



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

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** [Hagel to Face Tough Questions on Iraq, Nuke Cuts](#)

1. [IAEA Specifies February 13 for Next Round of Talks with Iran](#)
2. [Iran May Use UN Nuclear Talks to Seek Leverage with Big Powers](#)
3. [Iran Proposes Cairo for P5+1 Nuclear Talks](#)
4. [No Nuclear Activity at Parchin Military Site: Iranian Lawmaker](#)
5. [China's Buying a Fleet of Russian Bombers Perfect for Taking on the US Navy](#)
6. [Most of December Rocket Was Produced within North Korea](#)
7. [UN Condemns North Korea's Rocket Launch](#)
8. [N. Korea Ramps Up Threat of Another Nuclear Test](#)
9. [N. Korea Completes Preparations for Nuclear Test](#)
10. [Russia Urges North Korea to Abide by Nuclear, Missile Rules](#)
11. [N. Korea Ready to Conduct Nuke Test if Leadership Makes Decision: Defense Ministry](#)
12. [North Korea: Pyongyang Plans Nuclear Test Targeted at US](#)
13. [Sanctions Mean Declaration of War: DPRK](#)
14. [N. Korea Threatens "Physical Countermeasures" against S. Korea over U.N. Sanctions](#)
15. [Beijing Calls for Restraint amid DPRK Nuclear Test Pledge](#)
16. [What's the Threat? North Korean Rhetoric, Reality](#)
17. [Indian Kashmir Advises People to Prepare for Nuclear War](#)
18. [Trident: No Need for Like-For-Like Replacement, Says Danny Alexander](#)
19. [Lord Browne: Scrap Round-the-Clock Nuclear Deterrent](#)
20. [Hagel to Face Tough Questions on Iraq, Nuke Cuts](#)
21. [Bird Flu Experts End Halt to Lab Research](#)
22. [Arabian al Qaeda's Number Two is Dead: Yemeni Official](#)
23. [Is Nuclear Arms Control Dead?](#)
24. [Borey-Class Nuclear-Powered Ballistic-Missile Submarine Yuri Dolgorukiy Will Provide Russia with Effective Nuclear Deterrent](#)
25. [Trident Renewal: Expensive Insurance Policy or Unaffordable Irrelevance?](#)
26. [Trident Will Not Protect Us](#)
27. [North Korea's Cut-and-Paste Diplomacy Suggests What's Next](#)
28. [The Nation's ICBM Force: Increasingly Creaky Broken Missiles](#)
29. [BELLAMY VAN AAI, LOPEZ, KAHILLI: Scent of 'Germ' Warfare Raises Fear in the Mideast](#)
30. [Young Kim Tests Washington](#)

*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.1042, 25 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

FARS News Agency – Iran  
Tuesday, January 22, 2013

## **IAEA Specifies February 13 for Next Round of Talks with Iran**

TEHRAN (FNA) - The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said on Tuesday that its next round of talks in Tehran over Iran's nuclear program will be held on 13 February, not on 12 February as it had stated last week.

"In fact the talks will be held on February 13 rather than February 12," the IAEA spokeswoman Gill Tudor told AFP. No reason was given for the change.

On January 19, Iran's Residing Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency Ali Asqar Soltaniyeh described the last round of talks between Iran and the IAEA as "progressive".

Speaking to FNA about the two-day talks between Iran and the IAEA in Tehran, Soltaniyeh said the two sides had "intense and technical" discussions, and added that "the negotiations focused on technical and legal aspects".

The Iranian diplomat said that 8 representatives from the UN agency were present in the talks, and mentioned that "some points of disputes were resolved during the negotiations, although some others still remain to be solved" in the next round of talks in Tehran on February 12.

Soltaniyeh stated that Iran was ready to continue the talks for one more day since the talks had a progressive trend but the two sides decided to continue their negotiations on February 12 since two IAEA envoys were slated to carry out a different mission in another country.

The talks in Tehran were led by Soltaniyeh and the IAEA Deputy Director-General, Herman Nackaerts.

The last 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.

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=9107137965>

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

The Daily Star – Lebanon

## **Iran May Use UN Nuclear Talks to Seek Leverage with Big Powers**

January 22, 2013

By Fredrik Dahl, Reuters

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



VIENNA: Iran may be holding back from working with a U.N. investigation into its nuclear programme to use it as a bargaining chip in pursuit of significant sanctions relief or other concessions in broader negotiations with world powers.

That could explain why United Nations nuclear inspectors once again returned empty-handed after talks last week in Tehran, where they tried to overcome obstacles to a long-stalled inquiry into suspected atomic bomb research by Iran.

Iran has suggested at various times in the past that it would expect a "kind of reward" for cooperating with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a Western official said, making clear he saw no rationale for this.

If this is Tehran's thinking, a year-long effort by the IAEA to unblock its investigation looks unlikely to succeed as long as separate diplomacy between the six major powers and Tehran remains deadlocked.

"They don't want to offer substantive cooperation," one Western diplomat said after the IAEA's latest stab on Jan. 16-17 at coaxing the Islamic Republic into starting to address questions about its atomic activities.

Another envoy in Vienna, where the U.N. agency is based, described the IAEA's roller-coaster negotiations with Iran as a "well-practiced dance" by Tehran of "two steps backwards, one step forward."

The failure to achieve a breakthrough in the most recent of a series of largely fruitless meetings between the IAEA and Iran marked another setback for diplomatic efforts to resolve the stand-off and head off the threat of a new Middle East war.

Both Iran and the United States, Britain, France, Germany, China and Russia say they want to resume talks after a seven-month hiatus. But the two sides' priorities diverge: the powers want to curb Iranian nuclear work of potential use in developing atomic weapons, while Iran wants sanctions scrapped and their "rights" to enrich uranium formally recognised.

They have yet to announce a date and venue and as delays continue, Iran is amassing more nuclear material that could be turned into bomb fuel if refined further. Israel has threatened military action to foil any nuclear weapons capability in Iran.

The powers, known as the P5+1 as they group the five permanent, veto-wielding members of the U.N. Security Council along with Germany, want peaceful guarantees on Iran's enrichment programme and Iranian transparency toward the IAEA.

Iran, which says it seeks only peaceful nuclear energy from enrichment, is keen above all for the West to remove sanctions expanded last year to block its economically vital oil exports.

"Tehran apparently is seeking to withhold cooperation with the IAEA in order to increase leverage vis-a-vis the P5+1," said Daryl Kimball of the Arms Control Association, a U.S.-based research and advocacy group.

The IAEA, whose mandate is to forestall the spread of nuclear weapons, has been trying for a year to negotiate a framework agreement with Iran giving its inspectors access to sites, officials and documents for their investigation.

After the previous meeting in mid-December, the IAEA said progress had been made and that it expected to seal the deal in this month's session. But after the two days of talks last week it said "important differences" remained.

A new round of IAEA-Iran discussions has been scheduled for Feb. 13, which may allow for the global powers and Tehran to meet first to try and make headway in the wider dispute.

"Iran might think that if it grants access now, it may be in a weaker position to demand sanctions relief in a few week's time," said Shashank Joshi, a senior fellow and Middle East specialist at the Royal United Services Institute.

But the Western official said he saw no willingness among the powers "to pay any kind of reward" to Iran if it allowed the IAEA to resume its inquiry: "We think that is separate and it is in Iran's own interest to cooperate with the IAEA."



The powers and Iran last met in June, when Tehran rejected demands to halt its higher-grade enrichment and close an underground nuclear plant in exchange for limited sanctions relief, such as an end to a ban on imports of aviation spare parts, as well as civilian nuclear cooperation.

"Iran has always linked the IAEA and the P5+1 talks," Cliff Kupchan at political risk consultancy Eurasia Group said.

"They don't like what's on offer from the Western nations in the main talks, so they're holding all their chits, including ones relevant to the IAEA, for the main talks."

Hossein Mousavian, a former Iranian nuclear negotiator, said Iran and the powers should agree in their next meeting a "package consisting of all major requirements" of both sides.

"This should include technical demands of the IAEA and also address Iranian demands for recognition of its rights for enrichment and lifting sanctions. If so, then the IAEA would be able to have a successful visit to Tehran," he said.

<http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Middle-East/2013/Jan-22/203357-iran-may-use-un-nuclear-talks-to-seek-leverage-wit.ashx#axzz2lq2Lf33U>

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

Gulf News – U.A.E.

## **Iran Proposes Cairo for P5+1 Nuclear Talks**

*Egypt in consultation with the 5+1 to facilitate the summit*

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

January 23, 2013

TEHRAN: Iran on Wednesday proposed Cairo as the venue for the next talks with world powers on its disputed nuclear drive, adding that the Egyptians have welcomed the idea, the ISNA news agency reported.

Iran has proposed that "the next meeting be held in Cairo, and it was welcomed by our Egyptian brothers," it cited Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Salehi as saying after a cabinet meeting.

"Egypt is consulting with the 5+1," he added of the United States, China, Russia, Britain, France plus Germany.

Salehi said "consultations are under way between (Iran's top nuclear negotiator Saeed) Jalili and Catherine Ashton," the EU foreign policy chief who represents the P5+1 in nuclear talks with Iran.

"The date and venue of the talks will be announced by the Supreme National Supreme Council" which oversees the nuclear negotiations, he added.

At the most recent talks, in Moscow last June, Tehran rejected P5+1 calls for it to scale back its uranium enrichment activities, while also asking for relief from sanctions that began to bite in 2012.

<http://gulfnews.com/news/region/iran/iran-proposes-cairo-for-p5-1-nuclear-talks-1.1136636>

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

Press TV – Iran

Friday, January 25, 2013

## **No Nuclear Activity at Parchin Military Site: Iranian Lawmaker**

A senior Iranian lawmaker has rejected claims that the Islamic Republic carries out nuclear activities at Parchin military site located near the capital Tehran.



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

“We have no nuclear activities at Parchin and the center is a recognized military site and not engaged in our country’s nuclear activities,” Alaeddin Boroujerdi, a member of Majlis National Security and Foreign Policy Committee, said Friday.

He noted that the inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have so far visited Parchin twice.

He, however, added that at the current juncture, Iran sees no reason to increase its cooperation with the IAEA beyond the Safeguard Agreement first because the inspection of the Parchin site is not included in Iran’s commitments under the agreement and also because the country is facing increasing sanctions.

*Boroujerdi said that the West should lift sanctions against Iran in return for more cooperation from the country. “If we are supposed to have more cooperation with the IAEA, Western countries should know that this is a two-way road and mutual interests are an internationally acknowledged principle,” he added.*

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

The US and certain other countries have imposed sanctions against the Islamic Republic over the unfounded allegation.

Iran has vehemently rejected the allegations against its nuclear energy program, arguing that as a committed signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and a member of the IAEA, it is entitled to use nuclear technology for peaceful objectives.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/01/25/285437/no-nuclear-work-at-irans-parchin-site/>

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

Business Insider

## **China's Buying a Fleet of Russian Bombers Perfect for Taking on the US Navy**

David Cenciotti and Richard Clements, The Aviationist  
January 20, 2013

Chinese websites are again reporting that Russia has agreed to sell Beijing the production line for the Tupolev Tu-22M3 bomber at a cost of \$1.5 billion.

Once in service with the Chinese Naval Air Forces the Tu-22M3 will be known as the “H-10”.

The deal struck with Russia includes 36 aircraft: a batch of 12 followed by a second batch of 24 additional bombers.

The Tu-22 will be employed in the maritime attack role and used to attack targets from low levels to avoid radar detection.

The Tu-22 is a Soviet supersonic, swing-wing, long-range strategic and maritime strike bomber. It was developed during the Cold War and is among the closest things to a modern stealth bomber. However, it will get updated with indigenous systems and an extended range making it a significant threat to many latest generations weapon systems.

That's even more true if the deal with Russia includes the Raduga Kh-22 (AS-4 ‘Kitchen’) long-range anti-ship missile, in which case this could be a significant change in the strategic balance of the region.

The Tu-22 bombers will give China another tool to pursue the area denial strategy in the South China Sea and the Pacific theatre; a fast platform to launch cruise missiles, conventional or nuclear weapons in various regional war scenarios.

In other words, a brand new threat to the U.S. Navy in the region.

<http://www.businessinsider.com/china-buys-tu-22m3-david-cenciotti-the-aviationist-2013-1>

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



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

The Hankyoreh – South Korea

## **Most of December Rocket Was Produced within North Korea**

*Successfully launched rocket was retrieved by South Korea and shows advancement in NK capabilities*

January 22, 2013

By Kim Kyu-won, staff reporter

The second Unha-3 rocket, which was launched by North Korea on Dec. 12, 2012, used six to ten parts that were commonly available from China and four other countries, reports say. However, analysts believe that the majority of the parts were manufactured inside North Korea.

According to an analysis released on Jan. 21 by the Agency for Defense Development (ADD), which is affiliated with the Ministry of National Defense, the debris of the Unha-3 that was retrieved from the West (Yellow) Sea included 6-10 foreign parts. The majority was made in North Korea.

