



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Options Open for Obama to Slash Nukes](#)

1. [Deterrence against Aggression: Iran is a Nuclear Power, Says Larijani](#)
2. [Iran Installing New Centrifuges at Natanz Facility](#)
3. [Gulf Monarchies Reject 'Provocative' Iran Talks Idea](#)
4. [Iran, IAEA Fail to Agree on Deal; No New Date Set for Talks](#)
5. [N. Korea's Nuclear Test Aimed at Making Nuclear-Tipped ICBM: Experts](#)
6. [North Korea Nuclear Test Raises Uranium Concerns](#)
7. [S. Korea Beefs up Integrated Air and Missile Defense](#)
8. [N. Korea Informed U.S., China, Russia of Nuclear Test: Source](#)
9. [China Detects No Raised Radiation from North Korea Nuclear Test](#)
10. [Report: North Korea Upgrading Rocket Launch Site](#)
11. [Exclusive: North Korea Tells China of Preparations for Fresh Nuclear Test](#)
12. [Pakistan Successfully Test Fires Nuclear-Capable Hatf-IX Missile](#)
13. [Pak Successfully Tests N-Capable Hatf-II Missile](#)
14. [Pakistan Owns about 90-110 Nuclear Warheads: Report](#)
15. [Washington's New Arms Cuts Proposals for Moscow](#)
16. [No Arms Cut Till New START: Russia](#)
17. [Flaws Found in US Missile Shield](#)
18. [Sources: U.S. Bending on Nukes](#)
19. [Options Open for Obama to Slash Nukes](#)
20. [Pentagon Assessing Nork Threat](#)
21. [Sharpening the Nuclear Sword](#)
22. [U.S. Said to be Target of Massive Cyber-Espionage Campaign](#)
23. [Options for Reducing Nuclear Weapons Requirements](#)
24. [Nuclear Weapons: Can They Be Made Strategically Obsolete?](#)
25. [Obama's Nuclear Fantasy](#)
26. [North Korea's Lesson: Nukes for Sale](#)
27. [The U.S. Needs to Tame the Cyber-Dragon](#)

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.1045, 15 February 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.



The Express Tribune – Pakistan

Deterrence against Aggression: Iran is a Nuclear Power, Says Larijani

Parliamentary speaker hopes Pakistan will support Iran if US attacks.

By Javed Choudhry

February 12, 2013

ISLAMABAD: Iran is a nuclear power and any attack on the Islamic republic will cost the aggressor a heavy price, said the country's parliament's speaker Dr Ali Ardashir Larijani.

"We are not depending on nuclear weapons. We are also strong in other defence sectors," Larijani said on *ExpressNews'* talk show "Kal Tak". The show will be aired today at 10pm.

Asked if Iran had the capability to defend itself against aggression from Israel, Larijani said the Jewish state would not dare do that because Iran was a much larger and stronger country than Israel.

"If America ever attacked Iran, the government and people of Pakistan will support Iran because Tehran has historic relations with Pakistan and Pakistanis," said Larijani, adding that America would never commit such a mistake.

He proposed that Iran, Pakistan and Afghanistan should jointly devise a solution to the Afghan imbroglio since the region would be left with major issues after the withdrawal of foreign forces from Afghanistan.

Asked about the multi-billion-dollar Iran-Pakistan gas pipeline, Larijani said that despite US opposition the two countries should make decisions based on their own interests. He also offered to open up Iran's borders with Pakistan, if the project was approved.

Larijani belongs to a prominent family of Iran with one of his brothers serving as the chief justice while another is an influential religious leader. He is also a strong candidate for president in the upcoming elections.

The Islamic republic is under various rounds of international sanctions over its disputed nuclear programme which the West fears is aimed at developing weapons. Iran insists its atomic work is peaceful.

On Sunday, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said that Tehran would "not retreat an iota" from "its nuclear rights".

In an interview published on February 6 in Egyptian media, Ahmadinejad also claimed that Tehran had achieved nuclear capability. However, he said Iran was uninterested in attacking the "Zionist entity", while referring to Israel.

Decisions on Tehran's nuclear programme rests with supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, whose representative Saeed Jalili leads the negotiating team in talks with world powers. An earlier proposal by Washington to directly discuss the Iranian programme at Almaty with the Iranian team was shot down by Khamenei last week.

Iran is also being pressured by the UN's atomic watchdog agency to grant broader access to its facilities, scientists and documents to resolve outstanding concerns over its past atomic activities.

Translated by Arshad Shaheen

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/506088/deterrence-against-aggression-iran-is-a-nuclear-power-says-larijani/>

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

Press TV – Iran

Wednesday, February 13, 2013

Iran Installing New Centrifuges at Natanz Facility

The head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) says new centrifuges have been installed at Natanz enrichment facility since one month ago.



Fereydoun Abbasi made the remark on Wednesday as inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) arrived in Tehran for a new round of talks over Iran's nuclear energy program.

"In order to reach industrial-scale [nuclear fuel] production, we have to install a large number of these devices (centrifuges). The installation of new centrifuges at Natanz site started nearly one month ago. We plan to double their number in order to complete a lab related to the new generation [of centrifuges]," Abbasi said.

"These centrifuges have been developed for enrichment below five percent and they cannot be used in 20-percent enrichment," he added.

Abbasi also criticized IAEA inspectors for letting confidential information out after visiting Iran's nuclear facilities.

"Three to four days after IAEA experts reported the installation of these [new] centrifuges to the Agency, their information was given to Western media which cited their source as an IAEA expert. This shows that information is easily leaked from the Agency."

Abbasi stressed that some IAEA employees are on the payroll of their countries of origin and provide secret information at their disposal to their countries' intelligence services, and media. "We have warned Mr. [Yukiya] Amano [director general of IAEA] that this problem should be solved."

He went on to say that Iran has already produced 12 nuclear fuel assemblies.

"We are doing this because of our need for 20-percent fuel and we will gradually transform our 20-percent enriched uranium to powder and then shape them into fuel assemblies for nuclear reactors," he said.

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

Iran rejects the allegations, arguing that as a committed signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty and a member of the IAEA it is entitled to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

In addition, the IAEA has conducted numerous inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities but has never found any evidence showing that the Iranian nuclear program has been diverted toward military objectives.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/02/13/288771/iran-installs-new-centrifuges-at-natanz/>

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

Al-Arabiya – U.A.E.

Gulf Monarchies Reject 'Provocative' Iran Talks Idea

Thursday, 14 February 2013

By AL Arabiya with Agence France-Presse (AFP)

The Gulf monarchies on Thursday rejected as a provocation an Iranian proposal to include the Syria crisis and the situation in Bahrain on the agenda of upcoming talks on Tehran's nuclear program.

The head of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC), Abdellatif Zayani, announced the "total rejection" of the Iranian proposition, calling it "a provocation" and "interference in the internal affairs of Arab states."

He was reacting to comments by Iran's deputy minister for Asian affairs, Abbas Araghchi, who was cited by the Mehr news agency on Tuesday as saying Tehran had "proposed that the crises in Syria and Bahrain be the subject of talks with the Western powers in Kazakhstan."

It was a way of "mixing up the cards," which reflected "Iran's procrastination and lack of seriousness in reaching a settlement that puts an end to regional and international concerns over its nuclear programme," Zayani said in a statement.



Iran's charge d'affaires was summoned on Thursday by Bahrain's foreign ministry, where he was handed a note of protest, the official BNA news agency reported.

The Iranian proposal was "an interference in Bahrain's internal affairs and a violation of sovereignty," which "stirs regional tensions and instability," the agency added.

Saudi Arabia's Prince Saud added, "we are seeking neither conciliation nor a settlement between Iran and any entity that wants to negotiate with it. Instead, we are seeking a solution to evade any increase in nuclear weapons in the Middle East. We would like to see a nuclear-free Middle East, as this is the policy we are pursuing."

Relations between Iran and the GCC have plunged to a new low, with Tehran suspected of supporting Shiite opposition protests in Bahrain against the Sunni monarchy.

The Islamic Republic is also a staunch ally of Syria's President Bashar al-Assad, while the Gulf monarchies are key backers of the rebels in the conflict that has raged for almost two years and cost tens of thousands of lives.

Fears of a nuclear weapon

The comments by the Gulf States come less than two weeks before Iran and the so-called P5+1 - Britain, China, France, Russia, the United States and Germany - are due to resume discussions in Kazakhstan, eight months after they were suspended.

The talks aim to address a key Western concern about Iran's capacity to enrich uranium to fissile purities of 20 percent, a process that can be used for peaceful atomic purposes as well as for making the core of a nuclear bomb.

Saudi Foreign Minister Prince Saud Al-Faisal Tuesday criticized Iran's lack of cooperation with the international community and called on Iran to be more forthcoming about its nuclear program to remove any doubts that surround its peaceful use.

Iran recently sought to garner tens of thousands of specialized magnets that are commonly used in centrifuge machines, sparking concerns that the country is planning a major expansion of its nuclear program.

Purchase orders, copies of which were obtained by the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) and shown to The Washington Post, show an attempt, by the Iranians, to buy 100,000 ring-shaped magnets.

The magnets are currently banned from export to Iran under a U.N. resolution. However the order was requested from China about one year ago. It is not clear whether the attempt was successful.

The order is considered unusual due to its sheer size and due to the nature of the items. Iran has allegedly ordered enough magnets to, theoretically, outfit 50,000 new centrifuges reported the Washington Post on Thursday.

Iran recently announced that it plans to add thousands of more advanced, second generation centrifuges to its current lineup. This will allow the country to ramp up production of enriched uranium even further state experts.

The purchase orders have sparked concern abroad.

"They are positioning themselves to make a lot of nuclear progress quickly," said a European diplomat who spoke on the condition of anonymity. "Each step forward makes the situation potentially more dangerous."

Engineers in Iran installed more than 1,000 new IR-1 centrifuge machines at the country's largest uranium plant, close to the city of Natanz. This adds to the 9,000 IR-1 machines currently in operation, said officials of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Furthermore, 2,800 IR-1s have been installed near the city of Qom at a small enrichment plant built beneath a mountain.

U.S. intelligence officials have not commented on the magnet case.



According to an ISIS investigation the company that placed the order had previously been linked to Iran's attempts to acquire controversial technology.

The recent move would shorten Iran's timeline to obtaining nuclear weapons capability.

"Adding new machines just means you get there a lot faster," a Western diplomat privy to internal IAEA reports said.

A U.N. watchdog report, outlining Iran's nuclear attempts, will be released this week.

<http://english.alarabiya.net/articles/2013/02/14/266291.html>

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

Bloomberg News

Iran, IAEA Fail to Agree on Deal; No New Date Set for Talks

By Jonathan Tirone & Ladane Nasseri

February 14, 2013

The United Nations atomic watchdog failed to reach a deal with Iran that would give inspectors access to alleged nuclear facilities and couldn't agree on a date for a future meeting, the agency's top negotiator said.

"We will work hard now to try and resolve the remaining differences, but time is needed to reflect on a way forward," International Atomic Energy Agency chief inspector Herman Nackaerts said today at Vienna International Airport after returning from a one-day meeting in Tehran. The IAEA, which had announced new dates for discussions after its last two rounds of talks, has "unwavering" commitment to the process, he said.

A team of UN inspectors led by Nackaerts met yesterday with Iranian officials to win access to people and places, including a military base in Parchin, about 20 kilometers (12 miles) southeast of Tehran. The IAEA says it was provided with intelligence that Iran may have built a blast chamber for testing nuclear-weapons components at the military site.

Nackaerts's comments contrasted with more optimistic remarks made late yesterday by Iran's IAEA envoy, Ali Asghar Soltanieh, suggesting that some disagreements had been bridged and the two sides would meet again to discuss fresh proposals.

"Some differences were overcome and we agreed on certain points," Soltanieh said in Tehran after the talks. "It was agreed that the two sides would review new proposals made and give their opinions in the next meeting."

Oil Advances

Oil prices, which initially fell on Iranian news reports of progress, neared a three-day high in London. Brent crude for April settlement climbed as much as 41 cents to \$118.29 on the London-based ICE Futures Europe exchange and traded at \$117.49 at 11:30 a.m. local time.

The IAEA's investigation into alleged atomic-weapons work by Iranian scientists is in its 10th year. The Persian Gulf nation denies allegations that it seeks to build atomic bombs and says it isn't willing to give wider access to inspectors until its right as a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty are officially recognized and it is allowed to see documents on which claims about its atomic program are based.

Iran will also resume stalled multilateral negotiations on its nuclear work with the U.S., the U.K., France, Germany, Russia and China on Feb. 26 in Kazakhstan. The last round of talks between Iran and the group, known as P5+1, were held in Moscow in June and failed to yield results, with world powers asking the Islamic Republic to suspend production of 20 percent enriched uranium while Iran pressed for relief from financial and trade sanctions imposed over its atomic program.



