



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** [Air Force Eyes Return of Mobile Nuclear Missiles](#)

1. [Can Assemble Chemical Arms: Syrian Rebels](#)
2. [Syria's Chemical Weapons Sparked Action](#)
3. [Official: Iran Ready to Meet Concerns over Parchin Site](#)
4. [West Fears Iran Will Try to Seize Syria's Uranium Stockpile](#)
5. [IAEA Chief Says Not Optimistic on Iran Nuclear Talks](#)
6. [Iran-P5+1 to Meet in Istanbul Late January: Russian Source](#)
7. [Top U.S. General Says Stopping a Syrian Chemical Attack is 'Almost Unachievable'](#)
8. [S. Korea to Push for Quick Deployment of Long-Range Ballistic Missiles: Official](#)
9. [Google Chairman Delegation Pressing N. Korea to Stop Missile, Nuke Tests](#)
10. [Experts Debate North Korea's Missile Goals and Capability](#)
11. [Japan to Review Defense Guidelines with U.S. to Counter China, N. Korea](#)
12. [India Tests Sea-Based Brahmos Missile](#)
13. [Tensions Rise between Nuclear Neighbours Pakistan and India](#)
14. [Russia to Get 20 New Aerospace Defense Radars](#)
15. [Russia, China Plan to Boost Cooperation on Missile Defense](#)
16. [Finally Flying Colors: Yury Dolgoruky Nuclear Sub Joins Russian Navy](#)
17. [Russia to Create New Missiles to Compete with U.S.](#)
18. [MoD: Trident Submarines Cannot Be Moved from Scotland to Plymouth](#)
19. [France Affirms Nuclear Weapons Arsenal despite Looming Military Cuts](#)
20. [New U.S. Law Seeks Answers on Chinese Nuke Tunnels](#)
21. [Exclusive: U.S. Nuclear Lab Removes Chinese Tech over Security Fears](#)
22. [Air Force Eyes Return of Mobile Nuclear Missiles](#)
23. [Airborne Pods Seek to Trace Nuclear Bomb's Origins: Modular Units Crossing 'Valley of Death' for Air Force Use](#)
24. [U.N. Nuclear Chief Amano Has No Rivals for New Term](#)
25. [Satellite Test Sparks Overblown Worries](#)
26. [A Threat that Demands Action](#)
27. [India-Pakistan Dialogue Must Continue](#)
28. [Economics Aside, Getting Rid of Trident Is a Moral Issue](#)
29. [US Playing Strategic Arms Game](#)
30. [Time for Plan-B on Denuclearization](#)

*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.

**Issue No.1040, 11 January 2013**

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.



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The Hindu – India  
Dubai, January 3, 2013

## **Can Assemble Chemical Arms: Syrian Rebels**

By Atul Aneja

The Syrian opposition has claimed it can counter the government's chemical arsenal by assembling its own stocks of chemical weapons — an assertion that threatens to further destabilise the region and spur greater internationalisation of the conflict in the Levantine state.

Bassam al-Dada, a political adviser in the anti-government Free Syrian Army (FSA) has told Turkey's state-run Anatolia news agency that the opposition has the raw materials and know-how to produce chemical weapons.

He warned Syrian President Bashar al-Assad not to threaten the opposition with chemical weapons as "we also possess them".

Mr. Dada said the opposition would use chemical weapons only in response to chemical attack by the government — a pronouncement that amounts to the opposition's declaration of a no-first use doctrine on chemical weapons. "If we ever use them [chemical weapons], we will only hit the regime's bases and centres," said Mr. Dada.

Analysts say it is in the opposition's interest to keep chemical arms in international focus, for any talk of using these mass-destruction weapons is bound to encourage direct foreign intervention in the Syrian conflict. The Obama administration has already warned that the use of chemical weapons is a red line that the Syrian government must not breach. U.S. concerns about Syria's chemical arsenal falling into the hands of jihadists could be another trigger for western intervention to gain control of the weapons.

Unsurprisingly, the opposition is investing considerable psychological capital in its assertions that the Syrian government may not be in firm control of its chemical weapons stocks. Adnan Silu, a former Major General who had defected to the opposition had told the Al Arabiya television network in June 2012 that "probably anyone from the Free Syrian Army or any Islamic extremist group could take them [Syrian chemical weapons] over". He had claimed that Syrian forces had not properly secured stocks of mustard gas and nerve agents in conflict-prone zones such as Homs and areas east of Damascus and Aleppo.

The threat of a Syrian chemical weapon attack has been used by Turkey to substantiate its case for the deployment of Patriot anti-missile defences — a move that threatens to destabilise the region.

With NATO acceding to the Turkish "request" for Patriot missiles, Iran has been drawn deeper into the Syrian conflict. "Each one of these Patriots is a black mark on the world map, and is meant to cause a world war. They are making plans for a world war, and this is very dangerous for the future of humanity and for the future of Europe itself," warned Iran's armed forces chief General Hassan Firouzabadi in a mid-December comment. Observers say the Patriot batteries, on mobile platforms, can always be shifted from the Syrian border to face the Iranian city of Tabriz.

The deployment of Patriot missiles also seems to have sown the seeds of an arms race in West Asia between Russia and NATO. In response to the Patriot missiles, Moscow has apparently transferred the state-of-the-art Iskander missiles to Syria. Travelling at six to seven times the speed of sound, Iskander missiles are expected to nullify the Patriot missile defence shield.

Alert to the negative fallout of the use of chemical weapons, Syria has sounded the alarm on a possible false-flag attack with chemical weapons by the opposition. Bashar Jaafari, Syria's representative to the United Nations, warned in December that Syrian opposition might use chemical weapons against innocent civilians and pin the blame on Mr. Assad's government, because they had established control over "a toxic chlorine factory" east of Aleppo.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/fighting-escalates-around-syrian-military-air-base/article4269001.ece>

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

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

San Francisco Chronicle

## Syria's Chemical Weapons Sparked Action

New York Times

Monday, January 7, 2013

Washington -- In the last days of November, Israel's top military commanders called the Pentagon to discuss troubling intelligence that was showing up on satellite imagery: Syrian troops appeared to be mixing chemicals at two storage sites, probably the deadly nerve gas sarin, and filling dozens of 500-pound bombs that could be loaded on airplanes.

Within hours, President Obama was notified, and the alarm grew over the weekend, as the munitions were loaded onto vehicles near Syrian air bases. In briefings, administration officials were told that if Syria's increasingly desperate president, Bashar Assad, ordered the weapons to be used, they could be airborne in less than two hours - too fast for the United States to act, in all likelihood.

What followed next, officials said, was a remarkable show of international cooperation over a civil war in which the United States, Arab states, Russia and China have almost never agreed on a common course of action.

The combination of a public warning by Obama and more sharply worded private messages sent to the Syrian leader and his military commanders through Russia and others, including Iraq, Turkey and possibly Jordan, stopped the chemical mixing and the bomb preparation. A week later, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said the worst fears were over - for the time being.

But concern remains that Assad could now use the weapons produced that week at any moment. U.S. and European officials say that while crisis was averted in that week from late November to early December, they are by no means resting easy.

"I think the Russians understood this is the one thing that could get us to intervene in the war," a senior defense official one said last week. "What Assad understood, and whether that understanding changes if he gets cornered in the next few months, that's anyone's guess."

How the United States and Israel, along with Arab states, would respond remains a mystery. U.S. and allied officials have talked vaguely of having developed "contingency plans" in case they decided to intervene in an effort to neutralize the chemical weapons, a task that the Pentagon estimates would require upward of 75,000 troops. But there have been no evident signs of preparations for any such effort.

The violence on the ground, meanwhile, continued unabated.

Syria's state media said Monday that government troops repulsed a rebel attack on a police school in the northern city of Aleppo.

The official SANA news agency said government forces killed and wounded members of a "terrorist group" in the fighting late Sunday, but did not provide a number. The government and the pro-government media refer to the rebels seeking to topple Assad as terrorists.

Aleppo, Syria's largest city and former commercial hub, has been a major front in the civil war since July, with battles often raging for control of military and security facilities such as the police school. Rebels have recently made gains around Aleppo, as well as in the east and in the capital Damascus, bringing the civil war closer to the seat of Assad's power.

*The Associated Press contributed to this report.*

<http://www.sfgate.com/world/article/Syria-s-chemical-weapons-sparked-action-4173720.php>

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

FARS News Agency (FNA) – Iran

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



January 8, 2013

## Official: Iran Ready to Meet Concerns over Parchin Site

TEHRAN (FNA) - A senior Iranian foreign ministry official announced on Tuesday that if the country's rights to use peaceful nuclear technology are recognized, Tehran will be ready to remove alleged concerns about its Parchin military site.

"If an agreement framework is created between us and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) so completely that all of our peaceful nuclear activities are recognized and we can use the nuclear know-how and the fuel cycle completely and in line with the peaceful goals, we will be ready to adopt the necessary measures to obviate the (IAEA) concerns," Iranian Foreign Ministry Spokesman Ramin Mehman-Parast said in his weekly press conference in Tehran today.

In relevant remarks in March 2012, Iran's Representative Office at the IAEA announced that Tehran would be ready to provide the UN nuclear agency with one-time access to its Parchin military test facility once modalities of Iran-IAEA cooperation have been agreed on, reminding that the facility is a highly sensitive military site already visited by inspectors twice in January and November 2005.

"And how could these concerns be removed will be an issue to be discussed within the framework of an agreement between our representatives and the IAEA," Mehman-Parast said.

The latest round of talks between Iran and the IAEA was held in Tehran mid-December and the two sides discussed a modality plan for their cooperation.

After the talks, Deputy Director-General of the IAEA Herman Nackaerts, who headed the Agency's delegation, voiced optimism about a deal with Iran in the upcoming talks between Tehran and the UN nuclear watchdog on January 16 on the remaining issues of difference over Tehran's nuclear program.

Speaking to reporters in Vienna airport after returning from Tehran, Nackaerts said progress was made in Thursday's talks between the agency and Iran in the capital Tehran.

"We were able to make progress," he said.

He added that more talks are due with Iran on January 16. He also said that he expects to reach a deal with Iran in January on the remaining issues related to the country's nuclear energy program.

Washington and its Western allies accuse Iran of trying to develop nuclear weapons under the cover of a civilian nuclear program, while they have never presented any corroborative evidence to substantiate their allegations. Iran denies the charges and insists that its nuclear program is for peaceful purposes only.

Tehran stresses that the country has always pursued a civilian path to provide power to the growing number of Iranian population, whose fossil fuel would eventually run dry.

Despite the rules enshrined in the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) entitling every member state, including Iran, to the right of uranium enrichment, Tehran is now under four rounds of UN Security Council (UNSC) sanctions for turning down West's calls to give up its right of uranium enrichment.

Tehran has dismissed West's demands as politically tainted and illogical, stressing that sanctions and pressures merely consolidate Iranians' national resolve to continue the path.

Tehran has repeatedly said that it considers its nuclear case closed as it has come clean of IAEA's questions and suspicions about its past nuclear activities.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=9107134103>

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



Ha'aretz Daily News – Israel

## West Fears Iran Will Try to Seize Syria's Uranium Stockpile

*Nuclear experts believe that the Syrian uranium is enough for the construction of at least five nuclear bombs; obtaining the uranium could help the Iranians begin a secret enrichment program without the international community's knowledge.*

By Anshel Pfeffer

January 10, 2013

Amid the international community's concerns over Syria's possible use of its chemical weapon arsenal against its citizens and the possible transfer of those weapons to terror organizations, another worry has been added: a stockpile of some 50 tons of uranium that are still held by the Assad regime following the destruction of its planned nuclear reactor.

