



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

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** [U.S. Sees China Launch as Test of Anti-Satellite Muscle: Source](#)

1. [Iran to Chair UN Nuke Disarmament Conference](#)
2. [Iran Says Next Government Won't Change Nuclear Policy](#)
3. [IAEA and Iran Fail to Agree on Nuclear Inspections](#)
4. [Stuxnet Worm 'Increased' Iran's Nuclear Potential](#)
5. [Iran Downplays US Boycott of UN Meetings on Disarmament](#)
6. [U.S. Says 'Small Amount' of Chemical Arms Used Twice in Syria](#)
7. [Iran's Jalili, EU's Ashton wrap up 'Fruitful' Discussions in Turkey](#)
8. [U.S. Under Secretary for Political Affairs: "We Will Not Allow Iran to Obtain a Nuclear Weapon"](#)
9. [Iranian Candidate: I Will 'Resist' the West](#)
10. [N. Korea Replaces Hawkish Armed Forces Minister](#)
11. ['Father' of Pakistan's Nukes Says N.Korea Is Ready to Attack](#)
12. [N Korea has No Nuclear Warhead to Fit Missile: US Official](#)
13. [Sanctions 'Delaying N Korea Nuclear Aims'](#)
14. [N. Korea Replaces Vice Minister of Defense](#)
15. [N. Korea thought to Have 200 Mobile Missile Launchers: Report](#)
16. [India Does Not Retaliate against Pak due to Nukes: US Expert](#)
17. [Russia's Mediterranean Task Force to Include Nuclear Subs – Navy Chief](#)
18. [US Missile Defense Plan Changes Linked to 'Economic Issues'](#)
19. [Open Secrets](#)
20. [U.S. Sees China Launch as Test of Anti-Satellite Muscle: Source](#)
21. [Obama Reportedly Offers Putin Deal on Sharing of Antimissile Data](#)
22. [Missile Defense System Tested over Pacific Ocean](#)
23. [Second US General Warns of 'Disruptive and Destructive' Cyber Attacks](#)
24. [Saudi Health Workers Sickened by SARS-Like Virus](#)
25. [U.S. Loses Track of Terror Suspects in Protection Program](#)
26. [Is Missile Defense Useful?](#)
27. [US and the Art of Exaggeration](#)
28. [Continue Aggressive Response to Minot AFB Problems](#)
29. [How U.S. Can Break Up Iran's Long Nuclear Game](#)
30. [New Report Outlines Containment Strategy if Efforts to Prevent Iran Nuclear Weapon Fail](#)
31. [Why the U.S. Needs to Flex its Cyber Muscles](#)
32. [The Cold War Returneth](#)
33. [Missile Defense Turns 30](#)
34. [Missile Defense Testing Necessary to Protect America](#)
35. [US Military Reports Aimed at Bigger Budgets and Baffling Beijing](#)

*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.1058, 17 May 2013**

The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.



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

Jerusalem Post – Israel

## Iran to Chair UN Nuke Disarmament Conference

*Western powers skeptical of Iran's own nuclear ambition raise eyebrows at Iran's role in Geneva conference.*

By MICHAEL WILNER, Jerusalem Post Correspondent

14 May 2013

NEW YORK – Iran will chair a United Nations conference on disarmament in Geneva this month, raising eyebrows from Western powers skeptical of Iran's own nuclear ambitions.

The UN conference addresses not only nuclear proliferation but policies concerning the race to weaponize space, the production of radiological weapons and the stockpiling or use of other weapons of mass destruction.

In a statement issued Monday afternoon, the United States said it would withdraw ambassadorial representation at the conference in protest so long as Iran retained its chair. Calling Iran's chairmanship "highly inappropriate," the statement from the US mission to the UN noted that the Islamic Republic was under UN Chapter VII sanctions for weapons proliferation and human-rights abuses.

"While the presidency of the CD is largely ceremonial and involves no substantive responsibilities, allowing Iran--a country that is in flagrant violation of its obligations under multiple UN Security Council Resolutions and to the IAEA Board of Governors--to hold such a position runs counter to the goals and objectives of the Conference on Disarmament itself," the statement read.

"Any member state that is the subject of UN Security Council sanctions for proliferation – and found guilty of massive human rights violations – should be ineligible to hold a leadership position in a UN body," said Hillel Neuer, executive director of UN Watch, which first noticed the chairmanship.

"We urge world leaders to declare that allowing Iran to chair a UN disarmament body is simply unacceptable, given the fundamentalist regime's illicit activities in precisely the opposite direction," said Neuer.

Iran will chair the conference barely a month after Geneva held a separate preparatory conference on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT, where Iran and North Korea were the top two concerns of participating states.

Iran remains one of 189 signatories of that treaty, though the DPRK does not, since withdrawing in 2003.

At the preparatory meeting in April, Angela Kane, head of the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, told member states that a cohesive international effort would be required to address Iran.

"The whole raison d'être of this review process is to focus on implementation of commitments relating to the treaty's three pillars – nuclear disarmament, nonproliferation and peaceful uses of nuclear energy," Ms. Kane said.

"What is most needed now in NPT arenas is to revive a sense of forward progress, however slow, however difficult it may be," she added.

The office of Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon provided no comment on Iran's position as chair, noting that such decisions are left to member states.

<http://www.jpost.com/Iranian-Threat/News/Iran-to-chair-UN-sponsored-nuclear-disarmament-conference-313098>

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

Bloomberg News

## Iran Says Next Government Won't Change Nuclear Policy

By Ladane Nasserri & Yeganeh Salehi

May 14, 2013

Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013

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



Iran's nuclear policy is based on the nation's rights and will not be modified no matter who succeeds President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, Foreign Ministry spokesman Abbas Araghchi said.

"The Islamic Republic's policies, including on its nuclear program, are based on people's rights and can't be compromised under any government," Araghchi told reporters in Tehran today. The "next government will pursue the same process and defend Iran's rights."

Iran holds a presidential election on June 14 in which Ahmadinejad isn't eligible to run.

Araghchi spoke a day before top nuclear negotiator Saeed Jalili and European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton meet in Istanbul. The last round of nuclear negotiations between world powers and Iran in April didn't yield immediate results. Iran maintains its nuclear program is solely civilian while the U.S. says it may be a cover for developing atomic weapons.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-14/iran-says-next-government-won-t-change-nuclear-policy.html>

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

Trend – Azerbaijan

## **IAEA and Iran Fail to Agree on Nuclear Inspections**

15 May 2013

Iran and international nuclear inspectors failed to reach agreement on starting a probe into Iran's alleged nuclear weapons programme, a senior International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) official said Wednesday after talks between the two sides, dpa (German Press Agency) reported.

"We must recognize that our best efforts have not been successful so far," IAEA chief nuclear inspector Herman Nackaerts said in Vienna after the tenth round of negotiations since early 2012.

Iran's IAEA envoy Ali Asghar Soltanieh said the discussions on an agreement that would allow access to Iranian nuclear sites, documents and officials were "constructive and intensive."

He added that "the aim of all these elaborations is to bridge the gap towards the conclusion of the text by the next meeting."

Nackaerts and Soltanieh said they wanted talks to continue, but no date for a new round was agreed.

While Iranian nuclear officials talked in Vienna, Tehran's chief nuclear negotiator Saeid Jalili was in Istanbul to meet EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton to prepare the ground for the next full round of talks with the permanent UN Security Council members China, Britain, France, Russia and the United States, plus Germany.

Iran would not change its nuclear stance after the June presidential election, Jalili warned the so-called P5+1 group ahead of his evening meeting with Ashton.

The nuclear programme is a national matter and, therefore, stands above party politics, Jalili said, stressing that his country has the right to use civilian nuclear technology.

The group of six has been trying to pressure Tehran to stop enriching uranium, fearing that this know-how might be used to make nuclear weapons fuel. Iran says it is making reactor fuel, not nuclear arms.

US Undersecretary for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman said at the Senate Wednesday that the P5+1 were still waiting for signs that Tehran would seriously address a new offer of easing of some sanctions in return for an enrichment stop, which was presented at talks in Almaty in February.

"We are not interested in talks for talks' sake, but we must give diplomacy every chance to succeed," she told the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee.



Neither the IAEA nor the six-country group have made progress in negotiations with Iran this or last year. Diplomats had said they had not expected progress this week.

They also noted that Jalili is a presidential candidate and was unlikely to continue in his current role after the June 14 election.

<http://en.trend.az/regions/iran/2150860.html>

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

The London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Stuxnet Worm 'Increased' Iran's Nuclear Potential**

*Iran's nuclear potential may have been significantly increased by the Stuxnet worm that is believed to have infected the country's uranium enrichment facility at Natanz in 2009 and 2010, new research claims.*

By Jennifer O'Mahony

15 May 2013

The report, published in the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) journal, claims the Stuxnet worm exposed vulnerabilities in Iranian enrichment facilities that would otherwise have gone unnoticed, and that production actually went up in the year after it was allegedly discovered.

Furthermore, the impression in the West that Natanz was under attack left the Iranians to "progress quietly" with enriching more uranium, hindering diplomatic solutions to reducing the threat of a nuclear Iran.

In an analysis of data collected by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Ivanka Barzashka, an academic at King's College, London, argues that Iran has regrouped and improved centrifuge performance and has started enriching uranium to higher concentrations than before.

Furthermore, since August 2010 the number of operating machines has been "steadily growing" at Natanz.

The Stuxnet worm, which allegedly attacked the Natanz plant by altering the frequency at which motors connected to gas centrifuges that separate uranium isotopes turn, formed part of a wave of digital attacks on the country in 2009 and 2010.

Iran decommissioned and replaced about 1,000 IR-1 centrifuges in the Fuel Enrichment Plant (FEP) at Natanz, late in 2009 or early in 2010.

Barzashka writes that Iran's ability to successfully operate new machines "was not hindered" and that "Stuxnet's effects have not simply 'worn off'."

"Iran's uranium-enrichment capacity increased and, consequently, so did its nuclear-weapons potential," she says.

"Stuxnet was of net benefit to Iran if, indeed, its government wants to build a bomb or increase its nuclear-weapons potential.

"The malware - if it did in fact infiltrate Natanz - has made the Iranians more cautious about protecting their nuclear facilities," she adds.

Former Foreign Secretary Sir Malcolm Rifkind criticised the report, emphasising that bilateral talks between the US and Iran were the only way to curb Iranian nuclear ambition.

Sir Malcolm, who currently serves as Chairman of the Intelligence and Security Committee, which oversees Britain's cybersecurity strategy, told *The Daily Telegraph*: "What is undoubted is that it [Stuxnet] significantly slowed down the enrichment process.

"Part of the objective of many people in the international community has been to stop, or if you can't stop, to slow down the Iranian nuclear programme.



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

"In so far as Stuxnet may have done that, and I emphasise may have done that, it was a plus.

"The most important diplomatic initiative on the table is the offer by the President of the United States for a direct bilateral discussion between the United States and Iran."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/news/10058546/Stuxnet-worm-increased-Irans-nuclear-potential.html>

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

Oman Tribune – Oman  
Thursday, May 16, 2013

## **Iran Downplays US Boycott of UN Meetings on Disarmament**

By Agencies

TEHERAN - Teheran on Tuesday played down a decision by the United States to boycott meetings of the UN Conference on Disarmament when Iran takes over the body later this month.

"Pressure, presence or their boycott will not be important to Iran," newly appointed foreign ministry spokesman Abbas Araqchi told reporters when asked about the planned boycott by US ambassadors when Iran takes over.

Iran will take over presidency of the disarmament conference from May 27 until June 23 under an alphabetical rotation among the 65 member states.

The conference is struggling to craft a deal on nuclear disarmament, preventing arms from spreading to outer space and halting the development of other weapons of mass destruction.

"Iran has had a very active presence in the conference and its initiatives," Araqchi said. "We will continue this role, whether it is in a participation capacity or presidency" of the conference.

The boycott was announced in Washington on Monday by Erin Pelton, spokeswoman for the US mission at the United Nations.

"The United States continues to believe that countries that are under Chapter VII sanctions for weapons proliferation or massive human-rights abuses should be barred from any formal or ceremonial positions in UN bodies," she said.

"The United States will not be represented at the ambassadorial level during any meeting presided over by Iran," she added.

The conference was launched in 1979 to try to stem the Cold War arms race.

Iran takes over the conference presidency from Indonesia and at the end of June hands over to Iraq.

"We hope to see good progress" in the talks scheduled for Wednesday in Vienna between the Iranian mission and the International Atomic Energy Agency, Araqchi said.

The IAEA says there is "overall, credible" evidence that until 2003, and possibly since, Iran conducted activities to develop nuclear weapons, despite Teheran's denials. It seeks to persuade Iran to grant it access to sites, documents and scientists involved in these alleged efforts.

