreement on cyberspace presents special difficulties because the matter touches on issues like censorship of the Internet, sovereignty and rogue actors who might not be subject to a treaty.

United States officials say the disagreement over approach has hindered international law enforcement cooperation, particularly given that a significant proportion of the attacks against American government targets are coming from China and Russia.

And from the Russian perspective, the absence of a treaty is permitting a kind of arms race with potentially dangerous consequences.

Officials around the world recognize the need to deal with the growing threat of cyberwar. Many countries, including the United States, are developing weapons for it, like “logic bombs” that can be hidden in computers to halt them at crucial times or damage circuitry; “botnets” that can disable or spy on Web sites and networks; or microwave radiation devices that can burn out computer circuits miles away.

The Pentagon is planning to create a military command to prepare for both defense and offensive computer warfare. And last month, President Obama released his cybersecurity strategy and said he would appoint a “cybersecurity

coordinator” to lead efforts to protect government computers, the air traffic control system and other essential systems. The administration also emphasizes the benefits of building international cooperation.

The Russian and American approaches — a treaty and a law enforcement agreement — are not necessarily incompatible. But they represent different philosophical approaches.

In a speech on March 18, Vladislav P. Sherstyuk, a deputy secretary of the Russian Security Council, a powerful body advising the president on national security, laid out what he described as Russia’s bedrock positions on disarmament in cyberspace. Russia’s proposed treaty would ban a country from secretly embedding malicious codes or circuitry that could be later activated from afar in the event of war.

Other Russian proposals include the application of humanitarian laws banning attacks on noncombatants and a ban on deception in operations in cyberspace — an attempt to deal with the challenge of anonymous attacks. The Russians have also called for broader international government oversight of the Internet.

But American officials are particularly resistant to agreements that would allow governments to censor the Internet, saying they would provide cover for totalitarian regimes. These officials also worry that a treaty would be ineffective because it can be almost impossible to determine if an Internet attack originated from a government, a hacker loyal to that government, or a rogue acting independently.

The unique challenge of cyberspace is that governments can carry out deceptive attacks to which they cannot be linked, said Herbert Lin, director of a study by the National Research Council, a private, nonprofit organization, on the development of cyberweapons.

This challenge became apparent in 2001, after a Navy P-3 surveillance plane collided with a Chinese fighter plane, said Linton Wells II, a former high-ranking Pentagon official who now teaches at the National Defense University. The collision was followed by a huge increase in attacks on United States government computer targets from sources that could not be identified, he said.

Similarly, after computer attacks in Estonia in April 2007 and in the nation of Georgia last August, the Russian government denied involvement and independent observers said the attacks could have been carried out by nationalist sympathizers or by criminal gangs.

The United States is trying to improve cybersecurity by building relationships among international law enforcement agencies. State Department officials hold out as a model the Council of Europe Convention on Cybercrime, which took effect in 2004 and has been signed by 22 nations, including the United States but not Russia or China.

But Russia objects that the European convention on cybercrime allows the police to open an investigation of suspected online crime originating in another country without first informing local authorities, infringing on traditional ideas of sovereignty. Vladimir V. Sokolov, deputy director of the Institute for Information Security Issues, a policy organization, noted that Russian authorities routinely cooperated with foreign police organizations when they were approached.

This is not the first time the issue of arms control for cyberspace has been raised.

In 1996, at the dawn of commercial cyberspace, American and Russian military delegations met secretly in Moscow to discuss the subject. The American delegation was led by an academic military strategist, and the Russian delegation by a four-star admiral. No agreement emerged from the meeting, which has not previously been reported.

Later, the Russian government repeatedly introduced resolutions calling for cyberspace disarmament treaties before the United Nations. The United States consistently opposed the idea.

In late April, Russian military representatives indicated an interest in renewed negotiations at a Russian-sponsored meeting on computer security in Garmisch, Germany.

John Arquilla, an expert in military strategy at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, Calif., who led the American delegation at the 1996 talks, said he had received almost no interest from within the American military after those initial meetings. “It was a great opportunity lost,” he said.

Unlike American officials who favor tightening law enforcement relationships, Mr. Arquilla continues to believe in cyberspace weapons negotiations, he said. He noted that the treaties on chemical weapons had persuaded many nations not to make or stockpile such weapons.

The United States and China have not held high-level talks on cyberwar issues, specialists say. But there is some evidence that the Chinese are being courted by Russia for support of an arms control treaty for cyberspace.

“China has consistently attached extreme importance to matters of information security, and has always actively supported and participated in efforts by the international community dedicated to maintaining Internet safety and cracking down on criminal cyber-activity,” Qin Gang, spokesman for the Foreign Ministry, said in a statement.