The U.S. warned in November that absent Iranian agreement to boost IAEA cooperation, the nation faced another referral to the Security Council. The IAEA's 35-member board of governors convenes in Vienna on March 4 to discuss Iran.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-02-14/iran-iaea-fail-to-agree-on-deal-no-new-date-set-for-talks-1-.html>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

February 12, 2013

N. Korea's Nuclear Test Aimed at Making Nuclear-Tipped ICBM: Experts

By Kim Eun-jung

SEOUL, Feb. 12 (Yonhap) -- The explosive power of North Korea's nuclear test Tuesday was weaker than expected, but the communist nation is now one step closer to building a nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) capable of striking the United States, military officials and experts said Tuesday.

Shortly after seismic tremors were detected at the Punggye-ri test site in the country's northeastern tip, Pyongyang announced it had successfully conducted an underground test with "a smaller and light atomic bomb unlike the previous ones, yet with great explosive power."

As the North's widely expected nuclear test came two months after it fired off a long-range rocket, which invited extended U.N. Security Council sanctions, experts now question whether the isolated nation has mastered the technology to build a small warhead mounted on a long-range missile that is capable of hitting the U.S., its archrival.

Outside watchers say that the North's high-stake nuclear test is aimed at building a smaller weapon because it's the key ICBM technology, though it was not immediately clear whether the reclusive state used uranium or plutonium to build its latest atomic bomb.

"If the third test produced stronger explosive yield with smaller amount of plutonium, it is believed to have made progress in making a smaller nuclear warhead," said Jung Yong-hoon, a nuclear science professor at the Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology.

South Korea's defense ministry said seismic data suggested the nuclear test had a yield of 6-7 kilotons, which is more powerful than previous tests but weaker than the bombs detonated in Japan during World War II. North Korea's first test carried out in 2006 created one kiloton yield, while the 2009 detonation was estimated to have an output of 2-6 kilotons.

South Korea's intelligence agency chief said Pyongyang is making progress towards building a smaller and lighter bomb, but doubted whether the North detonated a bomb on Tuesday with "great explosive power," calling the North's announcement an "exaggerated advertisement."

"We don't need to worry about North Korea's nuclear capacity with overly exaggerated assessment, though we shouldn't ease down defense posture," Won Sei-hoon, the chief of the National Intelligence Service, was quoted as saying during a parliamentary meeting.

"We don't see the North has succeeded in mastering miniaturization technology," another senior intelligence official said during a closed parliamentary meeting convened after the test.

In a parliamentary defense meeting, South Korea's defense chief Kim Kwan-jin said three nuclear tests are not enough to secure technology to make a small warhead to be mounted on a long-range missile.

If the North has made progress since revealing its HEU program to visiting American nuclear scientist Siegfried Hecker in late 2010, the defense ministry said the communist state is believed to have accumulated the technology to annually produce about 40 kilograms of HEU.



A successful test coupled with a highly enriched uranium (HEU) program would be menacing to North Korea's adversaries, as a uranium facility is much easier to conceal than a plutonium facility, which requires a reactor to produce the fissile element, experts said. Pyongyang's two previous tests used plutonium.

The reactor operations necessary to produce plutonium are fully visible from satellite imagery because the reactor's cooling tower emits a visible plume, whereas it is more difficult to observe uranium centrifuge facilities from a distance, Hecker wrote in the latest edition of Foreign Policy magazine.

While seismic monitoring stations quickly detected signs of a nuclear explosion, it could take days for scientists to collect air samples from the test site to determine the presence of fission materials such as xenon and krypton, and collection is only possible if radiation materials are leaked from the test site for examination.

"We should collect (gas) from the air, if it's possible. But it's hard to expect," Kim said.

Radionuclide like xenon was detected after the 2006 test, but no such material was found after the 2009 test.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2013/02/12/75/0301000000AEN20130212017500315F.HTML>

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

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) – U.K.
February 12, 2013

North Korea Nuclear Test Raises Uranium Concerns

By Jonathan Marcus, BBC Diplomatic Correspondent

North Korea's third nuclear test - following on from two earlier explosions in 2006 and 2009 - inevitably raises all sorts of questions about the country's nuclear capabilities. In due course it may provide some answers.

Much will depend upon the analysis of data recorded at the time of the explosion. The exact size of the blast is still unclear.

James Acton of the Carnegie Endowment in Washington DC told me: "The geology of the test site is not well understood. It will take a lot of seismic analysis to get a good figure."

His initial "back of an envelope" calculation suggests a yield of between four and 15 kilotons. "In short," he argues, "all early yield estimates should be treated with caution."

The size of the blast is one thing, but the exact nature of the device exploded is quite another. This matters.

'Game-changer'

North Korea's first two nuclear tests are believed to have been plutonium-based devices. But there has been active speculation amongst experts that this latest test might involve a device based upon uranium.

Determining this will depend upon the identification of any leakage of gases during the test itself.

Mark Fitzpatrick, Director of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Programme at the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, suggests that one tell-tale sign that this might be a highly-enriched uranium (HEU) device would be the detection of xenon or other noble gases in the atmosphere.

James Acton says "there is a significant chance that there will be leakage of gases, but there is no guarantee that material will be detected". There were leaks after Pyongyang's first nuclear test, he notes, but none were detected after the second.

A device based upon highly-enriched uranium would be a very significant development.

As Mark Hibbs, also of the Carnegie, notes: "In the past North Korea had no choice but to deplete its small and finite inventory of plutonium to test nuclear weapons.



"Today and in the future," he says, "an unchecked and growing enrichment capability in North Korea is a game-changer because it will allow Pyongyang to indefinitely stockpile highly-enriched uranium fuel for an ever-larger nuclear weapons arsenal."

Mark Fitzpatrick argues that if Pyongyang has perfected the highly-enriched-uranium route to a bomb, then there will be heightened concern about the potential for the proliferation of these weapons or materials.

"HEU can be more readily fashioned into crude nuclear weapons by terrorists and other non-state groups," he points out.

Of course, Pyongyang's nuclear and missile programmes must be viewed in tandem.

There is no point in developing a working nuclear device if it cannot be weaponised - in other words, turned into a functioning bomb that can actually be delivered to a target. That too could be what this test is all about.

North Korea's ambitious long-range missile programme is seen as the obvious delivery system for such a weapon.

But a nuclear warhead would have to be small enough to fit onto, say, a Nodong missile - and it would have to be capable of withstanding the buffeting and other forces exerted on it during flight.

The forensic investigation of this nuclear test is only just getting underway. Data may be limited. But the potential is there to discern vital clues about Pyongyang's secretive nuclear programme.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-21431599>

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

The Korea Herald – South Korea

S. Korea Beefs up Integrated Air and Missile Defense

February 13, 2013

South Korea's defense ministry vowed Wednesday to speed up building an integrated air and missile system, and secure missile capability to hit all parts of North Korea to counter threats from North Korea, which is building up its nuclear arsenal.

Seoul has been making efforts to improve its missile capacity following the revision of a missile guideline in October 2012, but calls for improved security measures have heightened after Pyongyang launched a long-range missile and conducted its third atomic test recently despite a chorus of international condemnation.

In a show of protest, the defense ministry said it has deployed indigenous cruise missiles capable of hitting all parts of North Korea and will soon reveal more details.

"The South Korean military has secured various combat capabilities, including cruise missiles and ballistic missiles, to cope with North Korea's threat," ministry spokesman Kim Min-seok said in a briefing.

According to officials, the Navy has installed ship-to-land cruise missiles with a range of 500-1,000 kilometers on its Aegis warships and destroyers. South Korea's Navy chief earlier announced that the deployment will be completed in the next couple years to be able to strike nuclear and missile arsenals.

The military will also accelerate the process to develop an advanced missile interception system, the so-called "kill chain," which is designed to detect, target and destroy missiles. The system mobilizes spy satellites and surveillance aircrafts as well as missile and fighter jets to detect incoming targets and destroy them in the air.

While the military had initially planned to complete the missile defense system by 2015 to coincide with Seoul regaining its wartime operational control of its troops from Washington, the recent atomic test is expected to accelerate the process for early deployment.



The U.S. stations 28,500 troops in South Korea and provides a "nuclear umbrella" for its ally, limiting Seoul's nuclear and missile capability as part of a non-proliferation campaign.

In addition, the military will push to adopt a military spy satellite by 2021 to put closer tabs on the communist country and integrate with its own missile defense shield program, dubbed the Korean Air and Missile Defense (KAMD).

South Korea currently operates Arirang-3, a multipurpose satellite, which provides geographical information on the Korean Peninsula, including North Korea's missile and nuclear test sites. However, it still relies on the United States for much of its intelligence due to the commercial satellite's limited vision and longer rotation period.

With adding reconnaissance satellites to its monitoring capabilities, the military hopes to increase its surveillance of major North Korean military facilities to better anticipate aggressive actions by the communist state.

As the North warned of additional measures against the U.S. and its allies that denounced Tuesday's atomic test, military officials remain on high alert whether it will carry out additional tests or launch provocations with missiles or artillery.

"The military is preparing various kinds of provocations, including an artillery bombardment, infiltration across the border and attacks against major government facilities," Kim said.

As the reclusive country is believed to have prepared underground tests at two of the three tunnels, South Korea and U.S. forces are closely monitoring the Punggye-ri test site to detect signs of an additional test, while mobilizing a radiation detection airplane to collect air samples from the test site to determine fission materials.

"(The North) has completed all preparations to carry out another test at any time, and another test is possible without further preparations," Kim said, without giving further details.

Seoul's defense ministry determined the magnitude of the latest explosion was bigger than those of the previous tests, but it still fell short of atomic bombs detonated in Japan.

The yield of the 2006 test has been estimated at less than 1 kiloton, equivalent to 1,000 tons of TNT, and the second at some 2-7 kilotons. A Nagasaki-type bomb is estimated to have a 20 kiloton yield.

"Although North Korea announced that it succeeded in making a smaller and lighter bomb, we still doubt whether it mastered the technology," Kim said. "It would take time to achieve the goal."

As Pyongyang claimed it had used a "miniaturized" and lighter nuclear device, some suspect it again used plutonium, which is suitable for use as a missile warhead. If it turns out the test used a new uranium-based weapon, it would show that the North has made more progress in its highly enriched program, which would provide a second route to expand the isolated nation's nuclear arsenal. (Yonhap News)

<http://nwww.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20130213000706>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea
February 13, 2013

N. Korea Informed U.S., China, Russia of Nuclear Test: Source

SEOUL, Feb. 13 (Yonhap) -- South Korea has confirmed that North Korea informed the United States, China and Russia of its decision to go ahead with the third nuclear test about 14 hours before it detonated an atomic device, a Seoul diplomatic source said Wednesday.

Unlike its first and second nuclear tests, North Korea didn't notify China first, but instead sent the notification to the three nations simultaneously Monday night.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"North Korea simultaneously informed the U.S., China and Russia of its plan to carry out a nuclear test as of around 9:20 p.m. on Monday," the source said on the condition of anonymity.

The U.S. relayed the North's notification to South Korea at around 10:00 p.m. on Monday, the source said.

It was not clear whether the North's notification cited any specific timing for the nuclear test.

North Korea conducted the underground nuclear test at 11:57 a.m. on Tuesday, drawing international condemnations that will likely present major security challenges for South Korea's incoming President Park Geun-hye and U.S. President Barack Obama.

The North's test came on the eve of Obama's State of the Union address.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/02/13/4/0401000000AEN20130213010800315F.HTML>

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

AsiaOne News – Singapore

China Detects No Raised Radiation from North Korea Nuclear Test

By Reuters

Thursday, Feb 14, 2013

SHANGHAI - China has increased radiation monitoring in its northeast following North Korea's nuclear test this week and found no immediate abnormalities, the Environment Ministry said on Thursday.

North Korea conducted its third nuclear test on Tuesday in defiance of UN resolutions, drawing condemnation from around the world, including from China which for years has been the North's only major ally.

China would release radiation data twice a day from the northeastern provinces of Jilin and Liaoning, which border North Korea, the ministry said.

None of more than 150 radiation monitoring stations across China had reported abnormalities as of Wednesday, it added.

China last ramped up its radiation monitoring in 2011 after an earthquake and tsunami destroyed Japan's Fukushima nuclear power plant, triggering fuel-rod meltdowns and radiation leakage in the world's worst nuclear crisis since Chernobyl in 1986.

<http://www.asiaone.com/News/AsiaOne%2BNews/Asia/Story/A1Story20130214-402055.html>

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

Report: North Korea Upgrading Rocket Launch Site

February 15, 2013

The Associated Press (AP)

WASHINGTON--North Korea is upgrading one of its two major missile launch sites, apparently to handle much bigger rockets, and some design features suggest it is getting help from Iran, a U.S. research institute said on Feb. 14.

