



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

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** [Draft House Measure Demands Nuclear Capability in New Bomber from Get-Go](#)

1. [Iran Reiterates Readiness to Cooperate More Closely with IAEA](#)
2. [Iran Undecided on Nuclear Bomb - Israel Military Chief](#)
3. [Israeli Official Warns Of Nuclear Arms Race](#)
4. [North Korea's Nuclear Test Ready 'Soon'](#)
5. [German Experts Dismiss N. Korean Missiles at Parade as Mock-Ups](#)
6. [Military Says NKorea Has 'Powerful Modern Weapons'](#)
7. [Russia Has No Illusions over N. Korea's Intentions: Report](#)
8. [N.K. Reneging on U.S. Deal Suggests Disarray at Top: Hill](#)
9. [China Warns N.Korea Off Nuclear Test](#)
10. [N.K. May See Its End in a Collapse: Cha](#)
11. ['North Korean Provocations Born from Stroke'](#)
12. [After Agni-V Launch, DRDO's New Target Is Anti-Satellite Weapons](#)
13. [Pakistan Successfully Test Fires Hatf IV Ballistic Missile](#)
14. [Reagan Era Envoy Found Pakistan 'Lied' on Nukes](#)
15. [Russia Repeats Iskander Deployment Threat](#)
16. [Russian Military Concedes Iran, N. Korea Nuclear Threat](#)
17. [Reshuffles as Medvedev Sacks Air Force Chief](#)
18. [Pentagon Reshapes Spy Service](#)
19. [Republicans Eye Missile-Defense Site on East Coast](#)
20. [Draft House Measure Demands Nuclear Capability in New Bomber from Get-Go](#)
21. [Russia Says Many States Arming for Cyber Warfare](#)
22. [Nuclear Weapon Reductions Must Be Part of Strategic Analysis](#)
23. [India's Missile Warning](#)
24. [India's Nuclear Choices](#)
25. [Why Is North Korea Threatening to Conduct a Nuclear Test?](#)
26. [It's Time for the U.S. To Finally Sign the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty](#)
27. [China and India's Agni-V](#)
28. [Iranian Cyber Threat Cannot Be Underestimated](#)
29. [The U.S. Obsession with Absolute Security](#)

*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. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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

Press TV – Iran

## **Iran Reiterates Readiness to Cooperate More Closely with IAEA**

Tuesday, April 24, 2012

Iran's Foreign Ministry spokesman has reiterated Tehran's readiness to continue the talks and cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

"Once again, we announced our readiness to continue negotiations and collaboration with the agency," Ramin Mehmanparast told reporters in reference to Iran's latest communication with the agency.

"We have always been ready to have closer cooperation with the agency and have proved this in practice as we have had the most [extensive] collaboration with the body," he said in his Tuesday press conference in the Iranian capital, Tehran.

The Iranian official expressed hope that Iran would fully enjoy the right to peaceful nuclear energy in return for the country's commitment to its international obligations.

Mehmanparast also said Tehran has a positive approach to the upcoming round of talks with the P5+1 -- the permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany -- in the Iraqi capital, Baghdad, on May 23, and expressed optimism that the next round of the negotiations will be fruitful and guarantee the rights of the Iranian nation.

He further argued that any decision by the West could seriously affect the atmosphere of the upcoming talks, and noted, "We consider any sanction measure as a wrong and negative step; however, we regard a removal of the illegal and unreasonable embargoes as the right approach for rectifying the previous mistakes."

Iran and the P5+1 wrapped up their latest negotiations in the Turkish city of Istanbul on April 14, hailing the talks as "constructive."

The two sides had previously held two rounds of talks, one in Geneva in December 2010 and another in Istanbul in January 2011.

The United States, Israel, and some of their allies accuse Tehran of pursuing military objectives in its nuclear energy program.