Whether the American or Russian approach prevails, arms control experts said, major governments are reaching a point of no return in heading off a cyberwar arms race.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/28/world/28cyber.html>

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

New York Times

June 24, 2009

Documents Back Saudi Link to Extremists

By ERIC LICHTBLAU

WASHINGTON — Documents gathered by lawyers for the families of Sept. 11 victims provide new evidence of extensive financial support for Al Qaeda and other extremist groups by members of the Saudi royal family, but the material may never find its way into court because of legal and diplomatic obstacles.

The case has put the Obama administration in the middle of a political and legal dispute, with the Justice Department siding with the Saudis in court last month in seeking to kill further legal action. Adding to the intrigue, classified American intelligence documents related to Saudi finances were leaked anonymously to lawyers for the families. The Justice Department had the lawyers' copies destroyed and now wants to prevent a judge from even looking at the material.

The Saudis and their defenders in Washington have long denied links to terrorists, and they have mounted an aggressive and, so far, successful campaign to beat back the allegations in federal court based on a claim of sovereign immunity.

Allegations of Saudi links to terrorism have been the subject of years of government investigations and furious debate. Critics have said that some members of the Saudi ruling class pay off terrorist groups in part to keep them from being more active in their own country.

But the thousands of pages of previously undisclosed documents compiled by lawyers for the Sept. 11 families and their insurers represented an unusually detailed look at some of the evidence.

Internal Treasury Department documents obtained by the lawyers under the Freedom of Information Act, for instance, said that a prominent Saudi charity, the International Islamic Relief Organization, heavily supported by members of the Saudi royal family, showed “support for terrorist organizations” at least through 2006.

A self-described Qaeda operative in Bosnia said in an interview with lawyers in the lawsuit that another charity largely controlled by members of the royal family, the Saudi High Commission for Aid to Bosnia, provided money and supplies to the terrorist group in the 1990s and hired militant operatives like himself.

Another witness in Afghanistan said in a sworn statement that in 1998 he had witnessed an emissary for a leading Saudi prince, Turki al-Faisal, hand a check for one billion Saudi riyals (now worth about \$267 million) to a top Taliban leader.

And a confidential German intelligence report gave a line-by-line description of tens of millions of dollars in bank transfers, with dates and dollar amounts, made in the early 1990s by Prince Salman bin Abdul Aziz and other members of the Saudi royal family to another charity that was suspected of financing militants' activities in Pakistan and Bosnia.

The new documents, provided to The New York Times by the lawyers, are among several hundred thousand pages of investigative material obtained by the Sept. 11 families and their insurers as part of a long-running civil lawsuit seeking to hold Saudi Arabia and its royal family liable for financing Al Qaeda.

Only a fraction of the documents have been entered into the court record, and much of the new material is unknown even to the Saudi lawyers in the case.

The documents provide no smoking gun connecting the royal family to the events of Sept. 11, 2001. And the broader links rely at times on a circumstantial, connect-the-dots approach to tie together Saudi princes, Middle Eastern charities, suspicious transactions and terrorist groups.

Saudi lawyers and supporters say that the links are flimsy and exploit stereotypes about terrorism, and that the country is being sued because it has deep pockets and was home to 15 of the 19 hijackers.

“In looking at all the evidence the families brought together, I have not seen one iota of evidence that Saudi Arabia had anything to do with the 9/11 attacks,” Michael Kellogg, a Washington lawyer representing Prince Muhammad al-Faisal al-Saud in the lawsuit, said in an interview.

He and other defense lawyers said that rather than supporting Al Qaeda, the Saudis were sworn enemies of its leader, Osama bin Laden, who was exiled from Saudi Arabia, his native country, in 1996. “It’s an absolute tragedy what happened to them, and I understand their anger,” Mr. Kellogg said of the victims’ families. “They want to find those responsible, but I think they’ve been disserved by their lawyers by bringing claims without any merit against the wrong people.”

The Saudi Embassy in Washington declined to comment.

Two federal judges and the Second Circuit Court of Appeals have already ruled against the 7,630 people represented in the lawsuit, made up of survivors of the attacks and family members of those killed, throwing out the suit on the ground that the families cannot bring legal action in the United States against a sovereign nation and its leaders.

The Supreme Court is expected to decide this week whether to hear an appeal, but the families’ prospects dimmed last month when the Justice Department sided with the Saudis in their immunity claim and urged the court not to consider the appeal.