A successful satellite launch in December and a nuclear test on Feb. 12, both in defiance of U.N. Security Council resolutions, have intensified concern that North Korea is moving toward its goal of building a bomb small enough to be fitted on an intercontinental missile.

An analysis written for 38 North, the website of the U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies, indicates that North Korea has made significant progress since October in constructing a new

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



launch pad and other facilities at Tonghae, on the country's northeast coast. The assessment is based on commercial satellite photos, the latest taken in January.

It says design features, including a flame trench covering that protects large rockets from the hot exhaust gases they emit on takeoff, is similar to one at a launch complex in Semnan, Iran, and hasn't been used by the North before.

The analysis also identifies activity at an older launch pad at Tonghae, last used for a long-range rocket in 2009, but says it's unclear if that indicates preparations for another launch there.

The North's most recent long-range launches--a failed attempt to put a satellite into space atop an Unha-2 rocket in April, then a successful effort in December--were conducted at a newer site, Sohae, on the west coast.

38 North estimates that construction at Tonghae's new launch pad could be completed by 2016. It says tanks installed last fall in support buildings that would be used to store fuel propellant prior to a launch would be big enough for rockets three or four times larger than the Unha.

Assessing the intentions of North Korea's secretive regime and the nation's technical capabilities is notoriously difficult. Analysts doubt the North has yet mastered how to miniaturize a nuclear device to mount on a long-range missile and attain its goal of being able to directly threaten the United States.

"This analysis is just another piece of the puzzle indicating North Korea's intention to field increasingly capable long-range missiles able to carry nuclear warheads," said Joel Wit, a former State Department official and editor of 38 North.

He said it hinted at "the cozy relationship between the North and Iran as both move forward with developing weapons of mass destruction."

U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry on Feb. 13 drew a direct connection between North Korea and Iran, saying both cases demonstrated the need for international resolve against proliferation threats. He did not touch on whether they could be cooperating on missile and nuclear development.

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/korean_peninsula/AJ201302150019

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

Reuters – U.S.

Exclusive: North Korea Tells China of Preparations for Fresh Nuclear Test

By Benjamin Kang Lim

Friday, February 15, 2013

BEIJING (Reuters) - North Korea has told its key ally, China, that it is prepared to stage one or even two more nuclear tests this year in an effort to force the United States into diplomatic talks with Pyongyang, said a source with direct knowledge of the message.

Further tests could also be accompanied this year by another rocket launch, said the source who has direct access to the top levels of government in both Beijing and Pyongyang.

The isolated regime conducted its third nuclear test on Tuesday, drawing global condemnation and a stern warning from the United States that it was a threat and a provocation.

"It's all ready. A fourth and fifth nuclear test and a rocket launch could be conducted soon, possibly this year," the source said, adding that the fourth nuclear test would be much larger than the third at an equivalent of 10 kilotons of TNT.

The tests will be undertaken, the source said, unless Washington holds talks with North Korea and abandons its policy of what Pyongyang sees as attempts at regime change.



North Korea also reiterated its long-standing desire for the United States to sign a final peace agreement with it and establish diplomatic relations, he said. The North remains technically at war with both the United States and South Korea after the Korean war ended in 1953 with a truce.

Initial estimates of this week's test from South Korea's military put its yield at the equivalent of 6-7 kilotons, although a final assessment of yield and what material was used in the explosion may be weeks away.

North Korea's latest test, its third since 2006, prompted warnings from Washington and others that more sanctions would be imposed on the isolated state. The U.N. Security Council has only just tightened sanctions on Pyongyang after it launched a long-range rocket in December.

The North is banned under U.N. sanctions from developing missile or nuclear technology after its 2006 and 2009 nuclear tests.

North Korea worked to ready its nuclear test site, about 100 km (60 miles) from its border with China, throughout last year, according to commercially available satellite imagery. The images show that it may have already prepared for at least one more test, beyond Tuesday's subterranean explosion.

"Based on satellite imagery that showed there were the same activities in two tunnels, they have one tunnel left after the latest test," said Kune Y. Suh, a nuclear engineering professor at Seoul National University in South Korea.

Analysis of satellite imagery released on Friday by specialist North Korea website 38North showed activity at a rocket site that appeared to indicate it was being prepared for an upcoming launch.

NORTH 'NOT AFRAID' OF SANCTIONS

President Barack Obama pledged after this week's nuclear test "to lead the world in taking firm action in response to these threats" and diplomats at the U.N. Security Council have already started discussing potential new sanctions.

The North has said the test this week was a reaction to what it said was "U.S. hostility" following its December rocket launch. Critics say the rocket launch was aimed at developing technology for an intercontinental ballistic missile.

"(North) Korea is not afraid of (further) sanctions," the source said. "It is confident agricultural and economic reforms will boost grain harvests this year, reducing its food reliance on China."

North Korea's isolated and small economy has few links with the outside world apart from China, its major trading partner and sole influential diplomatic ally.

China signed up for sanctions after the 2006 and 2009 nuclear tests and for a U.N. Security Council resolution passed in January to condemn the latest rocket launch. However, Beijing has stopped short of abandoning all support for Pyongyang.

Sanctions have so far not discouraged North Korea from pursuing its nuclear ambitions, analysts said.

"It is like watching the same movie over and over again," said Lee Woo-young, a professor at the University of North Korean Studies in Seoul.

"The idea that stronger sanctions make North Korea stop developing nuclear programs isn't effective in my view."

The source with ties to Beijing and Pyongyang said China would again support U.N. sanctions. He declined to comment on what level of sanctions Beijing would be willing to endorse.

"When China supported U.N. sanctions ... (North) Korea angrily called China a puppet of the United States," he said. "There will be new sanctions which will be harsh. China is likely to agree to it," he said, without elaborating.

He said however that Beijing would not cut food and fuel supplies to North Korea, a measure that it reportedly took after a previous nuclear test.



He said North Korea's actions were a distraction for China's leadership, which was concerned the escalations could inflame public opinion in China and hasten military build-ups in the region.

The source said that he saw little room for compromise under North Korea's youthful new leader, Kim Jong-un. The third Kim to rule North Korea is just 30 years old and took over from his father in December 2011.

He appears to have followed his father, Kim Jong-il, in the "military first" strategy that has pushed North Korea ever closer to a workable nuclear missile at the expense of economic development.

"He is much tougher than his father," the source said.

Writing by David Chance; Editing by Raju Gopalakrishnan and Mark Bendeich.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/15/us-korea-north-nuclear-idUSBRE91E0J820130215>

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

The Indian Express – India

Pakistan Successfully Test Fires Nuclear-Capable Hatf-IX Missile

By Press Trust of India (PTI)

ISLAMABAD, Monday, February 11, 2013

Pakistan today successfully tested the nuclear-capable Hatf-IX tactical missile with a range of 60 km, designed to defeat all known anti-tactical missile defence systems.

The test consisted of "successive launches of two missiles from a state-of-the-art multi-tube launcher", the military said in a statement describing the test of the short range surface-to-surface missile as successful.

The Hatf-IX or Nasr, which has "inflight manoeuvre capability", can carry "nuclear warheads of appropriate yield with high accuracy".

"This quick response system, which can fire a four missile salvo, ensures deterrence against threats in view of evolving scenarios. Additionally Nasr has been specially designed to defeat all known anti-tactical missile defence systems," the statement said.

The test was witnessed by Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee Chairman Gen Khalid Shameem Wynne, Strategic Plans Division chief Lt Gen (retired) Khalid Ahmed Kidwai, Army Strategic Forces Command chief Lt Gen Triq Nadeem Gilani, senior officers from the armed forces and scientists and engineers of strategic organisations.

The statement did not say where the test was conducted. Addressing scientists and military officers of strategic organisations, Wynne congratulated them for a high standard of proficiency in operating the Nasr weapon system.

He said the armed forces were "fully capable of safeguarding Pakistan's security against all kinds of aggression". The successful test was appreciated by the President and Prime Minister, who congratulated the scientists and engineers.

The first test of the Hatf-IX was conducted in April 2011. At that time, experts and analysts said the short-range nuclear-capable missile was primarily aimed at deterring India's Cold Start military doctrine, which envisages quick thrusts by small integrated battle groups in the event of hostilities.

Experts said the Hatf-IX would be deployed with a mobile multi-barrel launch system that has "shoot and scoot attributes", or the ability to fire at a target and immediately relocate to another position to avoid enemy counter-fire.

<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/pakistan-successfully-test-fires-nuclearcapable-hatfix-missile/1072588/0>

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

Hindustan Times – India



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Pak Successfully Tests N-Capable Hatf-II Missile

Press Trust of India (PTI)

February 15, 2013

ISLAMABAD -- Pakistan on Friday successfully tested the nuclear-capable Hatf-II ballistic missile with a range of 180 km, marking the second test of a missile system in four days as part of measures to evaluate the capabilities of its Strategic Forces.

The test of the Hatf-II or Abdali short range surface-to-surface ballistic missile was part of the "process of validation of land-based ballistic missile systems", the military said in a statement.

It described the test as successful but did not say where it was conducted.

The missile can carry nuclear or conventional warheads with "high accuracy", the statement said.

"The weapon system with its varied manoeuvrability options provides an operational level capability to Pakistan's Strategic Forces," it said.

On February 11, Pakistan tested the nuclear-capable Hatf-IX tactical missile with a range of 60 km.

The military had said the weapon system was specially designed to defeat anti-tactical missile defence systems.

Analysts say the short-range Hatf-IX missile is primarily aimed at deterring India's Cold Start military doctrine, which envisages quick thrusts by small integrated battle groups in the event of hostilities.

Friday's test was witnessed by Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee Chairman Gen Khalid Shameem Wynne, Strategic Plans Division Director General Lt Gen (retired) Khalid Ahmed Kidwai, Army Strategic Forces Command chief Lt Gen Tariq Nadeem Gilani, senior officers from the Strategic Forces and scientists and engineers of strategic organizations.

The President and Prime Minister congratulated the scientists and engineers on the test "which consolidates Pakistan's deterrence capability both at the operational and strategic levels", the statement said.

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/world-news/Pakistan/Pak-successfully-tests-N-capable-Hatf-II-missile/Article1-1012147.aspx>

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

Indian Express – India

Pakistan Owns about 90-110 Nuclear Warheads: Report

Press Trust of India (PTI)

Friday, February 15, 2013

Pakistan's atomic arsenal probably consists of between 90 to 110 nuclear war heads, a latest Congressional report has said, informing the American lawmakers that Islamabad is interested in concluding a nuclear cooperation deal with the US, which would require their approval.

"Pakistan's nuclear arsenal probably consists of approximately 90-110 nuclear warheads, although it could be larger," said the report of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), an independent research wing of the US Congress.

"Islamabad is producing fissile material, adding to related production facilities, and deploying additional delivery vehicles. These steps could enable Pakistan to undertake both quantitative and qualitative improvements to its nuclear arsenal," the report said.

India currently has approximately 60-80 nuclear weapons, it said, referring to one public estimate.

"Whether and to what extent Pakistan's current expansion of its nuclear weapons-related facilities is a response to the 2008 US-India nuclear cooperation agreement is unclear. Islamabad does not have a public, detailed nuclear doctrine,

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 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

but its 'minimum credible deterrent' is widely regarded as designed to dissuade India from taking military action against Pakistan," it said.

"It is worth noting that Pakistani officials have expressed interest in concluding a nuclear cooperation agreement with the United States, which would require congressional approval," said the report titled 'Pakistan's Nuclear Weapons: Proliferation and Security Issues'.

Noting that Pakistan has in recent years taken a number of steps to increase international confidence in the security of its nuclear arsenal, the report however said instability in Pakistan has called the extent and durability of these reforms into question.

"Some observers fear radical takeover of a government that possesses a nuclear bomb, or proliferation by radical sympathizers within Pakistan's nuclear complex in case of a breakdown of controls. While US and Pakistani officials continue to express confidence in controls over Pakistan's nuclear weapons, continued instability in the country could impact these safeguards," it said.

Observing that Pakistan appears to be increasing its fissile production capability and improving its delivery vehicles in order to hedge against possible increases in India's nuclear arsenal, the CRS report said Islamabad may also accelerate its current nuclear weapons efforts.

The Congressional report running into nearly 30 pages informs lawmakers that in addition to making qualitative and quantitative improvements to its nuclear arsenal, Pakistan could increase the number of circumstances under which it would be willing to use nuclear weapons.

"For example, Peter Lavoy has argued that India's efforts to improve its conventional military capabilities could enable New Delhi to achieve technical superiority in intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, as well as precision targeting, providing India with the capability to effectively locate and efficiently destroy strategically important targets in Pakistan," it said.