The parts manufactured overseas were DC converters, temperature sensors and a number of other electronic devices. All of them were products made for everyday use. Aside from these, the rest of the parts were confirmed to have been manufactured directly by North Korea.

The Ministry of National Defense announced that the foreign parts had been manufactured in five countries that were not named due to diplomatic considerations. China was one of the five countries, reports say.

“The foreign parts would have been easy to buy, even by someone who was traveling,” explained a source at ADD. Consequently, it appears unlikely that North Korea smuggled in these parts, as was suggested by certain groups.

A source at the Ministry said much the same thing. “The foreign-manufactured parts are not included in the items that are restricted by United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1874, which was passed in 2009, or the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR).”

Despite this, the Ministry said that the UNSC might reexamine how North Korea purchased these parts.

“If any of the companies that produced the foreign parts that were used in the Unha-3 rocket have dealings with North Korea or with companies affiliated with that country, it could become a problem,” a Ministry source said. “We are planning to report the findings of our investigation to the UNSC, and we will also send them to the MTCR if they request it.”

North Korea’s Unha-3 rocket makes use of a different kind of technology than South Korea’s Naro space launch vehicle, ADD analysts found. The Naro has two boosters, while the Unha-3 has three.

The two rockets’ steering methods are also different. On the Naro, the entire engine is able to move, but on the Unha-3, the main engine is fixed in place, with four supplementary engines rotating to change direction. Additionally, the surface of South Korea’s rocket is smooth, while the North Korean rocket’s coating is rough.

In the case of the engine, the key rocket component, North Korea used Rodong missile technology from the 1990s. This is for the most part similar to Iran’s missile technology and different from China’s long-range nuclear missile, the Dong Feng 31, ADD staff explained.

A source at the ADD offered the following assessment. “Notwithstanding restrictions on the introduction of technology and the acquisition of parts through sanctions by the international community, the North was able to improve the quality of its long-range missile technology through many experiments.”

[http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english\\_edition/e\\_northkorea/570753.html](http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_northkorea/570753.html)

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

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

Atlanta Journal-Constitution

Tuesday, January 22, 2013

## UN Condemns North Korea's Rocket Launch

By PETER JAMES SPIELMANN, Associated Press

UNITED NATIONS — The U.N. Security Council on Tuesday unanimously approved a resolution condemning North Korea's rocket launch in December and imposing new sanctions on Pyongyang's space agency.

The multi-stage rocket launch is considered part of a covert program to develop ballistic missiles that can carry nuclear warheads.

The council reiterated its previous demand that North Korea abandon its nuclear weapons program in a "complete, verifiable and irreversible manner" and cease launches.

China joined in approving the resolution, the first resolution in four years to expand the sanctions regime on North Korea.

"We believe that action taken by the Council should be prudent, measured, proportionate, and conducive to stability," Chinese Ambassador Li Baodong said after the vote.

China's agreement to join a resolution is a step away from the protection it usually gives to North Korea, its neighbor, which it supported in the Korean War in the early 1950s against U.S.-led U.N. troops.

China is seen as North Korea's closest ally, and its protection of North Korea meant that the Security Council previously denounced North Korea's launches with non-binding council statements, which are unenforceable.

In a defiant statement early Wednesday, North Korea's Foreign Ministry warned that it will strengthen its military and nuclear defenses in reaction to what it called evidence of "U.S. hostility" toward Pyongyang. It also warned that it would rebuff any attempt to engage Pyongyang in disarmament negotiations.

"There can be talks for peace and stability of the Korean Peninsula and the region in the future, but no talks for the denuclearization of the peninsula," the Foreign Ministry said in a memorandum carried by the state-run Korean Central News Agency.

North Korea ominously warned that it would take steps to "bolster the military capabilities for self-defense, including the nuclear deterrence."

North Korea sent a satellite into space on Dec. 12 aboard a long-range rocket, a launch that the U.S. and its allies have criticized as a test of banned ballistic missile technology. Pyongyang maintains the launch was a peaceful bid to send a satellite into space and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un cited its success in his New Year's Day speech.

In 2006 and 2009, Pyongyang conducted atomic tests after being slapped with Security Council condemnation and sanctions for similar launches of long-range rockets.

Security Council resolutions ban North Korea from any use of ballistic missile technology, even if characterized as a satellite launch or space launch vehicle.

The resolution imposes new sanctions under existing authorities on North Korean companies and government agencies, including North Korea's space agency and several individuals.

It also updates lists of nuclear and ballistic missile technology banned for transfer to and from North Korea and includes several new provisions targeting North Korea's smuggling of sensitive items that could contribute to the prohibited programs.

In its talks with China, the U.S. had to agree that the resolution would not bring in new forms of sanctions but would build on the existing Security Council sanction regimes.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



""We hope that all relevant sides can, with a view to maintaining peace and stability, stay calm and restrained, and avoid all acts that will escalate tension, which is conducive to the interest of all sides," Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman Qin Gang said in Beijing on Wednesday. He stressed the importance of moving ahead with the six-nation, aid-for-disarmament talks.

China's support for the new resolution comes at a time when the region braces for the possibility that North Korea may test a nuclear device as it did following previous rocket launches. Satellite photos taken at North Korea's nuclear test site in Punggye-ri last month indicated continued activity, even in winter, according to analysis by 38 North, a North Korea website affiliated with the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies.

North Korea vowed last week to strengthen its defenses amid concerns the country may conduct a nuclear test as a follow-up to last month's rocket launch.

Citing U.S. hostility, Pyongyang's Foreign Ministry said in a memorandum that North Korea will "continue to strengthen its deterrence against all forms of war."

The memorandum carried by state media did not say what action North Korea would take to defend itself. However, North Korea has claimed the right to build atomic weapons to protect itself from the United States, which stations more than 28,000 troops in South Korea.

<http://www.aic.com/ap/ap/international/un-set-to-condemn-north-koreas-rocket-launch/nT4Cn/>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
January 23, 2013

## **N. Korea Ramps Up Threat of Another Nuclear Test**

By Lee Joon-seung

SEOUL, Jan. 23 (Yonhap) -- North Korea's provocative decision to give up denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula and build up its deterrence capabilities in response to fresh U.N. sanctions is causing speculation of another atomic weapons test by the North, diplomatic watchers forecast Wednesday.

The communist country made the announcement just hours after the U.N. Security Council (UNSC) condemned the country's Dec. 12 rocket launch. North Korean watchers in Seoul speculated that Pyongyang may move to conduct another nuclear test to show its defiance as well as its ability to deal a serious blow to its adversaries.

In a foreign ministry statement carried by the state-run Korean Central News Agency (KCNA), the North stressed there will be no further discussion about denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

"The resolution is the product of blind pursuance of hostile policy of the U.S. seeking disarmament of the DPRK and collapse of the North's system in violation of universally accepted international law," the North's ministry said. It said because of such developments, the six-party talks and other reconciliatory statements made in the past have become null and void.

The DPRK stands for the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the North's official name.

The ministry claimed "the UNSC resolution is a wanton violation of the inviolable sovereignty of the DPRK," and aims to ban peaceful launching of satellite-carrying rockets into space. Pyongyang claimed the 15-nation Security Council is a marionette of the United States.

The resolution, which condemned the "ballistic missile technology" test, is the fifth to be slapped on the North for its rocket and nuclear programs since May 1993. It calls for the tightening of existing sanctions, like imposing travel bans on four individuals and freezing assets belonging to North Korea's space agency, a bank and four trading companies





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

accused of engaging in arms shipments. It also banned technology developments and the transfer of money that supports such operations.

The North has consistently argued that the Unha-3 rocket was designed to carry the Kwangmyongsong 3-2 into orbit. This view has been refuted by many countries, including the United States, which said the launch is a "cover up" to test banned ballistic missile technology.

The KNCA report also said the country will "take physical actions to strengthen self-defense military capabilities including nuclear deterrence," adding that measures can be taken to completely eliminate the source of hostile action and that the North is fully committed to taking a firm stance.

These remarks can be interpreted as a sign that the country may detonate another nuclear device that possibly uses highly-enriched uranium as its fissile material.

Related to the belligerent stance taken by the North, Seoul's Unification Ministry expressed its regrets and called on Pyongyang not to engage in further provocation that runs counter to the wishes of the international community.

"The country must immediately discontinue development of nuclear weapons and long-range rockets," said an official. The official made clear that the country should take steps to follow through on the denuclearization efforts it pledged in the past.

Other policymakers said that while there are no clear hints that the North is preparing for another nuclear test, intelligence showed that the country could take such a step if it opted to do so. Government and military officials said they are closely monitoring shafts at the Punggye-ri nuclear test site in North Hamgyeong Province for any signs of activity.

Worries about another detonation are credible because in the past, rocket launches by the country were invariably followed by nuclear tests. The country launched a long-range rocket in July 2006 and tested its first nuclear device Oct. 9. In April 2009, it sent up another rocket that was condemned by the international community, but it detonated its second nuke on May 25.

Regarding the impact of such a move, Hong Hyun-ik, director of securities strategy studies at Sejong Institute, said that the North's hinting of a third nuclear test could seriously disrupt conditions on the Korean Peninsula, which are currently in a transitional period. The leadership of South Korea, China, Japan have changed, while in the United States Barack Obama is beginning his second term in office.

On the other hand, some civilian experts said there is a chance that the North may not conduct a nuke test, and pointed out that the response shown by the communist country was already expected.

"What is important is what actions are taken by the North," said Yun Duk-min, a professor at the Korea National Diplomatic Academy.

Those who do not believe that the North will take drastic measures said there is a chance the country will first wait and see what independent sanction measures are taken by countries such as South Korea and the United States.

"It makes sense for them to see what tough actions are taken beyond the United Nations sanctions since if they respond hastily, they can make it impossible for negotiations to take place with the incoming Park Geun-hye administration and Washington," said an expert, who declined to be identified.

He pointed out that because Pyongyang already conducted two nuke tests, another test may not cause shock among the international community at large.

Park, who takes office as the country's first female president on Feb. 25, said she is willing to negotiate with the North and build trust between the two sides that could help end Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions and fuel inter-Korean cooperation.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



The conservative president-elect, however, has made clear that she will not tolerate a nuclear armed North Korea and warned that Seoul will respond firmly to any future provocations. This may be an indication that unless Pyongyang shows clear signs of ending its "rogue" behavior, relations may remain chilly between the two countries who have technically been at war since the 1950-53 Korean War ended with a cease-fire.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2013/01/23/28/0301000000AEN20130123005600315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
January 23, 2013

## **N. Korea Completes Preparations for Nuclear Test**

By Kim Eun-jung

SEOUL, Jan. 23 (Yonhap) -- North Korea has completed all technical preparations for a nuclear test and can carry it out in a few days if it makes a decision, a South Korean intelligence source said Wednesday.

North Korea had dug up a tunnel for a test at its Punggye-ri nuclear test site, but the tunnel has now been plugged with dirt and concrete, the source said, suggesting that all measuring and other equipment has already been installed inside.

It was unclear when the tunnel was sealed.

"North Korea has completed technical preparations for a nuclear test," the source said. "If (North Korean leader) Kim Jong-un makes a political decision, the North can conduct a nuclear test in a few days."

Earlier in the day, North Korea hinted at the possibility of conducting a nuclear test after the U.N. Security Council adopted a new resolution condemning the country's Dec. 12 long-range rocket launch.

South Korean officials said they have stepped up monitoring of the test site.

North Korea had detonated nuclear devices at the Punggye-ri test site in 2006 and 2009, following long-range rocket launches.

South Korean officials earlier had said that the North had repaired extensive rain damage at the sprawling nuclear test site known to have three tunnel entrances and multiple support buildings.

"North Korea has continuously conducted computer simulations for an additional atomic test with data acquired from the first and second nuclear tests," a senior official said, asking for anonymity as he is not allowed to disclose information to media.

Seoul officials say the North is expected to detonate a nuclear device made of highly enriched uranium, which is difficult to immediately detect with available techniques, including airborne radioactivity, seismological and airborne sound wave tests.

"It seems that the North needs to develop highly enriched uranium to secure additional nuclear materials because of its limited quantity of plutonium," a senior intelligence official said, asking to be unnamed.

The North is capable of producing about 40 kilograms of HEU a year, intelligence officials said, considering North Korean officials at Yongbyon nuclear complex told U.S. nuclear scientist Siegfried Hecker, former chief of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, that 2,000 centrifuges were operational during his 2010 visit.

If that's correct, the North can produce up to two nuclear devices per year with that amount, they noted.

The defense ministry estimated in December that the North had spent about US\$1.1-15 billion on its nuclear program.



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

Although Pyongyang insists the Dec. 12 rocket launch was aimed at sending an observation satellite into space, the UN resolution condemned it as a disguised ballistic missile test which violated current sanctions imposed after the North's nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2013/01/23/15/0301000000AEN20130123005551315F.HTML>

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

Reuters – U.S.