<http://www.omantribune.com/index.php?page=news&id=144103>

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

Al Arabiya – U.A.E.

## **U.S. Says 'Small Amount' of Chemical Arms Used Twice in Syria**

Thursday, 16 May 2013

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



Washington - Small amounts of chemical weapons have been used at least twice in Syria, but Washington is seeking more information as it mulls its response, a top U.S. official said Wednesday.

"The intelligence community has agreed with varying levels of confidence that chemical weapons were used in small amounts in at least two instances in Syria," Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman told U.S. lawmakers.

"But having high confidence up in the intelligence community, for which I have great admiration, is not in fact all that one needs to take some of the actions that many people have contemplated."

Sherman did not say which side was believed to have used the weapons in the bloody conflict in Syria now in its third year, in which rebels are seeking to oust President Bashar al-Assad.

But she told the House foreign affairs committee that U.S. President Barack Obama -- who has said the use of chemical weapons would be a red line for the international community -- was right to proceed cautiously.

"We have unfortunate experience in our history, where we've taken action and it turned out that the intelligence assessment was either misinterpreted or not accurate," Sherman said.

"So I think he is being very thoughtful about how he is proceeding here."

Secretary of State John Kerry said on Friday there was "strong evidence" that the Assad regime had used chemical weapons against rebel forces.

"This fight is about the terrible choices that the Assad regime has made with its willingness to kill anywhere... to use gas, which we believe there is strong evidence of use of," Kerry said in an online forum.

But top U.N. rights investigator Carla del Ponte said earlier this month that rebels may have been using the deadly nerve agent sarin.

U.S. officials have stressed they do not believe the rebels have any such arms in their arsenal of weapons.

"Rest assured we are gathering additional data and making additional judgments," Sherman told the lawmakers in a hearing about Iran's suspect nuclear program. Iran is backing Assad as he fights to stay in power.

<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2013/05/16/U-S-says-small-amount-of-chemical-arms-used-twice-in-Syria-.html>

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

Press TV – Iran

May 16, 2013

## **Iran's Jalili, EU's Ashton wrap up 'Fruitful' Discussions in Turkey**

Secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council (SNSC) Saeed Jalili and EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton have concluded their talks in Istanbul, Turkey, describing the negotiations as fruitful.

Speaking to reporters, Jalili said he held "fruitful" talks with Ashton, adding the two sides agreed to meet again in the near future, IRNA reported.

"We will soon hold talks again to set a date for the meeting," the SNSC secretary added.

Ashton, representing the six world powers which make up the P5+1 group, also said she had "useful" discussions with Iran's chief nuclear negotiator in Istanbul on May 15.

*"We will now reflect on how to go on to the next stage of the process," she said in a statement.*

"We will be in touch shortly," she added.



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

Ahead of the Wednesday talks, Jalili had said Iran was still waiting for answers to the proposals it made to the P5+1 group in April.

During the April meeting, Iran presented the P5+1 with the details of its proposal “to launch a new round of cooperation” between the two sides, SNSC Undersecretary Ali Baqeri said on April 5.

Iran and the P5+1 group of world powers - Russia, China, France, Britain, and the US plus Germany - have held several rounds of talks, mainly over the Iranian nuclear energy program. The latest rounds of negotiations between the two sides were held in the Kazakh city of Almaty on April 5-6 and February 26-27.

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

Using the unfounded allegation as a pretext, the US and the EU have imposed illegal unilateral sanctions against the Islamic Republic.

Tehran rejects the allegation over its nuclear energy activities, maintaining that as a committed signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and a member of the IAEA, it has the right to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/05/16/303792/jalili-ashton-wrap-up-useful-talks/>

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

APA (Azeri-Press Agency) – Azerbaijan

## **U.S. Under Secretary for Political Affairs: “We Will Not Allow Iran to Obtain a Nuclear Weapon”**

16 May 2013

Baku. Victoria Demytyeva – APA. “Iran’s nuclear activity and its support for terrorist organizations pose a threat to the region,” said Under Secretary for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman, addressing the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, APA reports.

She said Iran’s nuclear activity – in violation of its international obligations and in defiance of the international community – is one of the greatest global concerns we face: “A nuclear-armed Iran would pose a threat to the region, to the world. In confronting this challenge, our policy has been clear: we are determined to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. “

“Our preference is to resolve this through diplomacy. However, as President Obama has stated unequivocally, we will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon, and there should be no doubt that the United States will use all elements of American power to achieve that objective,” she said.

Sherman said Iran exports over 1 million fewer barrels of crude oil each day than it did in 2011, costing Iran between \$3-5 billion per month, due to sanctions. All 20 importers of Iranian oil have either significantly reduced or eliminated oil purchases from Iran.

“We also have grave concerns about Iran’s destabilizing activities in the Middle East, particularly its support for Bashar Asad in Syria; its support for terrorist organizations like Hizballah. Iran is the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism, which it uses as a strategic tool of its foreign policy,” she said.

[http://en.apa.az/news\\_us\\_under\\_secretary\\_for\\_political\\_affai\\_192961.html](http://en.apa.az/news_us_under_secretary_for_political_affai_192961.html)

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

Arutz Sheva (Israel National News) – Israel

## **Iranian Candidate: I Will 'Resist' the West**

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



*Iran's top nuclear negotiator and presidential candidate pledges to "resist" western demands regarding his country's nuclear program.*

By Elad Benari  
May 17, 2013

Iran's top nuclear negotiator, one of the candidates in the upcoming presidential elections, pledged on Thursday to "resist" western demands regarding his country's nuclear program if he is elected.

Speaking to the *Financial Times*, Saeed Jalili, the most prominent among a group of candidates in the June poll who are close to Iran's Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, said he would apply a policy of "progress, justice and resistance" as president, insisting that international sanctions imposed over Iran's nuclear program could be circumvented.

"My understanding is that the more we rely on our religious and internal principles, the more we can create the capacity to pursue the path of progress and the more we can resist [pressure from outside opponents of the regime]," Jalili told the *Financial Times*.

"What matters today is to defend the rights of the Iranian nation in various areas that should not be violated by others. The more we defend these rights, the more progress we can make," he added.

Regarding his country's negotiations with world powers regarding the nuclear program, Jalili criticized the West for not recognizing Iran's right to enrich uranium.

"We do not want anything beyond [Iran's rights under] the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty)," he told the *Financial Times*. "We naturally expect to enjoy our rights under the NPT. The main question is why they do not recognize Iran's right to uranium enrichment under the NPT. Those who claim they respect the NPT, should respect this right of the Iranian nation."

Asked if Iran would agree to demands to ship out its stocks of uranium enriched to 20 percent, Jalili responded, "We have gone into extensive details about this in the talks [with major powers]. We have said that what has been produced is for our domestic and pharmaceutical needs. They see that the fuel is [produced] under the supervision of IAEA inspectors in Fordow and Natanz and they see this is used for peaceful purposes. We have said this is for our needs. We have not produced it to be sent abroad but to meet the medical needs of people."

Asked if Iran was being careful not to cross Israel's "red line", as laid out by Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu during his United Nations speech, he replied, "We do not give any credibility to Israel or its threats. Our red line is the NPT regulations."

<http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/168059>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
May 13, 2013

## **N. Korea Replaces Hawkish Armed Forces Minister**

SEOUL, May 13 (Yonhap) -- North Korea replaced its hard-line armed forces minister with a relatively "young" and unknown field commander, a news report said Monday, in a move that may signal a shift in the country's confrontational policies.

According to the report by the Korean Central News Agency (KCNA) monitored in Seoul, Jang Jong-nam, in his 50s, was introduced as minister of the People's Armed Forces during the Song and Dance Ensemble of the Korean People's Internal Security Force that was attended by North Korean leader Kim Jong-un and his wife Ri Sol-ju.

The People's Armed Forces Ministry is equivalent to South Korea's defense ministry and comes under the control of the communist country's powerful National Defense Commission.





The KCNA report marks the first time that Pyongyang has acknowledged a change in the top ministerial post. The same news wire service said four days earlier that Kim Kyok-sik attended another state ceremony as armed forces chief.

North Korea experts deemed the 75-year-old Kim as a hardliner within the armed forces due to his involvement in the shelling of a South Korean island in the Yellow Sea in November 2010 and the sinking of the South Korean naval vessel eight months earlier when he was in charge of the 4th Corps in Hwanghae Province on the west coast. He held the ministerial post for about seven months and was a four-star general in the Korean People's Army (KPA).

Jang, on the other hand, was promoted to major general in April 2002 and lieutenant general in November of 2011, and until recently was reported to be the commander of the KPA's 1st Corps in Kangwon Province on the east coast. A photo by the Rodong Sinmun, an organ of the ruling Workers' Party of Korea, published earlier in the day showed him as a three-star colonel general.

"Jang was considered a member of the junior faction within the military and his sudden emergence may be a sign that the North Korean leadership is seeking a change to younger officers," an expert in Seoul speculated. He said Kim's replacement effectively meant the retirement of most senior officers in their 70s who held key military positions in the past.

The change started with the sacking of the chief of the General Staff of the KPA, Ri Yong-ho (71), and replacing him with Hyon Yong-chol (64) last July. Moreover, the appointment of Choe Ryong-hae (63) to the director of the military General Political Bureau post, the senior most post in the armed forces No. 1, can be seen as an effort to give greater opportunities to younger officers.

He added that Pyongyang may be trying to alleviate the current state of high tension by changing a hardliner with another officer.

The country last week lifted the high state of military readiness it ordered in response to South Korea and the United States conducting the two-month-long Foal Eagle annual military exercise that ended on April 30.

"The latest move could be seen as an attempt to get younger people to exercise more control over military matters," said Chang Yong-seok, senior researcher at the Institute for Peace and Unification Studies at Seoul National University. Others, however, said the latest appointments may not necessarily translate into a generation change.

A senior government official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, said North Korea has recently changed the commanders of four army corps along the frontline.

The latest reshuffle called attention to a potential generation change in the North Korean military rank under young leader Kim Jong-un.

"Our military is attentively tracing the latest trend of the North Korean military, including replacement of high military ranks," ministry spokesman Kim Min-seok said in a briefing. "It needs more analysis to conclude whether (North Korea) has replaced hardliners, but it does seem that military commanders have become really younger."

Another source within the government said the unexpected sacking of Kim for Jang, who is not well known, can be seen as an irregular development. He added that appointing a colonel general to a post held by a vice marshal or four-star officer in the past is out of the ordinary.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/05/13/18/0401000000AEN20130513008600315F.HTML>

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

The Chosun Ilbo – South Korea  
May 13, 2013

## 'Father' of Pakistan's Nukes Says N.Korea Is Ready to Attack



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

The colourful "father" of Pakistan's nuclear bomb, Abdul Qadeer Khan, has claimed North Korea may have perfected a nuclear weapon and long-range missile warheads, according to Al Jazeera English.

Khan, a gifted scientist but shady individual, is believed to have sold nuclear technology to North Korea.

"No doubt they are quite capable and they can do it," Khan told the channel. "They can even build an [intercontinental ballistic missile] if they want to."

Khan admitted the North's missile technology is "crude" and "not as sophisticated as the western countries have. But sometimes a crude system will also work. It is good enough to frighten other people."

Khan is revered as a national hero by some in Pakistan but spent years under house arrest for selling nuclear technology to North Korea, Libya and Iran.

But in the latest interview he claimed North Korea "got all their engineers and scientists trained in China and the Soviet Union in this field."

Turning to Iran's suspected nuclear arms program, he called the allegations Western "propaganda," on a par with Iraq's non-existent weapons of mass destruction that duped a number of UN member states into backing the U.S. invasion in 2003.

[http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html\\_dir/2013/05/13/2013051301213.html](http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2013/05/13/2013051301213.html)

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

Channel NewsAsia – Singapore

## **N Korea has No Nuclear Warhead to Fit Missile: US Official**

*North Korea has yet to develop a nuclear warhead small enough to fit on a missile, a senior US official said on Wednesday, contradicting a recent US military intelligence report.*

May 15, 2013

By Agence France –Presse (AFP)

SEOUL: North Korea has yet to develop a nuclear warhead small enough to fit on a missile, a senior US official said on Wednesday, contradicting a recent US military intelligence report.

The North claimed its third atomic test staged in February involved a "miniaturised and lighter" warhead, prompting speculation that it had acquired the crucial technology to fit nuclear devices to a missile delivery system.

The latest test -- the North's most powerful to date -- came only two months after it successfully launched a long-range rocket in what was widely viewed as a ballistic missile test.