According to a report in the Financial Times, Western intelligence services are concerned that the stockpile of nuclear fuel, non-enriched uranium, held by Syria is about to be transferred to an unknown destination. Satellite photographs made over the last few months show evacuation work being done at a secret site used for uranium processing at Marj al-Sultan north of Damascus.

The uranium was purchased from an unknown source to operate the nuclear reactor built by Syria with North Korean knowhow and Iranian assistance near Deir A-Zour in northern Syria.

The reactor's existence was reportedly discovered by Israeli intelligence and bombed and destroyed by the Israeli air force in September 2007 before it became operational. A team of inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency that visited the site in May 2008 detected traces of uranium but Syria has denied the existence of a nuclear reactor and the fate of 50 tons of nuclear fuel remained unclear.

Now with the weakening of the Assad regime and the loss of control of large parts of the country, the fear that Syria's ally, Iran, will try to get its hands on the uranium stockpile is growing. Nuclear experts believe that the Syrian uranium is enough for the construction of at least five nuclear bombs. Obtaining the uranium could help the Iranians begin a secret enrichment program without the IAEA inspectors and the international community's knowledge.

Nuclear fuel is made through a process that takes uranium ore (yellow cake) and transforms it into gas which is then processed to nuclear fuel which can power a nuclear reactor or be enriched for nuclear weapons.

Despite the international sanctions that forbid the export of uranium to Iran, the regime in Tehran has claimed that it can extract the uranium it needs in its own country. In addition, over the years Iran has received nuclear fuel from Russia as part of the agreement to operate the civilian reactor in Bushehr.

Near the Iranian port of Bandar Abbas, there is an open-pit uranium mine and milling facilities that the IAEA believe are already productive while another mine is being developed. But international experts don't believe Iran can extract sufficient uranium for both its civilian energy and nuclear weapons programs.

In recent years, Iran tried to obtain uranium from Robert Mugabe's government in Zimbabwe, which controls one of the largest deposits of uranium in Africa. Western intelligence agencies believed that in 2011 Zimbabwe was about to grant Iran exclusive mining rights for uranium in its territory. Iranian ministers visited Harare to finalize the agreement but it ultimately was not signed due to international pressure.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/middle-east/west-fears-iran-will-try-to-seize-syria-s-uranium-stockpile.premium-1.492979>

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

Reuters U.S.

## IAEA Chief Says Not Optimistic on Iran Nuclear Talks

Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



- \* U.N. nuclear agency and Iran to meet on Jan. 16
- \* Both sides reported progress in last month's talks
- \* But IAEA chief says "outlook is not bright"

Friday, January 11, 2013

By Aaron Sheldrick

TOKYO, Jan 11 (Reuters) - The U.N. nuclear agency chief said on Friday he was not optimistic about talks with Iran next week on getting access to a military base Western powers suspect has been used for atom bomb-related work.

The comments by Yukiya Amano, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), contrasted with a more upbeat assessment given by the Vienna-based U.N. agency after a meeting with Iranian officials last month.

The IAEA, whose mission it is to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons in the world, has been trying for a year to negotiate a so-called structured approach with Iran that would give it access to sites, officials and documents.

The IAEA's priority is to visit the Parchin military facility southeast of Tehran, where the agency suspects explosives tests relevant for nuclear weapons may have taken place, perhaps a decade ago. Tehran denies this.

"The outlook is not bright," Amano said in Tokyo, referring to the negotiations to be held in Tehran on Wednesday on the framework accord the IAEA hopes will enable it to quickly resume its stalled investigation into suspected atom bomb research.

The talks between the IAEA and Iran are separate from, but linked to, broader diplomacy by six world powers to resolve the nuclear row with Iran before it leads to a Middle East war, feared because of Israeli threats to bomb Iranian nuclear sites.

Western powers say Iran is trying to develop the capability to make atomic weapons, a charge the Islamic Republic rejects.

Both the IAEA and Tehran have said progress was achieved at the December meeting, without giving details.

However, Amano said in Japanese comments translated into English: "Talks with Iran don't proceed in a linear way. It's one step forward, two or three steps back ... So we can't say we have an optimistic outlook" for the Jan. 16 meeting.

#### WINDOW OF OPPORTUNITY?

Western diplomats say Iran has worked for the past year to cleanse Parchin of any evidence of illicit activities, but Amano said late last year an IAEA visit would still be useful.

The IAEA said after last month's talks in Tehran it expected a deal could be completed in January and swiftly implemented.

But Western diplomats in Vienna later said stumbling blocks remained, including Iran's demand for access to intelligence documents that form part of the basis for the IAEA's concerns.

Even if a deal is reached, the diplomats said, it remained to be seen how it would be carried out. Western officials have often accused Iran of stonewalling IAEA investigations.

"An agreement is a good first step, but implementation is the most important part," one Western envoy said on Friday.

Iran's refusal to curb nuclear activity with dual civilian and military applications, and its lack of openness with the IAEA, have drawn tough Western punitive measures and a threat of pre-emptive military strikes by its arch-adversary Israel.

Analysts and diplomats say there is a window of opportunity for world powers to make a renewed diplomatic push to find a broader negotiated solution to the dispute after U.S. President Barack Obama won re-election in November.

The six powers - the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China - want Iran to scale back its uranium enrichment programme and cooperate fully with the IAEA. Iran wants the West to lift sanctions hurting its economy.



Both sides say they want to resume talks this month, but have yet to agree on a date and venue.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/11/nuclear-iran-iaea-idUSL4N0AG5FS20130111>

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

Press TV – Iran

## **Iran-P5+1 to Meet in Istanbul Late January: Russian Source**

Friday, January 11, 2013

Iran and the six major world powers (P5+1) will meet in the Turkish city of Istanbul at the end of January to discuss the outstanding issues related to Tehran's nuclear energy program, a Russian official says.

An unnamed Russian source told the state RIA Novosti news agency on Thursday that the next meeting between Iran and the P5+1 - Russia, China, France, Britain, France, the US and Germany -- has been provisionally scheduled for the end of January in Istanbul which hosted the first round of such talks in April 2012.

The source; however, did not name a specific date.

The last round of talks between Iran and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany was held in Moscow in June.

Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov said on Wednesday that the pause in the talks between Iran and the P5+1 has sent a "wrong signal."

Ryabkov stated that during the Christmas holidays, Moscow proceeded with efforts to organize a schedule for Iran-P5+1 talks and expected a clear result as soon as possible.

Russia, a veto-wielding member of the UN Security Council, has repeatedly reaffirmed Iran's right to peaceful nuclear energy.

Iran and the P5+1 have held several rounds of talks with the main focus being on Iran's nuclear energy program.

*On January 4, Secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council Saeed Jalili said that Tehran welcomes the readiness of the six major world powers to hold constructive talks with Iran.*

"Just as Iran feels obligated to act within the framework of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) regulations and in line with the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), it is adamant on asserting its rights within the same framework," Jalili stated.

The United States, Israel and some of their allies have repeatedly accused Iran of pursuing non-civilian objectives in its nuclear energy program.

Iran argues that as a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it is entitled to develop and acquire nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

<http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/01/11/282964/iranp51-talks-set-for-late-january/>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.

## **Top U.S. General Says Stopping a Syrian Chemical Attack is 'Almost Unachievable'**

- *General Martin Dempsey says the U.S. must instead rely on deterrence*
- *America rules out sending in ground troops under hostile circumstances*
- *But may provide some forces if President Assad agrees to peaceful end*



- *There are fears Assad may use sarin and mustard gas in bid to save regime*

By Simon Tomlinson

11 January 2013

Stopping a chemical attack by the Syrian government would be nearly impossible so opposing forces will need to rely on deterrence, a top U.S. general has said.

The United States has largely ruled out sending in ground troops to secure Syrian chemical weapons under hostile circumstances, but the Pentagon could provide some forces if the Assad regime ever agrees to a peaceful transition.

General Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the U.S. must instead continue to warn Syria that using such weapons would be unacceptable.

'The act of preventing the use of chemical weapons would be almost unachievable,' Dempsey said during a Pentagon press conference.

'You would have to have such clarity of intelligence, you know, persistent surveillance, you'd have to actually see it before it happened, and that's - that's unlikely, to be sure.'

Speaking to Pentagon reporters, Defense Secretary Leon Panetta says his biggest concern is how the U.S. and allies would secure the chemical and biological weapons sites scattered across Syria and ensure the components don't end up in the wrong hands if the regime falls, particularly under violent conditions.

He said the U.S. is preparing no options for having U.S. ground troops in that country if the regime falls while under attack.

But he added: 'You always have to keep the possibility that, if there is a peaceful transition and international organizations get involved, that they might ask for assistance in that situation.'

There are widespread worries among allies and countries in the region that if Syrian President Bashar Assad is toppled, Islamic extremists could gain control of Syria's stockpile of chemical weapons, which includes sarin and mustard gas.

And there are lingering worries that Assad might use his chemical weapons, perhaps on his own people, in a last-ditch effort to save his regime.

President Barack Obama has said the regime's use of chemical weapons against the rebels would be a 'red line' and change his 'calculus' about possible military intervention there.

Fears escalated early last month when U.S. officials said there was evidence that Syrian forces had begun preparing sarin, a nerve agent, for possible use in bombs.

But Panetta later said that it appeared the Syrian government had slowed its preparations for the possible use of the weapons.

The Pentagon has put together a variety of options for securing the weapons under a range of circumstances, Dempsey said.

And he acknowledged the U.S. has been in contact with NATO allies, such as the Czech Republic, who have developed capabilities for handling chemical, biological and nuclear weapons.

But Dempsey said not specific request has been made of the Czech Republic.

At least 60,000 people have died during Assad's two-year crackdown on rebels, according to a recent U.N. estimate.

Opposition fighters have seized large swaths of territory in northern Syria, and on Thursday activists said they now control parts of a strategic air base.

But despite significant rebel advances on the battlefield, the opposition remains outgunned by government forces and has been unable to break a stalemate on the ground.





USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Panetta on Thursday said he believes there is a strong likelihood that Assad will ultimately leave power.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2260607/Top-U-S-General-says-stopping-Syrian-chemical-attack-unachievable.html>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
January 7, 2013

## **S. Korea to Push for Quick Deployment of Long-Range Ballistic Missiles: Official**

SEOUL, Jan. 7 (Yonhap) -- South Korea will speed up the development of longer-range missiles capable of striking all of North Korea and deploy them as early as possible, an official on the presidential transition team said Monday.

In October last year, South Korea announced a new missile agreement with the U.S. that allows Seoul to extend the range of its ballistic missiles from 300 kilometers to 800 km, a distance long enough to reach the northern tip of North Korea.

"We will work toward quickly putting in force ballistic missiles with the range of 800 km," said Kim Jang-soo, who has been named to oversee external affairs and North Korean policies for President-elect Park Geun-hye. "Reviewing our security readiness is a pressing matter."

Kim, a former defense minister, was responding to an inquiry about Seoul's course of action in light of Pyongyang's successful launch of a long-range rocket last month. During her presidential campaign, Park had stressed the need for a fast deployment of long-range missiles to ensure active and preemptive deterrence against North Korean military provocations.

Discussing response to Pyongyang's latest rocket launch, Kim called on the international community to cooperate and further isolate North Korea with more sanctions.

The U.N. Security Council is weighing options to punish North Korea for violating U.N. resolutions that ban the North from testing any ballistic missile-related technology. North Korea is already under international sanctions for carrying out two nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2013/01/07/43/0301000000AEN20130107011100315F.HTML>

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

The Korea Herald – South Korea

## **Google Chairman Delegation Pressing N. Korea to Stop Missile, Nuke Tests**

January 9, 2013

Former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson, who is in North Korea with Google's chairman, said his delegation is pressing the communist country to stop missile launches and nuclear tests, an international media outlet said Wednesday.