The Justice Department said a 1976 law on sovereign immunity protected the Saudis from liability and noted that “potentially significant foreign relations consequences” would arise if such suits were allowed to proceed.

“Cases like this put the U.S. government in an extremely difficult position when it has to make legal arguments, even when they are the better view of the law, that run counter to those of terrorist victims,” said John Bellinger, a former State Department lawyer who was involved in the Saudi litigation.

Senior Obama administration officials held a private meeting on Monday with 9/11 family members to speak about progress in cracking down on terrorist financing. Administration officials at the meeting largely sidestepped questions about the lawsuit, according to participants. But the official who helped lead the meeting, Stuart A. Levey, the under secretary for terrorism and financial intelligence, has been outspoken in his criticism of wealthy Saudis, saying they have helped to finance terrorism.

Even if the 9/11 families were to get their trial in the lawsuit, they might have difficulty getting some of their new material into evidence. Some would most likely be challenged on grounds it was irrelevant or uncorroborated hearsay, or that it related to Saudis who were clearly covered by sovereign immunity.

And if the families were to clear those hurdles, two intriguing pieces of evidence in the Saudi puzzle might still remain off limits.

One is a 28-page, classified section of the 2003 joint Congressional inquiry into the Sept. 11 attacks. The secret section is believed to discuss intelligence on Saudi financial links to two hijackers, and the Saudis themselves urged at the time that it be made public. President George W. Bush declined to do so.

Kristen Breitweiser, an advocate for Sept. 11 families, whose husband was killed in the World Trade Center, said in an interview that during a White House meeting in February between President Obama and victims’ families, the president told her that he was willing to make the pages public.

But she said she had not heard from the White House since then.

The other evidence that may not be admissible consists of classified documents leaked to one of the law firms representing the families, Motley Rice of South Carolina, which is headed by Ronald Motley, a well-known trial lawyer who won lucrative lawsuits involving asbestos and tobacco.

Lawyers for the firm say someone anonymously slipped them 55 documents that contained classified government material relating to the Saudi lawsuit.

Though she declined to describe the records, Jodi Flowers, a lawyer for Motley Rice, said she was pushing to have them placed in the court file.

“We wouldn’t be fighting this hard, and we wouldn’t have turned the material over to the judge, if we didn’t think it was really important to the case,” she said.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/06/24/world/middleeast/24saudi.html?em>

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

Newsmax.com

June 25, 2009

Obama Officials Fight Saudi-Qaida-9/11 Revelation

Detailed intelligence that could link members of the Saudi royal family to groups that financed the 9/11 terror attacks may never see the light of day, in part because of an Obama administration move to have a lawsuit filed on behalf of 7,600 relatives of 9/11 victims thrown out.

"Physically, President Obama has done what previous presidents have done for a long time, which is bow down," Debra Burlingame, co-founder of 9/11 Families for a Safe and Strong America, told The Washington Times on Tuesday.

So far, two federal judges and the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals have ruled that the suit would violate the Foreign Sovereign Immunity Act of 1976, which prevents U.S. citizens from suing the governments of other nations. That law is intended to block legal actions by private U.S. citizens against other countries, based on the notion that those countries enjoy legal immunity.

The Supreme Court is scheduled to rule this week on whether the 9/11 relatives' lawsuit can go forward.

Last month, the Justice Department drew the wrath of 9/11 family members by siding with the Saudis, asking that the lawsuit be nixed.

"Myself and the other family members are unanimously upset," Doug Connors, who lost an older brother in the South Tower of the World Trade Center, told The Washington Times. "We feel that our government hasn't supported us as victims."

The administration's efforts to squelch the lawsuit may face a complication. An unknown source anonymously gave the families' attorneys more than 50 classified U.S. government documents related to the suit. The Justice Department subsequently destroyed the lawyers' copies of those documents.

However, details of alleged Saudi financial contributions to known terrorists — presumably in return for royal immunity to acts of terrorism — have begun to emerge gradually:

- A witness swore that he saw a top Saudi prince hand a check for \$267 million to a top Taliban leader in 1998.
- The New York Times reports a source, described as an al-Qaida operative in Bosnia, identified a Saudi charity that provided funds and supplies to al-Qaida in the 1990s.
- Another Islamic charity bankrolled largely by the Saudi royals exhibited "support for terrorist organizations" through 2006, according to Treasury Department documents that the attorneys obtained via Freedom of Information Act requests.
- The New York Times also reports that German intelligence documented "tens of millions of dollars" in bank transfers in the early 1990s to yet another charity suspected of financing extremist activities.