## **Russia Urges North Korea to Abide by Nuclear, Missile Rules**

Wednesday, January 23, 2013

MOSCOW (Reuters) - Russia urged North Korea on Wednesday to adhere to restrictions on its nuclear and missile programs, after the U.N. Security Council expanded existing sanctions against Pyongyang over a defiant rocket launch last month.

Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov's remarks added to pressure on Pyongyang to abide by Security Council resolutions which banned Pyongyang from conducting further ballistic missile and nuclear tests.

"We hope our North Korean neighbors will heed the voice of the international community and return to the path of cooperation ... but for this it is necessary to stay within the bounds of the demands made in U.N. Security Council resolutions," Lavrov said.

The Security Council, in which Russia and China hold veto power, unanimously approved a new resolution on Tuesday that condemned violations of previous restrictions and expanded existing sanctions. North Korea responded by saying it would boost its military and nuclear capabilities.

Russia has often balanced criticism of the nuclear activities and missile launches of North Korea, a Soviet-era client state, with calls on the United States and South Korea to refrain from belligerent actions that Moscow says would be counterproductive. But Russia is upset by any defiance of council resolutions.

*Reporting by Timothy Heritage; Writing by Steve Gutterman; Editing by Jon Boyle.*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/23/us-korea-north-russia-idUSBRE90M0DB20130123>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

January 24, 2013

## **N. Korea Ready to Conduct Nuke Test if Leadership Makes Decision: Defense Ministry**

SEOUL, Jan. 24 (Yonhap) -- North Korea is ready to conduct another nuclear test if the country's leadership decides to take such a step, South Korea's defense ministry said Thursday.

"It is our understanding that if the leadership gives consent, the North can detonate a nuclear device whenever it wants to," a ministry spokesman said.

He said due to this capability, the South Korean military is carefully monitoring activities taking place in the North, and preparing for any developments that can occur.

The official said South Korea and the United States are employing various intelligence assets, including satellites, to carefully monitor the Punggye-ri nuclear test site in North Hamgyeong Province. Unofficial sources hinted that there have been signs that the North is getting ready to test another nuclear weapon at the isolated site in the northeastern part of the country.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



The communist country detonated two nuclear devices at Punggye-ri in 2006 and 2009 right after they test fired long-range rockets. The launching of rockets and nuclear tests caused the U.N. Security Council (UNSC) to condemn the North and impose sanctions.

The ministry's announcement comes as North Korea's powerful National Defense Commission denounced the U.N. sanctions slapped on the country on Wednesday (Korea time), and claimed future rocket and nuclear tests may directly have the United States in mind.

Despite warnings by the international community, Pyongyang launched a long-range rocket on Dec. 12 that the United States and its allies think was a covert test of banned missile technology.

"In the new phase of our century-long struggle against the United States, we do not hide the fact that various satellites, long-range missiles that we will continue to launch and higher level nuclear test we will conduct will target our sworn enemy, the United States," the commission said in a statement carried by the state-run Korean Central News Agency.

The North also said that there will be no more talks on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, although it is willing to engage in dialogue that can ensure peace and stability for the broader Northeast Asian region.

South Korea's outgoing President Lee Myung-bak said what concerns him the most in the course of handing power over to the next government of President-elect Park Geun-hye is the possibility of North Korean provocations.

"North Korea is not an entity that we can handle with normal predictions. It always and at any time does something that deviates from common sense," Lee was quoted by spokesman Park Jeong-ha as saying during a national defense meeting.

Meanwhile, nuclear weapons experts in Seoul said that the defense commission's reference of "higher level" tests may be a sign that if Pyongyang opts to detonate another atomic device, it will show the country's technological advances made in the past few years.

"Advances can include a larger yield weapon, compact size or ability to detonate several devices simultaneously," an expert, who declined to be identified, said.

He said the North may be trying to increase its yield to at least 10 kilotons, although this can go up to 15 kilotons. A 15 kiloton device will have roughly the same destructive force as the bomb that was dropped by the United States on Hiroshima in World War II. One kiloton is equivalent to 1,000 kilograms of TNT explosives. North Korea's first nuclear test involved a weapon that had an estimated yield of about 1 kiloton, while its second may have been a 2 to 6 kiloton device.

Others said that the latest Unha-3 rocket clearly shows that the North has the ability to build launch vehicles that can send a warhead all the way to the United States. This means the country may try to test a light weight, compact device that can be placed inside a missile.

They said if the country makes a compact bomb, this will show it has the means to make a high-quality explosive charge, perfectly shaped explosive lens and has acquired the means to construct a very precise detonator.

Besides making bombs that are more destructive and are smaller in size, the isolationist country may experiment with multiple explosions, which could help its scientists and engineers gain valuable insight into making better weapons.

Local North Korean watchers said that while the past two nuclear devices used plutonium, there is a chance that the next test may use highly-enriched uranium (HEU) as its fissile material.

Unlike plutonium that requires a nuclear reactor, HEU only requires centrifuge equipment to make weapons grade material from natural uranium. This process makes it extremely difficult to detect the enrichment process.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/01/24/91/0401000000AEN20130124010700315F.HTML>



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

Reuters – U.S.

## **North Korea to Target U.S. with Nuclear, Rocket Tests**

By Ju-min Park and Choonsik Yoo

Thursday, January 24, 2013

SEOUL (Reuters) - North Korea said on Thursday it would carry out further rocket launches and a nuclear test that would target the United States, dramatically stepping up its threats against a country it called its "sworn enemy".

The announcement by the country's top military body came a day after the U.N. Security Council agreed to a U.S.-backed resolution to censure and sanction North Korea for a rocket launch in December that breached U.N. rules.

North Korea is not believed to have the technology to deliver a nuclear warhead capable of hitting the continental United States, although its December launch showed it had the capacity to deliver a rocket that could travel 10,000 km (6,200 miles), potentially putting San Francisco in range, according to an intelligence assessment by South Korea.

"We are not disguising the fact that the various satellites and long-range rockets that we will fire and the high-level nuclear test we will carry out are targeted at the United States," North Korea's National Defence Commission said, according to state news agency KCNA.

North Korea is believed by South Korea and other observers to be "technically ready" for a third nuclear test, and the decision to go ahead rests with leader Kim Jong-un, who pressed ahead with the December rocket launch in defiance of the U.N. sanctions.

China, the one major diplomatic ally of the isolated and impoverished North, agreed to the U.S.-backed resolution and it also supported resolutions in 2006 and 2009 after Pyongyang's two earlier nuclear tests.

Thursday's statement by North Korea represents a huge challenge to Beijing as it undergoes a leadership transition, with Xi Jinping due to take office in March.

China's Foreign Ministry called for calm and restraint and a return to six-party talks, but effectively singled out North Korea, urging the "relevant party" not to take any steps that would raise tensions.

"We hope the relevant party can remain calm and act and speak in a cautious and prudent way and not take any steps which may further worsen the situation," ministry spokesman Hong Lei told reporters at a regular press briefing.

North Korea has rejected proposals to restart the talks aimed at reining in its nuclear capacity. The United States, China, Russia, Japan and the two Koreas are the six parties involved.

"After all these years and numerous rounds of six-party talks we can see that China's influence over North Korea is actually very limited. All China can do is try to persuade them not to carry out their threats," said Cai Jian, an expert on Korea at Fudan University in Shanghai.

Analysts said the North could test as early as February as South Korea prepares to install a new, untested president or that it could choose to stage a nuclear explosion to coincide with former ruler Kim Jong-il's Feb 16 birthday.

"North Korea will have felt betrayed by China for agreeing to the latest U.N. resolution and they might be targeting (China) as well (with this statement)," said Lee Seung-yeol, senior research fellow at Ewha Institute of Unification Studies in Seoul.

### **U.S. URGES NO TEST**

Washington urged North Korea not to proceed with a third test just as the North's statement was published on Thursday.



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

"Whether North Korea tests or not is up to North Korea," Glyn Davies, the top U.S. envoy for North Korean diplomacy, said in the South Korean capital of Seoul.

"We hope they don't do it. We call on them not to do it," Davies said after a meeting with South Korean officials. "This is not a moment to increase tensions on the Korean peninsula."

The North was banned from developing missile and nuclear technology under sanctions dating from its 2006 and 2009 nuclear tests.

A South Korean military official said the concern now is that Pyongyang could undertake a third nuclear test using highly enriched uranium for the first time, opening a second path to a bomb.

North Korea's 2006 nuclear test using plutonium produced a puny yield equivalent to one kiloton of TNT - compared with 13-18 kilotons for the Hiroshima bomb - and U.S. intelligence estimates put the 2009 test's yield at roughly two kilotons

North Korea is estimated to have enough fissile material for about a dozen plutonium warheads, although estimates vary, and intelligence reports suggest that it has been enriching uranium to supplement that stock and give it a second path to the bomb.

According to estimates from the Institute for Science and International Security from late 2012, North Korea could have enough weapons grade uranium for 21-32 nuclear weapons by 2016 if it used one centrifuge at its Yongbyon nuclear plant to enrich uranium to weapons grade.

North Korea has not yet mastered the technology needed to make a nuclear warhead small enough for an intercontinental missile, most observers say, and needs to develop the capacity to shield any warhead from re-entry into the earth's atmosphere.

North Korea gave no time-frame for the coming test and often employs harsh rhetoric in response to U.N. and U.S. actions that it sees as hostile.

The bellicose statement on Thursday appeared to dent any remaining hopes that Kim Jong-un, believed to be 30 years old, would pursue a different path from his father, Kim Jong-il, who oversaw the country's military and nuclear programs.

The older Kim died in December 2011.

"The UNSC (Security Council) resolution masterminded by the U.S. has brought its hostile policy towards the Democratic Peoples Republic of Korea (North Korea) to its most dangerous stage," the commission was quoted as saying.

*Additional reporting by Christine Kim in SEOUL, Ben Blanchard and Sui-Lee Wee in Beijing; Writing by David Chance; Editing by Raju Gopalakrishnan and Ron Popeski.*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/24/us-korea-north-nuclear-idUSBRE90N03I20130124>

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

Xinhua News – China

## **Sanctions Mean Declaration of War: DPRK**

January 25, 2013

PYONGYANG, Jan. 25 (Xinhua) -- The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) vowed Friday to take "strong physical countermeasures" if South Korea is directly involved in the UN sanctions, which would be seen as "a declaration of war" against Pyongyang.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

"We declare complete nullification of the Joint Declaration on Denuclearization on the Korean Peninsula adopted in 1992 and its total invalidity," the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of Korea said in a statement.

As long as the South Korea persistently pursues a hostile policy, the DPRK will never negotiate with anyone, it said.

The committee also reiterated that the country would react to provocation with immediate retaliatory blows and a war of justice for national reunification.

On Tuesday, the UN Security Council unanimously approved Resolution 2087 which requires the DPRK to comply with all relevant resolutions approved by the Security Council and not to use ballistic missile technology for any launch.

It also reiterated to seek a peaceful, diplomatic and political solution to the issues concerned and advocated the renewal of the six-party talks over the denuclearization issue on the Korean Peninsula.

Both the South Korea and the United States have pledged to implement provisions of the UN resolution.

Rejecting the resolution, the DPRK on Thursday vowed to conduct more rocket launches and a higher-level nuclear test targeting its "sworn enemy" -- the United States.

On Dec. 12 last year, the official KCNA news agency confirmed that the DPRK launched and orbited the second version of the Kwangmyongsong-3 satellite. After the launch, the DPRK has defended its right to launch satellites for peaceful and scientific purposes.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2013-01/25/c\\_132127426.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2013-01/25/c_132127426.htm)

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

January 25, 2013

## **N. Korea Threatens "Physical Countermeasures" against S. Korea over U.N. Sanctions**

SEOUL, Jan. 25 (Yonhap) -- North Korea on Friday threatened "physical countermeasures" against South Korea if it directly takes part in United Nations-led sanctions against the communist country.

The statement carried by the Korean Central News Agency and issued by the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of the Fatherland, claimed that South Korea played an active part in the passage of the U.N. Security Council resolution that condemned Pyongyang for launching a long-range rocket on Dec. 12.

The resolution passed unanimously by the 15-member council on Wednesday (Korea time) is the fifth to be slapped on the North for its rocket and nuclear programs since May 1993. It calls for the tightening of existing sanctions, such as imposing travel bans on four individuals and freezing assets belonging to North Korea's space agency, a bank and four trading companies accused of engaging in arms shipments. It also banned technology developments and the transfer of money that supports such operations.

"If the South takes direct part in the U.N. sanctions, the DPRK will take strong physical countermeasures against it," it said, referring to North Korea's official name, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

North Korea also said that imposing sanctions is tantamount to a declaration of war and it will respond immediately to such provocations with counter strikes. The committee that is one of the main conduits for talks with South Korea claimed that any act of aggression will be met by a grand war of unification, hinting it may take military action against the South.

The committee, moreover, said that there will be no more inter-Korean talks on the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

"Now that the South Korean conservative groups are desperately kicking up a racket against the DPRK over its nuclear and rocket issue with the United States, there will be no more discussions on the denuclearization between the North and South in the future," it said.