Iran refutes such allegations, arguing that as a committed signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and a member of the IAEA, it has the right to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

<http://www.presstv.com/detail/237837.html>

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

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)

25 April 2012

## **Iran Undecided on Nuclear Bomb - Israel Military Chief**

The head of the Israeli military has said he does not think Iran will develop nuclear weapons.

Chief of Staff Lt Gen Benny Gantz made the statement in an interview with the Israeli newspaper, Haaretz.

He said Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, had not yet made the final decision whether to build a nuclear bomb.

Tehran says it wants nuclear technology for peaceful purposes but the West believes Iran is developing weapons.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



In November, the UN's International Atomic Energy Agency published a report which complained it had been unable to "provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran" and that it continued to have "serious concerns regarding possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear programme".

The US, European Union, Canada, Japan and Australia are among those who have imposed sanctions on Tehran.

The measures include restrictions on Iranian oil sales, a ban on the supply of heavy weaponry and nuclear-related technology to the country, and an asset freeze on certain individuals and organisations.

### **At odds with PM?**

Gen Gantz says this pressure is beginning to bear fruit.

He added that Iran "is going step by step to the place where it will be able to decide whether to manufacture a nuclear bomb. It hasn't yet decided to go the extra mile".

And speaking of the supreme leader he continued: "I don't think he will want to go the extra mile. I think the Iranian leadership is composed of very rational people."

But these views appear to put him at odds with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

In an interview with CNN this week Mr Netanyahu said he would not want to bet "the security of the world on Iran's rational behaviour".

The prime minister has also warned he would be prepared to take action against Iran to stop it obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Gen Gantz warned: "Clearly, the more the Iranians progress the worse the situation is. This is a critical year but not necessarily 'go, no-go'. We're in a period when something must happen.

"Either Iran takes its nuclear programme to a civilian footing only, or the world - perhaps we too - will have to do something. We're closer to the end of discussions than the middle."

Haaretz reported that the general believed Iran's nuclear programme was vulnerable because its facilities were not bomb-proof.

He also expressed concern that "we are the only country in the world that someone calls for its destruction and also builds devices with which to bomb us".

"But despair not," he said. "The State of Israel is the strongest in the region and will remain so. Decisions must be made carefully out of historic responsibility but without hysteria."

Although Gen Gantz does not think Iran would ultimately go ahead with a nuclear weapon, he said that as a military man he had to be prepared for every eventuality.

"I am preparing for full deployment of our capabilities. The political leadership will have to take courageous, painful decisions," he said.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-17837768>

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

National Public Radio (NPR)

## **Israeli Official Warns Of Nuclear Arms Race**

By The Associated Press

April 27, 2012



JERUSALEM (AP) — Israel's defense minister says the world must prepare to "swiftly and firmly" stop Tehran from acquiring atomic weapons and setting off a regional nuclear arms race.

In a thinly veiled reference to a military strike, Ehud Barak acknowledges that such an operation would be "complex, risky and unpredictable."

He warns that a nuclear Iran "would be far more complex, dangerous and immeasurably more costly," both in terms of human lives and financially.

At the Israeli Defense Ministry's annual Independence Day reception late Thursday, Barak warned that "Saudi Arabia, Turkey and even Egypt would be forced to join the race."

He also predicted a nuclear Iran would "assertively" back anti-Israel militants in "sowing terror in the region and throughout the world."

Iran denies it aims to build nuclear weapons.

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=151505625>

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

Deccan Chronicle – India

## **North Korea's Nuclear Test Ready 'Soon'**

April 24, 2012

By Reuters

Beijing -- North Korea has almost completed preparations for a third nuclear test, a senior source with close ties to Pyongyang and Beijing said, which will draw further international condemnation following a failed rocket launch if it goes ahead.

The isolated and impoverished state sacrificed the chance of closer ties with the United States when it launched the long-range rocket on April 13 and was censured by the U.N. Security Council, including the North's sole major ally, China.