The families' attorneys have accumulated thousands of pages of information they say supports their claim four Saudi princes indirectly supported al-Qaida and the Taliban before 9/11. But that information may never be presented unless the U.S. Supreme Court rules that the case can go forward.

"In looking at all the evidence the families brought together, I have not seen one iota of evidence that Saudi Arabia had anything to do with the 9/11 attacks," Michael Kellogg, a Washington attorney representing one of the Saudi princes, told The New York Times.

Administration officials in the Justice and State departments met with the 9/11 families in the past week to discuss terrorist financing and the closing of the Guantanamo Bay prison. Family members asked why the administration was siding with the Saudis and trying to block their case, but the officials dodged those questions, they said.

http://www.newsmax.com/insidecover/saudi_al_qaeda_links/2009/06/25/229020.html

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

Reuters UK
June 26, 2009

N. Africa Qaeda Says it shot American in Mauritania

DUBAI (Reuters) - Al Qaeda's North Africa wing claimed responsibility for the shooting of an American aid worker in Mauritania, saying it was done in retaliation for U.S. military operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan.

"Two knights ... active in the organisation in Mauritania carried out the attack at a time when savage U.S. bombs are mowing down our Muslim brothers in Pakistan and Afghanistan," the group said in a statement posted on Friday on a website used by al Qaeda-linked groups.

Two gunmen shot dead the U.S. director of an aid group on Tuesday in Nouakchott, the capital of Mauritania, an ally of the West in its fight against growing al Qaeda activity in northwest Africa and the Sahara desert.

Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb has claimed responsibility for a number of attacks in Algeria and several other countries in the region.

Attacks in Mauritania are infrequent but in December 2007, four French tourists were killed by group. The Israeli embassy was attacked in 2008.

<http://uk.reuters.com/article/idUKTRE55P2L420090626>

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

Los Angeles Times
June 28, 2009

Turks Increasingly Turn to Islamic Extremism

Reporting from London -- In an audio message from a hide-out in South Asia this month, an Al Qaeda chief did something new: He sang the praises of an ethnic group that once barely registered in the network.

"We consider the Muslims in Turkey our brothers," said Mustafa Abu Yazid, the network's operations chief. Lauding Turkish suicide bombers killed in recent attacks near the Afghan-Pakistani border, he declared, "This is a pride and honor to the nation of Islam in Turkey, and we ask Allah to accept them amongst the martyrs."

The message is the latest sign of the changing composition of Islamic extremism, anti-terrorism officials and experts say. The number of Turks in Al Qaeda, long dominated by Arabs, has increased notably, officials say. And militant groups dominated by Turks and Central Asians, many of whom share Turkic culture and speak a Turkic language, have emerged as allies of and alternatives to Al Qaeda in northwestern Pakistan.

"We are aware of an increasing number of Turks going to train in Pakistan," said a senior European anti-terrorism official who asked to remain anonymous because the subject is sensitive. "This increase has taken place in the past couple of years."

Turkey's secular tradition and official monitoring of religious practice for years helped restrain extremism at home and in the diaspora. But the newer movements churn out Internet propaganda in Turkish as well as German, an effort to recruit among a Turkish immigrant population in Germany that numbers close to 3 million.

"We are seeing almost as much propaganda material from these Turkic groups as we are from Al Qaeda," said Evan Kohlmann, a U.S. private consultant who works with anti-terrorism agencies around the world. "Turks were perceived as moderate with few connections to Al Qaeda central. Now Germany is dealing with this threat in a community that could be a sleeping giant."

Germany is especially vulnerable because it has troops in Afghanistan. The threat could also intensify in other countries with Turkish populations, such as France, Belgium and the Netherlands, whose anti-terrorism agencies focus on entrenched extremism in large North African communities.

And the implications are serious for Turkey, a Muslim ally of the West and a longtime gateway to battlegrounds in the Middle East and Asia.

As Al Qaeda's multiethnic ranks burgeoned in the 1990s, Turks trained in Afghanistan and fought in Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Russian republic of Chechnya. In 2003, Al Qaeda suicide bombers killed 70 people in attacks on synagogues and British targets in Istanbul, Turkey's largest city.

Despite Turkey's population of more than 70 million, however, Turks were once among the smallest contingents in the network.

"I used to tell the Germans they are very lucky because you couldn't find much radicalization among Turks," said Zeyno Baran, a Turkish-born expert on Islam at the Hudson Institute, a think tank in Washington. "No one was paying much attention to Turks because they were considered the safe group."

Although Turkey works closely with Western anti-terrorism forces, some officials say it devotes more energy to fighting Kurdish separatists. Baran expressed concern that the moderate Islamist government in power since 2002 has lowered its guard.