Richardson is also calling on Pyongyang to allow more cell phones and unrestricted Internet access for North Koreans as well as humane treatment for an American detained in the country, the Associated Press reported in an interview story dispatched from Pyongyang.

"The citizens of the DPRK will be better off with more cell phones and an active Internet," Richardson said. His delegation has delivered such views to many North Korean officials, he said.

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



The delegation, which arrived in the North late Monday via Beijing on what Richardson called "a private humanitarian mission," also includes Eric Schmidt, the chairman of Google, the world's biggest Internet company, as well as several staff members.

The four-day trip reportedly aims to secure the release of Kenneth Bae, a Korean-American tour agent being detained for nearly two months, and assess the country's Internet environment and determine if improvements can be made.

The U.S. government expressed its reservations over the trip as it comes less than a month after the communist country launched a long-range rocket. Pyongyang said the rocket carried a satellite into orbit, but the United States and many other country's condemned it as an experiment to test the country's ballistic missile technology. Washington is in the process of reviewing what penalties it can slap on the country for ignoring warnings by the international community.

The country successfully launched the rocket on Dec. 12 and the outside world is closely watching whether the launch will be followed by nuclear weapons tests as were the country's two previous rocket launches in 2006 and 2009.

Photo images from Pyongyang showed Schmidt browsing a computer lab at the North's top-ranked Kim Il-sung University and watching a North Korean student conduct an Internet search.

North Korean leader Kim Jon-un highlighted its ambitions in the science and technology sectors in his televised New Year's speech, which is deemed to be outlining the country's policy plan for 2013.

"We should wage a dynamic campaign to push back the frontiers of science and technology so as to develop the country's overall science and technology to the world standards as soon as possible," Kim said. (Yonhap)

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20130109000871>

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

Los Angeles Times

## **Experts Debate North Korea's Missile Goals and Capability**

*Some say the nation is many years from building an intercontinental missile that could strike the U.S. Others say the Dec. 12 satellite launch showed a leap in progress.*

By Ken Dilanian, Los Angeles Times

January 9, 2013,

WASHINGTON — When North Korea launched a small satellite into orbit last month for the first time, U.S. officials called it a cover for a more ominous goal: a ballistic missile that could carry a nuclear weapon as far as the continental United States.

But North Korea is a long way from building a workable intercontinental missile and, at the current pace of testing, it could take many years before they are close, missile technology experts say.

"They could put up something that would look like a credible missile but ... it's not really much of a threat," said Boston-based physicist David Wright, who follows the North Korean program for the nonpartisan Union of Concerned Scientists. "They have no idea whether it's going to blow up on the launch pad or dump one of their precious nuclear weapons into the Pacific Ocean."

This week, Bill Richardson, a former governor of New Mexico, is visiting Pyongyang, the North Korean capital, with Eric Schmidt, the executive chairman of Google, on what they are calling a private humanitarian trip. Richardson said Wednesday that he was pressing the government to stop all missile launches and nuclear tests and to allow more cellphones and an open Internet for its citizens.

Some experts outside the U.S. government contend that North Korea's failure-prone missile program is essentially a bluff aimed at spurring concessions from the international community.



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

U.S. intelligence officials disagree. They say North Korea is intent on developing a capability to threaten the West with nuclear weapons. In 2011, then-Defense Secretary Robert Gates said North Korea would have a missile that could strike the continental United States by 2016, although some U.S. officials believe that timetable has now slipped.

The North Koreans "haven't tested a lot, which slows development," said a U.S. official familiar with the latest intelligence. "But they're still moving forward."

North Korean leader Kim Jong Un hailed the Dec. 12 satellite launch in a televised New Year's Day speech, calling on the nation to rebuild its ailing economy "in the same spirit and mettle as were displayed in conquering space."

But progress has been halting. In recent years, North Korea has attempted one or two rocket tests annually, most of which failed. In April, a rocket carrying a satellite exploded 90 seconds after takeoff.

Building a dependable intercontinental ballistic missile would require "flight tests every other month, over several years," said Markus Schiller, who wrote a paper about the missile program in October for Rand Corp., a Santa Monica-based think tank. "First-generation long-range missiles require dozens of flight tests until they are reliable and accurate enough for deployment."

Schiller said in his Rand paper that the main purpose of the North's rocket launches is to deter the United States and South Korea, and "to gain strategic leverage in foreign politics."

The three-stage Unha rocket that put a small satellite into orbit last month "was developed as a satellite launcher and not as a weapon," Schiller said in a telephone interview from Germany. "The technology was only suited for satellite launch."

The rocket's third stage took a dog leg turn to avoid flying over Taiwan and the Philippines, said Brian Weeden, a former U.S. Air Force space expert now with the Secure World Foundation, a Washington think tank.

"That is definitely something more associated with a space launch than with a ballistic missile launch," he said. "It's not what you would expect to see with a missile test."

Any successful rocket launch could theoretically help North Korea improve its missile technology, Weeden said. But launching a satellite is easier than perfecting a missile that can carry a weapons payload into space and then deliver it to a specific target without burning up in the atmosphere.

Other analysts believe North Korea made a major technological advance with the satellite launch. Bruce Klingner, a former CIA analyst now at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington think tank, called it "a huge step forward in their capabilities."

Jeffrey Lewis, a nonproliferation expert at the nonpartisan Monterey Institute of International Studies, worries that North Korea is making just enough progress to be dangerous.

"The North Koreans might just be willing to deal with less reliable systems," he said. "They might just be happy with 50% reliability. My starting assumption is that they are serious, that this is something that they intend to build. I presume that they are competent enough that this is not an impossible missile."

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/world/la-fg-north-korea-missile-20130110,0,1017563.story>

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

## **Japan to Review Defense Guidelines with U.S. to Counter China, N. Korea**

January 10, 2013

By The Asahi Shimbun

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 / Fax: 334.953.7530



Japan and the United States will start reviewing their defense cooperation guidelines to strengthen the alliance against China's military buildup and North Korea's missile and nuclear programs.

Foreign affairs and defense officials of both countries will open talks in Tokyo on the Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation as early as Jan. 16.

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe is also expected to use the review to push his plan to lift Japan's self-imposed ban on the exercise of the right to collective self-defense. Under the current Japanese government interpretation, the Constitution bans the exercise of that right.

The guidelines define the roles of Japan's Self-Defense Forces and the U.S. military if Japan comes under attack. They were initially put together in 1978 amid the Cold War to prepare for a possible invasion by the Soviet Union.

In 1997, when tensions were running high on the Korean Peninsula, the guidelines were expanded to state that Japan and the United States would cooperate in dealing with emergencies in areas surrounding Japan.

The administration of Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda planned talks in early December for an additional review, but North Korea's rocket launch on Dec. 12 and other factors scrapped that plan.

The Lower House election on Dec. 16 ousted Noda and his Democratic Party of Japan from power.

Immediately after assuming office in late December, Abe instructed Defense Minister Itsunori Onodera to prepare for a revision of the guidelines, the first since 1997.

The revision is expected to be one of the main themes at a foreign ministerial meeting in Washington on Jan. 18 on strengthening the Japan-U.S. alliance.

Momentum toward a revision is growing in Japan in light of its feud with China over sovereignty of the Senkaku Islands and the new U.S. security strategy under the administration of President Barack Obama that puts emphasis on Asia.

Enhancing the alliance's cooperation with Australia, South Korea, India and Southeast Asian nations will also be discussed.

Abe wants Japan's right to exercise collective self-defense as the main pillar of a stronger Japan-U.S. alliance. But he is not expected to make a hasty change in the government's interpretation because such action could hurt his Liberal Democratic Party's chances in the Upper House election scheduled for July.

Abe also argues that the SDF should be strengthened, and if the ban is lifted, the SDF's role would change significantly.

During Abe's first tenure as prime minister that started in September 2006, he set up a panel of experts on the ban. The panel in 2007 proposed that Japan should be allowed to exercise the right to collective self-defense in response to attacks against the U.S. fleet on open seas and to intercept ballistic missiles fired toward the United States.

Abe plans to hear experts' opinions again on the issue.

"We will review the guidelines, observing the prime minister's direction," a senior Defense Ministry official said.

Another subject in the review discussions will be the ban on SDF backup support activities that are considered "inseparable from the use of force."

Japan limits the SDF's rear-echelon activities and operation areas when providing logistics to troops of other countries using force overseas.

The government argues that such activities could violate Article 9 of the Constitution, which renounces the threat or the use of force as a means of settling international disputes.

However, the United States said such limits would hinder SDF support for the U.S. military in dealing with emergencies in areas surrounding Japan.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“Backup support that does not use force, such as providing supplies, transport and medical care, should not be banned,” Abe’s panel has said.

But New Komeito, the LDP’s junior coalition partner, has taken a cautious stance on these issues.

Japan and the United States are expected to include only a rough direction of the revisions in a document released by the end of 2013.

“It will take two to three years until we finally reach a conclusion,” a senior Foreign Ministry official said.

[http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind\\_news/politics/AJ201301100075](http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind_news/politics/AJ201301100075)

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## India Tests Sea-Based Brahmos Missile

9 January 2013

NEW DELHI, January 9 (RIA Novosti) – The Indian Navy successfully tested on Wednesday a highly-maneuverable version of a sea-based Brahmos supersonic cruise missile, an Indian defense source told RIA Novosti.

The missile was fired from an unspecified warship off the coast of Vishakhapatnam in Bay of Bengal in a 34th test by the Indian military.

The source said the missile made a “double-maneuver in S-form” and hit the designated target ship just one meter above the waterline, “ripping through the ship’s hull.”

India has recently updated BrahMos missiles by installing the advanced satellite navigation systems from Russia's Kh-555 and Kh-101 strategic long-range cruise missiles, adding GPS-GLONASS technology to the existing doppler-inertial platform.

“After acquiring the target, the missile flies toward it with high precision, constantly receiving updated coordinates from a satellite navigation system,” the source said.

The BrahMos missile has a range of 290 km (180 miles) and can carry a conventional warhead of up to 300 kg (660 lbs). It can effectively engage targets from an altitude as low as 10 meters (30 feet) and has a top speed of Mach 2.8, which is about three times faster than the U.S.-made subsonic Tomahawk cruise missile.

Brahmos is based on the Russian-designed 3M55 Yakhont (SS-N-26) missile.

Sea- and ground-launched versions of the missile have been put into service with the Indian Army and Navy.

The flight tests of the airborne version were expected to be completed by the end of 2012.

The Indian Air Force is planning to arm 40 Su-30MKI Flanker-H fighters with BrahMos missiles.

Russia and India recently agreed to develop hypersonic BrahMos 2 missile capable of flying at speeds of Mach 5-Mach 7.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20130109/178664783/India\\_Tests\\_Sea-Based\\_Brahmos\\_Missile\\_.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130109/178664783/India_Tests_Sea-Based_Brahmos_Missile_.html)

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

London Telegraph – U.K.

## Tensions Rise between Nuclear Neighbours Pakistan and India

*India accused Pakistan of the "barbaric and inhuman" mutilation of two soldiers killed in a Kashmiri border attack as the crisis between the two nuclear-armed neighbours intensified.*

Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 / Fax: 334.953.7530



By Rob Crilly, Islamabad and agencies  
09 January 2013

Indian officials summoned Pakistan's High Commissioner to New Delhi for a dressing down as grisly details of the attack were confirmed by an army spokesman.

"We can confirm that one of the Indian soldiers was beheaded by the Pakistani army in Kashmir," the spokesman J Dahiya told AFP, adding that the head had apparently been carried away.

Kashmir has been at the centre of Pakistan and India's difficult relationship since independence. The dispute has sparked two full-scale wars and countless skirmishes.