It said the 1992 Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula is now totally invalid.

The organization said that as long as the South maintains its anti-North Korea stance there will be no interaction.

"As long as the South Korean group of traitors persistently pursues a hostile policy toward the DPRK, we will never negotiate with anyone," it stressed.

The latest remarks by the committee is the third statement issued by Pyongyang since the UNSC passed the resolution.

The first response was made by the North's foreign ministry just two hours after the international body agreed to penalize the country, while the second came Thursday and was issued by the powerful National Defense Commission. The commission denounced U.N. sanctions and warned future rocket and nuclear tests may directly target the United States.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/01/25/63/0401000000AEN20130125005100315F.HTML>

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

China Daily – China

## **Beijing Calls for Restraint amid DPRK Nuclear Test Pledge**

January 25, 2013

By Li Xiaokun and Zhou Wa (China Daily)

Page – 1

Beijing urged restraint on Thursday after Pyongyang said it is planning a third "higher level" nuclear test and more rocket launches aimed at the US.

Washington said the nuclear test, if staged, would be "a mistake and a missed opportunity" for Pyongyang.

Experts said the planned nuclear test is likely to use highly enriched uranium instead of the plutonium used in Pyongyang's previous tests. The test date will probably be Feb 16, the birthday of Kim Jong-il, or April 15, the birthday of Kim Il-sung.

"All parties should refrain from action that might escalate the situation in the region," Foreign Ministry spokesman Hong Lei told reporters in Beijing.

China called for the resumption of the Six-Party Talks, which have been stalled since 2009.

"Currently, the situation on the Korean Peninsula is very complicated and sensitive," Hong said.

The comments came several hours after Pyongyang's top military body, the National Defense Commission, announced a third nuclear test would be conducted, without giving a date.

"We do not hide that a variety of satellites and long-range rockets that will be launched by the DPRK, one after the other, and a nuclear test of a higher level that will be carried out by it in the upcoming all-out action - a new phase of the anti-US struggle that has lasted century after century - are targeted against the US, the sworn enemy of the Korean people," the commission said in a statement, according to state news agency KCNA.

The statement was the latest response from Pyongyang to a United Nations Security Council resolution on Tuesday condemning the December rocket launch by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The resolution also expanded existing UN sanctions.

Pyongyang's previous nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009 were carried out within months of long-range rocket launches.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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





Seoul-based Yonhap News Agency, citing an ROK intelligence source, reported earlier that Pyongyang had finished technical preparations and could conduct a test within days.

A US think tank said last month that, based on satellite photos, the DPRK had repaired damage at its nuclear test site and could conduct a detonation within weeks.

The DPRK statement said that "settling accounts with the US needs to be done with force, not with words, as it regards jungle law as the rule of its survival".

The US has more than 28,000 troops in the Republic of Korea.

Pyongyang has cited the US troops as a key reason to develop nuclear weapons.

In an earlier response, the DPRK rejected involvement in any future disarmament negotiations. Washington urged Pyongyang on Thursday not to proceed with the nuclear test.

"Whether North Korea tests or not is up to North Korea," Glyn Davies, the top US envoy for DPRK diplomacy, said in Seoul. "We hope they don't do it, we call on them not to do it. It would be a mistake and a missed opportunity if they were to do it," Davies said after a meeting with ROK officials, speaking shortly before Pyongyang's statement. Davies will soon fly to Beijing.

"This is not a moment to increase tensions on the Korean Peninsula," he said.

Seoul on the same day voiced deep regret at the plan. "Our government once again strongly urges North Korea to pay heed to the international community's constant warnings and not commit any further provocative acts including nuclear tests," ROK Foreign Ministry spokesman Cho Tai-young said.

The UN Security Council resolution threatened "significant action" if Pyongyang fulfilled a third nuclear test.

It is widely speculated that the nuclear test of a "higher level", as Pyongyang announced, would use highly enriched uranium instead of plutonium. The DPRK declared in 2009 that it would begin enriching uranium.

Zhang Liangui, a professor on Korean Peninsula studies at the Party School of the Communist Party of China Central Committee, said it's still early for the DPRK to conduct a successful nuclear test. "Usually a successful nuclear test comes after about 10 trials," he said.

And the DPRK has an even longer way to go before it can potentially send nuclear warheads to the US, he added.

As for the time of the test, Zhang said it will likely be on April 15 - Kim Il-sung's 101st birthday. Reuters quoted analysts as saying that the test could also be staged as early as Feb 25 as the ROK's President-elect Park Geun-hye is sworn in.

But Liu Jianguo, vice-dean of the Institute of Modern International Relations at Tsinghua University, said it is too early to say whether and when the DPRK will conduct nuclear test as it is now "very emotional" after the UN resolution.

Though Washington and Seoul are reportedly discussing the possibility of bilateral sanctions against Pyongyang, aside from the UN resolution, Liu said that will not really work as trade ties are quite weak.

Pyongyang's reaction now is the result of sanctions, and sanctions alone cannot solve the nuclear impasse, he said.

Yu Shaohua, director of the Department for Asia-Pacific Security and Cooperation Studies of the China Institute of International Studies, noted that "Pyongyang's pursuit of a nuclear deterrence is due to deep security concerns. In that regard, relevant parties, including the US and the ROK, are responsible for the situation."

[http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2013-01/25/content\\_16172756.htm](http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/cndy/2013-01/25/content_16172756.htm)

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

Bloomberg Businessweek

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

## What's the Threat? North Korean Rhetoric, Reality

By Eric Talmadge, Associated Press (AP)

January 25, 2013

TOKYO (AP) — According to its official statements, North Korea is ready to go to the brink. But how serious are Pyongyang's threats?

This week, new U.N. sanctions punishing the North's successful December rocket launch have elicited a furious response from Pyongyang: strong hints that a third nuclear test is coming, along with bigger and better long-range missiles; "all-out action" against its "sworn enemy," the United States; and on Friday, a threat of "strong physical countermeasures" against South Korea if Seoul participates in the sanctions.

"Sanctions mean war," said a statement carried by North Korea's official Korean Central News Agency.

In the face of international condemnation, North Korea can usually be counted on for such flights of rhetorical pique. In recent years it threatened to turn South Korea into a "sea of fire," and to wage a "sacred war" against its enemies.

If the past is any indication, its threats of war are overblown. But the chances it will conduct another nuclear test are high. And it is gaining ground in its missile program, experts say, though still a long way from seriously threatening the U.S. mainland.

"It's not the first time they've made a similar threat of war," said Ryoo Kihl-jae, a professor at the University of North Korean Studies in Seoul. "What's more serious than the probability of an attack on South Korea is that of a nuclear test. I see very slim chances of North Korea following through with its threat of war."

Although North Korea's leadership is undeniably concerned that it might be attacked or bullied by outside powers, the tough talk is mainly an attempt to bolster its bargaining position in diplomatic negotiations.

The impoverished North is in need of international aid and is eager to sign a treaty bringing a formal end to the Korean War, which ended nearly 60 years ago in a truce. It uses its weapons program as a wedge in the ever-repeating diplomatic dance with the U.S.-led international community, and there is no reason to believe this time is different.

"I see this as their way of testing the water," said Narushige Michishita, a North Korea expert at Tokyo's Graduate Institute of Policy Studies. "North Korea will probably never be able to defeat the United States in a war. But they are getting stronger."

In 2006 and 2009, North Korea carried out underground nuclear tests just after receiving U.N. sanctions for launching long-range rockets. The latest barrage of rhetoric comes after the U.N. Security Council voted unanimously on Tuesday to condemn the successful Dec. 12 rocket launch and further expand sanctions against Kim Jong Un's regime. Pyongyang replied with its threat of more launches and possibly another nuclear test.

"Settling accounts with the U.S. needs to be done with force, not with words," said Thursday's statement from the National Defense Commission, which promised "a new phase of the anti-U.S. struggle that has lasted century after century."

North Korea has long insisted that its rocket launches were peaceful attempts to put a satellite in orbit, while the U.S. and United Nations consider them illegal tests of missile technology. This week, however, Pyongyang, made it clear that one goal of its rocket program is to attack the United States.

But its ability to do so is limited, say experts who believe North Korea still has technological kinks to work out in its nuclear devices. It is thought to be unable to make a nuclear weapon small enough to be mounted on a missile, so it needs to test that technology as well.

Another big issue is money.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



In his first speech to his people, the young leader, Kim, who is still believed to be in his 20s, said North Korea will continue its "military first" policy. But for a nation that chronically struggles to feed its own people, resources are limited. And because of trade restrictions, acquiring parts for its weapons from abroad is increasingly difficult.

Despite December's successful launch, North Korea's ability to get missiles off the launch pad is less than reliable. In April, a similar rocket splintered into pieces over the Yellow Sea. Days later, North Korea showed off what appeared to be an intercontinental ballistic missile, but many experts who reviewed footage of the rockets said they were clearly fakes.

The North does, however, appear to be making some progress.

Japan's Defense Ministry, in an assessment of the December launch presented to the prime minister on Friday, said the North's best designs probably give its missiles a range of more than 10,000 kilometers (6,200 miles), according to Japan's Kyodo news service. That would be enough to reach the West Coast of the United States. A South Korean defense official said Friday that Seoul agrees with that assessment.

The Japanese report warned that Pyongyang's missile technology has "entered a new stage" that is of serious concern to the international community. Japan is particularly wary of North Korea's capabilities because all of its islands are well within striking distance. Japan also hosts about 50,000 U.S. troops, whose bases would be a tempting target if Pyongyang were to try to make good on its threats.

"There has been a tendency to underestimate what North Korea can do in the space and missile field, and possibly with technology in general," U.S. nuclear expert Jeffrey Lewis wrote recently on his Arms Control Wonk blog. He noted that debris recovered from the wreckage of the December rocket's first stage indicates that most of it was made in North Korea.

North Korea claims the right to build nuclear weapons as a defense against the United States, which stations more than 28,000 troops in South Korea.

It is believed to have enough weapons-grade plutonium for about four to eight bombs, according to nuclear scientist Siegfried Hecker, who visited North Korea's nuclear complex in 2010. And in 2009, Pyongyang also declared that it would begin enriching uranium, giving it a second way to make atomic weapons.

U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta said Thursday that he has seen no outward sign that North Korea will follow through soon on its plan to conduct a test, but added that doesn't mean preparations aren't under way.

<http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2013-01-25/whats-the-threat-north-korean-rhetoric-reality>

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

London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Indian Kashmir Advises People to Prepare for Nuclear War**

*Police in Indian Kashmir have warned residents to build underground bunkers to prepare for a possible nuclear war in the disputed region, which is on edge after a string of deadly border clashes.*

22 January 2013

Source: Agence France-Presse (AFP)

The warning comes despite a ceasefire which took hold last week in the scenic Himalayan region, after the Indian and Pakistani armies agreed to halt cross-border firing that had threatened to unravel a fragile peace process.

"If the blast wave does not arrive within five seconds of the flash you were far enough from the ground zero," says the notice, headed "Protection against Nuclear, Biological and Chemical (NBC) Weapons".

It warns of "initial disorientation" from a nuclear attack, saying the blast may "carry away many prominent and familiar features".



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

The instructions were issued on Monday in a local English-language Greater Kashmir newspaper by the State Disaster Response Force, which is part of the police.

They vividly describe a nuclear war scenario to prepare residents to deal with "the initial shock wave".

The notice tells them to "wait for the winds to die down and debris to stop falling".

"Blast wind will generally end in one or two minutes after burst and burns, cuts and bruises are no different than conventional injuries. (The) dazzle is temporary and vision should return in few seconds," it says.

It tells residents to build lavatory-equipped basement shelters "where the whole family can stay for a fortnight", and says that they should be stocked with non-perishable food.

Nuclear-armed India and Pakistan have fought three wars since partition in 1947, two of them over the Kashmir region that both nations claim.

Police confirmed they issued the notice but said it "should not be connected with anything else", in an apparent reference to border tension.

The notice is part of regular year-round civil defence preparedness, Mubarak Ganai, deputy inspector general of civil defence in Kashmir police, told AFP.

An Indian counter-terrorism expert criticised the warning as valueless for Kashmiris, who could be forgiven for imagining war was an imminent prospect.

"There can be no conceivable motive for issuing a notice like this," Ajay Sahni, executive director of the Institute for Conflict Management in New Delhi, told AFP.

"Such information collected from here and there is not worth the paper it is printed on," he said, adding that "there can be no preparedness for such an eventuality".

There has been calm along the de facto border in Kashmir since commanders of the two sides agreed last Thursday to halt the cross-border firing.

Pakistan says three of its soldiers died in the firing while India says it lost two of its soldiers – marking the worst violence along the frontier dividing the region since the two nations nearly went to war in 2003.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/india/9818453/Indian-Kashmir-advises-people-to-prepare-for-nuclear-war.html>

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

The London Guardian – U.K.