"With the government's reluctance to talk about the problem of Islamist ideology, Al Qaeda and groups like that seem to think there's an opening in Turkey and with Turks," said Baran, whose forthcoming book is titled "The Other Muslims: Moderate and Secular."

Combat-hardened Central Asians have adopted a global agenda and tapped a new recruitment pool. Only five years ago, Kohlmann said, there was little need for Turkic-language translators to monitor extremist Internet traffic; now they are in demand.

"These groups are trying to establish their pedigree and catering their propaganda to Turkic speakers who don't speak Arabic or Pashto," the dominant language in the Afghan-Pakistani border region, he said. "Their media organizations are saying: We are the equivalent of Al Qaeda for Turks."

The Islamic Jihad Union, an Uzbek-led group, has alternately competed and worked with Al Qaeda. The organization trained and directed two Turks and two German converts who have agreed to plead guilty in a 2007 bomb plot against U.S. targets in Germany.

Last year, the group announced that another recruit, a 28-year-old Turk born in Bavaria, killed two U.S. soldiers in a suicide bombing in Afghanistan.

During the same period as the attack last year, half a dozen French and Belgian militants were training in Al Qaeda compounds in the Waziristan region of Pakistan. The subsequent description by a French trainee of the nationalities of the fighters he encountered departs from the commonly held image of an essentially Arab movement.

"It's possible to join different groups: a big Turkish group, an Arab group (the smallest of all the groups), a group of Uighurs from . . . northwest China, the biggest group," the trainee, Walid Othmani, said during an interrogation by French police after his arrest in January of this year.

Othmani, who is of Tunisian descent, said he trained with a mixed group of Arabs and North Africans that was led by an Egyptian and numbered 300 to 500 fighters.

The Uzbeks, meanwhile, totaled about 3,000, according to Othmani's confession. He said a Turkish contingent of 1,000 to 2,000 was commanded by a Turk.

It's not clear how precise his estimates are, investigators say. Some numbers seem accurate, others larger than expected based on previous intelligence. Overall, his account is regarded as credible, investigators say.

The mix of nationalities may reflect the future in the making. Yazid, Al Qaeda's veteran financial chief, runs the network's day-to-day operations while Osama bin Laden and his deputy, Ayman Zawahiri, devote themselves largely to avoiding capture, officials say. Yazid used his recent audio message to make an urgent appeal for money.

"And here we, in the battlefield in Afghanistan, are lacking a lot of money and a weakness in operations because of lack of money, and many mujahedin are absent from *jihad* because of lack or absence of money," he said, according to a translation by Kohlmann's organization, the NEFA Foundation.

As Al Qaeda weathers hard times, the appeal geared to Turkic speakers suggests that audience is seen as a source of rejuvenation, experts said.

"They are attempting to broaden their appeal, and it certainly looks like an instinctual competitive reaction to the sudden flourishing of Turkic-speaking *jihadi* groups in the Afghanistan-Pakistan theater," Kohlmann said. "It's an evolving recruitment and financing market for them, and they don't want to be left out in the cold."

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-turk-terror28-2009jun28,0,2926336.story>

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

Khaleej Times – United Arab Emirates (U.A.E.)
June 28, 2009
OPINION

Nuclear Hide and Seek

Charles A. Duelfer (World View)

North Korea and Iran get closer and closer to a full-fledged nuclear capability by the day, and as they do, attention repeatedly turns to inspections as the remedy.

Yet, too often, too many have expected too much from such mechanisms. Inspections are not a goal in themselves.

Having served as deputy chairman of UN inspections in Iraq for seven years, I know that arms inspections are no substitute for war or political compromise—or good independent intelligence.

There is perhaps no better case study for the limits and opportunities provided by monitors than Iraq. Baghdad manipulated the great powers, and infighting among them eventually led to a dramatic and unceremonious end to inspections without any clear knowledge of Baghdad's WMD programme.

There are lessons to be learned from this fiasco — North Korea and Iran are equally recalcitrant, dangerous and advancing apace in realising their nuclear ambitions.

Back in 1991, at the conclusion of the first Gulf War, the UN Security Council crafted a ceasefire resolution that continued sanctions on Iraq, and the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) was created to verify Iraqi disarmament. Thus began the most intrusive inspection regime backed by force since the Versailles Treaty imposed similar measures on Germany after World War I. So by 1998 I found myself in Iraq at the center of a circus. I was leading a team of 70 monitors from a dozen countries to “inspect” over 1,000 buildings in eight large presidential areas, considered the most secure of Iraqi sites, access to which had been completely denied in the past. Per an agreement between Saddam Hussein and Kofi Annan, the increased oversight would hopefully lead to the end of this intrusive inspections regime. But alas, this was not exactly to be. We traveled from one palace area to another in a huge Slinky-like convoy of over 70 vehicles, and, at every location, we found the Iraqis had meticulously cleansed each building. There was not a scrap of paper anywhere. Computers had vanished.