"Islamabad could respond by lowering the threshold for using nuclear weapons, according to Lavoy. Indeed, a Pakistan Foreign Ministry spokesperson warned in May 2009 that Islamabad could take this step... The Pakistani government may also consider fielding non-strategic nuclear weapons in order to increase the credibility of its nuclear deterrent versus Indian conventional military operations," the CRS report said.

According to the report, Pakistan has two types of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons: aircraft controlled by the Pakistan Air Force and surface-to-surface missiles controlled by the Pakistan Army.

"Pakistan could deliver its nuclear weapons using F-16 fighter aircraft purchased from the United States, provided that modifications are made. It is widely believed that Islamabad has made the relevant modifications to the F-16s previously sold to them by Washington, it added.

<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/pakistan-owns-about-90110-nuclear-warheads-report/1074764/0>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency
Russian Press - Behind the Headlines, February 11
11 February 2013
Kommersant

Washington's New Arms Cuts Proposals for Moscow

Washington will propose further nuclear weapons cuts to Moscow, Kommersant has learned. This will be the subject of a visit to Russia beginning tomorrow by US Assistant Secretary of State Rose Gottemoeller. The White House believes the two countries can scrap half of their warheads without any harm to their security. According to Kommersant, the

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



US delegation will try to persuade Moscow that the new cuts will help the US and Russia each save up to \$8 billion every year.

The new proposal stems from a report by the State Department, the Pentagon, the National Security Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the intelligence services and the US Strategic Command. The secret memorandum specifies a new list of targets for US strategic forces. The country's nuclear arsenal has been halved since 2000, while the number of potential US opponents has also declined.

Iraq and Syria are no longer among the targets. A nuclear strike at Baghdad is no longer needed, nor is Syria seen as a nuclear target now that the civil war has weakened Bashar al-Assad's regime.

Facilities in Russia, China, North Korea and Iran remain on the list of potential targets for US strategic forces. Until recently a first strike had the purpose of destroying a country's leadership and inflicting "undiminished damage" on its armed forces. Now, experts believe, the missiles could be re-targeted at economic and military facilities. According to analysts, the number of Russian ballistic missiles on combat duty is unlikely to be more than 230 now.

Washington believes that under the latest scenario 1,000 to 1,100 warheads are adequate. But the recent New START agreement actually allows Russia and the US to keep a larger inventory of nuclear weapons. The treaty says each country must have only 1,550 warheads on combat duty by 2018. However, the counting rules allow this number to be as high as 1,900.

Nor does the treaty limit the number of short- and intermediate-range warheads or warheads in storage. According to the Federation of American Scientists, the US has 2,700 such units, Russia almost the same: 2,680.

The Pentagon considers these numbers to be too high. James Kowalski, head of Global Strike Command, has called for reducing the number of strategic warheads on combat duty below the 1,500 limit. Such a cut could almost halve the total American nuclear arsenal – down to 2,500 warheads. That could lead to considerable savings: cancelling the construction of at least two Trident-class submarines would save \$16 billion, and the dismantling of one ground-based strategic missile command would cut US spending by \$360 million a year.

The details of the report are not being revealed. Nevertheless, the heads of key departments have already backed the new strategy. President Obama also supports these conclusions. A plan for the further reduction of the nuclear arsenal could be made public within the next few weeks. Such an agreement could be framed as a supplement to the START Treaty or as a protocol of intent.

<http://en.rian.ru/papers/20130211/179402554/Russian-Press---Behind-the-Headlines-February-11.html>

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

The Hindu – India
February 15, 2013

No Arms Cut Till New START: Russia

By Vladimir Radyuhin

MOSCOW -- Russia has poured cold water on U.S. President Barack Obama's pledge to pursue new cuts in the U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals even as it voiced its readiness to study American proposals.

Moscow made it clear that it would say 'no' Washington's proposal to slash nuclear weapons by 60 per cent, from the current goal of 1,550 deployed warheads by 2018 — outlined in the New START the two countries signed in 2010.

After Mr. Obama announced in his State of the Union Address on Tuesday that the U.S. would "engage Russia to seek further reductions in our nuclear arsenals", White House officials said they were looking to cut deployed nuclear weapons to "just above 1,000".

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 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

However, a spokesman for the Russian Foreign Ministry said that Moscow will not agree to further nuclear arms reductions with the U.S. until the two countries have “fully implemented” the New START and unless Washington shifts its stance on missile defence, nuclear tests, weaponisation of outer space, and conventional arms in Europe.

“Once the [New START] Treaty has been implemented, we would be ready to discuss possible further steps in the sphere of nuclear disarmament,” Foreign Ministry spokesman Alexander Lukashevich said in comments posted on the Ministry’s website on Thursday. “In doing that, we will take into consideration all factors affecting strategic stability, including plans for the deployment of a U.S. global missile defence, lack of progress in ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty by the U.S. and 44 more countries..., unwillingness to renounce the deployment of weapons in space, imbalances in the quantity and quality of conventional weapons in Europe and other factors.”

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/world/no-arms-cut-till-new-start-russia/article4415836.ece>

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

Atlanta Journal-Constitution
Saturday, February 9, 2013

Flaws Found in US Missile Shield

By DESMOND BUTLER, Associated Press (AP)

WASHINGTON — Secret Defense Department studies cast doubt on whether a multibillion-dollar missile defense system planned for Europe can ever protect the U.S. from Iranian missiles as intended, congressional investigators say.

Military officials say they believe they can overcome the problems and are moving forward with plans. But proposed fixes could prove difficult. One possibility has been ruled out as technically unfeasible. A second, relocating missile interceptors planned for Poland and possibly Romania to ships on the North Sea, could be diplomatically troublesome.

The studies are the latest to highlight serious problems for a plan that has been criticized on several fronts.

Republicans claim it was developed hastily in an attempt to appease Russia, which had opposed an earlier system. But Russia is also critical of the plan, which it believes is really intended to counter its missiles. A series of governmental and scientific reports has raised questions about whether it would ever work as planned.

At a time that the military faces giant budget cuts, the studies could lead Congress to reconsider whether it is worthwhile to spend billions for a system that may not fulfill its original goals.

The classified studies were summarized in a briefing for lawmakers by the Government Accountability Office, Congress’ nonpartisan investigative and auditing arm, which is preparing a report. The GAO briefing, which was not classified, was obtained by The Associated Press.

Military officials declined repeated requests to discuss the studies on the record, noting they were classified. Even speaking on condition of anonymity, officials declined to say whether the GAO accurately had reported its conclusions. But the briefing had been reviewed by several Defense Department officials and the revisions they requested were incorporated. There was no indication they had objected to how the studies had been described.

The officials who spoke to the AP emphasized that the interceptor intended to protect the United States is in the early stages of development and its capabilities are not known. They said that the U.S. is already protected by other missile defense systems. Even if European-based interceptors are unable to directly defend the United States, they say they would protect not only European allies and U.S. troops stationed on the continent, but also U.S. radars there that are necessary for all U.S. missile defense plans.

Missile defense has been a contentious issue since President George W. Bush sought to base long-range interceptors in Central Europe to stop missiles from Iran. Some Democrats criticized the plans, saying they were rushed and based on

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



unproven technology. Russia believed the program was aimed at countering its missiles and undermining its nuclear deterrent.

It might seem logical for the U.S. to want to have a defense against Russian missiles, but it's not that simple.

A new missile defense system aimed at Russia could undermine the balance between the nuclear powers, leading Moscow to add to its arsenal and build up its own defenses. It would undermine prospects for further cuts in nuclear weapons, which are a priority for President Barack Obama, and could hurt U.S.-Russian cooperation on other issues of international importance.

Obama reworked the plans soon after taking office in 2009, saying the threat from long-range Iranian missiles was years off. His plans called for slower interceptors that could address Iran's medium-range missiles. The interceptors would be upgraded gradually over four phases, culminating early next decade with those intended to protect both Europe and the United States.

The plans have gained momentum in Europe with the signing of basing agreements in Poland, Romania and Turkey, as well as backing by NATO.

Russia initially welcomed the plan, but now strongly opposes it, especially the interceptors in the final stage. Russia fears those interceptors could catch its intercontinental missiles launched at the U.S.

It is that fourth stage that is now at issue.

The GAO investigators said that the classified reports by the Missile Defense Agency concluded that Romania was a poor location for an interceptor to protect the U.S. It said the Polish site would work only if the U.S. developed capabilities to launch interceptors while an Iranian missile was in its short initial phase of powered flight.

But the administration is not pursuing that capability because it does not believe it is feasible, according to one senior defense official.

The military has considered deploying interceptors on ships, but the Navy has safety concerns that have not yet been resolved. The suggestion of attempting intercepts from ships on the North Sea probably would aggravate tensions with Russia. That could put it right in the path that some Russian ICBMs would use, further reinforcing Russia's belief that it, not Iran, is the target of the system.

The GAO investigators also took the administration to task for not conducting studies earlier that could have revealed the problems. Reports by the GAO and scientific bodies advising the government have raised other concerns about the missile shield, citing production glitches, cost overruns, problems with radars and sensors that cannot distinguish between warheads and other objects.

One report by the National Academy of Sciences recommended canceling the fourth phase of the system and deploying the interceptors to the East Coast.

The GAO study was requested by Rep. Michael Turner, R-Ohio, who until recently led a panel that oversees missile defense. He said he is concerned that the interceptor in development might be useless in protecting the United States.

"This report really confirms what I have said all along: that this was a hurried proposal by the president," he said.

<http://www.ajc.com/ap/ap/top-news/apnewsbreak-flaws-found-in-missile-shield/nWKgj/>

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

Philadelphia Inquirer

Sources: U.S. Bending on Nukes

February 10, 2013

By R. Jeffrey Smith, *McClatchy Tribune*



WASHINGTON - Senior Obama administration officials have agreed that the number of nuclear warheads the U.S. military deploys could be cut by at least a third without harming national security, according to those involved in the deliberations.

Such a reduction would open the door to billions of dollars in savings, which might ease the federal budget deficit. It also would improve prospects for a new arms deal with Russia before President Obama leaves office, those involved said, but it's likely to draw fire from conservatives.

The results of the internal review have not been announced, but they are reflected in a proposed classified directive prepared for Obama's signature that details how U.S. nuclear weapons should be targeted against potential foes, according to four people with direct knowledge of the document's content. The sources, who spoke only on the condition of anonymity, described the president as fully on board, but said he hasn't signed the document.

The document directs the first detailed Pentagon revisions in U.S. targeting since 2009, when the military's nuclear war planners last took account for the substantial shrinkage - roughly by half from 2000 to 2008 - in the number of nuclear weapons in the American arsenal. It makes clear that an even smaller nuclear force can still meet all defense requirements.

The officials said Obama's advisers had reached their consensus position last year, after a review that included the State Department, the Defense Department, the National Security Council, the intelligence community, the U.S. Strategic Command, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the office of Vice President Biden.

Participants said the results were not disclosed at the time, partly because of concerns that any resulting controversy might affect Obama's reelection hopes. Some Republican lawmakers have said they oppose cutting the arsenal out of concern that it might diminish America's standing in the world.

Under the new policy, the United States would target fewer, but more important, military or political sites in Russia, China, and several other countries.

Obama first adopted a policy to reduce the role of nuclear weapons in 2010, explaining in a Defense Department report that they are "poorly suited to address the challenges posed by suicidal terrorists and unfriendly regimes seeking nuclear weapons."

Much of the policy has yet to be implemented, but with the election behind him and a new national security team selected, Obama finally is prepared to send this new guidance to the Joint Chiefs of Staff and to open a new dialogue with Russia about corresponding reductions in deployed weapons, according to two senior U.S. officials involved in the deliberations.

http://articles.philly.com/2013-02-10/news/37009342_1_nuclear-weapons-smaller-nuclear-force-vice-president-biden

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Options Open for Obama to Slash Nukes

11 February 2013

By Carl Schreck for RIA Novosti

WASHINGTON, February 11 – As commander-in-chief of the US armed forces, President Barack Obama has the power to act unilaterally to drastically slash Washington's deployed nuclear arsenal—an initiative he reportedly hopes to explore with Russian President Vladimir Putin and is planning to address in his State of the Union speech Tuesday.

"If he has a thousand B-52s in his inventory and he decides the Air Force doesn't need that many, he can say, 'Let's scrap half of them,'" Thomas Graham, a former top US arms negotiator, told RIA Novosti on Monday. "He can do the same thing with nuclear weapons. ... The important thing is that his opposite number in Moscow does the same thing."

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



Senior officials in the Obama administration believe Washington could cut the number of nuclear warheads it deploys by more than a third while still protecting its national interests, according to a report last week by the Center for Public Integrity (CPI), a Washington-based nonprofit specializing in investigative journalism.