Critics say the rocket launch was aimed at honing the North's ability to develop an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of hitting the United States, a move that would dramatically increase its military and diplomatic heft.

Now the North appears to be about to carry out a third nuclear test after two in 2006 and 2009.

"Soon. Preparations are almost complete," the source said when asked whether North Korea was planning to conduct a nuclear test.

This is the first time a senior official has confirmed the planned test and the source has correctly predicted events in the past, telling Reuters about the 2006 test days before it happened.

The rocket launch and nuclear test come as Kim Jong-un, the third of his line to rule North Korea, seeks to cement his grip on power.

Kim took office in December and has lauded the country's military might, reaffirming his father's 'military first' policies that have stunted economic development and appearing to dash slim hopes of an opening to the outside world.

Washington, Seoul and Tokyo, which have most to fear from any North Korean nuclear threat, are watching events anxiously and many observers say that Pyongyang may have the capacity to conduct a test using highly enriched uranium for the first time.

Defence experts say that by successfully enriching uranium, to make bombs of the type dropped on Hiroshima nearly 70 years ago, the North would be able to significantly build up stocks of weapons-grade nuclear material.



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

It would also allow it more easily to manufacture a nuclear warhead to mount on a long-range missile.

The source did not specify whether the test would be a third test using plutonium, of which it has limited stocks, or whether Pyongyang would use uranium.

South Korean defence sources have been quoted in domestic media as saying a launch could come within two weeks and one North Korea analyst has suggested that it could come as early as the North's 'Army Day' on Wednesday.

Other observers say that any date is pure speculation.

The rocket launch and the planned nuclear test have exposed the limits of China's hold over Pyongyang. Beijing is the North's sole major ally and props up the state with investment and fuel.

"China is like a chameleon toward North Korea," said Kim Young-soo, professor of political science at Sogang University in Seoul. "It says it objects to North Korea's provocative acts, but it does not participate in punishing the North."

Reports have suggested that a Chinese company may have supplied a rocket launcher shown off at a military parade to mark this month's centenary of the birth of Kim Il-sung, the state's founder, something that may be in breach of UN sanctions.

China has denied breaching sanctions.

#### **Youngest Kim still in charge despite rocket fiasco**

The source said there was debate in North Korea's top leadership over whether to go ahead with the launch in the face of U.S. warnings and the possibility of further U.N. sanctions, but that hawks in the Korean People's Army had won the debate.

The source dismissed speculation that the failed launch had dealt a blow to Kim Jong-un, believed to be in his late 20s, who came to power after his father Kim Jong-il died following a 17-year rule that saw North Korea experience a famine in the 1990s.

"Kim Jong-un was named first secretary of the (ruling) Workers' Party and head of the National Defence Commission," the source said, adding that the titles further consolidated his grip on power.

North Korean media has recently upped its criticism of South Korean President Lee Myung-bak, who cut off aid to Pyongyang when he took power in 2008, calling him a 'rat' and a 'bastard' and threatening to turn the South Korean capital to ashes.

Pyongyang desperately wants recognition from the United States, the guarantor of the South's security. It claims sovereignty over the entire Korean peninsula, as does South Korea.

"North Korea may consider abandoning (the test) if the United States agrees to a peace treaty," the source said, reiterating a long-standing demand by Pyongyang for recognition by Washington and a treaty to end the 1950-1953 Korean War, which ended in a truce.

<http://www.deccanchronicle.com/channels/world/asia/north-koreas-nuclear-test-ready-%E2%80%98soon%E2%80%99-366>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
April 24, 2012

## **German Experts Dismiss N. Korean Missiles at Parade as Mock-Ups**

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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

SEOUL, April 24 (Yonhap) -- The new intercontinental ballistic missiles displayed in a military parade in North Korea were mock-ups and the presentation was "a nice dog and pony show," according to two German experts on North Korean missiles.