Because of these infractions, monitors demanded short-notice, anytime, anywhere inspections essentially ad infinitum. They were unwilling to sign off on Iraqi compliance as “good enough.” But Annan and some members of the Security Council believed inspectors were seeking to do too much. The French wondered whether we were being too fastidious. Was sorting out the remaining uncertainties really worth the cost of sanctions?

Making matters worse, Iraq eroded any remaining unity among Security Council members by offering economic incentives to those who aided its case for ending sanctions. Russia and France were given preferential treatment in the allocation of lucrative Iraqi oil contracts under the UN oil-for-food programme. Baghdad was also dangling rich oil-field-development rights in front of the noses of Security Council countries. But Washington had no interest in ending sanctions, which were the only tool short of war the US had to contain Saddam.

What this meant in the end was a lack of unity and credibility on maintaining the sanctions regime or even ratcheting up to war by the Security Council. These divisions were the death knell for inspections in Iraq. In some ways the cases of North Korea and Iran are eerily similar. Both countries are single, dedicated, unitary actors opposed in their WMD activities by a coalition of varying unity, commitment and purpose. Each has sought to sow dissension among the nations that want to deter its programs.

Neither Pyongyang nor Tehran will ever agree to the level of intrusive inspections that happened in Baghdad. Barring difficult-to-imagine military invasions of either state, we will have to settle for less. Yet this is clearly better than nothing. First, the case of North Korea. It is impossible to know what Kim Jong-Il will decide with respect to future negotiations or the possible return of inspectors. He is not overly vulnerable to sanctions. Like Iraq, North Korea is driven by a tyrant and calculations about policy are deeply affected by how long that ruler may last and

what may follow. Unchecked, Pyongyang can, over the period of a few years, develop and test nuclear warheads deliverable on missiles. In the nearer term, such missiles can threaten the cities of neighbouring Japan, South Korea or China. In the longer term, North Korea may be able to launch a longer-range missile with sufficient payload to carry a weapon to the United States. So the primary goal is to contain or walk back Pyongyang's nuclear capability and, perhaps even more importantly, guard against the transfer of weapons or fissile material to other state or non-state actors. In the case of Tehran, we are looking less at how to bide our time than how to provide trip wires. Iran can build a nuclear weapon. The questions are when and whether it will decide to do so. Weapons inspectors can perform an alert function. It would be safe to assume that Iran's intention is to get to a point where the lead-time between a decision to build a nuclear weapon and the means to effectively deliver one is relatively short.

There are three key factors here: the length of time to go from low-enriched uranium produced for civilian reactors to the highly enriched uranium required for a weapon; the ballistic-missile technology required to make a long-range weapon; and the creation of a nuclear warhead to place atop the ballistic missile. While limited, the current IAEA inspection activities do provide some important bounds on uncertainty. If Iran decides to produce highly enriched uranium, the monitoring procedures will force Tehran to either build separate clandestine enrichment facilities or break inspection procedures in a way that provides clear evidence of intent to proceed beyond its purely civil nuclear programme.

What is lacking in the current inspection procedure is the ability to detect clandestine enrichment or the kind of weaponisation activity that would help produce a functioning ballistic missile with a nuclear warhead. It is improbable that Iran will accept an inspection regime that would make this possible. And lest we forget, the invasive inspections in Iraq couldn't even tell us everything. We will likely remain in an ambiguous, prolonged diplomatic process with Tehran that will wind up with an "assumed" ability of Iran to go nuclear at a point in the future—the so-called virtual-nuclear-weapons state. Indeed, United Nations inspectors may have lots of rights written by ambassadors between their long lunches in New York, but on the ground in Iraq and elsewhere, outside some of the most heavily guarded facilities on the planet, these inspectors have only blue hats, cameras and pencils. The other guys have guns, and they determine the real limits of inspection activities.

From the experience in Iraq, we have seen the ability of the international community to hide behind inspectors in some circumstances and to expect too much from them in others. As we attend to the evolving problems with proliferation in North Korea, Iran and the states to follow, watch out for those trying to place too much responsibility on inspections and inspectors.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?col=§ion=opinion&xfile=data/opinion/2009/June/opinion_June141.xml

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

Wall Street Journal
OPINION
JUNE 29, 2009

Our Decaying Nuclear Deterrent

By JON KYL and RICHARD PERLE

A bipartisan congressional commission, headed by some of our most experienced national security practitioners, recently concluded that a nuclear deterrent is essential to our defense for the foreseeable future. It also recommended that urgent measures be taken to keep that deterrent safe and effective.