White House officials are pushing for a reduction to between 1,000 and 1,100 strategic nuclear warheads, according to the CPI and a report Monday in the *New York Times*, which said Obama plans to address further nuclear reductions Tuesday in his State of the Union speech to the US Congress.

Those cuts would be even deeper than the some 1,550 deployed warheads allowed by the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) that Obama and former Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed in 2010.

Rather than forging a new treaty or amending the New START deal—both of which would require ratification by the US Senate—Obama is mulling a possible informal agreement with Putin to implement the proposed reductions, the *New York Times* reported.

Such a “mutual unilateral” agreement on nuclear weapons between Washington and Moscow has a precedent in the 1991 reciprocal withdrawal of thousands of warheads by President George H.W. Bush and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, said Graham.

“What Obama is proposing to do is something very similar, but under the umbrella of the New START treaty,” said Graham, who worked as a negotiator on numerous US-Soviet arms-control treaties.

There are risks to sidestepping the US Congress when it comes to nuclear reduction efforts, arms control experts said Monday.

“It might be reversed by the next president, either in the United States or in Russia,” William Tobey, former director of counter-proliferation strategy at the White House Security Council under President George W. Bush.

Forging a bilateral treaty with Russia to pursue cuts beyond those mandated by the New START deal would help shield the reduction efforts from future shifts in the political winds, said Tobey, a senior fellow at Harvard University’s Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs.

But securing the needed number of votes could prove difficult for Obama given Republican lawmakers’ considerable resistance to his push for the New START reductions, which the US Senate ultimately approved in a 71-26 vote.

“I think the administration was surprised at how tough it was to get New START ratified,” Steven Pifer, director of the arms control initiative at the Brookings Institution, told RIA Novosti on Monday.

An informal agreement would not be legally binding for either nation, “but if both sides were determined to do it, then that might not be a significant problem,” said Tobey, who participated in START talks with the Soviet Union and in the so-called “Six Party Talks” with North Korea.

If the United States and Russia were to strike such an informal deal, the verification mechanisms in place under the New START agreement could be used to ensure both sides were sticking to their commitment to the additional cuts, said Pifer, a former US ambassador to Ukraine.

Under the New START provisions, the United States and Russia must reduce their respective arsenals to 1,550 deployed warheads by 2018.

Graham, the former top US arms control negotiator, noted that the current talk of reductions only concerns deployment—not whether the removed weapons are going to be retired or eliminated completely.

If the weapons are simply withdrawn under an informal agreement, future leaders in Washington and Moscow—or Obama and Putin themselves—could simply deploy them again unilaterally, Graham said.

“If they both agree to eliminate those additional weapons, then of course they’d have to make new ones,” he said. “But that would take longer.”



http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130212/179415936/Options-Open-for-Obama-to-Slash-Nukes-----.html

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

Washington Free Beacon

Pentagon Assessing Nork Threat

Pentagon conducting urgent assessment of North Korean mobile ICBM threat

By Bill Gertz

February 12, 2013

The Pentagon's Joint Staff is conducting an urgent threat assessment of North Korea's new road-mobile missile and the danger it poses to the United States.

The classified assessment is being done for Gen. Martin Dempsey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on an expedited basis, said defense officials familiar with the effort.

"This is an expedited examination of the North Korean ICBM threat specifically for the chairman," one official said.

A Joint Staff spokesman declined to comment on the North Korean ICBM assessment.

Disclosure of the urgent threat assessment from nuclear-armed North Korea comes as President Barack Obama is expected to announce Tuesday night that he plans to cut an additional one-third of the warheads from the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

The Pentagon plans to cut its nuclear warheads to 1,550 warheads under the 2010 New START arms treaty with Russia. An additional cut of a third of those warheads would bring the U.S. warhead arsenal to around 1,000.

Nuclear deterrence specialists have said cutting warheads below New START levels would undermine strategic deterrence and spur nations that rely on U.S. nuclear weapons to seek their own nuclear arms.

The Joint Staff assessment was ordered following recent intelligence reports indicating development work on the North Korean KN-08 mobile ICBM is nearing completion. Several KN-08s were spotted moving around North Korea in January.

The assessment is also expected to address whether North Korea will share the mobile ICBM technology with Iran. North Korea in the past has sold and shared its ballistic missile technology with Tehran, including the medium-range Nodong that Iran calls the Shahab-3.

The study is expected to impact the Obama administration's plans for U.S. missile defenses.

Currently, the Pentagon operates a limited missile defense system designed to counter a small number of long-range North Korean missiles with 30 interceptors based in Alaska and California.

The Obama administration opposes expansion of long-range ground based interceptors in favor of its European-based missile defenses that call for developing an enhanced version of the Navy SM-3 interceptor that can knock out ICBMs.

A recent Government Accountability Office report on missile defense found problems with the Pentagon's plan to deploy the SM-3 Block IIB for use against ICBMs by 2020.

Some officials said there were indications North Korea could test a KN-08 or the medium-range Musudan around the time of its nuclear test.

U.S. intelligence agencies are closely watching North Korea for signs of a missile test, officials said.

The Joint Staff study was underway prior to North Korea's third underground nuclear test Tuesday, which Pyongyang claimed was a major step toward developing a small nuclear warhead for its missiles.

The KN-08 ICBM was first disclosed in April 2012 during a military parade.



Officials said it represents a new level of threat to the United States because although it has yet to be flight-tested, U.S. intelligence agencies believe it will be able to range Alaska, Hawaii, and the western United States.

North Korea's other long-range missile is the static-launched Taepodong-2 ICBM. Pyongyang also has developed an intermediate-range nuclear missile called the Musudan, based on a Soviet-designed ICBM.

U.S. officials regard the Taepodong-2 as vulnerable to preemptive attack because of the relatively long times required for set up and launch.

The U.S. military regards road-mobile ICBMs like the KN-08 as a much greater threat because the missiles can be moved easily, hidden in garages, and launched with little or no warning.

A 2010 U.S. intelligence assessment of North Korea's missile programs, disclosed in a leaked State Department cable, revealed that North Korea was developing ICBMs in three paths, including using the Taepodong-2; further developing its intermediate-range missile; and "use the very large launch facility that is being constructed on the west coast of North Korea to launch a very large missile."

U.S. officials said the new launch site is believed to be where the new KN-08 is being developed.

According to the 2010 cable, the United States said the new North Korean missile facility is "of concern."

"It does not simply replicate other sites," the cable said. "This facility is much larger than the Taepodong launch facility. This is not to say there is evidence of a new missile system larger than the Taepodong-2 being developed, but it suggests the possibility."

A second cable from 2009 said North Korea's new Musudan medium-range missile is a solid-fueled, road mobile system. The cable said "the pursuit of longer-range systems remains a DRPK priority." DRPK is short for Democratic People's Republic of Korea, North Korea's formal name.

"North Korea's next goal may be to develop a mobile ICBM that would be capable of threatening targets around the world, without requiring the lengthy—and potentially vulnerable—launch preparation time required by the TD-2," the cable said.

Missile and nuclear specialists outside the government on Tuesday debated whether North Korea's boast about having a miniaturized nuclear weapon that could fit on a missile is accurate.

David Albright, a nuclear specialist with the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), said if the miniaturized nuclear device is confirmed, "it should not be a surprise."

"It should not come as a surprise to the international community that North Korea may now have the capability to explode a miniaturized nuclear device," Albright said in an analysis coauthored with Andrea Stricker. "ISIS and key members of the U.S. intelligence community have assessed for some time that North Korea likely has the capability to miniaturize a nuclear weapon for its 800 mile range Nodong missile."

Albright and Stricker said more information is needed to make a better assessment, but the organization believes North Korea lacks the ability to deploy a nuclear warhead on an ICBM.

Former CIA officer Fred Fleitz, who once worked for the agency's Weapons Intelligence Non-Proliferation and Arms Control Center, said he is skeptical of North Korea's claim to have miniaturized a warhead.

"The test may have been a step toward miniaturization and may have been slightly smaller than past devices," said Fleitz, now with the private Langley Intelligence Group Network (LIGNET). "But the North Koreans are a long way from building a small warhead that could fit on an ICBM capable of hitting the United States."

"North Korea's third nuclear test, particularly if it was successful in testing a 'miniaturized' device, may represent a significant upgrade in its nuclear weapons program," a LIGNET assessment stated. "Miniaturization is critical to mate a nuclear warhead to a delivery system such as a ballistic missile."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"However, confirming whether North Korea actually tested a miniaturized nuclear device is impossible unless it allows outside experts to examine one of these devices or their nuclear plans," the assessment said. "Going from a crude nuclear device, which would be large and heavy, to a miniaturized one is a huge technical leap, requiring major advances in nuclear science and metallurgy."

<http://freebeacon.com/pentagon-assessing-nork-threat/>

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

Air Force Magazine

February 2013, Vol. 96, No. 2

Sharpening the Nuclear Sword

Air Force Global Strike Command's bombers and missile forces are at an increasing level of readiness.

By Aaron M. U. Church, Associate Editor

Three years ago, USAF stood up Air Force Global Strike Command at Barksdale AFB, La., with the goal of revitalizing the service's nuclear enterprise, to ensure USAF's two legs of the nuclear triad are a safe, secure, and effective deterrent force, ready at all times.

Since then, the measurable readiness of USAF's intercontinental ballistic missile and nuclear bomber force has increased by 30 percent, according to AFGSC boss Lt. Gen. James M. Kowalski.

"A lot of what we've seen in improving our readiness has simply been the result of the Air Force reorganizing itself" and changing its cultural attitude, said Kowalski. "All of our airmen understand and embrace the special trust and responsibility of nuclear weapons." This is "foundational" to the ongoing renewal, he said in an interview.

Within Global Strike Command, two numbered air forces assure the day-to-day readiness of nuclear forces: 8th Air Force at Barksdale and 20th Air Force at F. E. Warren AFB, Wyo. They organize, train, and equip combat-ready nuclear forces for US Strategic Command. The ICBMs under the 20th are tasked to STRATCOM around the clock, while 8th Air Force's bombers serve both conventional and nuclear missions.

"To be clear, employment does not mean creating high-yield nuclear detonation," said Maj. Gen. Michael J. Carey, 20th Air Force commander. "It means the operation, maintenance, sustainment, and assured readiness of those forces, 24/7/365" to convincingly dissuade potential enemies from attacking.

To determine the combat readiness of its nuclear force, AFGSC considers weapons, personnel, and command and control. The Minuteman III system, for example, "is made up of the hardware—the missile itself—the men and women conducting the mission, and then the command and control elements that enable its proper use," Carey explained.

STRATCOM's entire nuclear command and control network exercises three times each day, from the national command level at the Pentagon all the way down to fielded ICBM forces scattered across the western United States. Coded messages pass to each launch control center (LCC) controlling all 450 of the Air Force's deployed ICBMs, and the responses are evaluated back up the chain of command.

Test, Test, and Test Again

In addition to the daily test of the "deployed" ICBMs, both bomber and missile forces take part in periodic strategic-level communications exercises to validate their deployment and strike protocols. In fact, evaluators have stitched together "no less than half-a-dozen types of tests, exercises, and readiness demonstrations" to make certain "our force is ready all the time," Carey said in an interview.

The sheer number of interdependent components, and the fact that ICBMs are on constant alert, makes missile force readiness by far the most complex mission.

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



In terms of physical components, the bomber weapon system comprises aircraft, air launched cruise missiles, or nuclear free-fall bombs, and the data links to relay and authenticate orders.

For ICBMs, in addition to the missile itself, there is the command and control network, the LCC, and the electrical interface joining the LCC to geographically separate launch sites.

On top of the terrestrial network, there's an airborne component. Alternately, Airborne Launch Control System E-4Bs or Navy E-6B aircraft can control ICBM launches, and this element must be validated as well. As a result, AFGSC must "isolate elements of the test program," then piece them together to "gain confidence that each segment of the force is viable and ready" as a matter of pragmatism, said Carey.

Yearly Tests

Three times a year, the Air Force selects a single operational Minuteman III for an operational test launch over the Pacific Ocean. Since launching ICBMs from their deployed locations across the High Plains would scatter "tankage" debris over Canada—and perhaps panic friends and adversaries alike—live shots take place only from Vandenberg AFB, Calif.

To conduct such a test, operational missiles are pulled directly from their silos near Malmstrom AFB, Mont., Minot AFB, N.D., or F. E. Warren and transported to Vandenberg.

"It's a random selection of missile so that we can get a realistic cross-cut of the deployed missile force," as opposed to cherry-picking a missile that may not reflect the fielded force, Carey said.

For several years, Air Force Space Command testers with the 576th Flight Test Squadron handled all the assembly, preparation, and launching from Vandenberg. Now, underscoring AFGSC's intense operational focus, missileers and maintainers from each missile wing conduct a test shot each year. The LCC capsule underground at Vandenberg has the same equipment the missileers have in their own system, again, to underscore continuity.