Relations between the two countries have improved since a low point of 2008 when Pakistan-based terrorists attacked multiple targets in Mumbai.

The latest flare-up was ignited at the weekend when Pakistan claimed that Indian troops crossed the Line of Control, attacking one of its military posts.

Two Indian soldiers died after a firefight erupted in disputed Kashmir on Tuesday, in what appears to be a reciprocal attack. The Indian army said a patrol moving in fog discovered Pakistani troops about 500 metres inside Indian territory.

"Regular Pakistan troops crossed the Line of Control ... and engaged the Indian troops who were patrolling the sector," India's Ministry of External Affairs said in a statement.

"Two Indian soldiers were killed in the attack and their bodies subjected to barbaric and inhuman mutilation." The allegations were denied by Pakistan, which called for the United Nations to investigate.

"These are baseless and unfounded allegations," it said in a statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Hasan Askari Rizvi, an analyst based in Lahore, said the exchanges were the most serious threat to peace since a ceasefire was declared in Kashmir in 2003.

However, he added that both countries were keen to stop the dispute going further.

"Although they both have complaints, I don't see that either side wants to reverse the warming in relations – particularly in terms of trade," said Dr Rizvi.

In recent weeks a more liberal visa regime has been agreed between the two countries and on Sunday the Pakistan's cricket team completed its first tour of India in five years.

Salman Khurshid, India's foreign minister, also sought to ease tensions.

"I think it is important in the long term that what has happened should not be escalated," he said. "We cannot and must not allow the escalation of any unwholesome event like this."

With elections looming in both countries, the concern is that populist parties will take to the streets, using Kashmir to whip up anger and drive nationalist voters to the polls.

In Pakistan, extremists are already threatening a fresh jihad.

Wali-ur-Rehman, a senior Pakistan Taliban commander, said he was prepared to send fighters to Kashmir in a video released at the weekend.

"Allah willing, the mujahideen of Tehrik-e-Taliban will arrive in Kashmir and as per the Islamic Sharia will help the Kashmiris get their rights," he said, according to a translation published by the Middle East Media Research Institute.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/india/9791050/Tensions-rise-between-nuclear-neighbours-Pakistan-and-India.html>



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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia to Get 20 New Aerospace Defense Radars**

8 January 2013

MOSCOW, January 8 (RIA Novosti) - Russia's Aerospace Defense Forces will receive about 20 new radar stations this year, a Defense Ministry spokesman said on Tuesday.

The radars will include systems of different classes and modifications, including Gamma-S, Nebo-U and Podlyot-K, as well as modernized Desna and Kasta systems, Col. Alexei Zolotukhin said.

He said on Sunday the Russian military had tracked about 40 launches of foreign and domestic ballistic missiles and space rockets last year. The new radar stations that have been put into operation as part of the Russian missile attack early warning system enable it to track not only ballistic targets and space objects but also aerodynamic targets, he added.

The system will be even more effective following the creation of the Integrated Space Tracking and Combat Command and Control System. Russia is able to reliably detect ballistic missile launches and monitor and control all probable directions for a missile attack, Zolotukhin said.

The ministry also said Russia will start building new radar stations later this year.

Russia announced it will no longer rent the Gabala radar station in Azerbaijan. The lease, signed in 2002, expired in December. Russia is replacing the Gabala radar station, which has played a crucial role in its missile defense system, with a new system based at Armavir in Russia's southern Krasnodar Territory.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20130108/178646802/Russia\\_to\\_Get\\_20\\_New\\_Aerospace\\_Defense.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130108/178646802/Russia_to_Get_20_New_Aerospace_Defense.html)

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

Russia & India Report - India

## **Russia, China Plan to Boost Cooperation on Missile Defense**

9 January 2013

RIA Novosti

BEIJING, January 9 (RIA Novosti) – Russia and China are planning to intensify their cooperation on missile defense in response to America's growing missile defense potential around the globe, Russian Security Council Secretary Nikolai Patrushev said on Wednesday.

"We are concerned about US plans to build a global missile defense system, including in the Asia-Pacific region," Patrushev said during the 8th round of Russian-Chinese consultations on strategic security in Beijing.

"Our Chinese partners share our concerns and we have agreed to coordinate our actions in that respect," he said, adding that it would help both countries to develop a "constructive" approach toward missile defense issue.

Russia and China have been keeping a close eye on US moves to deploy missile defenses around the arc of the South China Sea in addition to the planned European missile shield.

Washington and Tokyo agreed last September to construct an advanced X-band missile early-warning radar in southern Japan to join an existing AN/TPY-2 radar in Japan's northern Aomori Prefecture.

Some reports suggest that US Missile Defense Agency and the US Pacific Command are considering a third such radar somewhere else in Southeast Asia, possibly, in the Philippines.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Washington is also planning to expand the grouping of Aegis-equipped US warships that patrol international waters in the region.

Moscow and Beijing are objecting US missile defense initiatives saying they are worsening the global and regional security environment, especially military and nonproliferation processes, to the detriment of Russian and Chinese nuclear deterrents.

Russia and China have held regular bilateral consultations on strategic issues since 2005.

[http://indrus.in/articles/2013/01/09/russia\\_china\\_plan\\_to\\_boost\\_cooperation\\_on\\_missile\\_defense\\_21511.html](http://indrus.in/articles/2013/01/09/russia_china_plan_to_boost_cooperation_on_missile_defense_21511.html)

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

RT (Russia Today) – Russia

## **Finally Flying Colors: Yury Dolgoruky Nuclear Sub Joins Russian Navy**

10 January 2013

After years of sea trials and missile test launches, the Borei class nuclear-powered submarine Yury Dolgoruky has officially become part of the Russian Navy. The sub and its siblings are to be part of Russia's nuclear deterrence shield.

The official ceremony of raising the Russian Navy colors on the submarine on Thursday was led by Russian Defense Minister Sergey Shoigu. The Yury Dolgoruky is the lead vessel of the Borei family, the most modern nuclear-powered strategic submarines made in Russia.

Commenting on the news on Twitter, Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin, who is known for his saber-rattling, tongue-in-the-cheek rhetoric, posted: *"Tremble, bourgeoisie! You're done with!"*

The submarine was commissioned in 1996 at a shipyard in Severodvinsk. It endured several years of budget restraints and design changes, after the intercontinental ballistic missile Bark, which was slated to become its prime armament, was scrapped. Its reactor was finally launched in 2008.

Between 2009 and 2012 the submarine was involved in both sea trial and test-firing of the Bulava missile, which was the replacement for the Bark. It was expected to enter service back in 2011, but the deadline was eventually postponed by a year. In December 2012 the Navy officially accepted the submarine as ready to take combat missions.

Russia has commissioned three submarines of the Borei class. Yury Dolgoruky's sister boats, Aleksandr Nevsky and Vladimir Monomakh have been in construction since 2004 and 2006 respectively. Nevsky has been undergoing sea trials since October 2012 while Monomakh has been put on water in late December 2012.

In May 2012 the Navy has also contracted development of an upgraded version of the Borei class submarine, which will carry 20 ICBMs, compared to the regular version's 16. It will also have improved characteristics, such as reduced noise, better measurability and more advanced weapon controls. The keel of the lead advanced vessel, Knyaz Vladimir, was laid down in July 2012, with four more submarines expected to be built.

<http://rt.com/news/yury-dolgoruky-submarine-ceremony-678/>

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

Russia & India Report (RIR) – India

## **Russia to Create New Missiles to Compete with U.S.**

*While the United States is building a global missile defense system, Russia is preparing for a radical renewal of its strategic nuclear missile arsenal.*

January 10, 2013

By Andrei Kislyakov, especially for RIR

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 / Fax: 334.953.7530





It looks like the Russian military and the military-industrial complex have decided to prepare seriously for overcoming the American missile defense system. Work is underway simultaneously on two strategic missiles of different classes.

According to Sergei Karakaev, the commander of Russia's Strategic Missile Forces, these is a heavy, 100-ton, liquid-propellant intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) that should outperform the world's most powerful R-36M2 Voevoda (NATO reporting name: SS-18 Satan), and a solid-fuel ICBM scheduled to replace the fifth-generation Yars systems (the RS-24 and the Topol-M).

"Since the potential of solid-fuel ICBMs could become insufficient for overcoming the American missile defense system going forward, a heavy liquid-propellant ICBM is needed to perform this task. Such an ICBM will allow the creation of a non-nuclear, high-precision, strategic weapon with a practically global range, unless the United States abandons its program," Karakaev said.

This is the first time Russia has spoken about creating a new solid-fuel missile. According to Gen. Karakaev, several launches of a prototype of this missile took place in 2012 – most recently on Oct. 24.

This puts an end to the debate on whether Russia's Strategic Missile Forces need a heavyweight liquid-propellant missile.

Russia undertook a large-scale modernization of the Topol family in the 1990s and adopted the Topol-M silos (NATO reporting name: SS-27) in 2000, followed by the mobile Topol-M2 several years ago. It is the new Topol and the newly adopted RS-24 Yars that will be gradually replacing the decommissioned, first-generation, solid-fuel missiles.

But liquid-propellant missiles still form the backbone of the strategic deterrence forces: the UR-100N (NATO reporting name: SS-19 Stiletto) and the P-36M (U.S. Department of Defense and NATO reporting name: SS-18 Satan). These, however, are obsolete and will have to be retired over the next few years.

New missiles have been slow in arriving to the Russia's armed forces. According to an estimate by Leonid Kalashnikov, deputy chairman of the State Duma Defense Committee, Russia could receive 100-105 new ICBMs by 2015. If the bet remains on, the single-warhead Topol-M and the three-warhead Yars-24 would be able to carry a total of 110-115 warheads. At the same time, the United States is planning to deploy 900 ballistic missile interceptors worldwide by 2015.

The United States withdrew from the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty in 2001 and is no longer limited by any restrictions on building up the quantity and quality of such means. According to Karakaev, it is possible that America could deploy anti-missile defenses in space.

Russia's military and political leadership was counting on successful negotiations with the United States on missile defense. However, the negotiations have ended in a deadlock; Washington's persistent deployment of surface- and sea-based anti-missile defenses, coupled with a general deterioration of bilateral relations, have forced the Russian leadership to consider more decisive actions.

This is where the idea of a missile capable of carrying a dividing warhead with a large number of individually targeted blocks (which would also have a long range) originated. Russia already has such missiles – the above-mentioned liquid-propellant UR-100N and R-36M. However, these missiles have been on combat duty since the late 1980s, and their service life is nearing an end.

Development of new missiles was suspended in the 1990s, when the Strategic Missile Forces were expected to be fully converted to lightweight, solid-fuel missile complexes. However, lightweight missiles have not been able to become a full-fledged replacement for liquid-propellant giants.

According to Yuri Zaitsev, an expert at the Academy of Engineering Sciences, "It's unlikely that the lightweight Topol-M and the Bulava [a new sea-based solid-fuel Topol-M based missile] could serve as a worthy substitute for the decommissioned missiles."



Nonetheless, Russia is not planning to abandon its solid-fuel missiles either. Solid-fuel missiles are the best match for mobile complexes. This means that Russia will continue developing a replacement for both types of its active-duty missiles.

[http://indrus.in/articles/2013/01/10/russia\\_to\\_create\\_new\\_missiles\\_to\\_compete\\_with\\_us\\_21525.html](http://indrus.in/articles/2013/01/10/russia_to_create_new_missiles_to_compete_with_us_21525.html)

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

The London Guardian – U.K.

## **MoD: Trident Submarines Cannot Be Moved from Scotland to Plymouth**

*Devonport is ruled out as home for submarines, raising questions over future of fleet if Scotland votes for independence*

By Rob Edwards

Friday, 4 January 2013

Britain's nuclear-armed submarines cannot be moved from Scotland to the Devonport naval base in Plymouth because they do not have safety clearances to dock there.