## **Trident: No Need for Like-For-Like Replacement, Says Danny Alexander**

*Exclusive: Chief secretary to the Treasury tells Guardian there are 'credible and compelling alternatives'*

By Nick Hopkins, defence and security correspondent

Tuesday, 22 January 2013

The UK does not need to replace the Trident fleet with "like-for-like" nuclear submarines that will cost the country billions of pounds at a time of national austerity, the chief secretary to the Treasury, Danny Alexander, insists.

In an interview with the Guardian, Alexander said MPs from all parties and senior officers in the military should accept there are "credible and compelling alternatives" to continuous at-sea deterrence, and he warned that the Treasury did not have "a magic pot of money" to pay for a new generation of Successor submarines.

The world had changed, he said, and so had the defence assumptions that underpinned the position since the cold war.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



Alexander, who is now in charge of the Cabinet Office-led Trident Alternatives Review, said: "Given all the financial pressures across the whole of the public sector, all the things the government has to do and wants to pay for, and all the pressures in different areas, I just think the idea that somehow, out of thin air, we can carve a multibillion pocket to pay for this, that is not financially realistic."

He described as a "non-starter" the idea that the Treasury could find new cash to help the Ministry of Defence pay for new submarines, which is the privately held assumption of some Conservative MPs and officials at the MoD.

"We are in a position where the costs of the Successor have to be paid for from within the MoD budget. There is no magic pot of money that is going to be created out of thin air to go on top of that. As a government, we have been very clear about that. Certainly myself and the chancellor.

"That very financial imperative is one of the reasons why I think this review is so important. We have already set out that it is going to take another three years to deal with the deficit. That means budgets across the board naturally have to be squeezed, including defence."

The Liberal Democrats demanded a review into alternatives to replacing Trident as part of the coalition agreement, and it was initially led by the then armed forces minister, Nick Harvey.

When Harvey was moved from the MoD last September, Alexander took charge of the detailed study, which is due to be completed and published by June this year.

In his first interview since taking charge of the review, Alexander said nothing he had seen or heard in the last four months had challenged his view that replacing the Trident fleet was unnecessary – and unnecessarily expensive.

He said he doubted it would meet the UK's 21st-century defence requirements either, with experts estimating the whole-life costs of replacing Trident could exceed well over £100bn.

As one of the so-called "quad" of the coalition's most senior ministers – the others are David Cameron, Nick Clegg and George Osborne – Alexander said he was better placed than most to understand the need to challenge assumptions about nuclear deterrence.

"If anything, the fact that I have taken on the leadership of this review as a member of the 'quad' just demonstrates the level of importance and seriousness with which we are continuing to treat this review. The circumstances the country are facing reinforces that policy. It does not diminish it. The economic and financial circumstances reinforce the wisdom of [the Liberal Democrats'] policy."

Alexander said he could not spell out the alternatives before the review was published – they remain top secret. But he said he had already seen enough to know that the review would provoke serious debate – and that its findings would surprise people.

One potential option is for the current fleet of Astute submarines to be equipped with nuclear warheads, or to restrict the number of Successor submarines to two or three, rather than four.

"I would expect we will be able to set out serious, credible arguments and potential alternatives," he said. "I hope [the review] will open up a wide debate, in the public, among experts and the community, around the approach we take to nuclear deterrence.

"I am not a unilateralist, I don't think that we should not have a deterrent. But I think when budgets are under pressure, and when the assumptions that our current approach are based on are very much cold war assumptions, and we are in the 21st century and the world is changing, that this is absolutely the right time to have a serious, considered, objective look at the way in which this policy is constructed.

"We need to see if there are different ways of doing this that are more cost effective. This is the first time for a very long time these questions have been asked. We do need to ask fundamental questions about our posture.



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

"Is it right in the 21st century that we still need to have submarines at sea, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 12 months of the year? All those things are ripe for being reviewed and considered, and alternatives presented.

"We have just lived with these assumptions for quite a number of decades, and the notion that there is a different but credible way to think about these things may well be surprising to a lot of people. If you are prepared to take a slightly different approach, then it opens up a wider range of alternatives for consideration.

"I certainly don't expect the review to come back and say Trident is the only alternative or there is no alternative, which is what some in other parties would say."

The government has already spent £1.4bn on early design work for Trident replacement submarines but the final decision about whether to go ahead – which is known as "Main Gate" – will not be made until 2016.

The cost of replacing Trident is estimated at an initial £25bn-£30bn, with £3bn-a-year running costs during the submarines 30 to 40-year life.

Decommissioning costs of the fleet are estimated at £25bn. That does not include the cost of replacing the warheads themselves. A decision about that will be taken in 2019.

Britain's top military officers have privately expressed deep concern that the squeezed MoD budget may have to shoulder this burden, especially as it has to pay for two new aircraft carriers and other expensive equipment projects such as the Joint Strike Fighter. But Alexander said the MoD had no choice.

The parlous state of the MoD's finances was underlined on Tuesday when the army announced it needed to make another 5,300 job cuts. Letters were sent to 26,000 personnel setting out areas to be targeted and the terms of the voluntary redundancy scheme. It is the biggest tranche of army redundancies for 20 years.

An MoD source said: "The prime minister and the defence secretary are both committed to maintaining a continuous at-sea deterrent. A part-time deterrent to be wheeled out at a time of heightened tension would be less credible, vulnerable to a pre-emptive strike and its very deployment would risk escalating a dangerous situation. It would be a dangerous and naive road to go down."

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/jan/22/trident-replacement-danny-alexander>

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

Scotsman – Scotland, U.K.

## **Lord Browne: Scrap Round-the-Clock Nuclear Deterrent**

By TOM PETERKIN

Friday, 25 January 2013

FORMER defence secretary Lord Browne believes the UK should stop deploying nuclear submarines around the clock.

The Labour peer said yesterday that nuclear weapons should play less of a role in defence strategy, arguing Britain should "step down" from "continuous at sea deterrence (CASD)".

The view, expressed in a House of Lords debate on nuclear disarmament, is at odds with the UK Government's insistence on updating Trident with an identical replacement.

The SNP said last night that the comments created confusion around Labour's nuclear policy and added weight to the argument for independence.

Lord Browne said that although the focus had shifted away from the multilateral disarmament agenda, there was a need for the "relentless pursuit" of nuclear weapons reductions.

He said it was becoming clearer that deterrence as a cornerstone of defence strategy was "decreasingly effective and increasingly risky".

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

As nuclear technology spread, it would be more difficult to prevent acts of nuclear terrorism and more difficult to pinpoint the state responsible for an attack, he argued.

“That’s not to say that nuclear weapons are irrelevant in the 21st century. It is to say that they offer less of an insurance policy against the challenges we will face in the future.”

But Lord Browne, who drew up a 2006 white paper on Trident, said the time was ripe to “change our posture and step down from continuous at-sea deterrence”.

This, he said, would demonstrate that “nuclear weapons play less and less of a role in our national security strategy”. He warned there were no risk-free futures on offer. “We need to shift the emphasis now on to reducing the chances of any nuclear weapons ever being used anywhere.

“That means the relentless pursuit of nuclear weapons reductions, a relentless strengthening of non-proliferation and a decreased reliance on nuclear weapons for national security by all, including ourselves.”

For decades, Britain has held to the principle that one of the four submarines that carry the nuclear-tipped Trident II missiles must always be at sea.

Earlier this week, the Chief Secretary to the Treasury, Danny Alexander, said that there were “credible and compelling alternatives” to CASD, creating a divide with his Tory coalition partners.

Reacting to Lord Browne’s speech, the SNP defence spokesman Angus Robertson said: “Lord Browne’s intervention will only add to the confusion about the Trident replacement. As a minister, he maintained the conventional wisdom that to be effective Trident missiles always have to be deployed at sea: now he tells us that is outdated. Once a Labour defence secretary determined to dump these weapons in Scotland, he now questions the central nuclear doctrine of the UK.

“It will only add to the sense of confusion created by Danny Alexander’s intervention, putting the coalition partners at odds.”

Mr Robertson added: “It also confirms that what most Scots consistently demand – the complete removal of weapons of mass destruction from the Clyde – can only be successfully accomplished by a Yes vote in 2014.”

The debate was called by Lord Bramall, a former chief of the defence staff at the time of the Falklands War.

In his final speech in the Lords, Lord Bramall said the government should not go ahead with an unaffordable replacement for Trident.

<http://www.scotsman.com/news/politics/top-stories/lord-browne-scrap-round-the-clock-nuclear-deterrent-1-2757590>

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

Defense News

## **Hagel to Face Tough Questions on Iraq, Nuke Cuts**

January 22, 2013

By JOHN T. BENNETT

Two prominent GOP senators say Republicans want answers from Chuck Hagel, U.S. President Barack Obama’s pick for defense secretary, on his endorsement of nuclear arms reductions and criticisms of the Iraq war.

Hagel is continuing to meet with key senators ahead of his Jan. 31 Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) confirmation hearing. In fact, he is slated to huddle on Jan. 22 with Sen. John McCain of Arizona, an influential senior SASC Republican.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

During that one-on-one meeting and during the much-anticipated confirmation hearing, McCain wants Hagel to explain his 2006 criticism of the Iraq War, waged by the administration of President George W. Bush. McCain called Hagel's criticism of the Bush administration's so-called surge of forces into Iraq "bizarre." He wants to know why Hagel called the surge, as McCain summarized for reporters "the worst blunder since Vietnam."

McCain, as well as other Republicans, some defense analysts and Pentagon officials, claim "the surge was successful," he said.

Another line of questioning facing Hagel, a former GOP senator from Nebraska, will focus on several studies he has approved endorsing reductions to the U.S. nuclear arms arsenal.

Hagel and others, including most congressional Democrats, believe Washington could substantially shrink its nuclear arsenal, generating billions in annual savings while not hindering U.S. national security, they claim.

One such proponent is the man who will run Hagel's confirmation hearing: Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Carl Levin, D-Mich.

"We don't need the number" of nuclear warheads currently in the U.S. arsenal, Levin told reporters the same day.

"We can have significant reductions ... and stay secure," Levin said, adding that U.S. national security strategy has featured "an over-reliance on nuclear weapons in the last 20 years, since the Cold War ended."

The U.S. State Department last April released data that showed the U.S. possesses about 815 intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers deployed. Russia, the successor to America's Cold War foe, the Soviet Union, has around 495, according to the State Department.

But many congressional Republicans, especially those on the hawkish House Armed Services Committee, would rather swell the U.S. nuclear fleet.

The issue will be prominent not only during Hagel's confirmation process, but in coming years as White House and Pentagon officials trim the Pentagon's annual budget after a decade at war.

Asked whether he expects any Senate Republicans to vote for Hagel's nomination, Levin replied: "I haven't seen any." Democrats have a 55-45 majority in the upper chamber; Republicans have yet to signal whether they will threaten to filibuster Hagel's confirmation vote on the Senate floor.

It would take 60 votes to override such a move, meaning Senate Democratic leaders would need to find at least five GOP members to cross the aisle — and possibly more if hawkish or pro-Israel Democrats opt to oppose Hagel's nomination.

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130122/DEFREG02/301220009/Hagel-Face-Tough-Questions-Iraq-Nuke-Cuts?odyssey=tab%7Ctopnews%7Ctext%7CFRONTPAGE>

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

USA TODAY

## **Bird Flu Experts End Halt to Lab Research**

*Bird flu experts ended their voluntary halt to research on making the deadly H5N1 avian influenza capable of spreading to mammals. New public health safeguards led to the decision, they say.*

By Dan Vergano, USA TODAY

January 23, 2013

Bird flu experts on Wednesday ended a voluntary halt on research into how to make the deadly H5N1 avian influenza capable of spreading to mammals, and perhaps rapidly to people.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

The international moratorium began last year following uproar over two studies that looked at genes that might make the bird flu readily transmissible between ferrets, a mammal model for infection from person-to-person. But 40 experts from nine nations now say they're ending the moratorium, citing international research safeguards that are in place against the release of their flu bugs to the public.

The studies released last year stirred controversy over two fears: one, that the work could lead to the unintended release from labs of highly lethal bugs that would be readily transmissible to people; the other that bioterrorists might use the studies as their cookbook on how to create a pandemic flu.

"We believe the public health benefits of H5N1 research outweigh the risks," says signer Yoshihiro Kawaoka of the University of Wisconsin, Madison. In their letter announcing the end of the moratorium, published in the journals *Science* and *Nature*, he and the other experts cited benefits to monitoring possible natural outbreaks of the disease and in testing possible vaccines against such an outbreak. "There can never be zero risk in research but we think the risk can be successfully managed," Kawaoka said in a briefing on the announcement.

Normally transmitted only from poultry to people, the H5N1 virus has killed some 360 people since 2003, largely farm workers in Asia and Egypt, according to the World Health Organization. Because the disease has a roughly 60% death rate based on WHO case numbers (although the true death rate is disputed), research has looked at how gene mutations might facilitate the spread of the disease from person to person in order to aid monitoring against such outbreaks happening naturally and to test possible vaccines against the bug.