During the most recent shot from Vandenberg on Nov. 14, a 341st Missile Wing crew from Malmstrom conducted the "key turn"—turning four switches at essentially the same time to launch a missile—in this instance, from a Navy E-6B Mercury airborne command post aircraft. For purposes of the test, the ICBM was fitted with an inert re-entry vehicle, replicating the flight characteristics of a nuclear payload. The missile was then launched on a ballistic trajectory positioning the re-entry vehicle for splashdown at a predetermined point some 4,200 miles away, at the Kwajalein Atoll range in the Marshall Islands.

Processes are the same at Vandenberg, so everything is tested: the "fly-out" hardware, the re-entry system, how the re-entry vehicle performs, plus the control interface.

Similar test activity happens in the bomber force during weapon evaluations, added 8th Air Force commander Maj. Gen. Stephen W. Wilson. Weapon testers regularly perform an "end-to-end test" of the B-52's nuclear ALCMs, including live shots of unarmed missiles over the test range, he said. The tiny nuclear capable B-2 stealth bomber fleet can also deliver air-dropped bombs, but does not fire the ALCM.

Though most tests go off as planned, occasionally there are surprises. In July 2011, testers at Vandenberg terminated a shot in midflight over the Pacific due to an unexplained anomaly. For both the Minuteman III and the ALCM, "one of the key reasons we fly those weapons out is so that we can do what we call an aging and surveillance program," said Carey. With Minuteman, the data gleaned from test shots allows the Air Force to "see how all the components in a weapon system that was deployed in the '70s are performing" and make improvements and replacements as needed.

"What we observed as we did test launches was that certain components age out at different rates," Carey said. "As technology evolves, we can find appropriate points to integrate new technology and upgrade our capabilities."

Keeping the Force Viable

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



A service life extension program now under way will extend the reliability of the 1980s-era ALCM until its replacement enters service, circa 2030. The primary focus is on the guidance, control, propulsion, and arming systems.

With the test data, Minuteman too has had a makeover that should keep it viable until 2020. "That's not to say that we don't have our own issues with components and subcomponents that still need attention," Carey confessed, but the missiles now have fresh propellant and upgraded guidance. The original warheads have also been swapped for more modern ones recycled from retired Peacekeeper ICBMs.

Since fly-out launches from Vandenberg don't test the operational infrastructure, AFGSC's missile wings conduct full-up dry runs known as Simulated Electronic Launch-Minuteman at their home bases.

Under normal circumstances, LCCs are interlinked to assure continuous control of each ICBM, even if one LCC goes offline. During SELMs, "we electronically isolate a select number of missiles and then run both the crews and the support systems through all their paces," said Carey. SELMs prove that the actual fielded systems are ready and that "the entire weapon system would function reliably" should the President ever order a launch.

The final piece of the puzzle is personnel: the bomber and missile combat crews actually performing the mission.

"We train, evaluate, and assess the readiness of our personnel both with written tests and practical evaluations, and then in-field evaluations" on a daily basis, Carey stated. Missile combat crews are constantly being quizzed on knowledge, protocol, and procedures. From an institutional perspective, though, the dual-tasking bomber force probably faces the most challenges with personnel readiness.

Turning Things Around

"Training missions are nuclear-focused on one day, then the next day we may be turning around and going to a Red Flag exercise" in the conventional role, said Wilson. The B-52 wings at Barksdale and Minot—and previously the B-2s at Whiteman AFB, Mo.—also rotate on six-month deployments to the Pacific. During continuous bomber presence stints at Andersen AFB, Guam, the crews exercise with joint forces under US Pacific Command and allies from Australia to South Korea, but the "primary focus is on conventional," Wilson explained. The crews must still maintain proficiency in nuclear procedures, though, and are routinely tested during deployments as they would be at home base.

"We put into place a number of nuclear modules to make sure that they don't have a big spin-up time when they get back," Kowalski said, noting that the really tenuous balance actually concerns the flying hours.

Aircrews get just enough flight time to stay proficient and ready for both missions, said Kowalski. Since AFGSC stood up, the swing role bombers have focused more on the nuclear mission—so far, without blunting their conventional skill. With readiness demands from regional combatant commanders and STRATCOM holding constant and budget cuts looming, the command is keen to guard the bombers' hard-won readiness across the mission spectrum.

"I would be very uncomfortable to take any further cuts in flying hours," Kowalski cautioned.

From the command level down, "we really do get it, and we're strengthening the legs that we control ... to make them the most realistic and relevant deterrent out there," Wilson said. One of the biggest cultural changes AFGSC instituted has been to increase the accountability of squadron leaders for unit readiness. The command has also gone to great lengths to open communication and provide leaders with what they need to achieve requirements, according to Kowalski.

"We were very relentless in getting to the root cause of readiness reporting and making certain that the squadron commanders—that basic fighting level of the Air Force—were personally involved," he said. "If it was something in their control, they were certainly going to be held accountable for it," and he credits this shift as probably the biggest reason for the marked improvement under AFGSC.

Under a single dedicated command, squadron level readiness has improved, thanks to the command's ability to shift manpower, funds, and equipment between units as needed. "If we had a unit reporting less than fully ready, ... we can do some movement of things to bring everybody up to the same level," Kowalski pointed out.



Emblematic of the command's push to return to a combat-ready operational focus is the new consolidated unit inspection, or CUI. This initiative began in 2007 as part of the nuclear enterprise inspection system's reinvention, and it took hold across the service.

Units had spent so much time preparing for and undergoing inspections that training and operations were disrupted and curtailed. Instead, leaders proposed bundling all the inspections into a single event every two years. The resulting inspection regime gives units more time to focus on the mission.

"By trying to put a little bit more time in the schedule, we're hoping to improve that training long-term and the maturity and experience of our folks going forward," explained Kowalski. AFGSC conducted its first CUIs of a bomb wing in 2011 at Barksdale and a missile wing in 2012 at F. E. Warren, with positive initial reviews from both.

No Falls or Slips

After three years of focused attention, most of the easily fixed readiness problems have been resolved through concerted effort. The remaining challenges present more-difficult issues, such as maturing personnel or stocking adequate spare parts to meet requirements.

Kowalski said AFGSC has identified a need for experienced personnel. It is "just going to take us some time to grow those people and get them in place, but we think we're on the right track," he said.

In terms of procuring "high dollar items that need to be on shelves, ... we're just bumping up against fiscal realities" of a tightening defense budget, he admitted. "Pretty much all of the low-hanging fruit has been picked. ... The problems are a little bit tougher now in terms of why we wouldn't be achieving the highest levels of readiness."

With the New START agreement and presidential initiative to reduce the US nuclear arsenal, AFGSC will almost certainly "take some reductions" in force structure in the next few years, Kowalski acknowledged. As a result, the readiness of each airman, bomber, and ICBM in the inventory will count that much more.

"However you imagine the force structure being reduced, one of the key things that has to be factored in is readiness and reliability. It's our duty to make sure none of those fall or slip," Carey said.

"We're going to have to think hard about how we do some of our business," said Kowalski. Regardless of the force size, "at the end of the day, this is an essential, foundational mission set, and I think our nation is going to choose to continue to execute it." Even with reductions and shrinking budgets, nothing on the horizon jeopardizes Air Force Global Strike Command's "special trust and responsibility" to mount a ready and effective nuclear deterrent US citizens can rely on, he asserted.

<http://www.airforce-magazine.com/MagazineArchive/Pages/2013/February%202013/0213nuclear.aspx>

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

Washington Post

U.S. Said to be Target of Massive Cyber-Espionage Campaign

By Ellen Nakashima

February 10, 2013

A new intelligence assessment has concluded that the United States is the target of a massive, sustained cyber-espionage campaign that is threatening the country's economic competitiveness, according to individuals familiar with the report.

The National Intelligence Estimate identifies China as the country most aggressively seeking to penetrate the computer systems of American businesses and institutions to gain access to data that could be used for economic gain.

The report, which represents the consensus view of the U.S. intelligence community, describes a wide range of sectors that have been the focus of hacking over the past five years, including energy, finance, information technology,

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



aerospace and automotives, according to the individuals familiar with the report, who spoke on the condition of anonymity about the classified document. The assessment does not quantify the financial impact of the espionage, but outside experts have estimated it in the tens of billions of dollars.

Cyber-espionage, which was once viewed as a concern mainly by U.S. intelligence and the military, is increasingly seen as a direct threat to the nation's economic interests.

In a sign of such concerns, the Obama administration is seeking ways to counter the online theft of trade secrets, according to officials. Analysts have said that the administration's options include formal protests, the expulsion of diplomatic personnel, the imposition of travel and visa restrictions, and complaints to the World Trade Organization.

Cyber-espionage is "just so widespread that it's known to be a national issue at this point," said one administration official, who like other current and former officials interviewed spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss internal deliberations.

The National Intelligence Estimate names three other countries — Russia, Israel and France — as having engaged in hacking for economic intelligence but makes clear that cyber-espionage by those countries pales in comparison with China's effort.

China has staunchly rejected such allegations, saying the Beijing government neither condones nor carries out computer hacking.

Dating to at least the early 1980s, China has made the acquisition of Western technology — through means licit and illicit — a centerpiece of its economic development planning. The explosion in computer use has greatly aided that transfer of technology.

China's intelligence services, as well as private companies, frequently seek to exploit Chinese citizens or people with family ties to China who can use their insider access to U.S. corporate networks to steal trade secrets using thumb drives or e-mail, according to a report by the Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive.

The National Intelligence Estimate comes at a time when the U.S. government is making a concerted effort to develop policies that address cyberthreats against the nation.

"We need the NIE on cyber for a systematic and comprehensive understanding of what the most dangerous technologies are, who are the most threatening actors and what are our greatest vulnerabilities," said former deputy defense secretary William J. Lynn III, who requested the report in 2011 but has not seen or been briefed on the contents.

Some officials have pressed for an unclassified summary to be released publicly. Michael Birmingham, a spokesman for the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, declined to comment on the report, except to say that "as a matter of policy, we do not discuss or acknowledge the existence of NIEs unless directed to do so."

A range of sectors

Much of China's cyber-espionage is thought to be directed at commercial targets linked to military technology. In 2011, when Chinese hackers attacked network security company RSA Security, the technology stolen was used to penetrate military-industrial targets. Shortly after, the networks of defense contracting giant Lockheed Martin, which used RSA security tokens, were penetrated by Chinese hackers. The company said no data were taken.

Companies in other sectors also have been targeted, though the reasons for the espionage are not always related to economic interests. The New York Times, the Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post recently disclosed that they believe their networks were compromised in intrusions that originated in China.

Despite those disclosures and the growing prevalence of cyber-espionage, companies remain reluctant to report incidents.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“It’s harder for companies to suggest that they haven’t been attacked,” the administration official said. “The question is, how do they respond when they are asked about it? Is it in their interest to work with other companies and with the government to alleviate some of the problem?”

A watershed moment came in January 2010, when the tech titan Google announced that its networks had been hacked and that the intrusions originated in China. The intruders made off with valuable source code and targeted the Gmail accounts of Chinese human rights activists and dissidents, the company announced.

In a new book, Google chief executive Eric Schmidt says China is the world’s “most sophisticated and prolific” hacker, adding: “It’s fair to say we’re already living in an age of state-led cyberwar, even if most of us aren’t aware of it.”

Administration’s response

In recognition of the growing problem, the State Department has elevated the issue to be part of its strategic security dialogue with China. Within the past year, the Justice Department has set up a program to train 100 prosecutors to bring cases related to cyber-intrusions sponsored by foreign governments.

In many ways, the moves are a response to what experts have described as the government’s earlier passivity in tackling the problem.

“The problem with foreign cyber-espionage is not that it is an existential threat, but that it is invisible, and invisibility promotes inaction,” a former government official said. The National Intelligence Estimate, he said, “would help remedy that” by detailing the scope of the threat.

Some experts have said that cyber-espionage’s cost to the U.S. economy might range from 0.1 percent to 0.5 percent of gross domestic product, or \$25 billion to \$100 billion. Other economists, while viewing the problem as significant, have pegged the losses lower.

The White House is set to soon release a trade-secrets report, compiled by U.S. Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator Victoria Espinel, that highlights the need for companies to work with the government to stop the pilfering, said officials familiar with the report.

The government cannot mount a case on its own. A company needs to think it was wronged, have enough evidence that can be made public and be willing to burn bridges with the country accused of the hacking, officials said.