"I don't believe they have the capability to miniaturise the nuclear warhead, put it on top of the missile, work the launch and reentry problem, and target," said the senior US official who declined to be identified.

"I don't think they have been able to put the whole piece together," he told a press briefing for foreign media in Seoul.

His comments countered a recent report by the US military's Defence Intelligence Agency which suggested the North may have succeeded in miniaturising its warheads.

The February test drew UN sanctions which in turn triggered a cycle of escalating military tensions on the Korean peninsula that are only now beginning to subside.

At the height of the tensions, Pyongyang threatened pre-emptive nuclear strikes on the United States and South Korea.

The threats prompted some politicians in Seoul to call for the South to develop its own unilateral nuclear deterrent separate from the "nuclear umbrella" provided by its US ally.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The US official said the deployment of nuclear-capable US B-52s and B-2 stealth bombers in recent joint drills with South Korea were proof of US commitment to providing a complete nuclear deterrent.

"I don't think South Korea needs to develop its own nuclear capability," he said, adding that such a move carried "a lot, a lot, a lot of responsibility".

"And the headache it brings is more than you understand right now. And I think that the US is able to be there to provide what we call an extended nuclear deterrence," he said.

<http://www.channelnewsasia.com/news/asiapacific/n-korea-has-no-nuclear-warhead-to-fit-mi/675554.html>

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

Al Jazeera – U.A.E.

## **Sanctions 'Delaying N Korea Nuclear Aims'**

*Leaked UN report says sanctions have delayed, but not halted, development of nuclear and ballistic missile programme.*

15 May 2013

Tough financial sanctions and an arms embargo have significantly delayed expansion of North Korea's nuclear arms programme, according to a confidential UN report seen by the Reuters news agency.

The latest annual report by the UN sanctions-monitoring group comes as the US seeks to persuade China that applying economic and other sanctions against its neighbour is crucial to halting the programme.

"While the imposition of sanctions has not halted the development of nuclear and ballistic missile programmes, it has in all likelihood considerably delayed [North Korea's] timetable and, through the imposition of financial sanctions and the bans on the trade in weapons, has choked off significant funding which would have been channelled into its prohibited activities," the report said.

Diplomats said the 52-page document covers the period up through to last month, so it was too early to measure the effect of the latest round of UN sanctions adopted in March.

Al Jazeera's Harry Fawcett, reporting from Seoul, said that the new report contradicts the claims made by North Korea of success during their third nuclear test.

Fawcett said that the study contains slightly stronger wording than the previous report in 2012, where it said the banned activities by North Korea appeared to have been slowed.

In the report to the UN Security Council's North Korea sanctions committee, the panel also recommended sanctioning three North Korean entities and 12 individuals.

The three entities the panel said should be blacklisted are the newly created Ministry of Atomic Energy Industry, the Munitions Industry Department of the Central Committee of the Korean Workers Party (KWP), and the State Space Development Bureau.

The individuals the panel wants sanctioned include the atomic energy industry minister, once he is nominated, and four senior officials at the KWP Munitions Industry Department.

It also recommends the blacklisting of one national from Kazakhstan, Aleksandr Viktorovich Zykov, and two from Ukraine, Iurii Lunov and Igor Karev-Popov, for their involvement in North Korea-related arms deals.

### **Violations**

The panel listed North Korea's February nuclear test and its rocket launches as examples of violations of Security Council resolutions that have increased international concerns about Pyongyang.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

It was North Korea's third nuclear test since 2006. In April, North Korea said it would restart a nuclear reactor at Yongbyon to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Among potential violations the panel listed were the seizure by a UN member state of aluminium alloys suspected to be nuclear-related in August 2012, and the seizure of missile-related items bound for Syria in May 2012.

Previous breaches included shipments of arms-related material to Syria in November 2010 and rocket fuses for Iran in 2008, the report said.

The panel said countries should be on the lookout for North Korean attempts to procure the following key items for Pyongyang's nuclear programme - maraging steel, frequency changers, high-strength aluminium alloy, fibrous or filamentary materials, filament winding machines, ring magnets, semi-hard magnetic alloys in thin strip form and other items.

UN diplomats said that China, North Korea's principal ally and trading partner, continues to play a key role in enabling Pyongyang to skirt sanctions, though this is not discussed explicitly in the panel's report.

### **Cash deliveries**

Beijing has vowed full implementation of the latest round of UN sanctions adopted by the council in March.

Bank of China recently shut the account of North Korea's main foreign exchange bank, the state-run Foreign Trade Bank, which was hit with US sanctions in March after Washington accused it of helping finance Pyongyang's nuclear weapons programme.

The Security Council sanctions resolution adopted in March drew attention to North Korean bulk cash deliveries carried out by the country's diplomatic personnel, an issue the expert panel also touched on in its report.

It said the Bank of Congo processed a wire transfer linked with an attempted arms shipment in 2009 to an account in the name of a diplomat at North Korea's embassy in Beijing, but Banque de France refused to accept the transfer.

The report also said a diplomat at the North Korean embassy in the Republic of Congo has been actively involved in negotiating the contracts for the arms shipments.

*Source: Al Jazeera and agencies*

<http://www.aljazeera.com/news/asia-pacific/2013/05/20135155217257365.html>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
May 17, 2013

## **N. Korea Replaces Vice Minister of Defense**

SEOUL, May 17 (Yonhap) -- North Korea has appointed a new vice defense minister, a report showed Friday, in what appeared to be an ongoing reshuffle of the communist country's military personnel.

Jon Chang-bok, who was promoted to colonel general in 2010, accompanied North Korean leader Kim Jong-un on a field guidance trip to a food processing plant as the first vice minister of the People's Armed Forces, the North's Korean Central News Agency (KCNA) said in the report, monitored in Seoul.

The People's Armed Forces is the equivalent of South Korea's defense ministry. Jon is known to have served as a senior official of the ministry until April 2012.

Jon was also spotted with Kim at a May Day concert earlier this month.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The report comes only days after the North revealed the replacement of its defense minister. On Monday, the KCNA identified Jang Jong-nam, a relatively unknown field commander, as chief of the ministry.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/05/17/64/0401000000AEN20130517002800315F.HTML>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea  
May 17, 2013

## **N. Korea thought to Have 200 Mobile Missile Launchers: Report**

SEOUL, May 17 (Yonhap) -- North Korea could have as many as 200 mobile missile launchers, a report showed Friday, nearly double the number previously estimated by Seoul authorities.

According to the report submitted to the U.S. Congress by the Pentagon, North Korea appears to have accumulated up to 200 so-called transporter erector launchers (TEL), including up to 100 for short-range Scud missiles, 50 for medium-range Nodong missiles and 50 for long-range Musudan missiles, the state-run Korea Institute for Defense Analyses (KIDA) said.

South Korea's military and intelligence authorities previously estimated that the communist country appeared to possess a maximum of 94 mobile launchers.

It is the first time that South Korea or the U.S. has made public the number of North Korean TELs in an official document.

"The U.S. report shows that North Korea is bent on expanding its missile program despite its continued economic difficulties," said Kim Sung-kurl, a researcher at KIDA. "It is especially focused on certain asymmetric areas that can pose a threat to South Korea and U.S. forces stationed in the South."

It also appears that the North is strengthening its military capabilities in an attempt to tame internal dissent and preserve its regime, he said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/05/17/69/0401000000AEN20130517001300315F.HTML>

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

Times of India – India

## **India Does Not Retaliate against Pak due to Nukes: US Expert**

By Press Trust of India (PTI)  
May 11, 2013

WASHINGTON: India does not retaliate despite Pakistan-backed terrorist attacks against it because of the deterrence of nuclear weapons that the two countries possess, an American defence expert has said.

"All the terrorism that Pakistan has supported against India has been carried out, secure in the knowledge that India cannot retaliate," Stephen Blank, Research Professor of National Security Affairs at the Army War College, said.

"If Pakistan had no nukes, if there were no nukes on the South Indian peninsula, India could retaliate and probably would. But their hand is stayed by the threat of nuclear war," Blank told a meeting of National Defense Industrial Association in response to a question.

Similarly, nuclear weapons act as a deterrent for many countries, as was the case during the cold war between the US and China, he noted.

"If you look at the map, the Russian Far East, which directly adjoins China, is what we call an economy of force theatre. It is a theatre that can only survive by sustaining itself," Blank said.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

"If a war broke out between Russia and China -- and now and then Russian military and political officials actually allude to the possibility of a Chinese threat -- probably within a day the Chinese could take out the Trans-Siberian Railway and essentially isolate the area from the rest of continental Russia," he said.

"Therefore, the only recourse that the Russian military has in a contingency with China is nuclear," he added. During the Cold War, at the strategic level of nuclear weapons, the Russians could at any time they wanted destroy all of Europe.

"In return, we threatened to destroy all of the Soviet Union. That was basically the mutual hostage relationship. Then the US also became as well a target of enhanced Soviet capabilities," he said.

"If we are truly looking to build, 'a new world order', whatever that may be, and get beyond the Cold War, then we should not be encouraging people to build more nuclear weapons and to remain frozen in this posture of hostility and thinking about first-use scenarios," Blank said.

"So that already is the utility of nuclear weapons. It confers enormous political capabilities, as well as the strategic capability to wage conventional war. I mean, if you have nukes, you make the world safe for conventional warfare," Blank said.

[http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2013-05-11/india/39185579\\_1\\_south-indian-nuclear-weapons-cold-war](http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2013-05-11/india/39185579_1_south-indian-nuclear-weapons-cold-war)  
(Return to Articles and Documents List)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## Russia's Mediterranean Task Force to Include Nuclear Subs – Navy Chief

12 May 2013

MOSCOW, May 12 (RIA Novosti) – Russia's Mediterranean task force will comprise 5-6 warships and may be enlarged to include nuclear submarines, Navy Commander Adm. Viktor Chirkov said on Sunday.

"Overall, already from this year, we plan to have 5-6 warships and support vessels [in the Mediterranean Sea], which will be replaced on a rotating basis from each of the fleets – the Black Sea, Baltic, Northern and, in some cases, even the Pacific Fleet. Depending on the scope of assignments and their complexity, the number of warships in the task force may be increased," Chirkov told RIA Novosti.

Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu earlier said a decision to deploy a permanent task force in the Mediterranean to defend Russia's interests in the area had been made.

The Russian navy commander also said nuclear submarines could be deployed in the Mediterranean, if necessary.

"Possibly. In a perspective. They [submarines] were present there during the existence of the 5th squadron. There were both nuclear and diesel submarines there. Everything will depend on the situation," he said.

The Soviet Union maintained its 5th Mediterranean Squadron in that sea from 1967 until 1992. It was formed to counter the US Navy 6th Fleet during the Cold War, and consisted of 30-50 warships and auxiliary vessels at different times.

Russia also plans to use its Mediterranean task force for missions in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, the country's Navy chief said.

"No doubt, if necessary, when some tasks arise in other nearby regions, in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, the task force may be used," Chirkov said.

Now the Russian Navy is training officers who will perform their duties at sea on a permanent basis, he said.

"These persons must be comprehensively trained to solve tasks not only in the Mediterranean but also in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans," he said.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



The headquarters of Russia's Mediterranean taskforce will be set up already in the summer of 2013, he said.

"The headquarters will be established in the summer of this year and its officers will stay aboard one of the flagships in the Mediterranean Sea," he said.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20130512/181098977/Russias-Mediterranean-Task-Force-to-Include-Nuclear-Subs--Navy.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130512/181098977/Russias-Mediterranean-Task-Force-to-Include-Nuclear-Subs--Navy.html)

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## US Missile Defense Plan Changes Linked to 'Economic Issues'

15 May 2013

BRUSSELS, May 15 (RIA Novosti) – A senior Russian military official on Wednesday attributed the recent review of the US missile defense plans in Europe to economic and technological problems.

US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel announced in mid-March that plans for the final stage of Central European-based missile shields are to be scrapped and that interceptors will instead be placed in Alaska.

Those changes "are primarily linked to problems of an economic and technological nature," Col. Gen. Alexander Postnikov-Streltsov, deputy chief of the General Staff, told Russian reporters in Brussels after a session of the NATO-Russia Council at the level of general staff chiefs.

He did not elaborate.

Russian concerns about those plans and their impact on Russia's national security remain, he said, adding that Moscow is still interested in hearing more details from its US partners.

"Issues of the global missile defense system are closely connected with the missile defense system in Europe and we cannot consider them separately," he said.

The US says that the positioning of interceptors in Alaska and an additional radar station in Japan are designed to provide further coverage from any possible missiles launched from North Korea, but Russia worries that any missile defense program undermines the integrity of its own military strategy.