The disclosure has huge implications for the Ministry of Defence (MoD) if Scotland votes for independence and a new government demands the withdrawal of the nuclear fleet.

The MoD has revealed that the safety arrangements for Devonport do not permit the presence of submarines carrying Trident nuclear warheads. The MoD's safety experts are not considering changing that.

The problem is that the dockyard is in a densely populated area and, if there were an accident, thousands of people would be at risk. The worst accident scenario envisaged by the MoD would kill up to 11,000 people in Plymouth and would not meet the official criteria for what is acceptable, according to a new report.

The Scottish government, run by the Scottish National party, has said it would eject nuclear weapons from the Faslane submarine base on the Clyde as soon as possible after Scotland became independent. A referendum on independence is due to be held in the autumn of 2014.

Experts and politicians have repeatedly suggested that the Vanguard-class submarines that carry nuclear-tipped Trident missiles could be relocated to Devonport. In evidence to a House of Lords committee in December the former head of the Royal Navy, Admiral Lord West, said "they could go there".

But a response under freedom of information law from the MoD indicates that will not be possible. The "safety case" it has drawn up for regulators to demonstrate Devonport can be operated without undue risk rules out nuclear-armed submarines.

"Neither the Devonport naval base nor the Devonport dockyard, which is owned and operated by Babcock, safety case permit the berthing of an armed Vanguard class submarine," the MoD said.

It also disclosed that its internal safety watchdog, the Defence Nuclear Safety Regulator, "has not provided any advice on the feasibility of docking of an armed Vanguard class submarine in Devonport dockyard".

The MoD was responding to questions from the Scottish Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (SCND), which wants to get rid of Trident altogether.

"This shows that it is wrong to suggest that Trident can just move to Devonport if it is thrown out of Scotland," said the campaign's co-ordinator, John Ainslie.

A new report by SCND applies the MoD's criteria for accidents at Faslane to Devonport. It concludes that Devonport would never be an officially acceptable location for Trident submarines because of the much greater population that would be put at risk.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

There are about 166,000 people living within five kilometres of the Devonport base, compared with about 5,200 within that distance of Faslane. In assessing the dangers of a major accident at Faslane's shiplift in 2000, the MoD concluded that the "societal contamination" that could result meant that "the risks are close to the tolerability criterion level".

If a similar accident happened at Devonport, the MoD's tolerability criteria would be massively exceeded, the SCND report says. If there was a light wind blowing from the south-west, it estimates that 800 people would be killed by leaking plutonium.

If the weather was calm, the report says that as many as 11,000 people could die from radiation poisoning. There would also be additional casualties from the blast, which could break windows across a quarter of Plymouth.

The MoD's worst-case accident scenario assumes that all the conventional explosives in the eight Trident missiles carried by a single submarine detonate. It then assumes that all the plutonium in the missiles' 40 nuclear warheads is dispersed, amounting to perhaps 160kg.

"A missile accident at Devonport, in the centre of Plymouth, could result in thousands of deaths," said Ainslie. "In addition, a large proportion of the city would be abandoned for hundreds of years."

The MoD stressed that the UK government was making no plans for independence, as it was confident that Scotland would not vote to leave the UK.

"We are therefore not making plans to move the nuclear deterrent from HM Naval Base Clyde, which supports 6,700 jobs, and where all of our submarines will be based from 2017," said an MoD spokesman.

"The government is committed to maintaining a continuous submarine-based nuclear deterrent and has begun the work of replacing our existing submarines."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/jan/04/mod-nuclear-submarines-scotland-plymouth?INTCMP=SRCH>

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

Kansas City Star  
Wednesday, January 9, 2013

## **France Affirms Nuclear Weapons Arsenal despite Looming Military Cuts**

By JAMEY KEATEN, Associated Press

France's president says the country will maintain its costly nuclear arsenal despite looming military budget cuts, saying the weapons are essential for national defense.

President Francois Hollande said Wednesday that global security threats have made nuclear weapons essential for France, which is the only country in continental Europe to have them.

The statement came in Hollande's annual New Year's greeting to soldiers. The president says "it's a deterrent force that allows us protection against all threats and allows us to play a strong role on the world stage."

France's military is facing a tighter budget in coming years, and has already pulled its soldiers from the costly and unpopular war in Afghanistan.

<http://www.kansascity.com/2013/01/09/4001658/france-affirms-nuclear-arms-despite.html>

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

Defense News

## **New U.S. Law Seeks Answers on Chinese Nuke Tunnels**

January 5, 2013

By WENDELL MINNICK

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 / Fax: 334.953.7530



TAIPEI — The U.S. military must consider both conventional and nuclear capabilities to “neutralize” China’s underground nuclear weapons storage facilities, according to a Pentagon authorization signed into law.

The new National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), signed by U.S. President Barack Obama on Jan. 2, orders the Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) to submit a report by Aug. 15 on the “underground tunnel network used by the People’s Republic of China with respect to the capability of the United States to use conventional and nuclear forces to neutralize such tunnels and what is stored within such tunnels.”

A Georgetown University team led by Phillip Karber conducted a three-year study to map out China’s complex tunnel system, which stretches 3,000 miles.

The 2011 report, “Strategic Implications of China’s Underground Great Wall,” concluded that the number of nuclear weapons estimated by U.S. intelligence was incorrect. His team estimated that as many as 3,000 nuclear weapons could be hidden within a vast labyrinth in several locations in China. U.S. intelligence estimates have been reporting consistently that China had, at the most, 300 nuclear warheads in its arsenal.

Karber’s report presents evidence of a complex system of tunnels in areas noted for nuclear testing and storage — a far greater subterranean cavity than needed for just 300 nuclear weapons.

NDAA sections 1045, 1271 and 3119 all highlight U.S. congressional concerns over China’s nuclear and military modernization efforts. Bonnie Glaser, a China specialist at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, doubts these sections of the NDAA will have major policy consequences for U.S.-China relations: “The intelligence community tracks China’s nuclear weapons closely — is a federally funded research and development center going to find a new threat?”

Overall, Glaser believes the new reporting requirements are a reaction to Karber’s work, making him one of a few lonely challengers to suggest that U.S. intelligence estimates are wrong.

The NDAA-directed report by STRATCOM must include identification of the knowledge gaps regarding such nuclear weapons programs and a discussion of the implications of any such gaps for the security of the U.S.

The report must also assess the nuclear deterrence strategy of China, including a historical perspective and the geopolitical drivers of such strategy, and a detailed description of the nuclear arsenal, including the number of nuclear weapons capable of being delivered at intercontinental range.

The report will also include a comparison of the nuclear forces of the U.S. and China, projections of the possible future nuclear arsenals of China, a description of command-and-control functions and gaps, assessment of the fissile material stockpile of China, and its civil and military production capabilities and capacities.

Karber takes little credit for the NDAA requirements, which many have begun calling the “Karber effect.” “I believe a number of events, not least of which being Chinese testing and deployment patterns, have motivated this tasking, and I will leave to others to assess what part our research played in stimulating or adding motivation to it,” Karber said.

Naysayers and skeptics of Karber’s conclusions abound. The language in the NDAA reflects several things, said Hans Kristensen, director, Nuclear Information Project, Federation of American Scientists.

These include a general concern and fascination with Chinese military modernization; fallout from the Karber study; claims by Karber and retired Russian Col. Gen. Viktor Esin that China has 3,600 nuclear warheads, which Kristensen views as erroneous and rejected by STRATCOM; lobbying by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, which “see China as a small Soviet Union”; and “frustration among some, myself included, that the U.S. intelligence community and military is becoming more secretive about what it says about Chinese nuclear capabilities.”

Kristensen said this gradually increases the dangers of war between China and the U.S. “The two countries are dancing a dangerous dance that will increase military tension and could potentially lead to a small Cold War in the Pacific.”



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

He said most of the U.S. Navy's ballistic-missile submarine force is operating in the Pacific, nuclear bomber squadrons periodically deploy to Guam and recently extended tours from three to six months, and more naval forces are being shifted into the Pacific.

The final question many analysts are asking is, how does the U.S. "use conventional and nuclear forces to neutralize such tunnels and what is stored within such tunnels"? Tests of low-yield earth-penetrating nuclear weapons such as the B61-11 have been disappointing with low penetration results. It is unclear if the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator program or the improved B61-12 have solved the problem, but given the locations, lengths and various depths of the tunnel system outlined in Karber's report, more than one bomb would be needed to eliminate the threat.

So what has got the U.S. Congress so spooked about China's underground tunneling program? Karber's conclusions read like Cormac McCarthy's post-apocalyptic novel, "The Road."

Karber's paper estimates in 2020-plus that China's true nuclear arsenal, if used against the U.S. as a "counter-value attack," would inflict 50 million direct casualties; plus-or-minus 50 percent would suffer radiation sickness ranging from debilitating to life-shortening; two-thirds of the 7,569 hospitals would be destroyed or inoperable and half the physicians would themselves be casualties. One-third of the electrical generation capacity and 40 percent of the national food producing agricultural land would be destroyed or exposed to significant residual radiation. 100 million Americans would face starvation within the first 10 years of the initial attack.

"Bottom line," Karber's report said, "200 million lost, and surviving Americans will be living in the dark, on a subsistence diet, with a life style and life expectancy equivalent to the Dark Ages."

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130105/DEFREG02/301050003/New-U-S-Law-Seeks-Answers-Chinese-Nuke-Tunnels?odyssey=nav|head>

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

Chicago Tribune

## **Exclusive: U.S. Nuclear Lab Removes Chinese Tech over Security Fears**

January 7, 2013

By Steve Stecklow, Reuters

LONDON, Jan 7 (Reuters) - A leading U.S. nuclear weapons laboratory recently discovered its computer systems contained some Chinese-made network switches and replaced at least two components because of national security concerns, a document shows.

A letter from the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, dated November 5, 2012, states that the research facility had installed devices made by H3C Technologies Co, based in Hangzhou, China, according to a copy seen by Reuters. H3C began as a joint venture between China's Huawei Technologies Co and 3Com Corp, a U.S. tech firm, and was once called Huawei-3Com. Hewlett Packard Co acquired the firm in 2010.

The discovery raises questions about procurement practices by U.S. departments responsible for national security. The U.S. government and Congress have raised concerns about Huawei and its alleged ties to the Chinese military and government. The company, the world's second-largest telecommunications equipment maker, denies its products pose any security risk or that the Chinese military influences its business.

Switches are used to manage data traffic on computer networks. The exact number of Chinese-made switches installed at Los Alamos, how or when they were acquired, and whether they were placed in sensitive systems or pose any security risks, remains unclear. The laboratory - where the first atomic bomb was designed - is responsible for maintaining America's arsenal of nuclear weapons.

A spokesman for the Los Alamos lab referred enquiries to the Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration, or NNSA, which declined to comment.

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



The November 5 letter seen by Reuters was written by the acting chief information officer at the Los Alamos lab and addressed to the NNSA's assistant manager for safeguards and security. It states that in October a network engineer at the lab - who the letter does not identify - alerted officials that H3C devices "were beginning to be installed in" its networks.

The letter says a working group of specialists, some from the lab's counter intelligence unit, began investigating, "focusing on sensitive networks." The lab "determined that a small number of the devices installed in one network were H3C devices. Two devices used in isolated cases were promptly replaced," the letter states.

The letter suggests other H3C devices may still be installed. It states that the lab was investigating "replacing any remaining H3C network switch devices as quickly as possible," including "older switches" in "both sensitive and unclassified networks as part of the normal life-cycle maintenance effort." The letter adds that the lab was conducting a formal assessment to determine "any potential risk associated with any H3C devices that may remain in service until replacements can be obtained."