The White House is also expected this week to issue an executive order on cybersecurity that calls for voluntary standards for critical private-sector computer systems and for enhanced sharing of threat information by the government with companies to help secure private-sector systems against cyber-intrusions.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-said-to-be-target-of-massive-cyber-espionage-campaign/2013/02/10/7b4687d8-6fc1-11e2-aa58-243de81040ba_story.html

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

Federation of American Scientist (FAS)
OPINION/FAS Strategic Security Blog

Options for Reducing Nuclear Weapons Requirements

February 11, 2013

By Hans M. Kristensen

With the ink barely dry on the New START Treaty, Jeff Smith at the *Center for Public Integrity* reports that the Obama administration has determined that the United States can meet its national and international security requirements with 1,000-1,100 deployed strategic nuclear warheads – 450-550 warheads less than planned under the New START Treaty.

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



The administration is exploring how to get Russian agreement to the reductions without a new treaty, according to the *New York Times*. That would avoid a new agreement being held hostage to conservative Cold Warriors in Congress who fought ratification of the New START Treaty. Their efforts will be complicated by the fact that the U.S. military (and others) backs the reduced force level.

This is great news that reaffirms the administration’s commitment to continuing reducing excessive nuclear force levels. The fact that the new force level ended up closer to 1,000 than 1,200 warheads continues the 30 percent step-by-step reduction trend of the New START Treaty. The new initiative apparently also seeks reductions of non-deployed and non-strategic nuclear weapons, although it is unclear whether this is part of the first phase of the effort.

The lower force level has the potential to save billions of dollars, but how much depends on how the administration decides to implement it.

Reduction Options

The United States could meet the lower force level simply by reducing the warhead loading on ballistic missile submarines but without changing the force structure planned under the New START Treaty (see Table 1, Option 1). This would be a mistake because it would make it hard to convince Russia to join and it would save little money.

A more likely option would be to combine an ICBM reduction with a smaller SLBM download (Table 1, Option 2). That would reduce the ICBM force to 300 missiles and the overall force structure to 600 deployed launchers, or 100 less than under New START. Reducing the ICBM force to 300 from 400 planned under new START – a reduction of 150 from today’s 450 Minuteman III missiles – could be achieved by closing one of the three ICBM bases. A more likely option would be to spread job losses across the force by reducing the number of missile squadrons at each wing from three to two.

US Options for 1000-1100 Deployed Strategic Warheads					
Triad Leg	Platforms	Loading	Launchers	Loading	Warheads
<i>Planned New START Treaty Force Structure (2018):</i>					
SSBN	12*	20	240	4-5	1080
ICBM	400		400	1	400
Bombers	60		60	1	60
Total			700		1540
<i>Option 1: New START Structure With SLBM Download</i>					
SSBN	12*	20	240	2-3	600
ICBM	400		400	1	400
Bombers	60		60	1	60
Total			700		1060
<i>Option 2: ICBM Reduction and SLBM Download</i>					
SSBN	12*	20	240	3	720
ICBM	300		300	1	300
Bombers	60		60	1	60
Total			600		1080
<i>Option 3: ICBM Reduction, SLBM Reduction</i>					
SSBN	12*	16	192	3-4	672
ICBM	300		300	1	300
Bombers	60		60	1	60
Total			552		1032
<i>Option 4: ICBM Reduction, SSBN Reduction, SLBM Reduction</i>					
SSBN	10*	20	200	3-4	700
ICBM	300		300	1	300
Bombers	60		60	1	60
Total			560		1060
* Two additional SSBNs in refueling overhaul are not counted.					



Another option would be to cut the ICBM force to 300 and reduce the missile loading on each SSBN from 20 planned under New START to 16, the same number planned for the next-generation SSBN (Table 1, Option 3). This option would reduce the force structure by nearly 150 deployed launchers below New START limit, thereby limiting the large advantage compared with Russia’s smaller force structure.

Yet another option could be to retire two SSBNs and reduce the ICBM force to 300. This option (Table 1, Option 4) would cancel the expensive refueling overhauls of the USS Wyoming (SSBN-742) and USS Louisiana (SSBN-743), retire the two submarines, and reduce the SSBN force to 12. Only 10 of those would be available for deployment.

How would a reduction to 1,000-1,100 deployed strategic warheads affect Russia’s posture? There are many uncertainties about how Russia’s missile forces will evolve over the next decade, but by the early 2020s the number of deployed missiles might decline to some 350 (down from around 450 today), or significantly less than the 700 permitted by the New START Treaty. So a new treaty would likely have little effect on reducing Russian deployed launchers.

The most important effect of a new limit of 1,000-1,100 deployed strategic warheads would be to reduce the warhead loading on Russia’s ICBMs. This is particularly important because Russia compensates for its smaller missile inventory by deployed more warheads on each missile. Again, the numbers are uncertain, but the lower warhead limit could potentially reduce Russian ICBM warheads by as much as 50 percent from roughly 800 estimated under the New START Treaty to approximately 400 warheads under the new reduced limit (see Table 2).

Russia: 1000-1100 Deployed Strategic Warheads					
Triad Leg	Platforms	Loading	Launchers	Loading	Warheads
<i>Planned New START Treaty Force Structure (estimated for 2018):</i>					
SSBN	9	16-20	148	4-6	630
ICBM	250		250	1-10	800
Bombers	68		68	1	68
Total			~460		~1500
<i>New START With ICBM Download:</i>					
SSBN	9	16-20	148	4-6	630
ICBM	250		250	1-10	400
Bombers	68		68	1	68
Total			~460		~1068

The only reason Russia would agree to this, it seems, is if the United States significantly reduced its deployed missiles and also reduced the number of warheads kept in reserve as a potential upload capability. The combination of a larger U.S. missile force with a large upload capacity is a significant breakout capability that undermines the changes of reaching a new agreement.

It is double important that a new agreement limits the upload capability because it could otherwise result in Russia also creating a “hedge” of non-deployed strategic warheads. Closing this “reconstitution” loophole in the arms reduction process is important for making nuclear reductions irreversible.

Effect on Role of Nuclear Weapons

How the reduced force level will reduce the role of nuclear weapons is yet unclear. President Obama stated in his Prague speech that he wanted to “put an end to Cold War thinking” by reducing “the role of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy.”

We have yet to hear how the new guidance puts and end to Cold War thinking in the way the military is required to plan for the potential use of nuclear weapons. Smith’s article states that the lower deployed warhead level would be



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

achieved by U.S. Strategic Command “targeting fewer, but more important, military or political sites in Russia, China, and several other countries.”

If so, that would appear to refer to what is known as “nodal targeting,” in which planners focus targeting with nuclear forces on the most important facilities rather than holding at risk all facilities within a target category. Nodal targeting has been used for the past two decades to reduce warhead requirements and focus the strategic nuclear war plan on effects rather than on creating rubble.

The current nuclear war plan (OPLAN 8010, Strategic Deterrence and Global Strike [<http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2010/02/warplan.php>]) is designed to hold at risk nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction (WMD) forces, command and control, military and political leadership, and war supporting industries of six potential adversaries: Russia, China, North Korea, Iran, Syria (a country that might be dropped from the plan soon, if it hasn’t happened already), and a non-state WMD attack.

Focusing nodal targeting more would not necessarily change how nuclear targeting is performed. Nor does a force level itself of 1,000-1,100 deployed strategic warheads suggest that the day-to-day alert level of the forces has been reduced significantly. Indeed, Smith’s story describes that the review considered, but rejected, a proposal by the State Department, National Security Council staff, and Vice President Biden’s staff to consider changing targeting policy more fundamentally:

“A much steeper reduction, to around 500 total warheads, was debated within the administration last year, but rejected, sources said. Known as the “deterrence only” plan, it would have aimed U.S. warheads at a narrower range of targets related to an enemy’s economic capacity and no longer emphasized striking the enemy’s leadership and weaponry in the first wave of an attack. [...]

Some officials at the State Department, the NSC staff, and Vice president Biden’s staff urged consideration of the smaller arsenal and new targeting policy, officials said. But ‘a small brake’ was applied by the Joint Chiefs of Staff chairman, Army Gen. Martin E. Dempsey, who worried that making such a major policy change was too risky at a moment of upheaval in conventional military strategy, and would create too much uncertainty among allies, said one of the sources with knowledge of the discussion.”

This appears to refer to a targeting policy similar to the one FAS and NRDC proposed in our 2009 study *From Counterforce to Minimal Deterrence* as a way of putting an end to Cold War thinking in nuclear planning. President Obama apparently “decided we did not need to do deterrence-only targeting now,” but did not rule it out for later.

Obviously, we have more work to do to put an end to Cold War thinking.

Hans M. Kristensen is director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists where he provides the public with analysis and background information about the status of nuclear forces and the role of nuclear weapons.

This publication was made possible by a grant from the Ploughshares Fund. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the author.

<http://www.fas.org/blog/ssp/2013/02/nukeoptions.php>

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

Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPAC) – India
OPINION/Article #3810
12 February 2013

Nuclear Weapons: Can They Be Made Strategically Obsolete?

By Debak Das

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



With U.S. President Barack Obama's second term in office and the possible appointment of Chuck Hagel as his Secretary of Defence, there is a widespread belief in the possibility of the movement for nuclear disarmament receiving a fillip. The President's commitment to the cause notwithstanding, there are numerous issues that plague the issue of nuclear disarmament.

Can nuclear disarmament be pursued given the large asymmetries in conventional arms of nuclear states? Can nuclear weapons be made strategically obsolete?

Asymmetric Forces: Is Simultaneous Global Conventional Arms De-escalation Possible?

Until all countries multilaterally agree upon removing nuclear weapons from their arsenal, the goal towards nuclear zero is unattainable. However, why would a country like the US be in favour of such an agreement?

A world bereft of nuclear weapons leaves the US with a conventional superiority that would take conventionally strong China decades to catch up with. This conventional asymmetry, while a strong incentive for the US to disarm, is a strong deterrent for the possibility of disarmament in countries with small nuclear arsenals. Especially outliers to the international norm, such as Iran and North Korea, would never give up this option; both Tehran and Pyongyang consider nuclear weapons as political weapons that stand between them and a possible western military intervention.

In South Asia, it is unlikely that Pakistan would give up nuclear weapons (that provide a parity in military strength), even if India decides to move towards a tangible manifestation for global nuclear disarmament. India and the US thus have the most to gain from nuclear disarmament owing to their strong conventional capabilities.

Given the conventional asymmetries, nuclear disarmament is not possible without a large scale de-escalation of conventional arms. These two processes of disarmament cannot be divorced from each other as they are not mutually exclusive and remain intrinsically interrelated. However, this may diminish the 'great power status' of nuclear states, which would be an unacceptable proposition even to the strongest proponent of nuclear disarmament. A call for the 'global parity of conventional forces' would not only deal a deathblow to the global military industrial complex machinery but also be counterintuitive to the global trend of arms acquisition, that has its biggest market in South Asia.

Can Nuclear Weapons Be Made Strategically Obsolete?

The normative imperative for states to disarm is obvious. However, even if the outliers to the international community can be brought back into the mainstream, strategic obsolescence (both imaginative and doctrinal) of nuclear forces is difficult to achieve.

Fears of humanitarian disaster, nuclear winter, failure of deterrence and nuclear accidents do not provide a tangible enough cause for the nuclear strategic community, or even atomic publics at large, to transform what are now traditional notions of strength and power. Nuclear weapons are a currency of hard power. Can the strategic community in countries possessing nuclear weapons be disincentivised to stop placing the premium they currently place on nuclear arms?

Nuclear arms are likely to pass out of strategic discourse only by obsolescence. For some, the creation of a 'taboo' through 'discrediting and delegitimizing' the use of nuclear weapons can go a long way in achieving this objective (Rebecca Johnson: Preventing Nuclear Use: The Humanitarian Imperative to Disarm, 2013). There is a perception that nuclear weapons have already been stigmatised as unacceptable weapons and that there already exists a powerful taboo against the use of nuclear weapons (Nina Tannenwald: The Nuclear Taboo: the United States and the non-use of nuclear weapons since 1945, 2007). However, as Johnson points out, "The use of nuclear weapons is legitimised by the presence of nuclear weapons in military doctrines." Even a doctrine of 'no first use' advocates and legitimises the use of nuclear weapons with devastating effect. The taboo that came about on chemical and biological weapons was primarily because of the number of times that these weapons have been used. As the same is unlikely to be true of nuclear weapons, its role in the strategic imperatives of nuclear states is likely to remain the same.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Even if there is a nuclear taboo followed by a global ban on the use of nuclear weapons, verification would still remain near impossible. Even an exhaustive verification regime of the Chemical Weapons Convention could not prevent Syria from possessing a stockpile of chemical weapons. The political and strategic fall-out of such a scenario in the case of nuclear weapons would indeed be devastating. If Iran, North Korea or Pakistan keeps a secret stockpile stashed away, it could possibly lead to a nuclear re-armament race, which would be more dangerous than the system of nuclear status quo that exists today.