Unfortunately, President Barack Obama has adopted an agenda that runs counter to the commission's recommendations.

Consider the president's declaration, in a major speech this spring in Prague, of "America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons." Will such a world be peaceful and secure? It is far from self-evident.

In the nuclear-free world that ended in 1945 there was neither peace nor security. Since then there have indeed been many wars but none has come close to the carnage that occurred regularly before the development of nuclear weapons, and none has pitted nuclear powers against each other.

Consider also that while the administration accepts the urgency of halting the spread of nuclear weapons, the policies it has embraced to reach that goal are likely to make matters worse.

Thus, in his Prague speech, Mr. Obama announced that the U.S. would "immediately and aggressively" pursue ratification of the comprehensive ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. The administration believes, without evidence, that ratification of the test-ban treaty will discourage other countries from developing nuclear weapons.

Which countries does it have in mind? Iran? North Korea? Syria? Countries alarmed by the nuclear ambitions of their enemies? Allies who may one day lose confidence in our nuclear umbrella?

There are good reasons why the test-ban treaty has not been ratified. The attempt to do so in 1999 failed in the Senate, mostly out of concerns about verification -- it simply is not verifiable. It also failed because of an understandable reluctance on the part of the U.S. Senate to forgo forever a test program that could in the future be of critical importance for our defense and the defense of our allies.

Robert Gates, who is now Mr. Obama's own secretary of defense, warned in a speech last October that in the absence of a nuclear modernization program, even the most modest of which Congress has repeatedly declined to fund, "[a]t a certain point, it will become impossible to keep extending the life of our arsenal, especially in light of our testing moratorium." Suppose future problems in our nuclear arsenal emerge that cannot be solved without testing? Would our predicament discourage nuclear proliferation -- or stimulate it?

For the foreseeable future, the U.S. and many of our allies rely on our nuclear deterrent. And as long as the U.S. possesses nuclear weapons, they must be -- as Mr. Obama recognized in Prague -- "safe, secure and effective." Yet his proposed 2010 budget fails to take the necessary steps to do that.

Those steps have been studied extensively by the Perry-Schlesinger Commission (named for co-chairmen William Perry, secretary of defense under President Bill Clinton, and James R. Schlesinger, secretary of defense under Presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford). Its consensus report, released in May, makes numerous recommendations to increase the funding for, and improve the effectiveness of, the deteriorating nuclear weapons laboratory complex (e.g., the Los Alamos facility in New Mexico, the Pantex plant in Texas, and the dangerously neglected Y-12 plant in Tennessee) that has become the soft underbelly of our deterrent force.

The commission also assessed the nuclear weapons infrastructure that is essential to a safe, secure and effective deterrent and declared it "in serious need of transformation." It looked at our laboratory-based scientific and technical expertise and concluded that "the intellectual infrastructure" is in "serious trouble." A major cause is woefully inadequate funding. The commission rightly argued that we must "exercise the full range of laboratory skills, including nuclear weapon design skills . . . Skills that are not exercised will atrophy." The president and the Congress must heed these recommendations.

There are some who believe that failing to invest adequately in our nuclear deterrent will move us closer to a nuclear free world. In fact, blocking crucial modernization means unilateral disarmament by unilateral obsolescence. This unilateral disarmament will only encourage nuclear proliferation, since our allies will see the danger and our adversaries the opportunity.

By neglecting -- and in some cases even opposing -- essential modernization programs, arms-control proponents are actually undermining the prospect for further reductions of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. As our nuclear weapons stockpile ages and concern about its reliability increases, we will have to compensate by retaining more nuclear weapons than would otherwise be the case. This reality will necessarily influence future arms-control negotiations, beginning with the upcoming Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty follow-on.

For these negotiations, the Russians are insisting on a false linkage between nuclear weapons and missile defenses. They are demanding that we abandon defenses against North Korean or Iranian missiles as a condition for mutual reductions in American and Russian strategic forces. As the president cuts the budget for missile defense and cedes ground to the Russians on our planned defense sites in Poland and the Czech Republic, we may end up abandoning a needed defense of the U.S. and our European allies from the looming Iranian threat.