Russia says it is pressing for "legally binding agreements guaranteeing that US missile defense elements are not aimed against Russia's strategic nuclear forces."

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20130515/181166549/US-Missile-Defense-Plan-Changes-Linked-to-Economic-Issues.html>

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

Washington Free Beacon

## Open Secrets

*Pentagon Plans to Share Missile Secrets with Russia Opposed by Republicans*

By Bill Gertz

May 13, 2013

The Pentagon held internal talks on declassifying sensitive missile defense technology that it plans to share with Russia as part of the Obama administration's efforts to assuage Moscow's opposition to European defenses.

Republicans in both the House and Senate plan to block any technology declassification for missile defense technology in the current defense authorization bill and other legislation. Legislative mark up on the authorization bill begins this week.



Critics say giving Russia classified data would undermine the effectiveness of missile defenses, which have cost taxpayers more than \$100 billion since the 1980s.

Vice Adm. James Syring, director of the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency (MDA), disclosed during a congressional hearing Wednesday that the Obama administration has asked him about sharing sensitive missile defense data with Russia during talks over the past several years aimed at reaching a missile defense cooperation agreement.

"I have not been asked to declassify anything in terms of disclosing information to Russia," Syring said under questioning from Rep. Mo Brooks (R., Ala.) at a House Armed Services Strategic Forces subcommittee hearing Wednesday.

However, pressed for details, Syring revealed that there were discussions among senior policy officials, including Undersecretary of Defense for Policy James Miller, about "what is classified and what is not" in the context of data sharing with the Russians.

Syring said the discussions involved sensitive data to be used in talks with Moscow, including "the capability of the current missiles we're building and the velocity of burn out."

The Obama administration has sought to convince Russia's government that its phased missile defense plan for Europe will not be used against a Russian missile attack against the United States. As part of that process, Pentagon and State Department officials in the past have tried to give sensitive data to the Russians that they hope would convince them some U.S. defenses do not have the capability to shoot down long-range missiles.

Missile defense specialists have said a missile's velocity burnout rate is a key characteristic that can be used by states with offensive missiles to defeat the defenses.

Syring told the Senate Armed Services Committee Strategic Forces subcommittee on Thursday that he would not give up valuable technology to the Russians. "I will not cede the advantage of the United States to anybody," he said.

Syring declined to elaborate on his comments a day earlier about internal discussions on technology declassification and deferred questions to Madelyn Creedon, assistant defense secretary for Global Strategic Affairs.

Creedon said there are no plans to share classified information with the Russians. She said "multiple discussions" were held in the Pentagon regarding how to protect classified data on missile defenses during talks in Moscow.

A Pentagon spokeswoman also sidestepped questions about Syring's reference to discussions on declassifying data for sharing with the Russians.

The MDA "has not been asked to declassify data to give to Russia, nor has MDA declassified data to give to Russia," Lt. Col. Monica Matoush said.

She did not respond when asked about the internal discussions on declassifying interceptor burn data and other missile defense capabilities mentioned by Syring.

Brooks said in an interview that he is committed to fighting any missile defense technology sharing with the Russians.

"The more information we share about this technology with any foreign power, the greater the likelihood that our enemies will develop countermeasures, with catastrophic consequences should anyone launch a missile strike against American," Brooks said.

Brooks has introduced legislation that would ban the sharing of sensitive missile defense technology. If free-standing legislation does not pass, Republicans plan to add language to the annual defense authorization bill prohibiting the sharing of missile defense technology as has been done in the past several years, he said.

Protecting missile defenses and the technology used in them is becoming more important as a result of growing missile threats from both North Korea and Iran, Brooks said.

North Korea last month made unprecedented threats to fire nuclear-tipped long-range missiles at U.S. cities.





Current missile defenses are located on Aegis ships based in Asia and Europe, and at bases in California and Alaska. A ground-based interceptor base is also planned for the East Coast.

The Missile Defense Information Act of 2013, introduced by Brooks earlier this year, would prohibit the Pentagon from sharing missile defense technology, including hit-to-kill know-how, with Russia.

However, if the administration declassifies the technology, it could be shared with a foreign government.

"I know the White House is brazen, but it would be quite remarkable if they would in fact declassify technology that cost American taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars to develop," Brooks said when asked about the technology declassification plans.

"And a technology that is unique in the world," he added.

Both China and Russia are building missile defenses in response to U.S. missile defenses.

Rep. Mike Rogers (R., Ala.), chairman of the House Armed Services Strategic Forces subcommittee, criticized the administration data-sharing plan.

"It's appalling that the administration is considering further concessions—this time, classified information about our missile defenses—just to get Russia to agree to sit down and talk about further nuclear reductions," Rogers told the *Washington Free Beacon*. "The administration must stop treating our missile defenses like something it can trade away."

"If the administration would invest half as much time and effort in countering real threats, like Iran and North Korea, the American people could be a whole lot safer," Rogers said.

Ed Timperlake, a Pentagon technology security official in the George W. Bush administration, also criticized the technology-sharing plan.

"In a world of very bad ideas that constantly go around in Washington, like the Clinton administration's effort to limit defenses as part of ABM treaty demarcation, this initiative is truly pointless for the United States, and a huge boon to Russia," he said. "It makes absolutely no strategic sense for our national security."

Arms control advocates during the Clinton administration sought to restrict U.S. missile defenses in talks with the Russians, including limits on interceptor velocity, as a way to preserve the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, which banned strategic defenses against nuclear missiles.

President George W. Bush withdrew from the treaty as one of his first acts as president. The withdrawal paved the way for the deployment of U.S. missile defenses.

Sen. Mark Kirk (R., Ill.) on Thursday joined House Republicans in opposing the missile defense technology-sharing plan.

"We will not provide Russia with sensitive info about our missile defense systems," Kirk stated on Twitter.

Kirk said he is very concerned about the disclosures made by Syring because they raise questions about whether the data being considered for declassification would violate an agreement reached between Congress and the administration in 2011 that no interceptor velocity burnout data would be declassified unless it went through a rigorous security review and if it would benefit U.S. security and U.S. missile defenses.

Syring stated that his guidance to U.S. missile defense negotiators on not disclosing classified information to the Russians in missile defense talks "has been adhered to 100 percent."

Brooks then said: "I'm not sure that you're answering the question or maybe I'm not phrasing the question properly. Let me give it another crack. Have you had any discussions not about what information is classified or [un]classified, but, instead have you had any discussions about whether any classified information should become declassified with respect to our missile defense technology [and] Russia?"



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

"Yes sir, there has been a discussion on the capability of the current missiles we're building and the velocity of burn out," Syring said.

Then-Under Secretary of State for Arms Control Ellen Tauscher in 2011 offered to provide Moscow with data on the burnout rate for SM-3 interceptor missiles, the mainstay of sea-based defenses.

Republicans opposed that effort as well.

Paula A. DeSutter, assistant secretary of state for Verification, Compliance, and Implementation in the George W. Bush administration, said declassifying information about current and future U.S. missile defense systems and providing it to Russia is unwise.

"First, the cost to U.S. national security is very high because, particularly in light of Russia's military trade with other nations, including Iran, it is absurd to believe that Russia will not provide the data to current and potential foes," DeSutter said.

Provision of sensitive U.S. missile defense data would enable Russia and other states to design offensive ballistic missiles that could defeat U.S. defenses, she said, rendering U.S. defenses less effective and thus causing further U.S. investment that would be required to offset increasing ballistic missile threats as a result.

"Second, there is no benefit to doing so since, as we saw during protracted efforts during the Bush administration, no technical data, threat rationale, or policy arguments will ever persuade Russia to agree to U.S. deployment of missile defenses," DeSutter said.

Additionally, the United States should develop and deploy "the best possible defense of the United States, our forces, and our allies against the threat of ballistic missiles carrying nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and stop giving Russia veto power over U.S. national security requirements," she said.

A Pentagon spokesman had no immediate comment.

<http://freebeacon.com/open-secrets/>

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

Economic Times – India

## **US Sees China Launch as Test of Anti-Satellite Muscle: Source**

By Reuters  
May 16, 2013

WASHINGTON: The US government believes a Chinese missile launch this week was the first test of a new interceptor that could be used to destroy a satellite in orbit, one US defense official told Reuters on Wednesday.

China launched a large missile on Monday that reached 10,000 km (6,250 miles) above the earth, the highest suborbital launch seen worldwide since 1976, according to Jonathan McDowell at the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics.

China has said the rocket, launched from the Xichang Satellite Launch Center in western China, carried a science payload to study the earth's magnetosphere. However, a US defense official said US intelligence showed that the rocket could be used in the future to carry an anti-satellite payload on a similar trajectory.

"It was a ground-based missile that we believe would be their first test of an interceptor that would be designed to go after a satellite that's actually on orbit," said the official, who was not authorized to speak on the record. Representative Mike Rogers, chairman of the US House Intelligence Committee, declined to comment specifically on the rocket launch, but said China was clearly taking a more aggressive posture in space. "Any time you have a nation-state looking to have a more aggressive posture in space, it's very concerning," Rogers said at a Reuters Cybersecurity Summit.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The United States remains concerned about China's development of anti-satellite capabilities after Beijing shot a missile at one of its own defunct satellites in orbit in 2007, creating an enormous amount of debris in space. Monday's rocket launch was similar to launches using the Blue Scout Junior rocket that were conducted by the US Air Force in the 1960s for research on the Earth's magnetosphere, McDowell said in an emailed response to questions.

He said all the previous suborbital launches above 10,000 km (6,250 miles) had been conducted by the United States. All China's previous missile tests went to less than 2,000 km (1,250 miles), although Beijing had launched orbital vehicles higher, including to the Moon, he said.

Most scientific suborbital launches are at most 1,500 km (940 miles) or so, McDowell added. The 1976 launch was Gravity Probe A, when NASA and McDowell's institute worked together to launch an atomic clock to 10,280 km (6,425 miles).

Monday's launch came less than a week after US Deputy Defense Secretary Ashton Carter unveiled what he called a "long overdue" effort to safeguard US national security satellites and develop ways to counter the space capabilities of potential adversaries.

US military space officials are taking steps to improve the resilience of national security satellites in orbit, the defense official said. These include using new wave forms to make it more difficult for adversaries to jam signals from space, putting US sensors on commercial satellites and using terrestrial high frequency communications.

Last week, the Pentagon released an 83-page report on Chinese military developments that highlighted China's increasing space capabilities and said Beijing was pursuing a variety of activities aimed at preventing its adversaries from using space-based assets during a crisis.

[http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2013-05-16/news/39310675\\_1\\_rocket-launch-xichang-satellite-launch-center-china-launch](http://articles.economictimes.indiatimes.com/2013-05-16/news/39310675_1_rocket-launch-xichang-satellite-launch-center-china-launch)

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

Global Security Newswire

## **Obama Reportedly Offers Putin Deal on Sharing of Antimissile Data**

May 16, 2013

President Obama has reportedly proposed to Russian President Vladimir Putin that their two governments work toward a formal accord on sharing antimissile data, ITAR-Tass reported on Wednesday.

In a personal letter delivered to Putin in mid-April by U.S. national security adviser Tom Donilon, Obama suggested "developing a legally binding agreement on transparency, which would include exchange of information to confirm that our programs do not pose a threat to each other's deterrence forces," the Russian *Kommersant* newspaper reported.

An unidentified State Department source told the newspaper that Obama could conclude the agreement using his executive authority, which would not need approval from Congress. The accord, though, could be undone by a subsequent presidential administration.

Moscow "could well accept the U.S. proposal," a Russian envoy said, as "more transparency in the missile defense field is useful both in itself and as an instrument to improve mutual confidence."

Moscow has demanded a legally enforceable guarantee that sophisticated U.S. Standard Missile 3 interceptors planned for fielding in Europe would never be aimed at Russian strategic missiles. The Obama administration has spurned that request, saying it does not have the authority to make such a promise. The new deal would only cover information sharing, which could remain a sticking point for Russia.

The Defense Department last year said it was weighing providing Moscow with the "velocity at burnout" of SM-3 missiles to prove they were not fast enough to threaten Russian ICBMs. The resulting Republican uproar caused the

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

Obama administration to apparently put the plan on the back-burner while it focused on winning re-election. The head of the department's Missile Defense agency last week testified to Congress that he had been asked by the Defense secretary's office whether certain missile defense data was classified or unclassified.

Putin has written a response to Obama's proposal that will be delivered early next week by Security Council Secretary Nikolai Patrushev, ITAR-Tass separately reported. The letter will reaffirm Russia's stance on antimissile matters and "will be constructive in nature," according to presidential aide Yuri Ushakov.