To conclude, a sense of parity – in both conventional and economic power (both the currencies of hard power) is the only effective normative disposition that could make nuclear weapons obsolete. Without a commitment to conventional disarmament, neither can this parity nor nuclear disarmament be achieved. Obama, other ‘horsemen’ committed to the cause, and campaigns like the Global Zero movement, must take note and adopt a more holistic roadmap to nuclear disarmament.

Debak Das is a Research Officer, NSP, IPCS

<http://www.ipcs.org/article/us-south-asia/nuclear-weapons-can-they-be-made-strategically-obsolete-3810.html>

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

Wall Street Journal
OPINION/Global View Column
February 12, 2013

Obama's Nuclear Fantasy

The president is setting the stage for a world with more nukes in the wrong hands.

By Bret Stephens

Page – A13

As a young Soviet military officer, Viktor Esin was stationed in Cuba during the October 1962 crisis, where he had release authority over a nuclear-tipped missile targeting New York. On his first visit to Manhattan in December, I made sure to thank him for not obliterating our city.

Gen. Esin rose to become chief of staff for the Strategic Rocket Forces, and he is now a professor at the Russian Academy of Military Science. So what's been on his mind lately? Mainly the stealthy rise of China to a position of nuclear parity with the U.S. and Russia. "All in all, they may have 850 warheads ready to launch," he says. "Other warheads are kept in storage and intended to be employed in an emergency." He estimates the total size of the Chinese arsenal at between 1,600 and 1,800 warheads.

That is something to bear in mind as the Obama administration seeks to slash the U.S. arsenal to about 1,000 strategic warheads. That would be well below the ceiling of 1,550 warheads stipulated by the 2010 New Start Treaty. The administration also wants to spend less than the \$80 billion it promised on modernizing America's rusting nuclear-weapons infrastructure.

On the strength of that promise 13 Republican senators gave President Obama the votes he needed to ratify New Start. Suckers! Now the president means to dispense with the Senate altogether, either by imposing the cuts unilaterally or by means of an informal agreement with Vladimir Putin. This is what Mr. Obama meant in telling Dmitry Medvedev last year that he would have "more flexibility" after re-election.

But what, you ask, is so frightening about having "only" 1,000 nuclear weapons? Surely that is more than enough to turn any conceivable adversary Paleolithic. Won't we remain more or less at parity with the Russians, and far ahead of everyone else?

It all depends on China. It is an article of faith among the arms-control community that Beijing subscribes to a theory of "minimum means of reprisal" and has long kept its arsenal more or less flat in the range of 240-400 warheads. Yet that

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 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

is a speculative, dated and unverified figure, and China has spent the last decade embarked on a massive military buildup. Isn't it just possible that Beijing has been building up its nuclear forces, too?

When I broached this theory in an October 2011 column—noting that the U.S. had, in fact, underestimated the size of the Soviet arsenal by a factor of two at the end of the Cold War—I was attacked for being needlessly alarmist. But one man who shares that alarm is Gen. Esin. In July 2012, he notes, the Chinese tested an intermediate-range DF-25 missile, which Russia carefully tracked.

"In the final stage the missile had three shifts in trajectory, dropping one [warhead] at each shift," he notes. "It's solid evidence of a MIRV [multiple warhead] test." A month later, the Chinese launched a new long-range, MIRV-capable missile, this time from a submarine.

The general runs through additional evidence of China's nuclear strides. But what should really get the attention of U.S. military planners are his observations of how Russia might react. "If China doesn't stop, Russia will consider abandoning the INF Treaty," he warns. "Russia cannot afford not taking this factor into account."

The Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, signed in 1987 by Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev, is a cornerstone of the settlement that ended the Cold War. If Russia abandons it and begins building a new generation of intermediate-range missiles, the U.S. would either have to follow suit or lose parity with Moscow. We'd be off to the nuclear races once again.

And not just with Moscow. As North Korea gears up for a third nuclear test, South Korea is eager to begin recycling plutonium—ostensibly for peaceful purposes, in reality as a nuclear hedge against its neighbors.

Then there is Japan, which is scheduled to bring on line a reprocessing plant at Rokkasho later this year. As nuclear expert Henry Sokolski notes, "the plant will produce eight tons of nuclear weapons usable plutonium each year (enough for 1,000 to 2,000 Hiroshima-sized bombs) at a time when Japan has no nuclear reactors to burn the material."

Like the South Koreans, the Japanese don't want a nuclear arsenal: They have lived peacefully under the nuclear umbrella of the United States for nearly seven decades. But as that umbrella shrinks, it covers fewer countries. Those left out will look to deploy umbrellas of their own. "The U.S. has obligations on extended deterrence in Asia," Gen. Esin says. "The problem has to be at the forefront, not avoided."

President Obama has often said that he wants to live in a world without nuclear weapons. Who wouldn't? Even Gen. Esin is a "Global Zero" signatory. But the real choice isn't between more nuclear weapons or fewer. It is between a world of fewer U.S. nuclear weapons and more nuclear states, or the opposite. In his idealism, the president is setting the stage for a more nuclearized world.

Mr. Stephens writes the Journal's "Global View" column on foreign affairs, which runs every Tuesday in the U.S. He is a deputy editorial page editor, responsible for the editorial pages of the Asian and European editions of the paper, the columnists on foreign affairs, and the Far Eastern Economic Review.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323696404578297982354678200.html>

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

New York Times
OPINION/Op-Ed Contributor

North Korea's Lesson: Nukes for Sale

By GRAHAM T. ALLISON Jr., Cambridge, Mass.
February 12, 2013

THE most dangerous message North Korea sent Tuesday with its third nuclear weapon test is: nukes are for sale.

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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



The significance of this test is not the defiance by the North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, of demands from the international community. In the circles of power in Pyongyang, red lines drawn by others make the provocation of violating them only more attractive.

The real significance is that this test was, in the estimation of American officials, most likely fueled by highly enriched uranium, not the plutonium that served as the core of North Korea's earlier tests. Testing a uranium-based bomb would announce to the world — including potential buyers — that North Korea is now operating a new, undiscovered production line for weapons-usable material.

North Korea's latest provocation should also remind us of the limits of Western policies, led by the United States, that focus on "isolating" the hermit kingdom. Such policies do not isolate us from the consequences of North Korea's actions. For a decade, American policy makers' attention has been consumed by Iran's attempt to build its first nuclear weapon. During those years, American officials believe, North Korea has acquired enough plutonium to make an arsenal of 6 to 10 nuclear bombs, depending on the size, and is now most likely producing enough highly enriched uranium for several more bombs every year.

Nuclear weapons can be made from only two elements: uranium that has been highly enriched, and plutonium. Neither occurs in nature. Producing enough of either fuel for a bomb requires a significant industrial plant. North Korea produced its stock of plutonium at its Yongbyon reactor, but that plant was shuttered in 2007 during a hopeful period in international talks about curbing its nuclear arms program. By then, Pyongyang had reduced its arsenal by one bomb, with its 2006 test, and in 2009 it used up a second bomb in another test. We should only hope that it continues conducting plutonium-fueled tests until this stockpile is eliminated.

Those numbers figure heavily in the more realistic American assumption that North Korea would most likely use uranium fuel in a third test, rather than further deplete its limited stock of plutonium.

Two years ago, North Korea unveiled a showcase uranium enrichment plant at Yongbyon capable of producing enough highly enriched uranium for several bombs annually. There is no evidence, however, that this showcase has become operational. American experts therefore believe that Pyongyang must have another still-undiscovered parallel plant that has been operating for several years. That plant by now could have produced several bombs' worth of highly enriched uranium.

Hence the grim conclusion that North Korea now has a new cash crop — one that is easier to market than plutonium. Highly enriched uranium is harder to detect and therefore easier to export — and it is also simpler to build a bomb from it. The model of uranium-fueled bomb dropped on Hiroshima in 1945 was so elementary, and its design so reliable, that the United States never bothered to test one before using it. Yet it killed more than 100,000 people. As the former secretary of defense Robert M. Gates put it, history shows that the North Koreans will "sell anything they have to anybody who has the cash to buy it." In intelligence circles, North Korea is known as "Missiles 'R' Us," having sold and delivered missiles to Iran, Syria and Pakistan, among others.

Who could be interested in buying a weapon for several hundred millions of dollars? Iran is currently investing billions of dollars annually in its nuclear quest. While Al Qaeda's core is greatly diminished and its resources depleted, the man who succeeded Osama bin Laden, Ayman al-Zawahiri, has been seeking nuclear weapons for more than a decade. And then there are Israel's enemies, including wealthy individuals in some Arab countries, who might buy a bomb for the militant groups Hezbollah or Hamas.

President Obama has rightly identified nuclear terrorism as "the single biggest threat to U.S. security." If terrorists explode a single nuclear bomb in an American city in the near future, there is a serious possibility that the core of the weapon will have come from North Korea.

The Bush and Obama administrations have repeatedly warned the North Korean regime that it could not sell nuclear weapons, materials or technologies without being held "fully accountable." But the United States used precisely these words before Pyongyang's sale of a nuclear reactor to Syria — which by now would have produced enough plutonium for Syria's first nuclear bomb had it not been destroyed by an Israeli airstrike in 2007. With what consequences for



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

North Korea? Pyongyang got paid; Syria got bombed; and the United States was soon back at the negotiating table in the six-party talks.

Given America's failure to hold Kim Jong-un's father, Kim Jong-il, accountable when he sold Syria's president, Bashar al-Assad, the technology from which to make a bomb, could the younger Mr. Kim imagine that he could get away with selling a nuclear weapon or bomb-making material? The urgent challenge is to convince him and his regime's lifeline, China, that North Korea will be held accountable for every nuclear weapon of North Korean origin.

Mr. Obama should send Mr. Kim a direct, unambiguous message, with a carbon copy to the Chinese leadership in Beijing, warning that if a nuclear bomb of North Korean origin were to explode on American soil or that of an American ally, the United States would respond precisely as though North Korea itself had hit the United States with a nuclear-tipped missile. An unambiguously forceful warning, backed up by a credible threat of commensurate force, is the only guarantee that even the zealous, isolated North Koreans would hear.

Graham T. Allison Jr. is director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at the Harvard Kennedy School and the author of "Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe."

<http://www.nytimes.com/2013/02/12/opinion/north-koreas-lesson-nukes-for-sale.html? r=0>

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

Washington Post
OPINION/Editorial

The U.S. Needs to Tame the Cyber-Dragon

By Editorial Board
February 14, 2013

THREE MAJOR U.S. newspapers — The Washington Post, the New York Times and the Wall Street Journal — reported recently that Chinese intruders hacked into their computer networks, snooping for passwords and information about coverage of China. The intrusions at the Times and the Journal coincided with an extraordinary period in recent months, during which China's leaders and their extended families were shown by investigative newspaper reports in the papers to have amassed huge fortunes and one of China's most prominent politicians, Bo Xilai, fell from grace in a corruption scandal.

China denies carrying out cyber-espionage, theft and disruption. But there is a growing amount of evidence that it is behind one of history's great heists of intellectual property, a vast and multi-tentacled collection drive aimed at corporations, the U.S. government, universities, stock exchanges and think tanks, among others. The newspapers are only the latest example of companies that found footprints of the Chinese cyber-dragon in their corridors.

China's motivation in economic espionage is to steal technology that will help leapfrog generations of development; going after the military and newspapers is more like classic spying. The U.S. government spies on China, too, although U.S. intelligence agencies do not steal technology for the private sector.

All of this raises a question: How should the United States respond? In the absence of action by Congress, President Obama has just issued an executive order intended to help the private sector defend against cyberattacks by China and others. But discussions with China itself have gone nowhere. The time is ripe for something stronger. In an interview with reporters before leaving office, Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton said that the United States must make it clear to Beijing that there will be consequences for unbridled hacking.

Cold War-style arms control treaties are probably not workable in cyberspace, where attacks unfold at lightning speed and at the hands of hard-to-find hackers. But the United States could begin to speak more firmly to China's leadership about the problem, perhaps threatening to deny visas or expel those found to be involved in economic espionage. If a little pressure does not succeed, the United States could ponder more aggressive options, such as whether to launch offensive cyber-assaults to preemptively disarm adversaries. That would be delicate and risky. As Ms. Clinton noted,

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 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

this “can become a very unwelcome and even dangerous tit-for-tat that could be a crescendo of consequences, here and around the world, that no one wants to see happen.”

China is no longer the poor and isolated nation of Mao’s day. In cyberspace, it must behave like a global economic superpower and not like a petty pickpocket.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-us-needs-to-tame-the-cyber-dragon/2013/02/14/34e02248-6f0a-11e2-aa58-243de81040ba_story.html

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

Issue No. 1045, 15 February 2013

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