The North showed off the missiles on transporter-erector-launchers during the parade to mark the centennial of the April 15 birth of the country's late founder Kim Il-sung, the grandfather of current leader Kim Jong-un. The display sparked intense speculation on the North's ballistic missile capability following its botched rocket launch earlier this month.

"At first glance, the missile seems capable of covering a range of perhaps 10,000 kilometers. However, a closer look reveals that all of the presented missiles are mock-ups," Markus Schiller and Robert H. Schmucker, analysts with Schmucker Technology in Germany, wrote in an English-language report posted on a nuclear arms control and nonproliferation blog last week.

"There is still no evidence that North Korea actually has a functional ICBM."

The two said, "At a closer look, it is impossible to find a real warhead separation plane on any of the observed ICBMs," adding that the surface structure is another indication that the warhead is a mock-up.

"A real warhead's casing has to resist thermal and structural loads of an atmospheric reentry and is certainly not designed this way," the experts said.

The two also said a road-mobile missile of this size is always solid-fueled, though there are visible elements at each stage that look like filling or draining valves for liquid propellants.

"These elements only make sense on a liquid-fueled stage," the report said.

They suspected that the erector-launcher vehicle, whose maximum total weight is 122 tons, is oversized for a rocket weighing less than 40 tons.

The experts said it is not possible to securely bolt the missile to the launch table, saying the hole that might hold the bolt aligns with the outer diameter of the missile, or very close to it.

They said every presented missile features slightly different cable duct positions and slightly different positions of the ominous white bands, noting these bands appeared to have been added only for looks since no functional purpose could be identified.

"North Korea obviously presented the World's first liquid-fueled solid missile, in six different versions. There is no doubt that these missiles were mock-ups," the two wrote in the report.

They said the North seemed to have staged the whole presentation to celebrate the milestone anniversary and to gain some strategic leverage, though they said it remains unknown if the mock-ups were designed to confuse foreign analysts, or if the designers simply did some sloppy work.

"For now, the ICBM presentation was nothing else than a nice dog and pony show," the two said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2012/04/24/33/0401000000AEN20120424004100315F.HTML>

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

Atlanta Journal-Constitution

## **Military Says NKorea Has 'Powerful Modern Weapons'**

By JEAN H. LEE, Associated Press

Wednesday, April 25, 2012

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



PYONGYANG, North Korea — North Korea is armed with "powerful modern weapons" capable of defeating the United States, a top military chief in Pyongyang said Wednesday, a claim that matches the country's regular rhetoric but is questioned by experts.

The comments by Vice Marshal Ri Yong Ho at a meeting marking the 80th anniversary of the army's founding came amid increased speculation abroad about the nation's missile arsenal and nuclear ambitions.

Washington worries about the possibility that North Korea might develop a reliable intercontinental ballistic missile and a nuclear bomb small enough to use as a payload.

But outside experts believe that is still a long way off.

North Korea has enough plutonium for about four to eight "simple" bombs, according to estimates by scientist Siegfried Hecker of the Center for International Security and Cooperation, but it doesn't yet appear to have the ability to make bombs small enough to mount on a missile. The country's past long-range rocket tests — in 1998, 2006, 2009 and earlier this month — are believed to have ended in failure.

Ri emphasized the importance of strengthening the military to defend North Korea against threats it sees from the United States and South Korea. He called his nation a nuclear and military power and praised new leader Kim Jong Un, believed to be in his late 20s, as a "military strategist" who has been giving the army guidance for years.

"The Korean People's Army is armed with powerful modern weapons ... that can defeat the (U.S.) imperialists at a single blow," he told party and military officials, using familiar descriptions of the country's rivals.

The Associated Press was among foreign news agencies based in Pyongyang allowed to observe the closed meeting, attended by Kim Jong Un.

Ri, who is chief of the army's General Staff, did not provide further details about North Korea's weapons, but his call to arms comes as the United States, Britain and others warn the North against provocations that would further heighten tensions. The Korean peninsula remains officially at war because the 1950-53 Korean War ended with an armistice, not a peace treaty.