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/obama-reportedly-offers-putin-legally-binding-deal-sharing-antimissile-data/>

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

Military Times.com

## Missile Defense System Tested over Pacific Ocean

May 17, 2013

Associated Press

PACIFIC MISSILE RANGE FACILITY, HAWAII — The Missile Defense Agency and U.S. Navy sailors completed a successful test of a missile defense system by destroying a target launched Wednesday night over the Pacific Ocean.

A separating short-range ballistic missile target was launched from the Pacific Missile Range Facility on Kauai.

The USS Lake Erie detected and tracked the missile with onboard radar. The ship, equipped with an Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense weapon system, launched a block missile that released a kinetic warhead, which destroyed the target, the Department of Defense said.

"The kinetic warhead acquired the target re-entry vehicle, diverted into its path, and, using only the force of a direct impact, engaged and destroyed the target," the department said in a news release.

Initial reports show the Aegis system worked as designed. Officials will evaluate data taken during the test.

The test involved the latest version of the second-generation Aegis system, which can handle engagement of longer-range and more sophisticated missiles. It was the third consecutive, successful intercept test of the Aegis BMD 4.0 Weapon System and the SM-3 Block IB guided missile. Previous successful intercepts took place on May 9, 2012, and June 26, 2012.

The defense system has successfully intercepted 25 of 31 missiles since tests began in 2002.

<http://www.militarytimes.com/article/20130517/NEWS/305170004/Missile-defense-system-tested-over-Pacific-Ocean>

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

International Business (IB) Times – U.K.

## Second US General Warns of 'Disruptive and Destructive' Cyber Attacks

*The general responsible for the United States' cyber-security has warned cyber-attacks against the country will worsen unless greater security measures are introduced.*

By Edward Smith

May 15, 2013

Speaking at the Reuters Cyber-security summit, Army General Keith Alexander, head of the National Security Agency (NSA) and US Cyber Command said attacks could occur "in the not-too-distant future" which would target public utilities and the financial sector:

"Mark my words, it's going to get worse. The disruptive and destructive attacks on our country will get worse and ... if we don't do something, the theft of intellectual property will get worse."

Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

Alexander warned that billions of dollars' worth of intellectual property was being stolen during cyber-attacks each year. His remarks come months after China is believed to have attacked The Wall Street Journal and The New York Times in order to monitor the papers' coverage of the Chinese government.

Alexander proposed legislation that would allow the US government to more easily monitor private computer networks for signs of intrusion.

However, a similar piece of legislation, the Cyber Information Sharing and Protection Act (CISPA) has already faced problems in the Senate over concerns it would breach the privacy of individuals. The Act, which proposes to increase information-sharing between the government and private businesses, was thrown out by the Senate in April, 2012.

Following amendments, it recently passed the House of Representatives, but the Obama administration has threatened to veto the Act if greater measures are not introduced to safeguard the information of US citizens.

Alexander, however, said the NSA would not be interested in monitoring individuals, saying: "We can protect our networks and protect our civil liberties and privacy."

Except in special cases, his proposed legislation would not allow the US government to identify and monitor individual people.

Alexander is the second high-ranking US military officer this week to voice concerns about threats to America's cyber-security. Admiral Jonathan Greenert, chief of naval operations, said earlier that the investment being made into US cyber-security is the same as the country's nuclear weapons strategy, calling cyber-attacks the "future of warfare."

<http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/articles/467838/20130515/cyber-security-summit-attacks-china-wall-street.htm>

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

Bloomberg Businessweek

## **Saudi Health Workers Sickened by SARS-Like Virus**

By Mike Stobbe

May 16, 2013

NEW YORK (AP) — A deadly new respiratory virus related to SARS has apparently spread from patients to health care workers in eastern Saudi Arabia, health officials said Wednesday.

The Ministry of Health in Saudi Arabia told world health officials that two health care workers became ill this month after being exposed to patients with the virus. One is critically ill.

Since September 2012, the World Health Organization has been informed of 40 confirmed cases of the virus, and 20 of the patients have died. The deaths occurred in France, Germany, Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Qatar and the United Kingdom.

Experts have suggested calling the new virus MERS, for Middle East Respiratory Syndrome, but officials have not signed off on that yet.

Experts are watching carefully for signs that the deadly virus can spread from person-to-person. Health officials say the virus has likely already spread between people in some circumstances, including hospital patients in France. But the confirmed spread to nurses or other health care workers is new.

The new virus has caused severe respiratory disease in patients, some of them needing mechanical ventilators to help them breathe.

One of the Saudi health care workers is a 45-year-old man who is in critical condition. The other is a 43-year-old woman in stable condition. No other details about their jobs or where they work were released.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The new virus has been compared to SARS, an unusual pneumonia that first surfaced in China in late 2002 and erupted into a deadly international outbreak in early 2003. Spread of the virus in hospitals was a key development in the epidemic.

Ultimately, more than 8,000 cases were reported in about 30 countries, including eight people in the United States. The global tally included 774 deaths.

The SARS outbreak was declared contained by the summer of 2003, thanks to such measures as quarantines, hospital isolation of suspected cases, travel restrictions and the screening of airline passengers.

The WHO is currently not recommending any travel restrictions or special screening at airports or border crossings. Officials worry it will flare into an outbreak as big or worse. The new virus and SARS are both coronaviruses, a germ family that includes some cold viruses.

The new virus is distinct from SARS, but health officials worry it has potential to flare into a SARS-like international outbreak. But many questions remain about how it is spread, where it originated, and how deadly it truly is.

<http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2013-05-16/saudi-health-workers-sickened-by-sars-like-virus>

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

Bloomberg News

## **U.S. Loses Track of Terror Suspects in Protection Program**

By Phil Mattingly

May 16, 2013

The U.S. Marshals Service was unable to find two former participants in the federal witness protection program who were known or suspected terrorists, according to an inspector general's report.

The Justice Department's inspector general identified "significant issues concerning national security" in a review of the handling of terrorists admitted into the program, according to the report released today.

"We found significant deficiencies in the handling of known or suspected terrorists," according to the report by Michael E. Horowitz, the department's inspector general.

Included in the reported deficiencies were lax monitoring of individuals in the program -- something that included the inability to find two former participants in the program.

U.S. authorities have placed suspects in the program in lieu of prosecution as a way to gather intelligence and information about possible terrorists or plots.

A majority of known or suspected terrorists in the program were admitted prior to the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks, a Justice Department official said. Federal investigators have since accounted for the two individuals, both of whom left the program and the country, said the official, who asked for anonymity to discuss details which haven't been made public.

'Necessarily Included'

Armando O. Bonilla, senior counsel to the deputy attorney general, said in a written response to the report that a "small number" of known or suspected terrorists were "necessarily included" in the witness protection program as the government increased its focus on domestic and international terrorism cases.

Bonilla, in a memo to Horowitz dated May 6, said the department's leadership has implemented 15 of the 16 recommendations made in the report, including an increase in information sharing, consultations with the department's national security division and more stringent monitoring protocols for known or suspected terrorist in the program.

"The former known or suspected terrorists admitted into the program have provided invaluable assistance to the United States and foreign governments in identifying and dismantling terrorist organizations," Bonilla said.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

Representative Bob Goodlatte, a Virginia Republican who is chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, said losing track of the potentially dangerous witnesses echoed a failure to track one of the brothers who carried out the bombing of the Boston Marathon last month. Lawmakers are investigating whether law enforcement agencies properly handled a tip from the Russians that one of the brothers was becoming radicalized.

“This is gross mismanagement — pure and simple — that jeopardizes American lives and cannot be tolerated,” he said in an e-mailed statement.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-16/u-s-loses-track-of-terrorists-in-protection-program.html>

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

The Japan Times – Japan  
OPINION/Article

## **Is Missile Defense Useful?**

SENTAKU MAGAZINE  
May 13, 2013

Japan’s missile defense system invariably draws much attention every time a firing of a ballistic missile by North Korea appears imminent. The news media in this country have lately carried a wide variety of reports on whether that system would be effective, as there appeared to be growing signs of Pyongyang firing the Musudan intermediate-range ballistic missile.

But the true value of the missile defense system lies not in its ability to intercept or shoot down flying weapons, but rather in its effectiveness in persuading the adversary to give up the idea of firing a missile for fear of it being shot down. And an important underlying factor in the missile defense system is the fact that the missile defense system of the Japanese Self-Defense Forces complements that of the U.S. armed forces.

In other words, the missile defense system is a weapons system that symbolizes the Japan-U.S. alliance.

The missile defense system is a U.S.-led defense system consisting of an early detection of an enemy ballistic missile with early warning satellites and radar networks and interception and destruction of the missile in flight.

In Japan, naval vessels equipped with the Aegis combat system would fire the SM-3 sea-to-air missile to shoot down an enemy missile in outer space. If that fails, the PAC-3 Patriot ground-to-air missile takes over.

The Aegis system, named after the Greek word meaning an omnipotent shield, can instantly detect and identify enemy aircraft and missiles, automatically select and fire the most suitable weapons and shoot down more than 10 targets simultaneously. Deployment of two Aegis-equipped naval ships in the Sea of Japan would cover the whole Japan.

The PAC-3 is different as it has a quite limited range of 20 to 30 km. Therefore, it is meant to protect specific facilities. Although the PAC-3 is deployed at 11 locations in Japan, their coverage is extremely small when compared with Japan as a whole.

A Defense Ministry source said there is virtually no possibility of a North Korean missile hitting any part of Japanese territories and that PAC-3 deployment is more for public relations.

A high-ranking Self-Defense Force officer also noted that while the possibility of a North Korea missile coming down on any part of Japan by mistake cannot be altogether ruled out, it is utterly unrealistic that Pyongyang would deliberately aim a missile at Japan, because such an act would mean that the North had decided to wage a full-scale war against the United States. In his view, Pyongyang is simply using its possible missile firing as a diplomatic bargaining chip in dealing with the U.S.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



Other insiders went so far as to say that the Defense Ministry now has an opportunity to exaggerate the “threats” from North Korea, which in turn would enable the ministry to shore up the nation’s defense capabilities and to carry out military exercises openly.

These views are poles apart from the urgency suggested in TV newscasts, which in turn create fear among the public.

Both the Pentagon and the Defense Ministry claim that the probability of the missile defense system shooting down an enemy ballistic missile is better than 80 percent. But with little empirical data available, the reliability of the SM-3 or the PAC-3 has not yet been proven.

Yet it cannot be said that the missile defense system is unnecessary. Its value lies in deterring a potential aggressor from carrying out an attack. Deterrence, which is the basis of security, means the power to dissuade an enemy from undertaking a particular action by making it realize that the action is too difficult to carry out or will produce too costly a result.

The missile defense system has come to a major turning point as North Korea has made progress in its missile technology and is accelerating its nuclear weapons development.

When the North fired a Taepodong-1 medium-range ballistic missile and it flew over the Japanese archipelago toward the Pacific in 1998, the threat of North Korean missiles spread from South Korea to Japan.

This did not immediately alarm the United States, which at the time was more concerned with the unstable Middle East situation including proliferation of nuclear weapons technology to Iran. But it was forced to change its stance toward Pyongyang following the North’s firing of the advanced Taepodong-2 missile in December 2012 and carrying out of its third nuclear test in February 2013.

Recognizing that Pyongyang now possesses the technology to fire a missile that will fly more than 10,000 km and reach the U.S. mainland, Washington has become aware that not only South Korea and Japan but also the U.S. faces the North’s threats.

In a bid to make sure that Japan serves as a frontline defense to shield the U.S. from attacks from North Korea, the American movable X-band early warning radar was installed at the Kyogamisaki sub-base of the Air Self-Defense Force in Tango, Kyoto Prefecture, to track ballistic missiles fired in the direction of Guam.

The same type of radar has already been deployed at the ASDF Shariki sub-base in Tsugaru, Aomori Prefecture, to track ballistic missiles flying toward the U.S. mainland.

Japan and the U.S. are jointly trying to improve the performance characteristics of interceptor missiles carried by the Aegis-equipped naval vessels so that they can intercept enemy missiles flying at a higher altitude and to increase the number of such interceptor missiles.

All these moves have led Japan to assume a much greater role than before as the frontline defense for U.S. safety.

It is important to know that the missile defense system works only if the U.S. early warning satellites detect the source of heat generated at the time of a missile launch. Without this information, neither the X-band radar nor the Aegis-equipped ships would be able to track the missile to shoot it down. The most crucial aspect of the defense missile operation is under the control of the U.S.

In other words, the missile defense system constitutes the core of the U.S.-led security strategy. Japan is pouring huge sums of taxpayer money into the system and its Self-Defense Forces are coming to function as something like a subcontractor for the U.S. armed forces. The recent moves to strengthen the missile defense system indicate qualitative changes taking place in the Japan-U.S. alliance.