In 2011, the two journals releasing the statement on Wednesday reported that a federal "biosafety" board had called for limiting information released in two bird flu transmission studies, one headed by Kawaoka and another by Ron Fouchier of Erasmus Medical Center in The Netherlands.

Originally only for 60 days, the moratorium on the research was intended to allow research funders and public health authorities to create safeguards against such concerns.

"We have done as much as we can as far as addressing the concerns," says National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases chief Anthony Fauci. He says a framework for evaluating the safety of proposed H5N1 transmissibility research in mammals, up for public comment this month, should allow the research to resume receiving federal funding within weeks. "These decisions will always be made on a case-by-case basis with public health a chief concern," Fauci says. Research agencies in Europe and Asia have already put in place similar frameworks, which would add layers of safety review to research grant requests related to making bird flu more transmissible in the lab.

The research had led to sharply divided views among experts concerned with bioterrorism and lab safety, such as Michael Osterholm of the University of Minnesota, and other researchers who called the work fundamental to heading off a natural bird flu pandemic. "The lifting of the embargo on H5N1 transmission research is an important move forward for understanding what regulates influenza transmission," say virologist Vincent Racaniello of Columbia University. "In my view the moratorium has accomplished little other than delaying the conduct of important virology research."

In Europe, the research should begin again within weeks, Fouchier says. It will be aimed at determining the minimum number of genes needed to mutate to make the virus transmissible. First, he says, "we'll have to order more ferrets."

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/health/2013/01/23/avian-flu-moratorium/1858329/>

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

Reuters – U.S.

## **Arabian al Qaeda's Number Two is Dead: Yemeni Official**

By Mohammed Ghobari

Thursday, January 24, 2013

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

SANAA (Reuters) - A Saudi who was freed by U.S. authorities from detention at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, only to become second-in-command of Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) has died after being wounded by Yemeni security forces, a Yemeni security official said on Friday.

Said al-Shehri suffered injuries in an operation by the security apparatus on November 28 in the northern province of Saada, a member of Yemen's supreme security committee told the Yemeni state news agency.

He subsequently fell into a coma and then died, the source said, without saying when exactly Shehri had died.

"He was buried by al Qaeda in an unknown location as a strategy to keep up the morale of its members," the source, who was not named, was quoted as saying.

It was not the first time Yemen had announced Shehri's death. In September, the Ministry of Defense said he had been killed in an army operation, only for him to issue an audio tape a month later.

But whereas in September Saudi Arabia declined to confirm the death, this week Saudi-owned media have reported that Shehri is dead.

U.S. officials described Shehri as one of the most important al Qaeda-linked militants to be released from the Guantanamo detention facility, where he was taken in January 2002 after Pakistan handed him to U.S. authorities.

Shehri, a former officer in Saudi Arabia's internal security force, allegedly joined al Qaeda and helped to facilitate the movements of Saudi militants seeking to travel to Afghanistan via Iran.

According to the Pentagon document, Shehri was "assessed to be a HIGH risk" prisoner because "he is likely to pose a threat to the U.S., its interests and allies".

A U.S. official familiar with the case said Shehri was one of numerous Saudi militants at Guantanamo released by the administration of President George W. Bush under heavy pressure from Saudi authorities and the U.S. court system.

Shehri was released to Saudi Arabia in 2007 and put through a Saudi rehabilitation program for militants.

But he later returned to the battlefield in Yemen, and became AQAP's number two, leading one U.S. official to call him a "poster child for recidivism".

Shehri was wanted by Yemeni authorities for a suspected role in an attack on the U.S. embassy in Sanaa in 2008.

AQAP, which has planned attacks on international targets including airliners, is described by Washington, which has repeatedly used unmanned drones to target its members, as perhaps al Qaeda's most dangerous and innovative affiliate.

*Reporting by Mohammed Ghobari; Writing by Raissa Kasolowsky; Editing by Kevin Liffey.*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/01/24/us-yemen-qaeda-idUSBRE90N0Z720130124>

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

Foreign Policy

OPINION/The World of Threats

## **Is Nuclear Arms Control Dead?**

By David E. Hoffman

Tuesday, January 22, 2013

In his first inaugural address, President Obama made this pledge: "With old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat, and roll back the specter of a warming planet." In his second address, the president again returned to climate change -- but dropped the nuclear threat. He didn't mention it once.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



Perhaps it is not fair to read too much into this. But there's been a strange silence about nuclear arms control lately. It has largely been ignored in the public discussion of priorities for the president's second term.

No doubt, there will be plenty of arcane details discussed at confirmation hearings for Sen. John Kerry and Sen. Chuck Hagel to be secretaries of state and defense, respectively. But what about the president? Does he still believe in his vision of "a world without nuclear weapons," described in the Prague speech of April, 2009?

Last year, election campaigns in the United States and Russia meant a lost year for nuclear arms control. Now, the campaigns are over, but the prospects are still cloudy, at best.

The weapons haven't gone away just because we stopped talking about them. The United States and Russia still have the largest nuclear arsenals in the world. While there are serious concerns about Iran and North Korea, about India and Pakistan, among others, keep in mind the huge differences in scale. The arsenals of the United States and Russia are about 16,200 warheads, while the other countries in the world are estimated to have about 1,100 nuclear weapons combined.

The president's first-term New Start treaty with Russia established very important verification procedures, but it provides for only modest reductions in the two nation's stockpiles, down to 1,550 warheads on each side, after seven years. It was a stepping stone, but ought not to be Obama's last step.

A lot of thought has gone into the next moves, both inside the administration and outside. Scholars and non-government strategy groups have spent months coming up with detailed, useful reports about how to rein in the nuclear danger. This informal staff work is valuable, and ready.

For a roadmap of the possibilities, see "The Opportunity: Next Steps in Reducing Nuclear Arms," by Steven Pifer and Michael E. O'Hanlon of the Brookings Institution. The book is a sober, fact-filled assessment of the choices that Obama now faces. "Why pursue nuclear arms control when the cold war is more than twenty years in the past?" they ask. "Arms control is not and should not be considered an end in itself. It is a tool that, properly applied, can strengthen and enhance the security of the United States and America's allies." They offer seven arguments for additional nuclear arms control. Among them: to put under legally-binding, verifiable treaty agreements all those nuclear warheads which are currently outside the treaty system, both in the United States and Russia.

Another solid piece of work on this theme is the report "Trimming Nuclear Excess: Options for Further Reductions of U.S. and Russian Nuclear Forces," by Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists, published last month. Kristensen says, "There are indications that, although U.S. and Russian reductions are continuing, both countries are becoming more cautious about reducing further... both countries are now investing huge sums of money in new nuclear weapon systems that are designed to operate toward the end of the century. Unless new unilateral reductions take place or significant arms control agreements are reached, large nuclear forces could be retained far into the future."

Yet another significant source of thinking about a new agenda is contained in Global Zero's U.S. Nuclear Policy Commission report of last May. The commission was chaired by retired Gen. James Cartwright, included Hagel, and the study was directed by Bruce Blair. The report provides a series of illustrative steps in which the United States could reduce its nuclear arsenal to a maximum of 900 total nuclear weapons, while increasing the warning and decision time. The report also envisions bringing in all the nuclear weapons powers for the first time for multilateral negotiations to limit nuclear arms.

But with all this intellectual firepower, why has the debate seemed to grow silent?

Vladimir Putin is one reason. Since returning to the Russian presidency last year, he has championed new laws intended to push back against pro-democracy protestors in the streets, and in some cases, against American influence on Russian society and politics. Most damaging of all, Putin rammed through the Russian legislature a bill that forced the abrogation of a bilateral agreement, which had just come into force a few weeks earlier, on adoption of Russian children by American parents. This was Putin's angry retaliation for the Magnitsky Act, legislation approved by the



United States Congress and signed by the president that imposed visa and other restrictions on Russians believed to be involved in serious human rights abuses. The adoption bill seems to mark a nadir in recent relations between the two countries. Mistrust is again on the rise--corrosive mistrust.

One can only imagine the chorus of protests that Obama would face with another arms control treaty. It does not take a cynic to envision a Republican senator asking the question: If the Russians could so abruptly abrogate an agreement on adopting children which they negotiated carefully over a year's time, how can they be trusted to stick to an agreement on nuclear weapons? It is a very tough question to answer.

My own response to that is that nations don't have friends, they have interests. A treaty is a contract, and contracts are made to protect interests. It is in the interest of both the United States and Russia to avoid a nuclear catastrophe--an accidental launch, a loose nuke, a terrorist attack. Both countries possess thousands of nuclear weapons that are still not covered by any treaty, not subject to verification nor, in some cases, is the quantity even known to each other. These excess weapons are a legacy of the Cold War and really serve no useful military purpose today. Getting these warheads sorted out and locked down is in our national interest. Doing so should not be seen as a favor to Putin.

However, arms control does not exist in isolation from other issues roiling the relationship. It is hard to negotiate with Moscow or sell to Congress an agreement on something so consequential and difficult if there is an abundance of mistrust. Obama and Putin may need to reset the reset with Russia before they can do anything more on nuclear arms control.

I think Obama personally wants to do more, but much depends on Putin and how he sees Russia's interests when it comes to strategic weapons. In Moscow, there are some who think that despite the steady retirement of aging weapons from the Cold War years, Russia can modernize its arsenal, and doesn't really need another arms control agreement with the United States. For Putin, the question really boils down to whether he wants to spend heavily on that modernization, and whether he can sustain that resource drain, given other demands. The Russians are talking about building a massive new liquid-fueled, multiple-warhead intercontinental ballistic missile. Do they really need it? Putin's actions since returning to office suggest he is heading toward a Fortress Russia, a more isolated, go-it-alone approach.

But these things tend to oscillate, and could swing in the other direction yet again.

Although Obama didn't mention nuclear danger in his speech, he has a very full inbox on his desk of possible initiatives and decisions.

The president's Nuclear Posture Review of 2010 must be implemented. For more than a year, staffs have been working on memos about how to execute the decisions from that **document** and what guidance the president ought to give the Pentagon. His decisions could set a path for future reductions in nuclear arsenals--potentially deep cuts, if he choose to go that way. But so far there has been only silence from the White House about this.

The president has called for ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, but he did not submit it to the Senate in his first term. Many of the technical objections raised in 1999 when the Senate failed to ratify the treaty have been overcome in the stockpile stewardship program. Is the president ready to spend some political capital and wage a fight for the treaty?

Missile defense remains a thorny obstacle to arms control negotiations with Russia. The president could apply some creative thinking here to overcoming Moscow's concerns, which are largely focused on later stages of the U.S. missile defense plan, five to seven years from now. The near-term problem is that no negotiations on reducing offensive weapons will get to first base until there's some common understanding on missile defense. If the U.S. missile defense program is not a threat to Russia's strategic deterrent, how do we make that case in a persuasive way that permits arms control talks on offensive weapons to move ahead?

As I have argued earlier in FP, the president ought to consider a bilateral agreement with Russia to take nuclear-armed missiles off launch-ready alert.



And it is worth keeping in mind that two large categories of nuclear weapons are still uncovered by treaty-- the smaller or tactical nuclear warheads in Russia, and the strategic warheads kept in reserve since the end of the Cold War by the United States. No one knows precise numbers, but there are several thousand of these weapons that should be counted, verified and brought under treaty. That's a worthy goal for a second term.

*David E. Hoffman is a Pulitzer Prize-winning author and a contributing editor to Foreign Policy.*

[http://hoffman.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/01/22/is\\_nuclear\\_arms\\_control\\_dead](http://hoffman.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/01/22/is_nuclear_arms_control_dead)

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

Voice of Russia

OPINION/Opinion & Analysis

## **Borey-Class Nuclear-Powered Ballistic-Missile Submarine Yuri Dolgorukiy Will Provide Russia with Effective Nuclear Deterrent**

By Yulia Zamanskaya

January 22, 2013

On January 10th Russia's next-generation 'Borey'-class nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarine (SSBN) 'Yuri Dolgorukiy' officially entered service with the Russian navy's Northern Fleet.

Professor Thomas Fedyszyn, the Chair of the Europe-Russia Studies Group in the US Naval War College, suggests that the development of 'Boreys' is the first crucial step in Russia's attempts to modernize and revitalize its aging military-industrial complex. Equipped with the most advanced weaponry, the new submarine will not only provide Russia with an effective nuclear deterrence capability but will also serve to protect Moscow's economic interests in the Arctic. Crucially, while the might of the new submarine cannot be underestimated, the expert argues that for the moment 'Boreys' should not be viewed as Moscow's bid for naval dominance nor a threat to the NATO.

The views and opinions expressed by Prof. Fedyszyn in this article do not necessarily reflect official policies or positions of the United States Naval War College or the United States government.

After years of development and construction Russia's newest submarine has finally entered service with the Russian Navy. The first in its kind, 557 feet long 'Borey'-class submarine 'Yuri Dolgorukiy' is powered by an OK-650B nuclear reactor, has a maximum speed of 25 knots and can dive to more than 1,400 feet below the surface. Built using the most sophisticated technology, the vessel is equipped with 16 Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM) and six RPK-2 Viyuga cruise missiles, with a 5,000 mile range.