"We would like to emphasize that (Los Alamos) has taken this issue seriously, and implemented expeditious and proactive steps to address it," the letter states.

Corporate filings show Huawei sold its stake in H3C to 3Com in 2007. Nevertheless, H3C's website still describes Huawei as one of its "global strategic partners" and states it is working with it "to deliver advanced, cost-efficient and environmental-friendly products."

#### RECKLESS BLACKBALLING?

The Los Alamos letter appears to have been written in response to a request last year by the House Armed Services Committee for the Department of Energy (DoE) to report on any "supply chain risks."

In its request, the committee said it was concerned by a Government Accountability Office report last year that found a number of national security-related departments had not taken appropriate measures to guard against risks posed by their computer-equipment suppliers. The report said federal agencies are not required to track whether any of their telecoms networks contain foreign-developed products.

The Armed Services committee specifically asked the DoE to evaluate whether it, or any of its major contractors, were using technology produced by Huawei or ZTE Corp, another Chinese telecoms equipment maker. ZTE Corp denies its products pose any security risk.

In 2008, Huawei and private equity firm Bain Capital were forced to give up their bid for 3Com after a U.S. panel rejected the deal because of national security concerns. Three years later, Huawei abandoned its acquisition of some assets from U.S. server technology firm 3Leaf, bowing to pressure from the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. The committee evaluates whether foreign control of a U.S. business poses national security risks.

In October, the House Intelligence Committee issued an investigative report that recommended U.S. government systems should not include Huawei or ZTE components. The report said that based on classified and unclassified information, Huawei and ZTE "cannot be trusted to be free of foreign state influence" and pose "a security threat to the United States and to our systems."

William Plummer, Huawei's vice president of external affairs in Washington, said in an email to Reuters: "There has never been a shred of substantive proof that Huawei gear is any less secure than that of our competitors, all of which rely on common global standards, supply chains, coding and manufacturing."

"Blackballing legitimate multinationals based on country of origin is reckless, both in terms of fostering a dangerously false sense of cyber-security and in threatening the free and fair global trading system that the U.S. has championed for the last 60-plus years."

He referred questions about H3C products to Hewlett Packard. An HP spokesman said Huawei no longer designs any H3C hardware and that the company "became independent operationally ... from Huawei" several years prior to HP's



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

acquisition of it. He added that HP's networking division "has considerable resources dedicated to compliance with all legal and regulatory requirements involving system security, global trade and customer privacy."

*Editing by Richard Woods.*

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/topic/sns-rt-huawei-alamosl4n0ab0a7-20130107,0,1862642,full.story>

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

Nextgov.com

## **Air Force Eyes Return of Mobile Nuclear Missiles**

By Bob Brewin

January 9, 2013

The Air Force has dusted off plans more than two decades old to place fixed nuclear missiles on rail cars or massive road vehicles to protect them from a surprise attack.

The service also wants to explore alternatives to traditional missiles to carry nuclear warheads, which could include hypersonic aircraft capable of crossing the Atlantic Ocean in an hour, said Phillip Coyle of the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, a former associate director for national security and international affairs in the Obama administration's Office of Science and Technology Policy.

On Monday, the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center at Kirtland Air Force Base, N.M., kicked off a study on modernizing or replacing its current fleet of Minuteman III nuclear missiles housed in underground silos in Montana, North Dakota and Wyoming. The work includes potential upgrades to the command and control system.

The center said it wants industry and academic help in analyzing the future of its Minuteman III nuclear missiles. The options include no upgrades, incremental fixes, new missiles stored in silos, and new mobile or tunnel-based systems.

In 1984, the Air Force began developing a small intercontinental ballistic missile called the "Midgetman," which was carried on a massive, blast-resistant 200,000-lb. wheeled vehicle. The project was canceled in 1992 after the Cold War ended.

In the late 1980s, the Air Force also hatched a plan to place 50 missiles formerly stored in silos on rail cars deployed to seven states. This project was canceled in 1991 after the Air Force shifted funding to nuclear bombers.

In September 2011, the Center for Strategic and International Studies reported that China had developed a mobile missile system, the same month Russia indicated it planned to revive its rail car based missile program, which began in 1983 but was scrapped in 2006.

Coyle said he was concerned that proliferation of mobile missile systems could lead to another arms race. "The Air Force will need to be careful that they don't stir up a hornets nest with proposals for mobile basing or advanced concepts other than the traditional booster and reentry vehicle. The former could cause Russia or China to redouble their efforts on mobile basing of ICBMs, set off a new kind of arms race, and weaken U.S. defenses," Coyle said.

He added that if the Air Force decides to pursue hypersonic aircraft to deliver nuclear warheads, this could confuse nuclear armed countries such as Russia, which would not be able to determine if supersonic aircraft traveling at 4,000 miles per hour were carrying conventional or nuclear warheads, and potentially react with a nuclear strike.

<http://www.nextgov.com/defense/2013/01/air-force-eyes-return-mobile-nuclear-missiles/60565/>

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

Phys.Org

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

## Airborne Pods Seek to Trace Nuclear Bomb's Origins: Modular Units Crossing 'Valley of Death' for Air Force Use

January 10, 2013

Provided by Sandia National Laboratories

(Phys.org)—If a nuclear device were to unexpectedly detonate anywhere on Earth, the ensuing effort to find out who made the weapon probably would be led by aircraft rapidly collecting airborne radioactive particles for analysis.

Relatively inexpensive unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs)—equipped with radiation sensors and specialized debris-samplers—could fly right down the throat of telltale radiation over a broad range of altitudes without exposing a human crew to hazards.

A Sandia National Laboratories-developed airborne particulate-collection system demonstrated those kinds of capabilities in the blue skies above Grand Forks Air Force Base in Grand Forks, N.D., in late September. Dubbed "Harvester" for obvious reasons, the system "tasted" the atmosphere with two particulate sampling pods. A third pod would provide directional guidance for a real event by following the trail of gamma radiation.

The three pods, with additional hardware, software and ground-control equipment, are expected take their place on aircraft in the Air Force's investigatory arsenal in the next few years.

When they do so, they will have traversed the infamous technological "Valley of Death," in which many promising researched and developed ideas die before reaching production.

The successful Grand Forks demonstration was part of a formal Department of Defense (DoD) Joint Capability Technology Demonstration (JCTD) that mated the Harvester modular pods to the long wings of a Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection-provided MQ-9 Reaper UAV. (The Reaper is a more powerful cousin of the better-known Predator.)

While the tests did not include any radioisotope releases, the pods were able to collect and identify naturally occurring radioisotopes of lead and bismuth produced from the radioactive decay of atmospheric radon. In addition, radioactive beryllium-7 produced from cosmic ray-induced break-up (spallation) of naturally occurring carbon-14, also showed up on the filters, providing a uniform measure for debris distribution.

The modular pods eliminate the need for costly, permanent aircraft modifications that would limit the number of aircraft platforms on which Harvester can be flown.

"There's a high likelihood the Air Force will make Harvester operational in 2014 to augment its current manned aircraft collection capability," said Sandia project lead Joe Sanders. "For maximum responsiveness, we continually engaged with the Air Force to address its technological and operational needs throughout the project."

The Harvester's Directional Gamma Radiation Sensor (DGRS) helps guide the aircraft toward the radioactive plume using four large sodium iodide radiation detectors and a complex processing algorithm. The Harvester equipment operator informs the pilot, located far away in a UAV ground control station, to fly toward the plume's "hot spot."

"The operator will see a vector that shows peak plume intensity up and to the right, let's say," Sanders said. "It's the equivalent of a guide saying, 'You're getting warmer.'"

Air passes through the samplers, each about the size of a small snowmobile, as the Reaper cruises at 200 mph. This rams particles into filter paper like light hitting a photographic plate, causing the particles to stick to the filter fibers. A separate radiation sensor analyzes the filter in real time to estimate the type and quantity of radioactive particles collected. More extensive examination of the filters occurs after the aircraft has landed.

Because gas analysis can complement particle analysis, Sandia is developing a third type of pod called the Whole Air Sampling Pod (WASP) to demonstrate the feasibility of collecting multiple, large-volume air samples that can be

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530





analyzed for radioactive gases. Radioxenons, radioisotopes of the noble gas xenon, if detected, can provide a tell-tale indication of a nuclear detonation.

"While not small, the 9-foot-long, 650-pound WASP is designed to be compatible with an MQ-9 Reaper UAV," Sanders said. "WASP has not yet been flight-tested but has performed well in the laboratory, and the DoD's interest in modular gas sampling is growing. We look forward to demonstrating the WASP technology, and expect that it will also cross the Valley of Death."

<http://phys.org/news/2013-01-airborne-pods-nuclear-modular-valley.html>

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

Japan Today – Japan

## U.N. Nuclear Chief Amano Has No Rivals for New Term

January 8, 2013

Reuters

VIENNA — U.N. nuclear chief Yukiya Amano, a key figure in international diplomacy on Iran's disputed nuclear work, is set to win another four-year term as he faces no rivals for the post.

A letter from the chairman of the 35-nation governing board of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to member states of the U.N. agency, dated Jan 7, said no other candidates had come forward by a Dec 31 deadline.

It means Amano, who has taken a tougher approach on the Iran nuclear file than his predecessor Mohamed ElBaradei, will almost certainly be reappointed as director general without problems, in contrast to his close election victory in 2009.

"I wish to inform you that I have received no nominations and that, consequently, Mr Amano is the only candidate," said the letter from Canadian envoy John Barrett, seen by Reuters.

Barrett indicated that he aimed for a formal decision to reappoint Amano, a veteran Japanese diplomat, at the board's next meeting in early March.

Western diplomats are generally happy with the way he has stepped up pressure on Iran to stop stonewalling an agency investigation into suspected atom bomb research, even if that push has yet to bear fruit.

But the Vienna-based U.N. watchdog's relations with Tehran, which denies Western accusations that it is seeking to develop the capability to produce nuclear weapons, have become increasingly strained since Amano took office on Dec 1, 2009.

Under Amano, the IAEA was criticised in 2011 for a perceived slow initial response to Japan's Fukushima nuclear disaster, but later led international efforts to agree an action plan to improve global reactor safety.

In 2009, supported largely by industrialised nations, Amano defeated South Africa's Abdul Samad Minty in a sixth round of balloting after five inconclusive votes.

<http://archive.japantoday.com/category/national/view/u-n-nuclear-chief-amano-has-no-rivals-for-new-term>

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

Global Times – China

OPINION/Editorial

## Satellite Test Sparks Overblown Worries

January 6, 2013

By Global Times



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The US media reported on January 4 that there is speculation circulating within the US defense and intelligence communities that China is gearing up to launch an anti-satellite test this month. It is said that a successful test will put the US strategic satellites, such as Global Positioning System navigational satellites, at risk.

China reportedly conducted an anti-satellite test in early 2007, which caused a great uproar. Some analysts said that even China really once again launches a test, it will not strike down satellites, but invalidate them.

China's public policy is peaceful use of space, which is also China's real desire. China has no interest in launching a large-scale space race with the US. China and Russia jointly initiated a program to avoid an arm race in outer space in 2008, but this proposal was refused by the US.

Against this background, it is necessary for China to have the ability to strike US satellites. This deterrent can provide strategic protection to Chinese satellites and the whole country's national security.

Whether China will launch new anti-satellite test is still unknown. However China should continue substantive research on striking satellites. It can avoid the controversy of whether this action violates peaceful use of space by doing so under the aegis of developing anti-missile defense systems.

In the foreseeable future, gap between China and the US cannot be eliminated by China's development of space weapons. The US advantage is overwhelming. Before strategic uncertainties between China and the US can disappear, China urgently needs to have an outer space trump card.