*This is an abridged translation of an article from the May issue of Sentaku, a monthly magazine covering Japanese political, social and economic scenes.*

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2013/05/13/commentary/is-missile-defense-useful/#.UZQaH5Qo5Dx>





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

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

China Daily – China  
OPINION/Op-Ed Contributor

## **US and the Art of Exaggeration**

May 13, 2013

By Zhao Xiaozhuo (China Daily)

The annual report of the US Department of Defense on Chinese military and security development, released on May 6, is full of groundless speculations on the strength and aim of China's armed forces. In fact, it is out of tune with the development trend of Sino-US relations.

Briefing reporters at the Pentagon, David F. Helvey, US deputy assistant secretary of defense for East Asia, claimed the report was not speculative. The report has six chapters and four additional special topics on China's combat capability and its main body is 68 pages long compared with the 19 pages of the 2012 report. It covers an entire gamut of cases and data, which have been selectively included to show that China poses a military threat to other countries.

For instance, in the chapter titled "Understanding China's Strategy", the report says China employed "punitive trade policies" in response to the arrest of the captain of a Chinese fishing vessel after it collided with Japan coast guard boats in the disputed waters off the Diaoyu Islands in 2010. It also says the Philippines and Vietnam have had to bear the brunt of China's pressure in the South China Sea and misinterprets China's assertiveness in defending its sovereignty and territorial integrity as a deviation from the path of peaceful development.

The report mentions China's internal debate on its long-held principle of maintaining a low profile and alleges that Beijing may seek to play an aggressive role in regional and global issues. Even China's proposal of building a new type of power relationship has been misinterpreted as its aspiration to be regarded as a great power. And the commissioning of first and only aircraft carrier, Liaoning, the report says, is a sign of China flexing its military muscles to win regional maritime conflicts.

The report is littered with what the US claims is "evidence", to exaggerate China's military strength. For instance, it says that up to five Jin-class nuclear-powered, ballistic missile-carrying submarines may enter the services of the Chinese navy to give it the first credible sea-based nuclear deterrent, which is nothing but a baseless guess.

Compared with previous US annual reports on China's military, the latest one has more information about China's cyber capabilities and activities. It accuses China of using companies, research institutes and computer network operations to collect sensitive information and acquire export-controlling technology. But the report fails to furnish any concrete proof to this effect.

The report is actually an attempt to misguide international opinion against China to serve the US' strategic interests, an art that it mastered decades ago. The US used to release annual reports on the military strength of the former Soviet Union during the Cold War, and earlier this year it issued a report on the military of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea for the first time amid escalating tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

The surge in anti-war sentiments in the US over the past few years spurred the call to end the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. But the withdrawal of American troops from Iraq - and Afghanistan next year - has hurt the vested interests such as the Pentagon and arms manufacturers and suppliers. So portraying a rising China as a simulated enemy will divert the attention of the US' strategic failures and help the Pentagon to get Congress approval for its budget and arms dealers to secure their orders.

The US army has been leading the fight against terrorism for years undermining the role of the navy and air force. So the report's emphasis on access- and area-denial capabilities of the Chinese military is aimed at laying the ground for the US military to acquire resources to translate its air-sea battle concept into reality.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The report suggests that the US' policy toward China still wavers between containment and engagement. Despite the in-depth structural differences between the two countries, the US is fully aware of the need to secure China's support and cooperation in a wide range of regional and global issues. That is why the report, despite portraying the Chinese military as a threat, acknowledges China's growing international influence and highlights the principles that should be adhered to in military-to-military contacts between the two countries.

Such exchanges, according to the report, should help enhance the two militaries' ability to interact on a tactical or operational level, foster mutual understanding, clear misconceptions and allow the two countries' leaders to address global security challenges. This perhaps is the only redeeming feature of the US report.

That the US has come up with sensational speculations on China's military is not new. For instance, the 2004 US report said the Chinese mainland might launch a "decapitation strike" on Taiwan. And the 2006 report alleged that China's military development had already undermined the US' strategic capability to intervene in Asia-Pacific regional issues.

But with China growing in confidence and becoming more transparent in military affairs, the international community has gained far deeper knowledge about China's military development. And this will make the US false accusations and groundless speculations less eye-catching in the future.

*The author is a senior colonel and deputy director of the Center for China-America Defense Relations, the Academy of Military Science, PLA.*

[http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2013-05/13/content\\_16493568.htm](http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2013-05/13/content_16493568.htm)

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

The Bismarck Tribune – Bismarck, ND

OPINION/Editorial

## **Continue Aggressive Response to Minot AFB Problems**

Tribune Editorial

May 13, 2013

When it comes to controlling nuclear weapons, the standard of performance by U.S. men and women in uniform ought to be high. The officers in command of launch units should be some of the nation's finest. There are protocols to follow and standards to keep, and these men and women are charged with an awesome responsibility.

To fail at this task would be unthinkable.

Yet the U.S. Air Force felt compelled to remove 17 officers from Minuteman 3 launch crews at the Minot Air Force Base last week. The action came after inspection of the 91st Operations Group described conditions and attitudes in the unit as "marginal." That translates to a "D" on a civilian report card. The 91st Missile Wing has 150 officers.

Have we lived with nuclear weapons so long our military has become casual in its caretaker role?

The problems at the Minot Air Force Base surface in close timing with the belligerent pronouncements from the new leader of North Korea, who claimed his country had developed a nuclear weapon along with a delivery system that was capable of reaching the United States. Most people thought Korean leader Kim Jong Un and his minions were blowing smoke, but we didn't really worry because of our nation's missile defense shield. Little did we know of flaws in that shield.

Fortunately, inspectors at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana and F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming turned in excellent marks in the same period. It means the situation in Minot can be turned around, and the aggressive response from higher command is a good sign that will happen.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



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

The 17 officers removed are being reacquainted with protocols, procedures and the focus required in maintaining an important part of the nation's nuclear arsenal. Everyone would feel better if this had not happened. However, it did and now we deal with the consequences.

There's a feeling, and it extends even to the Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, that the United States should get rid of its nuclear missiles. But that decision has not been made, and until it has, the Air Force needs to hold to its responsibilities.

North Dakotans repeatedly have fought difficult political battles to keep the bases at Minot and Grand Forks fully staffed and operational. There always seems to be another round of base closings underway and a need to mobilize testimony and support. Incidents like the one related to missile launch crews at Minot do not help to secure the air base's future.

[http://bismarcktribune.com/news/opinion/editorial/continue-aggressive-response-to-minot-afb-problems/article\\_7e3603a2-b976-11e2-93af-001a4bcf887a.html](http://bismarcktribune.com/news/opinion/editorial/continue-aggressive-response-to-minot-afb-problems/article_7e3603a2-b976-11e2-93af-001a4bcf887a.html)

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

Bloomberg News  
OPINION/Bloomberg View

## **How U.S. Can Break Up Iran's Long Nuclear Game**

By Gary Milhollin  
May 13, 2013

There has been a lot of talk about Iran making a sudden dash for the bomb. The fear is that, with its thousands of gas centrifuges and its tons of enriched uranium, Iran might be able to make a bomb's worth of nuclear fuel before the U.S. or any other country could intervene to stop it.

In a speech in September at the United Nations, Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu went so far as to display a bomb diagram, on which he drew a red line showing when the dash might occur. He said it could be as early as this spring.

It is surprising that this version of events has gained such currency, because it isn't likely to happen. Iran, in fact, doesn't seem to be in a hurry. It is playing a longer game, all the more menacing because it is more likely to succeed.

Iran's goal is to build a nuclear arsenal at an acceptable cost. To achieve that, Iran must avoid any drastic step that would trigger a war. In a shootout with the U.S., the ayatollahs would risk their survival -- a large cost indeed.

Iranian leaders have stayed just beneath the line of intolerable provocation. Of course, they must also keep the pain from sanctions low enough to avoid revolt. They are succeeding there as well. So their strategy is working.

### **Multiple Bombs**

Its success is only one reason that Iran probably won't race for a bomb anytime soon. A second reason should be fairly obvious: No country wants only one bomb. That is especially true of the type of bomb Iran has been trying to develop. It employs the principle of implosion, and would have to be tested. The U.S. was obliged to test its implosion bomb in 1945 before dropping "Fat Man" on Nagasaki, Japan.

Iran, too, would be obliged to test, to find out whether its design worked, and to let the rest of the world know it worked. Otherwise, there would be no effect of nuclear deterrence, which is the reason for getting the bomb in the first place. Thus, a sprint to produce one bomb's worth of fuel -- a possibility that has spilled a small torrent of ink estimating how long it would take -- would cross the finish line with mainly test data.

And the activity would probably be detected. The director of U.S. intelligence, James Clapper, assured a congressional committee in March that Iran couldn't divert material and make a weapon-worth of uranium "before this activity is

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



discovered.” By “material,” Clapper meant the uranium Iran has already enriched. Most of it is “low-enriched,” meaning two-thirds of the way to weapon-grade. A small amount is “medium-enriched,” meaning 90 percent of the way.

To make a dash now, Iran would have to start with enriched material; to start with natural, unenriched uranium would take so long as to be impractical. But there is a catch: All the enriched uranium is regularly checked by UN inspectors. Within a few weeks at most, they would probably detect its diversion.

The result would be a perfect storm, politically. Governments would be under tremendous pressure to act. Israel, the U.S. and Europe couldn’t afford not to. Iran would be in flagrant breach of its Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty obligations, which require continuous inspection of enriched uranium and forbid its use for any but peaceful ends. Iran could face the very war it had been trying to avoid.

This war could start before the dash succeeded. To produce bomb-grade uranium, Iran would have to enrich its stockpile further. That means passing it again through its centrifuges. Unluckily for Iran, yet luckily for just about everybody else, its present generation of centrifuges is grossly inefficient.

Iran’s largest known enrichment site is near Natanz, about 160 miles south of Tehran. It is home to some 9,000 rapidly spinning centrifuge machines. How long would it take these machines to raise Iran’s uranium stockpile to weapon-grade?

### **Uranium Supply**

Only a small amount of work would be needed, in theory, if it started with the medium-enriched uranium. The minimum time, assuming everything went perfectly, could be as low as a few weeks. But there is a big problem. Iran has only enough of this material for one bomb. To fuel even a small arsenal of five bombs, Iran would need to amass far more, which would take three years at its present rate of production.

Could Iran start with its larger stock of low-enriched uranium? It has enough now to fuel five to six bombs, a plausible number for a beginner’s arsenal. But it would take at least eight months to raise that much to weapon-grade. Such a production run, of course, won’t happen. It wouldn’t be a sprint or even a jog. It would be a crawl, in plain view. Long before Iran could fuel even five bombs, precision-guided munitions could be streaking down.

Instead, Iran is playing the longer game. It can follow the example of Israel, India and Pakistan, which came to the bomb late, yet got true arsenals without armed conflict and are now accepted as nuclear powers.

The Iranians are experimenting with better centrifuges, reported to enrich uranium three to five times faster. Several hundred of these machines are at Natanz already, and Iran predicts that 3,000 will be installed “in the near future.”

Enrichment is also increasing. There is room at Natanz for tens of thousands of additional centrifuges, and Iran could triple the number operating at its fortified Fordo plant. Sometime next year, Iran will amass enough low-enriched uranium to fuel seven bombs and, if it activates its idle capacity at Fordo, enough medium-enriched uranium to fuel five more. A dozen bombs would be a credible nuclear force.

So roughly two years from now, we could see a new situation. Iran could have a hefty stockpile of medium-enriched uranium; it could be operating several thousands of potent new centrifuges; it could be operating thousands more of its old centrifuges; throughout the Islamic Republic, scores of workshops would be creating centrifuges at locations unknown to international inspectors. It may have entered at last the “zone of immunity” the Israelis have been warning about, meaning that Iran’s power to make nuclear weapons would no longer be vulnerable to air attack.

### **Comfort Zone**

That status is what Iran seems to be striving for. What Israel dreads as a danger zone, Iran would welcome as a comfort zone. If Iran fed its new centrifuges with its new stock of medium-enriched uranium, it could shave enrichment times to the bone. Instead of taking a few months to fuel five bombs, the theoretical time would shrink to a few weeks.



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

This is bound to create an aura of inevitability. Iran can reasonably hope that when its program is fully mature, the world will decide that an aerial attack won't be adequate, that all-out war will cost too much, and that "containment" will be the better way to go.