Earlier this month, North Korea launched a long-range rocket in what its officials called a failed attempt to put a satellite into space. The launch was decried internationally as a banned test of long-range missile technology.

The rocket broke into pieces shortly after liftoff. The U.N. Security Council later condemned the launch as a violation of resolutions prohibiting North Korea from engaging in nuclear and missile activity, and Washington halted a plan to provide the North with much-needed food aid in exchange for a moratorium on nuclear and missile tests.

On Monday, North Korea responded to U.S. and South Korean criticism with threats to reduce South Korean targets "to ashes" within minutes in a particularly sharp warning that followed days of protest rallies held nationwide.

There also are worries that North Korea may conduct a nuclear test, as it did after rocket launches in 2006 and 2009. South Korean intelligence officials say recent satellite images show the North has been digging a new tunnel in what could be preparation for a third atomic test.

U.S. Defense Secretary Leon Panetta warned North Korea not to engage in any further provocation.

He told reporters in Brazil that he had no knowledge of any specific actions being planned by North Korea but said he would "strongly urge" it to avoid any destabilizing acts.

<http://www.aic.com/news/nation-world/military-says-nkorea-has-1425467.html>

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

Yonhap News — South Korea  
April 26, 2012



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

## Russia Has No Illusions over N. Korea's Intentions: Report

MOSCOW, April 26 (Yonhap) -- Russia is under no illusions as to North Korea's intentions, a news agency has reported, as concerns grow Pyongyang may carry out a nuclear test following its failed rocket launch.

"If this or that country tries to create a weapon of mass destruction, it will be also trying to create a delivery vehicle," Russian Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin said earlier this week, as reported by the Itar-Tass news agency.

Rogozin made the comment about the North's recent failed rocket launch earlier this month.

The North claimed the launch was intended to put a satellite into orbit but South Korea and the United States believe it was a cover for testing the North's ballistic missile technology, which experts say could be used to deliver nuclear weapons.

"A WMD as such is worthless without a means to take it to the target," Rogozin was reported as saying. "For North Korea it is important to have a weapon of intimidation to threaten not only its near neighbors, such as South Korea, but U.S. naval bases, too."

Rogozin said it is common knowledge North Korea is trying to develop a missile, stating, "We have no illusions" as to the North's intentions, according to Itar-Tass.

His comments came alongside reports North Korea has almost completed preparations for a third nuclear test. A senior South Korean presidential official has described a third nuclear test as a political choice.

Some experts have said the North could try to compensate for its botched rocket launch with a nuclear test in a move to bolster the credentials of the North's new leader Kim Jong-un.

The North has twice before carried out a nuclear test following a long-range missile test.

In 2006, the North conducted its first nuclear test, three months after the test-firing of its long-range Taepodong-2 rocket. The second nuclear test in 2009 came just one month after another long-range rocket launch.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2012/04/26/41/0401000000AEN20120426005700315F.HTML>

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

Korea Herald – South Korea

### **N.K. Reneging on U.S. Deal Suggests Disarray at Top: Hill**

*Former U.S. nuke envoy says North is relic of China's past, not asset for its future*

April 26, 2012

By Song Sang-ho

North Korea's rocket launch in violation of a breakthrough deal in February with the U.S. is an indication of "deeper problems" within the leadership of the communist state, a former chief U.S. nuclear negotiator said Wednesday.

"I think it does suggest some disarray at the top or some lack of clarity on who does what in North Korea," Christopher Hill, a former U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asia, told The Korea Herald.

"There was no misunderstanding on the agreement and if there was misunderstanding, it was not between America and North Koreans. It was between North Koreans and other North Koreans ... a lot to be worried about today."

Hill, now dean of the Josef Korbel School of International Studies at the University of Denver, is in Seoul to attend the 2012 Asan Plenum, a three-day international forum on global challenges that kicked off on Wednesday. The annual forum was organized by Asan Institute for Policy Studies, a local think tank.