The US will continue to harass and even obstruct China's developing of its space capabilities. China should make tactical adjustments to reduce trouble. However, the bottom line of these adjustments should be that normal research cannot be undermined.

China's reputation is doomed to be poor in the West. Ingratiating ourselves to the West is the last choice for us. We have to develop ourselves and have complex communications with the West based on this. The West's stereotypes of China come from two reasons: ideological differences and national competition. With the rise of China, the latter becomes more obvious.

Security interests are the most important national interests. China's gradual rise of comprehensive power has brought Western countries a sense of crisis. However, as long as China sincerely wants to develop peacefully and maintain strategic restraints in disputes and conflicts, Western countries will gradually reassess China's strategic intentions and give up their paranoia.

It is key for China to have the ability of strategic retaliation. It is a safeguard for China to deter the US from taking risky action against China in this period of great transition. Currently China attaches great attention to improving people's livelihoods. However, consolidating China's strategic security is the foundation of long-term development. We must dedicate a portion of our resources and energy to the construction of advanced defense capabilities.

Therefore, hopefully, the speculation about China's anti-satellite tests is true.

<http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/753925.shtml>

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

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientist

OPINION/Columnist

## **A Threat that Demands Action**

By Fissile Materials Working Group

9 January 2013

For years, American politicians on both sides of the aisle have agreed that nuclear terrorism is one of the most serious national security threats the United States faces. In 2013, President Obama must capitalize on this rare consensus

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 / Fax: 334.953.7530



point and on his own power as a second-term president. After all, despite ongoing polarization in Washington, bipartisan cooperation has been the norm for nuclear security since the launch of the Nunn-Lugar program more than two decades ago, making the issue a unique outlier in Washington -- and for good reason. Nuclear terrorism is a real possibility that would cause catastrophic damage.

**The problem.** A fascinating and largely overlooked report issued a year ago by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) assesses the damage that would befall Washington, DC, in the event of a nuclear terrorist attack. The report, presented as a case study in disaster response, assumes that a terrorist detonates a 10-kiloton improvised nuclear device -- that is, a crude nuclear bomb -- in downtown Washington. Unfortunately, the basis for such a study is all too sound.

Fissile material is widespread and has been sold on the black market: There is currently enough fissile material across the globe for more than 100,000 additional nuclear weapons, and there are 20 known cases of unauthorized possession. These days, should a capable terrorist group acquire sufficient quantities of highly enriched uranium, it could produce an improvised nuclear device using a "gun-type" design and still have an impact similar to that of Hiroshima. (Modern-day strategic nuclear weapons are orders of magnitude more powerful than those used during World War II.)

While the odds of a nuclear terrorist attack are low (most experts believe a radiological or dirty bomb attack is more likely), the consequences are extremely high, as confirmed by the FEMA-DHS study. Within a half-mile radius of the detonation, few buildings (including the White House) would remain standing, and most of the 150,000 people within the radius would perish. Extending out another half-mile, most houses and weaker buildings would be destroyed, and approximately half of the 200,000 individuals in this area would be killed, with still more at risk from injuries, radiation exposure, and fires. Beyond that, the shock wave from the blast would blow-in windows and temporary flash-blindness would afflict onlookers, including drivers. There would ultimately be a staggering 100 injured individuals for each hospital bed available in the area. And, after the immediate devastation, there would be long-term effects, like exposure to radioactive fallout and massive agricultural embargoes.

But that's not all. In addition to the target area, the world at large would be in turmoil. In the aftermath of an attack, global trade would grind to a halt. As Kofi Annan, former secretary-general of the United Nations, has stated, a nuclear terrorist attack "would stagger the world economy and thrust tens of millions of people into dire poverty," triggering "a second death toll throughout the developing world." Meanwhile, in the United States itself, the official response just might be draconian: In the aftermath of 9/11, the United States launched two wars, stripped civil liberties, and authorized the use of torture and indefinite detentions -- legacies with which Americans are still struggling. Now imagine the response to an attack made with one of the world's deadliest weapons. In sum, the US capital would be a pile of radioactive rubble, hundreds of thousands would be killed, the US federal government would be in complete disarray, the global economy would sputter, the developing world would struggle, and US freedoms would be lost. All of this from a 10-kiloton improvised nuclear device in the wrong hands.

**Solutions.** Clearly, this is an issue that deserves the highest level of political attention. Fortunately, the importance of global action has been elevated as a result of Obama's Prague speech in 2009, which set a four-year goal to secure all vulnerable nuclear materials, and the Nuclear Security Summit process, which has twice brought together dozens of heads of state to pledge accelerated action to strengthen global nuclear security. Still, much work remains. As the president enters his second term, he must place nuclear security high on his agenda and take action to achieve the following goals:

*Lead by example.* First, Obama should work with Congress to implement a key commitment of the Nuclear Security Summit process: passing implementing legislation for the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and to the International Convention on the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. The former would require parties to secure domestic nuclear material and facilities, whereas the latter would provide a common legal framework for international cooperation to investigate and bring alleged perpetrators to justice. Both would fill



key gaps in the regime and enhance US and international security. Without swift US passage, it is unlikely that Nuclear Security Summit participants will be able to meet their 2014 deadline for entry into force.

*Protect funding.* Second, the administration should do a better job protecting critical security funding, particularly for the Global Threat Reduction Initiative and International Material Protection and Cooperation program, which both received significant cuts in the administration's 2013 budget request. The Global Threat Reduction Initiative secures and removes high-risk nuclear and radiological material around the globe. Since Obama's 2009 Prague speech, the initiative has removed all highly enriched uranium from ten countries and has successfully converted or shut down 20 research reactors that used highly enriched uranium. The International Material Protection and Cooperation secures weapons and material at the source and enhances international efforts to detect and interdict illicit trafficking of nuclear and radiological material. Both are critical to global nuclear security and must be protected.

*Continue cooperation with Russia.* Third, the administration should work with Russia to reach an agreement that will extend US-Russian cooperation on nuclear security through the Nunn-Lugar program beyond July 2013, when the current agreement will lapse. This vital program has substantially reduced the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction in the former Soviet Union, with more than 7,600 nuclear warheads deactivated and 24 nuclear weapons storage sites secured. This program is also critical to global nuclear security.

*Close security gaps.* Fourth, the president should consider how to best rectify major gaps in the nuclear security regime. At the least, there must be comprehensive standards of protection for nuclear materials and transparency over state-based nuclear security programs around the world. Taking steps to address these issues at the 2014 Nuclear Security Summit in the Netherlands would be a major step forward.

*Prioritize.* Finally, there have been many indications that the 2014 Nuclear Security Summit may be the final conclave at the heads-of-state level. Obama needs to determine whether the summit is the appropriate mechanism to drive global improvements on nuclear security beyond 2014. Either way, he must work with other world leaders to ensure that preventing nuclear terrorism remains a top priority for the international community.

The high consequences of the threat of nuclear terrorism demand serious action. Let's hope that President Obama can build on the positive steps he took in his first term and ensure that the world never has to face such a devastating attack.

*Editor's note: This column was written by Ryan Costello, formerly a program associate with the Connect U.S. Fund and the coordinator of the Fissile Materials Working Group.*

<http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/columnists/fissile-materials-working-group/threat-demands-action>

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

The Hindu – India  
OPINION/Op-Ed  
January 10, 2013

## India-Pakistan Dialogue Must Continue

*But New Delhi must create strong disincentives for hostile actions by Islamabad*

By B. Raman

The validity of our strategic objectives towards Pakistan should not be allowed to be distorted by any jingoistic reaction to the incident in Jammu & Kashmir on January 8, 2013, in which two Indian soldiers were killed well inside Indian territory by a Pakistani Army group and where one of them was allegedly decapitated.

While Pakistan has denied any decapitation, it has sought to project the incident as in retaliation for an earlier incident on January 6 in the Uri sector in which, according to it, a Pakistani soldier was killed by a raiding Indian Army unit. This has been denied by the Indian Army. According to it, it merely countered covering fire by Pakistani units in the area to facilitate the infiltration of some militants into J&K across the Uri area.

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



In the present state of contentious relations between the two countries, it would be difficult to establish the real sequence of events. Each government and Army will assert the veracity of its version.

Dialogue process

Our strategic objectives are to work for good neighbourly relations marked by normal trade, people to people contacts, greater sporting and cultural interactions, hassle-free travel and a confidence-building mechanism. A sustained dialogue process is necessary to achieve these objectives.

It will be unwise and short-sighted to allow our justified anger over the incident of January 8 to undermine the dialogue process. It will be in the interest of the people of both countries to resist the urge to discontinue the dialogue process.

At the same time, one has to recognise that such incidents of tactical gravity will continue to mar bilateral relations so long as there is no genuine change of mindset in the Pakistan Army towards India. This mindset is marked by sustained hostility towards India and a determination to annexe J&K and keep India destabilised through the use of terrorism as a strategic weapon against India.

Having achieved a reduction of the nuclear and conventional asymmetry through the acquisition of a nuclear and missile capability, Pakistan has built up for itself a set of tactical options to keep India bleeding and destabilised through terrorism and other means without triggering off a conventional and nuclear war.

The January 8 incident arose from the Pakistan Army's confidence that India has limited tactical options to retaliate without running the risk of starting a conventional and nuclear war. Pakistan's experience in helping the United States in waging a covert warfare against the Soviet troops in Afghanistan with the help of surrogates has taught it the importance of building for itself a mix of covert tactical options that it can use against India.

Prime Ministers Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi and P.V. Narasimha Rao knew the importance of a covert tactical armoury to act as a disincentive against Pakistan for increasing the cost of its using terrorism against India and encouraging it to seek accommodation with India.

Our subsequent Prime Ministers and our elite have had no understanding of the importance of such an armoury to supplement our conventional and nuclear arsenal.

As a result, we are totally bereft of any tactical options for riposte against Pakistan when it indulges in actions such as the 26/11 terrorist strikes in Mumbai or the January 8 incident in J&K. A power without suitable means of covert riposte will find itself a paper tiger.

Pakistan's mistaken belief that its nuclear, missile and covert capabilities have reduced India to a paper tiger has to be removed through the acquisition of covert options. Covert action does not mean doing to Pakistan what it has been doing to us. It means creating strong disincentives for its hostile actions. It does not mean tit-for-tat action. It means creating concerns and uncertainty in its mind about the consequences of its actions.

Covert action, to be effective, has to be sustained and unpredictable and must be based on the support of objective allies in its population. We have such objective allies in its population. It is for us to identify them and make common cause with them.

*B. Raman is Additional Secretary (retd.), Cabinet Secretariat, Government of India.*

<http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/indiapakistan-dialogue-must-continue/article4291266.ece>

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

Herald Scotland – Scotland, U.K.

OPINION/Columnist

Thursday, January 10, 2013

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

## Economics Aside, Getting Rid of Trident Is a Moral Issue

*So much for accentuating the positive.*

By Iain MacWhirter

Barely a week into 2013 and we are knee-deep in scare stories already. Though it has to be said this year some are scarier than others. Last week's shock, horror report from the Treasury claiming Scots would lose £1 a year if they voted to leave the Union didn't exactly make the hair stand on end. We are promised another 11 of these Treasury reports in 2013, which will please the Yes Scotland campaign no end.

And we are also being told, once again, that Scotland is going to be thrown out of Europe if we vote for independence. That's if David Cameron doesn't get us thrown out first with his No Surrender speech on Europe next month. The Eurosceptic noises coming from the Tory benches have so frightened business leaders, such as Richard Branson of Virgin, that a collection of them have written to the Prime Minister urging him "not to put our membership of the EU at risk". Funny, I thought it was only Alex Salmond who was allowed to do that.