Professor Fedyszyn suggests that such technical and military characteristics make the new submarine an effective nuclear deterrent. According to the expert, "the Borey class will possess characteristics that will more than enable it to perform its mission of open ocean deterrence patrol. Compared to previous Russian-designed SSBNs it will be quieter in the open ocean". As a consequence, "it will be very difficult for anyone to locate the submarine at sea" which will enable "its missile to be a relatively invulnerable second strike weapon: the most 'stabilizing' portion of the nuclear deterrent".

There is a growing controversy, however, over the question of whether Russia will use its new submarines only for the purposes of deterrence. Given the high costs of researching, designing and developing the new SSBN-SLBM combination (which at one point consumed more than one-third of Russia's defense budget), some have been quick to assume that the development of new submarines should be seen as Moscow's attempt to reassert its naval military dominance. Prof. Fedyszyn does not agree with this point of view. In his opinion, the development of the "new class of submarine should not be viewed as a Russian bid for naval dominance, but rather as an initiative to modernize one leg of the Russian nuclear deterrent. Its current Delta Class SSBNs are becoming obsolescent and rarely engage in deterrent patrols. The Borey class will take more SLBMs to sea and will enable Russia to emphasize what Americans feel is the most stable leg of the nuclear deterrent force. This cannot be confused with naval dominance."



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

Indeed, given that Russia's current naval deterrent capability consists of an aging fleet of pre-1990s submarines, the development of 'Boreys' is a significant step for modernization of Russia's strategic arsenal. Before the new submarine entered into service, only a few Russian SSBNs were available for deployment at any one time, with the remaining vessels either undergoing maintenance or modernization, or in training. As a result, for the past decade, Russian SSBN patrols have occurred intermittently, with lengthy gaps in coverage. After January 10th, however, at least one Russian strategic submarine can be at the sea at any time. When the fleet of 'Boreys' reaches eight submarines by 2020, Russia's navy would be able to conduct around one hundred deterrent patrols a year. According to Prof. Fedyszyn, "the U.S. is definitely aware of this increased move to reinvigorate the Russian Federation Navy and will observe closely". However, calling it a bid for naval dominance or a precursor to the arms race "would be an exaggeration".

Another debate surrounding the 'Boreys' focuses on the question of whether Russia's decision to build 'Yuri Dolgorukiy' was reinforced by the ongoing conflict between Russia and NATO over the BMD program in Europe. In Prof. Fedyszyn's view, "the Borey-Bulava combination is a plan many years in the making. Any coincidences with current events are just that: coincidences." Nonetheless, the expert admits that "it is feasible to imagine that Russia envisions this move as a 'counterbalance' " to NATO's BMD. Prof. Fedyszyn adds, however, that if Russian submarines are upgraded with more long-range cruise missiles, it would be NATO's turn to counterbalance "since war fighting would be emphasized over deterrence". In this sense, it is crucial that Russia maintains an appropriate balance between the deterrent and offensive capabilities of 'Boreys'.

In the meantime, the new submarines will serve not only Moscow's military-strategic goals, but will also help to secure Kremlin's economic interests in various parts of the world. According to Prof. Fedyszyn, "navies have historically assisted the economic interests of nations and it would be both appropriate and reasonable that the Russian Federation Navy be used to protect Russia's economic interests in such region as the Arctic". In the near future, the Northern Continent is expected to become the arena of intense struggle for territory and natural resources, and, in this sense, construction of 'Boreys' is a very timely development.

Crucially, however, Russia should not stop on 'Boreys' in its attempts to revitalize its Navy. Echoing the recent claims of President Putin, Prof. Fedyszyn suggests that further major reforms will be required to fully revive the naval complex.

[http://english.ruvr.ru/2013\\_01\\_22/Borey-class-nuclear-powered-ballistic-missile-submarine-Yuri-Dolgorukiy-will-provide-Russia-with-effective-nuclear-deterrent/](http://english.ruvr.ru/2013_01_22/Borey-class-nuclear-powered-ballistic-missile-submarine-Yuri-Dolgorukiy-will-provide-Russia-with-effective-nuclear-deterrent/)

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

The London Guardian – U.K.  
OPINION/Defence and Security Blog

## **Trident Renewal: Expensive Insurance Policy or Unaffordable Irrelevance?**

*Increasing number of senior military figures oppose replacing nuclear fleet, but supporters say alternatives are no cheaper*

By Richard Norton-Taylor  
Tuesday, 22 January 2013

Nothing illustrated better the irrelevance of the British fleet of Trident ballistic missile submarines than the jihadist terror attack in Algeria, say opponents of Britain's nuclear arsenal.

Those opponents include an increasing number of Britain's most senior military figures. Asked about the determination of the prime minister and the defence secretary to replace the existing nuclear fleet with a new one, they reply: "A very good question."

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

They cannot answer it in public. All they say is that it is a "political" decision. From a military point of view, Trident ballistic missiles are a hugely expensive irrelevance that the country – certainly the defence budget – cannot afford, defence chiefs say.

Trident will not deter, and will never be used against, what they say are Britain's real enemies, al-Qaida-influenced Islamist extremists charging around the desert in pickup trucks or planning terrorist attacks in sprawling cities.

The last time MPs voted on Trident, in March 2007, the Blair government had to rely on the Tories to get a majority in favour. In his autobiography, *A Journey*, Tony Blair revealed that he had "hesitated" himself.

He wrote: "I could see clearly the force of the common sense and practical argument against Trident ... The expense is huge, and the utility in a post cold war world is less in terms of deterrence and non-existent in terms of military use. Spend the money on more helicopters, airlift, and anti-terror equipment? Not a daft notion."

Blair admitted it was "frankly inconceivable" that the UK would use nuclear weapons without the US. In the end he opted to renew Trident, because giving it up would be "too big a downgrading of our status as a nation".

Most independent commentators say the status argument is anachronistic. Field Marshal Lord Bramall, a former chief of defence staff, says that if Britain had not already had the bomb "it certainly would not get it now".

Vital to Britain's security is its economic health, General Sir David Richards, chief of the defence staff, and MI5 agree. A new fleet of Trident submarines is officially estimated to cost more than £100bn over its intended lifespan. That does not include the expense of decommissioning the submarines.

The defence budget is still under huge pressure. It is already skewed by the decision – also described by defence chiefs as "political" – to build two large aircraft carriers for the navy. (Originally priced at £3.5bn, they are now estimated to cost £6.2bn. The Commons public accounts committee says the bill is likely to increase to as much as £12bn not including the cost of the US joint strike fighters planned to fly from them.)

One former senior military figure describes the carrier decision as "pork barrel politics", a reference to the number of shipyard constituencies that benefit from the project. Every time the Ministry of Defence announces new money for Trident-related research and development programmes, it emphasises the number of jobs that will be saved. Sometimes it seems as though the Trident and carrier projects are regarded as job creation schemes. Meanwhile, more cuts in the overall defence budget are on their way.

Philip Hammond, the defence secretary, and other supporters of a new Trident fleet argue that it is needed as an insurance policy against a resurgent Russia and China.

They seem to regard the outcome of a study on Trident alternatives, demanded by the Liberal Democrats as part of the coalition agreement, as a foregone conclusion. Alternatives such as placing nuclear warheads on cruise missiles would be no cheaper and a less effective deterrent, they expect the study to conclude.

Those opposed to Trident renewal argue that it would be better simply to let the existing Trident fleet expire, allowing Britain to disarm gradually and set an example while vigorously promoting international nuclear disarmament. Nearly 90 Labour MPs defied a three-line whip and voted against Trident renewal at the end of the Commons debate in March 2007.

It is now clear that a decision on whether or not to go ahead with a new nuclear missile fleet, due in 2016, will depend entirely on the political arithmetic after the general election in 2015.

*Richard Norton-Taylor regularly contributes to BBC news and current affairs programmes. Since 1998, he has been the Guardian's security editor. He edits the Guardian Defence and Security blog with Nick Hopkins.*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2013/jan/22/trident-expensive-insurance-policy-irrelevance>

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

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

The London Guardian – U.K.  
OPINION/Comment is Free

## Trident Will Not Protect Us

*Britain can't justify these military cuts without looking at the billions spent on nuclear weapons*

By Nick Harvey

Tuesday, 22 January 2013

With our long engagement in Afghanistan moving into its final chapter, we must now debate the role of our armed forces beyond 2015, when the next defence review is due. In my view, despite successive reviews forcing change, we are still too configured for state-on-state warfare.

On Monday, in the light of events in Mali and Algeria, David Cameron rightly suggested that the threat from international terrorism will have to be contested for decades to come. It is a threat we will have to tackle in co-operation with others, not on our own. And it is a threat against which we must wield strategic patience, avoiding the impulsive and costly errors of the past decade. Much visionary thinking has been undertaken by UK military chiefs about the Future Character of Conflict and the lighter, nimbler, more flexible and adaptable forces we will need. Getting our people into potential trouble areas before problems arise and political engagement will be vital. One of the most uplifting things I saw as defence minister was a training camp in the Sierra Leone bush, where we were helping train a battalion for an Amisom peacekeeping mission. Amazing when you think where Sierra Leone was just a decade ago. Sadly, we are currently cutting our effort there.

By cruel irony, the day after Cameron's statement, ministers were back in the Commons defending the latest army redundancies. Are we cutting the right things? Central to our narrative while making the cuts was the assertion – valid in my view – that if our predecessors had faced up to difficult decisions earlier, we would not have had to take such desperate measures.

But defence ministers in post later this decade will face even grimmer choices, and make that case even more forcefully, if big decisions are not made by 2015. Central among these will be the question of whether and how to replace our Trident nuclear deterrent.

In the decade or so from 2017-18, the current plan is to spend between £25bn and £30bn building four vast new submarines whose sole purpose will be to patrol the high seas 24/7 waggling our nuclear bomb at – er – no one in particular. For another 30 years we'll spend £3bn a year in today's money operating them, and one day it will cost several billion more to decommission our nukes. Yet our national security strategy has downgraded the nuclear threat to "secondary", and we have had no identified nuclear adversary since the end of the cold war.

But in the same decade, we will have to pay for: the F35 plane to fly off the new carriers; Type 26 frigates; whatever remotely piloted aircraft we end up building; and whatever amphibious shipping is to replace HMS Ocean and her like. The army must eventually be bought some kit fit at least for the 20th century, even if the 21st is a bit hopeful, and we must urgently expand our Istar – intelligence, surveillance, target acquisition and reconnaissance – capability. You cannot do all of that on the existing size of defence budget, even assuming that it can be conserved at today's value in real terms (a big if!). In fact, you probably can't do quite a lot of it. So it is absolutely essential that any further generation of nuclear deterrent must take its place alongside all those other items – far more relevant to the action we really will be involved in – on the table for debate.

If we give Trident an automatic bye we will become even less capable of protecting our real interests through joining in international action to tackle and pre-empt real threats. If replacing Trident like for like on its cold war scale comes at the expense of the rest of the Royal Navy's capabilities, this would have a devastating impact on our global reach. We already ask the navy to do too much with too little, as far apart as the south Atlantic and the Gulf. Cuts in the frigate programme would greatly reduce what can be done even further. Failure to complete the carrier-strike project would risk leaving us with two white elephants.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

And failure to replace HMS Ocean and the other amphibious shipping we have lost with a new 21st century generation of such assets would drastically curtail the work of the Royal Marines and our ability both to land forces from the sea, and sometimes evacuate people by sea. This will be the bread and butter work of the armed forces; we will need to fulfil the more expeditionary role being envisaged for them.

In the air we need more helicopters, as recent reports have pointed to at least a decade of shortfall in rotary capability – again vital both to our reach and to humanitarian work in tricky terrain. We have thin coverage of air surveillance assets and need far more to equip us for the long battles against insurgents that the PM described. More investment in the cyber domain will also be needed.

And on the land, in various parts of the globe, we need professional and properly equipped forces capable of deploying quickly and flexibly. Current plans see numbers cut, but as yet no corresponding upswing on equipment.

Sacrificing any of these for the sake of sustaining our nuclear capability at 1980 levels puts us at risk, and means that our perception of ourselves as a significant force at the world's top table will be based on historical anachronism rather than current capability.

*Nick Harvey is Minister of State for the Armed Forces in the Ministry of Defence and has been the Liberal Democrat MP for North Devon since 1992.*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2013/jan/22/trident-military-cuts-billions-nuclear?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487>

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

Wall Street Journal  
OPINION/Korea Real Time Blog  
January 23, 2013

## **North Korea's Cut-and-Paste Diplomacy Suggests What's Next**

By Evan Ramstad

When the North Korean regime issues a statement criticizing or condemning its critics, it's always important – and a little bit funny – to see how much of it has been said before.