There is a fashionable notion that if only we and the Russians reduced our nuclear forces, other nations would reduce their existing arsenals or abandon plans to acquire nuclear weapons altogether. This idea, an article of faith of the "soft power" approach to halting nuclear proliferation, assumes that the nuclear ambitions of Kim Jong Il or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad would be curtailed or abandoned in response to reductions in the American and Russian deterrent forces -- or that India, Pakistan or China would respond with reductions of their own.

This is dangerous, wishful thinking. If we were to approach zero nuclear weapons today, others would almost certainly try even harder to catapult to superpower status by acquiring a bomb or two. A robust American nuclear force is an essential discouragement to nuclear proliferators; a weak or uncertain force just the opposite.

George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn have, on this page, endorsed the distant goal -- about which we remain skeptical -- of a nuclear-free world. But none of them argues for getting there by neglecting our present nuclear deterrent. The Perry-Schlesinger Commission has provided a path for protecting that deterrent. Congress and the president should follow it, without delay.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124623202363966157.html>

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

Wall Street Journal

OPINION

June 29, 2009

Target: Hawaii

The Pentagon recently announced that it is repositioning ground-to-air radar and missile defenses near Hawaii in case North Korea decides to launch another long-range missile, this time toward the Aloha State. So at least 1.3 million Hawaiians will benefit from defenses that many officials in the current Administration didn't even want to build.

But what about the rest of us? It's an odd time to be cutting missile defense, as the Obama Administration is doing in its 2010 budget -- by \$1.2 billion to \$1.6 billion, depending on how you calculate it. Programs to defend the U.S. homeland are being pared, while those that protect our soldiers or allies are being expanded after the Pentagon decided that the near-term threat is from short-range missiles. But as North Korea and Iran show, rogue regimes aren't far from having missiles that could reach the U.S.

In case you're not convinced about the threat, consider this exchange between Arizona Republican Trent Franks and Lieutenant-General Patrick O'Reilly, head of the Missile Defense Agency, in a hearing last month at the House Subcommittee on Strategic Forces:

Rep. Franks: "Do you believe that the threat from long-range missiles has increased or decreased in the last six months as it relates to the homeland here?"

Gen. O'Reilly: "Sir, I believe it has increased significantly. . . . The demonstration of capability of the Iranian ability to put a sat[ellite] into orbit, albeit small, shows that they are progressing in that technology. Additionally, the Iranians yesterday demonstrated a solid rocket motor test which is . . . disconcerting. Third, the North Koreans demonstrated . . . that they are improving in their capacity and we are very concerned about that."

Among the losers in the Administration's budget are the additional interceptors planned for the ground-based program in Alaska. The number will be limited to 30 interceptor missiles located at Fort Greely in Alaska and Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. Also on the chopping block is the Airborne Laser, which is designed to shoot down incoming missiles in the boost phase, before they can release decoys and at a point in the missile trajectory when it would fall back down on enemy territory. This highly promising technology will be starved.

The Administration may also kill the plan for a missile defense system in Europe. The proposed system, which would place interceptors in Poland and a radar in the Czech Republic, is intended to protect Europe against Iranian missiles. As is often forgotten, it would also protect the U.S., by providing an additional layer of defense for the Eastern seaboard, which is a long way from the Alaskan defenses.

The Administration is reconsidering the European site due to opposition from Moscow, which says -- though it knows it's false -- that the European system is intended to defeat Russian missiles. In advance of Barack Obama's visit to Russia next week, there's talk of "cooperation" on missile defense, possibly by adding radars in southern Russia and Azerbaijan. From a geographical perspective, neither location would add much as an Iranian missile headed for Western Europe or the U.S. would be on the periphery of the radars' vision, at best.

Meanwhile, Moscow says that unless the Administration backtracks on missile defense, it won't agree to mutual reductions in nuclear arsenals under the START Treaty, which expires this year. Mr. Obama is eager to negotiate arms cuts. But it would be a mistake to tie decisions on missile defense to anything except what is best for the security of the U.S. and its allies.

In Congress, bipartisan efforts are afoot to restore some of the funding for missile defense. But even if more money is forthcoming, the bigger problem is the new U.S. mindset. The Obama Administration is staffed with Cold War-

era arms controllers who still believe missile defense is destabilizing -- except, apparently, now that they need it for Hawaii. They also reject the essential next phase, which is to make better use of space-based systems.

Missile defense is no techno-fantasy. The U.S. has made major strides since President Bush exercised the option to withdraw from the ABM Treaty in 2001. If North Korea launches a missile toward Hawaii, the best demonstration of that ability -- and of U.S. resolve -- would be to shoot it down.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB124623241163366311.html>

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