But fright night would not be complete without the old faithful: Trident jobs losses. West Central Scotland will be devastated if the Scots dare to challenge the presence of weapons of mass destruction on the Clyde. Pick a number, any one will do: 19,000 jobs to go according to anonymous Government sources yesterday; 11,000 according to Jackie Baillie, the local Labour MP; and 6000 according to the Better Together Campaign. Then again, the Scottish Trades Union Congress puts the number of jobs at direct risk from Trident removal at 1536, based on Government figures, and the Ministry of Defence told the Sunday Herald last year "there are 520 civilian jobs at HM Naval Base Clyde, including Coulpport and Faslane, that directly rely on the Trident programme". So you pays your money and you takes your choice – about £100 billion as it happens. That's a hell of a job creation programme.

The economics of this are questionable to say the least. If no defence review was to be permitted unless it involved zero job losses we'd still be building Dreadnoughts. Come to think of it, that's not a bad idea. At least the First World War battleships were of some conceivable use; we could send them to the Falklands to wind up the Argies. You can't do that with Trident, which is only useful for destroying Russian cities. In fact the Government could mop up those Trident job losses by building a range of heritage naval vessels, which could double as theme parks when we're not being threatened by foreigners.

Well, that makes about as much sense as spending tens of billions on an intercontinental ballistic weapons system that has no conceivable target. On the Government's reasoning, the peace dividend that followed the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the end of the superpower arms race was actually a peace penalty. Why did no-one tell us at the time? The US and Russia must have killed tens of thousands of jobs by scrapping all those ICBMS in the mistaken belief they were making the world a safer place.

And when exactly did Labour become the nuclear weapons party anyway? The last time I looked, Labour was committed to multilateral disarmament under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Didn't Jim Murphy, the Shadow Defence Spokesman, tell Labour's policy forum last year he's "working for a world free of nuclear weapons". The truth is out: Mr Murphy is a secret nuclear job killer too – that's if you believe anything Labour says about nuclear defence.

I'm not so sure I believe a lot of what the SNP says about getting rid of nuclear weapons any more. The party is supposedly committed to expelling Trident, but its resolve has been weakening since it decided to remain in Nato, which is, of course, a nuclear alliance.

Mr Salmond insists he would still get rid of Trident from the Clyde – but perhaps not right away. In July the First Minister was quoted as saying: "If [nuclear weapons] are regarded as an asset, which I would find difficult to regard it as, then I am quite certain we can trade that asset for something more useful." These negotiations could last some considerable time.

Which sounds very much as if the weapons might be around rather longer than the Scottish Affairs Select Committee in Westminster suggested in its report last year. The Labour-led committee of Scottish MPs announced that nuclear

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

weapons could be "disarmed within days and removed within months" following a vote for independence. I'm not sure if this was meant to be a threat or a promise. But this week the Ministry of Defence has said it doesn't see this as remotely possible and argues it would take many years and about £3.5bn to move the submarines to HM Naval Base, Devonport, on the south coast of England, or some other last resting place.

There are many ways of eliminating nuclear weapons. One obvious solution might be to keep the Faslane base, and even the Vanguard Class submarines that carry Trident missiles, but remove the warheads from Scotland. This decommissioning would be relatively easy to achieve because the nukes have to be transferred south, to and from the Atomic Weapons Establishment in Berkshire every three years, to be serviced and maintained. Just give them a one-way ticket. Job done. The 19,000 jobs scare is only credible if you believe the UK would abandon the entire naval infrastructure in the Clyde, which of course does not just service Trident but will also house a new generation of conventional submarines.

There are many solutions to the problem of removing nuclear weapons and very few of them involve losing tens of thousands of jobs. But in the end this is surely not an employment issue but a moral one. Scotland has had weapons of mass destruction on the Clyde now for half a century. No-one argues that England should be forced to be nuclear free. But it is surely time for them to look after their own.

<http://www.heraldscotland.com/comment/columnists/economics-aside-getting-rid-of-trident-is-a-moral-issue.19867387>

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

China Daily – China  
OPINION

## **US Playing Strategic Arms Game**

January 11, 2013

By Hu Yumin (China Daily)

The US could cut its defense spending because of the fiscal cliff. But it would be wrong to assume that such a cut will weaken the US military.

In fact, the US has allocated more funds for the development of Prompt Global Strike, a system that can deliver a precision non-nuclear weapon strike anywhere in the world within 1 hour. The number of such weapons in the US armory will continue to grow, with the Russian Defense Ministry estimating that Washington will have 1,500 to 1,800 sea- and air-based first-strike cruise missiles by 2015 and 2,500 to 3,000 by 2020.

The US aims to combine PGS with its space and anti-missile technologies to form an integrated defense system, which could render other countries' strategic weapons, including nuclear arms, almost useless. It intends to break the global and regional strategic balance, minimize other countries' capability of strategic counterattack during emergencies and squeeze their strategic space.

This could put other countries in a dilemma: they either lose the capability to launch a strategic nuclear counterattack or use nuclear weapons first to avoid devastation.

Russia's army, navy as well as air force still have the capability to deal with any challenge. Moscow's Topol-M missiles are its major strategic nuclear deterrent and the project to deploy them is the most important part of its national armament planning. Russia has a reliable protection system, which also consists of multi-range anti-aircraft missiles to defend against air attacks from even high-precision non-nuclear weapons.

The Russian army has a multi-level firepower system, comprising C-400 and C-400M anti-aircraft missiles, and Thor and Amor anti-aircraft missile launchers, which is regarded as the best anti-aircraft power combination targeting PGS.

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education / Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL*  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Since Russia's strategic weapon system is better than China's in terms of numbers, mobility and protection capabilities some experts believe that the US army's PGS poses a greater threat to China than Russia.

To many defense experts' surprise, Chinese military experts seem to pay more attention to missile defense while ignoring the precision-guided prompt long-distance strike system. Some experts even say that China faces a difficult choice. On one hand, it is not sure of being able to build an effective protection system. On the other, even if it can build one, it will expose its limited and covert strategic missile launching bases.

During talks on strategic arms reduction, Russia has opposed the US' use of nuclear weapons delivery vehicles for non-nuclear military objectives because it not only helps the US save huge amounts in defense spending, but also boosts its PGS project.

It is highly likely that Russia will stick to its stance at future strategic weapons reduction talks. But the fact is Russia can hardly stop the US from going ahead with its plan. Apart from demanding restrictions on the deployment of the European Antimissile System and seeking other nuclear powers' support, Russia does not have the bargaining chips to force the US into accepting its demand.

Major countries know that the advances made in military science and technology have made strategic stability in nuclear and non-nuclear fields highly correlated, especially during the strategic deployment process. And over-dependence on nuclear power, especially during an emergency, can undermine a country's national security.

But since other countries, compared to the US, are at a disadvantage in terms of conventional weapon systems, they have to adopt asymmetric corresponding actions. Global strategic stability depends more on the stability in Europe and Northeast Asia. This is something that the international community should understand and tell the countries that are calling for a "nuclear-free world" not to develop conventional weapons to replace nuclear ones, because it will have serious consequences on international security.

Some insightful people in the US have indeed emphasized the importance of maintaining global strategic stability. In 1967, Robert McNamara, then US secretary of defense, suggested that the former Soviet Union restrict the development of its anti-missile system to avoid escalating tensions. Initially, the Soviet Union opposed the idea but eventually it accepted it because it realized that developing the anti-missile system was destabilizing the world. This led to the 1972 Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems between the Soviet Union and the US.

In 1985, when the US began experiments on how to use missiles to destroy low earth orbit satellites, many American senators and scholars said a US-Soviet Union race in this field was dangerous. Since the Soviet Union had unilaterally stopped its anti-satellite experiments in 1983, the US also gave up its tests later.

People who value peace hope that long-distance launching vehicles for precision-guided conventional warheads and missile defense systems will be part of the agenda at the strategic arms reduction talks.

*The author is a senior research fellow with China Arms Control and Disarmament Association.*

[http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/us/2013-01/11/content\\_16104101.htm](http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/us/2013-01/11/content_16104101.htm)

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

Daily NK – Seoul, South Korea

OPINION/Analysis

## **Time for Plan-B on Denuclearization**

By Mok Yong Jae

January 11, 2013

With its December 12th long-range rocket launch, North Korea moved a step closer to getting its ICBM technology right. As such, there is a pressing need for policy reviews both at home and abroad on issues such as the Six-Party Talks and Seoul's stance on North Korea's nuclear weapons.

**Issue No. 1040, 11 January 2013**

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL  
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*





It is abundantly clear that North Korea intends to continue down its chosen path. Since the successful launch, the Kim Jong Eun regime has moved to emphasize the fact that there are to be more such launches, and not merely via the placing of a model “Unha-9” rocket in the arms of a snowman on the fringes of a televised concert by Moranbong Band on December 21st.

There is also the ever-present danger of a third nuclear test, which South Korean government officials, mindful of the way North Korea moved toward its second such test in the year following President Lee Myung Bak’s own inauguration, fear could happen with little prior warning. Speaking on January 2nd, Minister of National Defense Kim Kwan Jin reminded reporters, “They’ve been steadily preparing for a nuclear test for some time now; all that is needed is for the order to conduct it to be handed down.

“Because North Korea sees possession of a combination of nuclear and ICBM capabilities as its international political power, it is always going to be important to take the chance to show that off,” Kim added at the time.

In response, President-elect Park has repeatedly emphasized how important both the Six-Party Talks and cooperation with surrounding countries remain if the “North Korea problem” is to be solved. However, there is widespread expert skepticism about the existing framework for dealing with nuclear and missile issues.

According to Lee Chun Geun of Korea Economic Research Institute, “The Six-Party Talks were meant to stop North Korea’s nuclear development work; but, contrary to this aim, they provided a good shield behind which to keep doing it instead. It will be all-but impossible to achieve the goal of North Korean denuclearization in that way.”

Former Minister of National Defense Kim Jang Soo, who is part of Park’s transition team, recently commented that there is “no alternative to cooperation between the surrounding countries” on North Korea. This is true, and with the advent of the second Obama administration and selection of John Kerry to head the State Department, there is set to be an element of synergy on North Korea policy in Washington DC and Seoul. However, the keys will remain in Beijing, and experts say that, as such, ways must be found to elevate the role of the Chinese government of General-Secretary Xi Jinping. They say this will require much closer Sino-South Korean and Sino-U.S. strategic dialogue.

The current signs for Sino-South Korean relations are good. President-elect Park is said to have a good relationship with General-Secretary Xi, and the Chinese state media reacted in friendly style to her Chinese language ability at the time of her election. Such a good start may help her administration, and could contribute much to the systematization of bilateral dialogue, not to mention progress on the subject of a Sino-South Korean Free Trade Agreement.

Professor Hong Yong Pyo of Hanyang University in Seoul said of this, “During the Lee Myung Bak administration, relations between South Korea and the United States have been good, but there have been areas of difficulty between South Korea and China and this seems to have led to currents of distrust between the two leaders. In President-elect Park’s case, she is friendly with General-Secretary Xi, which could earn her the trust of the Chinese side.”

But friendship will not be enough. If Park is to solve the North Korea problem, she will also need to find a viable solution to pursue, and this is the problem. As one anonymous expert noted, “Kim Jong Eun will certainly never give up his nuclear and missile capabilities, which he needs for the continued existence of his system,” adding instead, “The nuclear and missile problems will solve themselves naturally if there is a big change, such as Kim regime change or reform and opening.”

Indeed, according to NKnet researcher Kim Young Hwan, “There is very, very little chance of bringing about North Korean denuclearization through dialogue, no matter what diplomatic or economic price is paid.”

Rather, Kim added, “More realistic results could be produced if just half that amount were invested in reform, opening and democratization.”

<http://www.dailyink.com/english/read.php?catald=nk00400&num=10228>

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