The U.S. and its allies have found no way to counter this strategy. They have imposed sanctions, yet the sanctions haven't stopped nuclear progress. They have warned of military action. Iran seems not to believe it. The U.S. and its allies have urged negotiations, but this misreads the needs of the long game. Iran must push ahead. How can it accept the UN's demand that it stop enriching uranium? If it did, it could never perfect its new centrifuges, and would be frozen at a level where it could never reach an arsenal. Iran's nuclear argosy would be stuck on a reef.

Instead, the U.S. is stuck. Iran is doing nothing sufficient to create a crisis. It tiptoes forward, builds its potential every day, claims a right to enrich uranium, deals with sanctions, and strings out negotiations. "No breakthrough but also no breakdown," was what a U.S. official called it after the most recent round of talks.

To sever the deadlock, the U.S. must change its game. It must carry out what it says is its policy on Iran. The Barack Obama administration claims to have a policy of "prevention," that is, to stop Iran from getting the bomb. This is different from "containment," which tries to manage a nuclear threat after it arises. The administration even says it will prevent the capacity to build a bomb -- an earlier phase in development -- rather than wait until Iran is only a screw-turn short of success.

#### **Small Arsenal**

There is only one way to apply such a policy: to define the point where Iran's ability to make a small arsenal comes into being and to state what will be done to prevent that point from being reached. In other words, red lines. Plus statements of what will happen when they are crossed.

For example, the U.S. could declare a limit on the amount of enriched uranium Iran would be allowed to accumulate (the excess would be sent abroad) or declare a limit on the number of centrifuges Iran could deploy (new or old). And the consequences could be a progression. First, more severe sanctions, and then military steps such as interdiction of oil shipments, a blockade of ports or even an air attack. At each step Iran could limit the harm by limiting its program.

None of this seems to fit the administration's playbook, yet without it, the U.S. has no way to build political support for taking action. This last point is vital. If prevention is really the policy, then force has to be an option. Yet the U.S. can't attack Iran out of the blue. The American public would have to be prepared, as would U.S. allies. The U.S. government would have to remind everyone that the UN has condemned Iran for violating the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, that Iran thereby lost any right to enrich uranium, that the UN has called on Iran to cease enrichment, and that Iran hasn't complied.

To this could be added Iran's unflagging support for terrorist groups, its supply of parts for roadside bombs in Iraq that have killed U.S. troops, and its outrageous violations of human rights. All of these could and would be cited in support of red lines, if prevention were really the policy.

Instead, Uncle Sam has maintained a mild demeanor, intended to nurture negotiations. They have gone nowhere for years. It is clear why. Iran sees all too acutely that the U.S. isn't ready to set red lines, and is even further from using force. None of the political groundwork has been done, or is likely to be done.

Without it, threats aren't credible. Thus, Iran sees no impediment to its long game. It is working well, and, unless something changes, it will give Iran the bomb.

*Gary Milhollin is executive editor of Iranwatch.org, a website on Iranian weapons programs that is published by the Wisconsin Project on Nuclear Arms Control. The opinions expressed are his own.*

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2013-05-13/how-u-s-can-break-up-iran-s-long-nuclear-game.html>

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

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

AI-Monitor – Washington, D.C.  
OPINION/Back Channel News Blog

## **New Report Outlines Containment Strategy if Efforts to Prevent Iran Nuclear Weapon Fail**

May 13, 2013

By Laura Rozen

President Obama has repeatedly declared that his policy is preventing Iran from producing a nuclear weapon. A new report by a former Obama Pentagon official, to be released Monday by the Center for New American Security, argues prevention should be the US policy, but that the United States needs to develop a containment strategy if prevention fails.

Among the key points the report makes is that resort to force in the event diplomacy is deemed to fail could itself trigger Iran's determination to produce a nuclear weapon—a decision that the US intelligence community this year assessed Iran's leadership had not yet made.

"Even an operationally effective strike would not, in and of itself, permanently end Iran's program," the report's lead author, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for the Middle East Colin Kahl, told AI-Monitor in an interview Saturday. "A strike might substantially degrade Iran's near-term capability to produce nuclear weapons, but it would almost certainly increase Tehran's motivation to eventually acquire nuclear weapons to deter future attacks."

Iran might respond to an attack by leaving the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and substantially decreasing cooperation with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors. "Such a move would complicate the international community's ability to detect Iran's efforts to rebuild its program," Kahl said.

For these reasons, Kahl argues, force should only be used if other options for halting Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions fail, if there is clear evidence that Iran is moving toward a bomb, and if every effort has been made to build international support for military action by seeking a diplomatic solution.

Outlining a Plan B containment strategy in the event prevention fails is not without political risks, however, Kahl acknowledged, while emphasizing he is no longer a member of the Obama administration. (Kahl, who served as DASD for the Middle East from 2009 until 2011, is now a professor at Georgetown University and a senior fellow at CNAS. He co-authored the new report *If All Else Fails: The Challenges of Containing a Nuclear Armed Iran*, with Georgetown graduate student Raj Pattani and CNAS researcher Jacob Stokes.) But the strategic risks of failing to prepare contingency plans would be more dangerous, Kahl said.

"If the administration were seen to be exploring a Plan B in the event that prevention fails, it might create the false impression that they were secretly planning to 'accept' a nuclear-armed Iran," Kahl said. "Nothing could be further from the truth."

"At the same time, there are also substantial risks associated with sticking our collective heads in the sand," he continued. "The failure to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons would be bad, but the failure to be prepared for that possibility would be even worse."

"One of the most important roles a think tank can play is to ask the questions that cannot be asked inside the government," Kahl said. "I believe, in general, that it is important to plan for the things we *don't* want to happen, not just the outcomes we desire."

Asked to explain why the new report is not in essence arguing the US can live with a nuclear Iran, Kahl responded: "'Live with' makes it sound like it would be 'no big deal' to simply accommodate a nuclear-armed Iran. That is not the right way to think about it, and it is definitely *not* what the report argues."

"The emergence of a nuclear-armed Iran would further destabilize an already turbulent and conflict-prone Middle East, and it would raise the specter of a regional nuclear war—a risk that does not exist today," Kahl said. "The report

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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



concludes that a robust containment strategy might be able to manage and mitigate many of these dangers. But we also conclude that it would be extraordinarily complex, costly, and far from foolproof—and the consequences associated with even a small risk that containment fails would be grave.”

Moreover, Kahl said, pursuing containment would force the United States to indefinitely double down on its security commitments to the Middle East, making it more difficult to “re-balance” U.S. foreign policy toward Asia and, by reinforcing ties with some of the least democratic governments in the region, could complicate the American response to the Arab Spring. Containment would also increase the role of nuclear weapons and nuclear deterrence in U.S. national security strategy at the very moment when the Obama administration hopes to go in the opposite direction, he said.

“For all these reasons, a commitment to using all instruments of national power, including the possible use of military force, to prevent—rather than contain—a nuclear-armed Iran is the right policy,” Kahl said. “We need to plan for containment if prevention fails, but no one should confuse this with an argument for pursuing containment if we can avoid it.”

*Laura Rozen writes the Back Channel news-blog for Al-Monitor. She previously served as senior foreign policy reporter for Politico and Yahoo News, and wrote the “Cable” blog for Foreign Policy magazine.*

<http://backchannel.al-monitor.com/index.php/2013/05/5222/plan-b-new-report-outlines-containment-strategy-if-efforts-to-prevent-iran-nuclear-weapon-fail/>

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

USA TODAY  
OPINION/CyberTruth

## Why the U.S. Needs to Flex its Cyber Muscles

By Jarno Limnéll, Special for CyberTruth  
May 14, 2013

*(Editor's note: In this guest essay, Dr. Jarno Limnéll, Director of Cyber Security at network security vendor Stonesoft, outlines why he believes the American public needs to demand more transparency from the Department of Defense regarding U.S. nation-state cyber security efforts.)*

The most tantalizing targets for America's cyber adversaries will not be government or military institutions, however, they will be critical infrastructure like utilities and transport networks in major metro areas. So it's fair to say that the average citizen has plenty of reason to follow the federal government's actions in this domain.

It is a positive step that the Cyber Command in Washington intends to hire 4,000 new recruits, quintupling its current force. Yet it remains a mystery as to what roles these recruits will have and the operations they might conduct. There are a number of compelling reasons why more transparency is desperately needed.

First and foremost is the need for America to flex its muscles.

It is important to accept that in cyber warfare, offense is typically a step or two ahead of defense. There is no such thing as a cast iron defense strategy when new threats and exploits emerge continually.

It is therefore essential that the U.S. candidly communicates the ferocious power of its offensive capabilities as a deterrent. Akin to the scenario of mutually assured destruction at the hands of nuclear weapons during the cold war, the threat of vastly destructive retaliatory capabilities is a powerful deterrent for prospective cyber enemies.

Another reason for an open approach is the danger of mistaken identity. Due to the intricate workings of the cyber threat landscape, misconstrued actions and intent is all too common, and can have drastic consequences. If wrongly suspected of a cyber attack due to ignorance about its capabilities, America could see retaliation from a major world power based on an attack that the U.S. cyber force didn't even perpetrate.



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

Finally, a prospective cyber attack might be more pertinently compared to September 11 than to Pearl Harbor because the impact is likely to be felt by civilians. Cyber warfare shifts the military paradigm to make civilian targets a priority over military. Cyber attacks have the potential to bring down critical infrastructure with terrifying ease, crippling water and power supplies, causing the maximum amount of damage to a nation or region. Imagine the entirety of the New York City without power or water for a week or longer. Are people resilient enough to cope with that eventuality?

With this in mind, it becomes clear that, more than ever, behind the scenes operations of the Department of Defense in Washington have huge import for the civilian population across the country, particularly in major metropolitan hubs. It is easy to see why the public might want to pay close attention to the country's cyber warfare strategy.

**About the essayist:** *Jarno Limnell is a Doctor of Military Sciences and Director of Cyber Security at network security vendor Stonesoft. He studies the global threat landscape and is an expert on international security politics.*

<http://www.usatoday.com/story/cybertruth/2013/05/14/cyber-warfare-global-politics/2157795/>

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

Time – U.S.

OPINION/Battleland

## The Cold War Returneth

By Mark Thompson

May 15, 2013

The Russians booted a U.S. diplomat from their country Tuesday, contending he was a CIA spy. The cable network FX has a hit on its hands with *The Americans*, a weekly show that focuses on a Soviet couple working for the KGB in Washington during the Reagan Administration.

While these superpower flashbacks may have the comfort of an old coat, there's a contemporary downside to it, as well. It seems the demise of the nuclear-tipped superpower rivalry was good while it lasted. Heck, there are soldiers serving in the U.S. Army who have never known the reliability of planning for war in the Fulda Gap.

But is its end a fiction?

You bet, according to a pair of defense experts who spoke last Friday in Washington. One is wrapping up his career as a professor at the Army War College, and the other is a former senior Pentagon official now affiliated with the hawkish National Institute for Public Policy.

Now you do have to keep what they say in perspective: their talk was sponsored by the National Defense Industrial Association, which is what the military-industrial complex has printed on its official stationery. The Air Force Association and the Reserve Officers Association were also sponsors.

You can glean the tone of these regular gatherings by checking out the topics of some recent and upcoming talks:

- *Sustaining the Nuclear Enterprise*
- *China's Challenge: Nuclear and Missile Defense Perspectives*
- *Future of USAF Nuclear Deterrent Forces*
- *The Enduring Requirements of US Strategic Security: Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control, Defense Policy and Missile Defense*
- *Missile Defense, Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control, Prompt Global Strike and the Search for Strategic Stability in a Constrained Budget Environment*
- *The Nuclear Infrastructure Challenge and Deterrence Implications*

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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





– Nuclear Triad, Arms Control, Deterrence and America's Security

So, yea, admittedly there's a bit of a Johnny-One-Nuke thing going on. And yes, it would be nice if there were a bit more balance to the session. And if it hadn't been held in the Capitol Hill Club, a private GOP social club on Capitol Hill.