The speed of its reaction to the United Nations Security Council's decision to penalize it for last month's rocket launch shows that North Korea has been waiting for the move. So observers then check whether the regime had anything new to say compared to last April 17, when the Security Council penalized it for its last rocket launch.

The most significant difference is that North Korea added a new element to its list of steps that it says will constitute its response to the U.N. action. And that element was a veiled threat for another test of a nuclear weapon.

Diplomats and other North Korea observers have been expecting that, of course. The country had already raised that possibility before the December launch. As well, such a step would fit the pattern of North Korea taking provocative actions within a few months of the election of a South Korean president – a pattern that dates back to 1992.

As it did last April, North Korea on Wednesday accused the Security Council of being a “marionette” of the United States and said that the council's members were applying double standards by trying to prevent it from launching rockets.

“The above-said countries insist that the DPRK's satellite launch is problematic, asserting that ‘it uses ballistic missile technology’ though they know better than any others about the fact that ballistic missile technology is the only means for launching satellite and they launch satellites more than any others,” the new North Korean statement said.

Its list of what steps it will now take was basically unchanged.

“First, the DPRK flatly rejects the unjust acts of the UNSC,” the new statement said.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

In April, it said, "First, we resolutely and totally reject the unreasonable behavior of the UNSC."

"Second, the DPRK will continue to exercise its independent and legitimate right to launch satellites," the new statement said.

In April, it said, "Secondly, we will continue exercising the independent right to use space."

"Third, the DPRK drew a final conclusion that denuclearization of the Korean peninsula is impossible unless the denuclearization of the world is realized," the new statement said, adding that the Sept. 19 agreement reached in the so-called six party talks in 2005 "has now become defunct as it has become clear now that the U.S. policy hostile to the DPRK remains unchanged."

In April, it said, "Third, as the U.S. violated the Feb. 29 DPRK-U.S. agreement through its undisguised hostile acts, we will no longer be bound by it."

To explain, the third step in both cases was to nullify an agreement with the U.S. Both the 2005 agreement and the one on Feb. 29 represented deals in which the U.S. would provide some form of energy or food assistance to North Korea while North Korea halted its development of nuclear weapons and materials.

The cut-and-paste element of the Wednesday's statement veers from the one last April with the addition of the fourth element to the list, in which North Korea says it will "take steps for physical counteraction to bolster the military capabilities for self defense including the nuclear deterrence."

For the template material of that paragraph, the North's diplomats had to go back to their statement on April 14, 2009, when they were reacting to a Security Council condemnation of a rocket launch earlier that month.

In that 2009 statement, the nuclear threat was the third element of possible follow-up actions by North Korea. It said at that time: "Third, the DPRK will boost its nuclear deterrent for self-defense in every way. The hostile forces' escalated military threat that they will intercept even a satellite for peaceful purposes compels the DPRK to further increase its nuclear deterrent."

And just a few weeks later, on May 25, 2009, it conducted its second-ever test of a nuclear explosive.

In coming weeks, the world will see whether North Korea repeats that history.

<http://blogs.wsj.com/korearealtime/2013/01/23/north-koreas-cut-and-paste-diplomacy-suggests-whats-next/>

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

Time U.S.  
Nuclear Weapons  
OPINION/Analysis

## **The Nation's ICBM Force: Increasingly Creaky Broken Missiles**

By Matthew Vanderschuere

January 23, 2013

As the Air Force begins to dust off plans for the Minuteman III ICBM replacement, a stark choice faces the service.

On one hand, the time has come to replace them. On the other, the Air Force is strapped for cash, victim to a perfect storm of bureaucratic bloat, several rounds of defense cuts, and a fighter fleet exhausted by war and age.

The purpose of our strategic deterrent is simple: prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used. And the current Minuteman III inter-continental ballistic missile system, long in the tooth at 40 years old, is the foundation of that strategy.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

The Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile was first deployed during the Nixon Administration. Though the missiles have been swapped out with a new skin and innards, the Air Force still uses the same ancient command and control infrastructure.

That technology, which the USAF uses to control and monitor the missiles, is crumbling:

- *There's more computing power in a first-generation iPhone than our ICBM force.*
- *Some replacement parts were built by companies that went out of business decades ago.*
- *Simple day-to-day tasks, routine during the peak of the Cold War, now take hours of wrench-turning, just to keep the deterrent on its feet.*

The question staring down a cash-crunched Air Force is one of priorities.

With budgetary and political pressures closing in, some elected officials (and no doubt some military leaders) may be singing the siren's song of abandoning the nuclear triad for a diad. Drop the missiles (some say), and leave deterrence for the submarines and bombers.

If the triad stays, as it should, the Air Force faces another tough choice.

The Minuteman fleet is on its last legs. A new system presents challenges that were foreign during the Cold War. Digging new, survivable underground bunkers could run afoul of a mountain of environmental regulations written after the Minuteman IIIs first went on alert. If the ICBMs went mobile, on roads or railways like the Russians or Chinese are wont to do, people near travel routes could create challenging political pressures.

Regardless, the USAF has signaled to Congress that it will press ahead with an ICBM replacement.

North Korea and Iran have both cracked the technology needed to field an alert force of long-range missiles, and are at varying stages of putting warheads on their delivery systems. Further, with Russia and China fielding robust, modernized triads of new missiles, subs, and bombers — and the United States' deterrent serving as the West's last nuclear triad (France has a diad, Britain is down to just a submarine deterrent), there's little doubt U.S. military leaders are uncomfortable with the potential imbalance in the world's strategic arsenals.

If your mission is to prevent nuclear weapons from ever being used — and ours is precisely that — imbalance is the enemy.

As former defense secretary Robert Gates said, the nuclear genie is out of the bottle. Our record in keeping the nuclear club exclusive has been terrible since the end of the Cold War (Iran, Pakistan, North Korea), despite historic reductions to our own force.

If we're serious about ensuring nuclear weapons are never used in anger, we're going to have to make some tough — and long-overdue — choices that keep our record of peaceful coexistence with other nuclear powers intact.

*Matthew Vanderschuere is a former Minuteman III launch officer and flight commander for the 320th Missile Squadron. He is currently a PhD student at American University and a captain in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.*

<http://nation.time.com/2013/01/23/the-nations-icbm-force-increasingly-creaky-broken-missiles/>

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

Washington Times  
OPINION/Commentary

## **BELLAMY VAN AAIST, LOPEZ, KAHLILI: Scent of 'Germ' Warfare Raises Fear in the Mideast**

*Iran, Syria and North Korea step up work on biological weapons*

By Jill Bellamy van Aalst and Clare Lopez and Reza Kahlili

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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



Thursday, January 24, 2013

The sectarian war in Syria reportedly has claimed more than 60,000 lives and spawned concerns in the Middle East and the West about access to chemical weapons by non-state actors such as al Qaeda, Hezbollah and Hamas. Syria's chemical weapons stockpiles are of immediate concern to Israel, Jordan and the United States, whether in Syrian President Bashar Assad's hands or those of terrorist organizations. Yet the locations of chemical weapons munitions and Scud missiles equipped with chemical warheads in Syria have been identified and are continually monitored. That is not the case with the arguably more dangerous biological weapons being developed by the nexus of Iran, Syria and North Korea.

More than 167 nations have signed the United Nations Biological Weapons Convention. Syria is a signatory but has not ratified the treaty. Iran, also a signatory, has ratified it, but is pursuing development of microbial agents with the aid of Russian and North Korean scientists who may be graduates of the Soviet-era Biopreparat program that created some of these dangerous biological agents.

Among the more than 16 biological agents that Iran reportedly is developing are anthrax, Ebola, encephalitis, biological toxins, severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), cholera, smallpox and plague.

Worse yet, Iran, with North Korea's help, has genetically altered the smallpox virus in ways that may make current vaccinations ineffective.

The Islamists ruling Iran may think their planned microbial attacks cannot be traced to them. Biological weapons pose a risk that other weapon classes (nuclear, radiological and chemical) do not. They are living organisms, some of which are highly infectious and transmissible, depending on the strain. Some have lengthy incubation periods that make early detection exceptionally difficult.

Genetically modified, weaponized biological agents would pose threats for which there are no known medical countermeasures. Biological weapons are silent until they explode in epidemics or pandemics. Calculating kill ratios and controlling strikes as with chemical weapons and nuclear weapons are nearly impossible with biological weapons.

Intelligence analyst Andrew O'Neil said in a 2003 article in the Australian Journal of International Affairs that terrorists would prefer to use biological weapons for three reasons:

"First, [biological weapons] agents are far easier to acquire than nuclear weapons and produce the same killing impact as [chemical weapons]. Moreover, on a pound-for-pound basis, [biological weapon] agents are far more potent than any of the most deadly [chemical weapon] agents, which must be 'delivered in massive quantities to inflict lethal concentrations over large areas.'

"Second, the effects of biological weapons on a target population would be extremely hard to counter.

"Third, the insidious nature of [biological weapon] agents — composed as they are of living microorganisms with the capacity to reproduce and mutate — has the potential to psychologically 'unhinge' target populations."

Iran and Syria are reported to be among regimes that have received variations of such deadly biological weapons agents and developed their own domestic programs. Each of these countries also has an extensive medical and pharmaceutical research and development infrastructure within which to produce and conceal its biological weapons programs. Iran and Syria also have shared artillery, ballistic missile and munitions technology with each other and likely with Hezbollah for delivery of such pathogens.

Middle East threat reduction requires a far more aggressive and comprehensive approach to deter the proliferation of biological weapons.

Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, and his powerful clerical and military regime continue to use deceitful tactics to conceal development of an arsenal of virtually untraceable deadly biological weapons that could result in tens of millions of deaths. They are doing it while Israel and the P5+1 — the five permanent members of the U.N.



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

Security Council plus Germany — are contending with the Islamic republic approaching the “red lines” of nuclear enrichment and weapons development.

The threats from these deadly microbial agents are alarming and real. The unleashing of biowarfare agents against Israel and the United States could bring both countries to their knees. These deadly biological weapons programs in Iran and Syria must be stopped.

*Jill Bellamy van Aalst is a biological warfare threat analyst. Clare Lopez is a senior fellow at the Center for Security Policy. Reza Kahlili, author of “A Time to Betray” (Threshold, 2010), is a former CIA operative and serves on the Task Force on National and Homeland Security.*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/jan/24/scent-of-germ-warfare-raises-fear-in-the-mideast/>

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

Wall Street Journal  
OPINION/Review & Outlook  
January 25, 2013

## Young Kim Tests Washington

*North Korea says its nukes and missiles are aimed at the U.S.*

Page – A12

North Korea's National Defense Commission, the country's most powerful body, on Thursday threatened a "higher level" test of a nuclear warhead "targeted at the U.S." The impending test is no surprise, since satellite photos showed preparations almost a year ago.

More striking is the vitriol directed at the United Nations Security Council, which on Tuesday approved new sanctions on the North as punishment for its December 12 missile test. Pyongyang accused the other members of the Council of "backstage dealings with the U.S." and "blind hand-raising." That can only be read as a swipe against China, the Kim family's main international patron.

The hostility suggests some tension in the relationship, but then we've been here before. The Chinese media have been reporting for weeks that the North had informed Beijing of its intention to conduct a nuclear test and was resisting attempts to convince it to stop. China's vote for new sanctions is less important than its follow-through in implementing existing measures. Until Beijing restricts trade flows for more than a few weeks at a time, one should be cautious in declaring a split.

So far events seem to be following the North's standard blackmail playbook of first creating a sense of crisis, as it is doing now, and then offering a way out—for a price. Kim Jong Eun has been in power little more than year, but he is playing this game with flair. His combative New Year's speech dashed hopes that he was a reformer and reiterated the "military first" emphasis of his father.

The relaxation phase following the nuclear test will be a good indication of whether China has had enough. That is typically when Beijing pressures the U.S. to respond to friendly overtures, resume the utterly discredited six-party talks and top up the North's food and fuel supplies.

The other development to watch is the North's promise of a "higher level" test. Its previous two nuclear tests were small-yield plutonium devices, the first being so small that some experts think it was a failure. This time there is speculation that uranium from the North's new centrifuge enrichment facilities will be used.

If so, it will be an important milestone in a program that could provide Pyongyang with enough fissile material to make many more bombs. Since centrifuges can be hidden in tunnels much more easily than a plutonium-producing reactor, they are more difficult to monitor—and destroy with air strikes.

**Issue No. 1042, 25 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

It's also worth noting the direct threat to the U.S. Even discounting for bluster and the North's game of creating a crisis, the reality is that a rogue state is slowly developing the means and has the avowed intention of striking U.S. territory with a nuclear weapon. This is what comes of two decades of failed attempts at appeasing a totalitarian and terrorist regime.

Washington, with all its intelligence resources, hasn't managed to predict Pyongyang's behavior, or Beijing's for that matter. So the best U.S. response to the North's latest provocation is to continue tightening sanctions and other measures to put pressure on young Kim, and refuse to be stampeded into another round of fruitless talks.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323539804578261321201203346.html>

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

**Issue No. 1042, 25 January 2013**

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