But just because they may be driven by pecuniary and partisan motives...*doesn't mean they're wrong.*

Here are some pertinent excerpts from the remarks of **Stephen Blank**, soon-to-retire professor of national security affairs at the Army War College, and **Mark Schneider**, a senior analyst at the National Institute for Public Policy:

**Schneider:** *Russia is increasingly anti-democratic and hostile to the United States. Xenophobia is widespread in Russia. The Kremlin is currently encouraging nationalism and militarizing the country. It constantly attacks the West. And a sizable number of the Russian population see neighboring countries as part of the Russian zone of influence. Now, this is not me speaking; this is taken from a recent statement by Alexei Kudrin, who, until September 2011, was the finance minister of Russia and who has just been publicly offered a Cabinet position by [Russian President] Vladimir Putin.*

**Blank:** *We are currently witnessing a 33 trillion ruble overall rearmament of the Russian military by 2020. That's about \$800 billion, depending on the exchange rate. Now there's no doubt that between 1990 and 2008 essentially there was a procurement holiday, for all intents and purposes, in the Russian military. The military was busted. They need to recapitalize the military...But to the extent that they are building this kind of military, it is clearly intended to take on, on the one hand, the U.S. and NATO, and secondly, the enemy that they will never speak about in public but which does preoccupy a lot of military thinking, namely China.*

**Schneider:** *There are massive differences in the infrastructure for nuclear weapons production and in missile production. In both cases, you have very active Russian programs underway and virtually minimal programs in the United States. One of the key differences is this, and I was able to get this declassified several years ago. The Russian nuclear weapons complex is capable of producing at least 2,000 nuclear weapons a year, and that's from a Russian source. And they have active production programs in both ICBMs [intercontinental ballistic missiles], SLBMs [submarine-launched ballistic missiles].*

**Blank:** *Now if you look at the map, the Russian Far East, which directly adjoins China, is what we call an economy-of-force theater. It is a theater that can only survive by sustaining itself. If a war broke out between Russia and China — and now and then Russian military and political officials actually allude to the possibility of a Chinese threat — probably within a day the Chinese could take out the Trans-Siberian Railway and essentially isolate the area from the rest of continental Russia. Therefore, the only recourse that the Russian military has in a contingency with China is nuclear.*

**Schneider:** *What's the Administration's reaction to this unprecedented, in the post-Cold War period, enhancement of Russian nuclear capabilities? Basically, it's more nuclear reductions. We're making nuclear reductions, according to the information released by the State Department, much faster than is necessary to comply with the New START treaty. We are pursuing minimum modernization programs, and we're going to do more arms control.*

**Blank:** *Fundamentally, this is a government that has what the German philosopher Carl Schmitt called a presupposition of conflict. It sees itself as threatened on all sides. I have, in a study that's coming out...a threat assessment that essentially NATO and the U.S. are advancing, are creating threats to strategic stability — that's missile defenses — and that the likelihood of war in an around Russia's frontiers is growing. And they've been saying those kind of things for about five or six years now. It's not just a new wrinkle in Russian thinking.*

**Schneider:** *They've designed new types of nuclear weapons in post-Cold War. They're probably doing hydronuclear testing as part of the development program. So all these things are underway, and there are enormous differences. On our side, we will soon have zero experienced nuclear weapons designers in our complex. The Russians have experienced nuclear weapons designers that have actually done small-yield testing, in all probability. They are designing, producing new types of ICBMs.*

**Blank:** *Further, Putin said, at the same time we see methodical attempts to undermine the strategic balance in various ways and forms — missile defense. The United States has essentially launched now the second phase in its global missile*



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

*defense system. There are attempts to sound out possibilities for expanding NATO further eastward. That tells me that they have bought an intelligence assessment that doesn't exist, that is basically fabricated. There is nobody in this town or in Brussels talking about expanding NATO. It's not going to happen anytime soon. Yet Russian intelligence and the government obviously believe this. And that's already a sign of something dangerous.*

**Schneider:** *We have not had an ICBM or SLBM design team operational since about 1990. That has an enormous potential asymmetrical impact. When we ever get around to designing a new missile — and right now the earliest date for that is 2042 IOC [initial operational capability] — we're going to face unprecedented problems because we will have no one — maybe a few people, you know, as consultants, elderly consultants, but — nobody in terms of, you know, experience — there's no experienced ICBM designer, SLBM designer in the United States with any sort of recent design experience of any significance.*

**Blank:** *We have a system in Russia where the intelligence apparatus is out of control. And we know from Russian history innumerable times where these guys deliberately inflate the threat. And Putin has said if the military says it's a threat, it's a threat. Now, in this country, that kind of stuff wouldn't be allowed for a minute...*

Thank God.

*Pulitzer Prize-winner Mark Thompson has covered national security in Washington since 1979, and for Time since 1994.*

<http://nation.time.com/2013/05/15/the-cold-war-returneth/>

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

The Hill  
OPINION/Congress Blog

## Missile Defense Turns 30

By C. Dean McGrath Jr.  
May 15, 2013

North Korea is preparing to test a long-range missile, and the Defense Department believes that the nation may soon be capable of building a nuclear-armed missile.

Meanwhile, Iran remains a serious threat — the nation already has missile capability, it's working to develop inter-continental missiles (ICBMs) and it's committed to developing nuclear weapons.

There is also the very real threat of terrorists gaining these capabilities — and radicals around the globe have shown a willingness to use whatever technology is available.

These threats are reminders of why the United States has invested decades of research into developing missile defense systems. While missile defense may have been a politically divisive issue when it was first proposed by President Reagan 30 years ago, the need for such capability is no longer in doubt.

Political and military leaders know the important role that missile defense systems play in protecting the United States and its allies from terrorist threats and rogue nations like North Korea and Iran. They also agree that improving those systems to meet new and evolving threats is a national security priority.

When Reagan first announced the concept of missile defense in 1983, he envisioned a system that could intercept incoming missiles from the Soviet Union. Until then, the United States relied on Mutual Assured Destruction — or MAD — as the only deterrent.

The move to missile defense made sense, both morally and practically. As Reagan said, "I've become more and more deeply convinced that the human spirit must be capable of rising above dealing with other nations and human beings by threatening their existence."

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

Today, it makes even more sense — MAD has limited applicability to address the threats posed by rogue nations and terrorists.

Thirty years ago, Reagan's vision was dismissed out of hand — called "Star Wars" — and was considered unrealistic. Reagan knew that the technological challenges would be enormous, but he never doubted that the United States could succeed. He challenged the nation to consider whether the world would be better off "if people could live secure in the knowledge that their security did not rest upon the threat of instant U.S. retaliation," but rather on our ability to "intercept and destroy strategic ballistic missiles before they reached our soil or that of our allies."

Thanks to bipartisan political support and 30 years of effort from scientists, engineers and military and civilian personnel, the skeptics have been proven wrong. Missile defense interceptors are successfully destroying incoming missiles in both test and real-world situations. Most are familiar with the Patriot Air Defense Missile System, but there's also Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD), the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense.

The Pentagon recently deployed the THAAD system to Guam to defend our military bases in the Pacific from North Korean threats, and Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel has announced plans to deploy 14 more ground-based interceptors to California and Alaska.

The United States isn't the only country that has recognized the necessity of strong missile defense. Friends and allies, including Israel, Japan, South Korea and the UAE, have come to rely on these systems. Several others, including Poland and Turkey, are in the process of assessing their missile defense options.

The global consensus has shifted so far in favor of missile defense that the NATO alliance has adopted territorial missile defense as an operational priority. This commitment could enable countries to pool their expertise and resources, allowing some smaller nations to acquire and use missile defense systems that would otherwise be unaffordable if pursued independently.

Thirty years ago, Reagan initiated "a comprehensive and intensive effort to define a long-term research and development program to begin to achieve our ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by strategic nuclear missiles." He noted that "Our only purpose — one all people share — is to search for ways to reduce the danger of nuclear war."

We have made much progress toward that end. It is indisputable that a strong, practical missile defense system will be needed in the coming years to protect the United States, our friends and allies. It is not a political or diplomatic bargaining chip. Neither is it a budgetary luxury. It's a strategic necessity.

But despite 30 years of progress and achievement, we cannot stop our support of missile defense until we achieve the "ultimate goal of eliminating the threat posed by nuclear missiles."

*McGrath was an associate counsel to former President Reagan (1986-1989). He is an attorney with McGrath & Associates and an adjunct professor of law at Georgetown University. He is a graduate of Duke University, the University of Nebraska College of Law and the National War College.*

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/homeland-security/299811-missile-defense-turns-30>

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

The Heritage Foundation  
OPINION/The Foundry

## Missile Defense Testing Necessary to Protect America

By Emil Maine  
May 15, 2013

Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013

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



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

The growing threat from long-range nuclear missiles endangers the lives of millions of Americans while upsetting regional and global stability. The latest flare-up on the Korean Peninsula is a sobering reminder of this harsh reality. To protect Americans effectively against rogue attacks in the near future, a rigorous program of missile defense testing must be implemented.

As Heritage's Michaela Dodge explains, these tests must be challenging in order to provide the best protection for the U.S. and its allies. Although tougher tests will increase the likelihood of missing targets, they present learning opportunities that can improve our missile defenses.

In any missile defense test, judging the success or failure of a given test is usually determined by whether or not the target was successfully intercepted. However, that shouldn't be the only—or even the primary—criterion for determining whether the test was a success or failure.

The core purpose of testing is, and must continue to be, to push systems to the point of failure. A “dumbed-down” test that ends with successful interception is of little value because it provides no new information that can be used to improve missile defenses. On the other hand, a well-constructed missile test can be of tremendous value even if the target evades interception.

“Failure” is a normal—in fact, necessary—part of experimentation and progress. This holds true for any field of scientific inquiry, including weapons development. The Polaris submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM), developed in the 1950s, “failed” 12 out of 17 times—all within a span of about a year. Despite this track record, the missile was deployed, and its many technical advances were incorporated later in the Trident SLBM.

If one looked only at the test “failures,” one could easily dismiss both systems as unproven and unreliable. In reality, the tests had been pushing technology to the extreme. As a result, the developers learned more, faster. The tests produced a complex technology so advanced that the Trident SLBM today stands as a bedrock of our strategic deterrent. It is expected to remain in service until 2040.

Defense systems can work, even if they fail to hit their targets every time during testing. Our sea-based Aegis Missile Defense system failed to destroy the target in six out of 30 tests, yet it is regarded today as the most effective component of U.S. missile defense.

*Emil Maine is a Research Assistant at The Heritage Foundation and Assistant Editor at Infinity Journal.*

<http://blog.heritage.org/2013/05/15/missile-defense-testing-necessary-to-protect-america/>

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

Global Times – China

OPINION/Op-Ed

## **US Military Reports Aimed at Bigger Budgets and Baffling Beijing**

Global Times, May 16, 2013

The report, which makes accusations over China's justified moves to advance military development, and questions the direction of China's defense policies, has aroused strong opposition from China's Ministry of National Defense.

Since 2000, the US has never tired of issuing such reports. The Pentagon report on China's military essentially is an embodiment of the US hegemony, showing the US won't give up easily its role as world policeman.

Since the mid-1990s, the US has taken China as the main threat to its hegemony.

The US strategic estimation at that time was that China would be a global threat by 2015 to 2020. Based on such judgment, the US suppresses China militarily by various means.

So far, the US has issued 13 Pentagon reports on China's military. Meanwhile, it has enhanced its military presence around China.

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 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

Military maneuvers activated by the US have been increased in scope, seeing more countries involved and becoming closer to real warfare with an increasingly prominent simulated enemy.

From a global perspective, the US carries out most of its military exercises in China's surrounding regions. Those military exercises put increasing military pressure on China and position China in a volatile situation.

The US is a pragmatic country. It issues the military reports with clear purposes.

Viewing China more like a realistic rival than a potential one, Washington will increase its attention to China's military development.

It is the US Congress that examines and approves the military budget every year, which makes the Pentagon have to work very hard to woo the Congress' support.

The annual Pentagon report submitted to the Congress will somehow affect US Congress members' views on China's military and the possible actions they will vote for.

Therefore, the Pentagon needs to magnify threats from China in the report on China's military development. From this sense, it's not hard to understand why the Pentagon report is filled with twisted and exaggerated information on China's military development.

Another purpose for the US to issue such a report is to disturb China's military development.

The US knows China's military development cannot be stopped, but it can take measures to dampen or slow down the process.

The reports issued by Pentagon affect the security and stability in China's neighboring regions. The keynote of all the 13 reports so far is the "China threat."

Thanks to the US clamor, the "China threat" has been inoculated into the security consciousness of China's neighboring countries.

This adds difficulties for China to build a stable surrounding environment for the country's development, since it has to deal with troubles constantly stirred up by Washington.

The US hopes to maintain the hot spots in China's neighboring region or even heat up conflicts. It gives special attention to the Diaoyu Islands dispute between China and Japan in its latest report on China's military development.

The Diaoyu Islands issue has been a prominent hot spot in recent years, but much attention has been shifted to the Korean Peninsula this year. Washington instigates Japan to aggravate competition with China over the Diaoyu Islands through the latest report, beefing up conflicts between the two.

The US intention is evident. It aims at making the Diaoyu Islands dispute a long-standing nightmare that China cannot get rid of, so as to disturb China's development.

China should stay sober over the US Pentagon report and recognize its real intentions.

*The author is a professor at the PLA University of National Defense.*

<http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/782177.shtml>

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

**Issue No. 1058, 17 May 2013**

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