Hill was referring to the deal Washington and Pyongyang reached on Feb. 29 as a pre-step for the resumption of the six-party denuclearization talks that involve the two Koreas, the U.S., Russia, Japan and China.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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





Under it, the North was to temporarily suspend uranium enrichment at its main nuclear complex in Yongbyon and halt missile and nuclear tests in exchange for 240,000 tons of “nutritional assistance.”

The North broke the deal earlier this month by launching a long-range rocket. The North claimed it fired off a research satellite but is widely suspected of carrying out a disguised ballistic missile test.

Regarding the argument that China still views the impoverished state as a strategic buffer zone against American power, Hill said that North Korea is a “relict of China’s past, not an asset for its future.”

“I don’t think a country whose only export is now refugees is particularly an effective buffer for China. I think China and all of us should look for buffers in the form of good neighbors,” said Hill.

“I would hope that in the context of this very difficult time that ... China will look to really be a close contact with the ROK (the Republic of Korea). Sooner or later, China and the ROK will have a common border.”

As for the skepticism over the effectiveness of the multilateral denuclearization framework, Hill said that the problem was not the mechanism, but North Korea itself.

“I don’t think we have a problem there, we have a problem with the behavior of North Korea,” he said.

“I think the six-party process should be thought as a platform on which we can do a lot of things. One of the activities is to put more pressure on China (to use its influence over Pyongyang).”

Underscoring China’s role in persuading the North to renounce nuclear ambitions, he said Beijing still should do more.

“I think China needs to do a lot more in terms of making sure that it does not give conflicting signals to the North Koreans. Today, I think there are some conflicting signals,” he said.

China has recently made unusual moves against the North in an apparent display of discontent over its provocative actions including the launching of a long-range rocket. Without any serious opposition, it also agreed last week to strongly condemn the North in a U.N. Security Council presidential statement.

<http://www.koreaherald.com/national/Detail.jsp?newsMLId=20120425001023>

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

Chosun Ilbo – South Korea

April 26, 2012

## **China Warns N.Korea Off Nuclear Test**

A high-ranking official in China's Foreign Ministry has issued a rare public warning to North Korea against another nuclear test, saying it would violate China's national interest. The comments were made by Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Cui Tiankai to reporters at a press conference in Beijing on Wednesday.

"I am opposed to any act that damages peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia, since such acts can damage the national security and interests of not only other countries but China's as well," Cui said. "No side should commit acts that raise tensions."

This is the first time for China to comment publicly on the North's nuclear development since the possibility of Pyongyang conducting a third nuclear test was raised.

But Cui resisted U.S. demands that China step up pressure on North Korea. "Maintaining peace on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia is the joint responsibility of all of the concerned countries, not just China alone," he said.

[http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html\\_dir/2012/04/26/2012042600674.html](http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/04/26/2012042600674.html)

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



Korea Herald – South Korea

## **N.K. May See Its End in a Collapse: Cha**

*Former White House adviser says Pyongyang not interested in bargaining over nukes*

April 26, 2012

By Song Sang-ho

The history of doomed autocratic regimes suggests that impoverished North Korea under untested leadership may see its end in a collapse, a renowned U.S. security expert said.

“I think this combination of the young, untested leadership, economic problems, food problems; this is not a good combination for predicting the longevity of a regime,” Victor Cha, the Korea Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, told The Korea Herald.

“All these dictators in Egypt and Tunisia and Syria and other places have all collapsed. Yet, despite all of this, we still have North Korea. Not only does it survive, but it goes into a third dynastic succession, which is, in today’s world, impossible to believe.”

Cha, who teaches at Georgetown University, is in Seoul to attend the 2012 Asan Plenum, a three-day international forum on global challenges that kicked off on Wednesday. The annual forum was organized by local think tank Asan Institute for Policy Studies.

While talking about its potential collapse, he pointed in particular to the possibility of destabilizing mistakes by the young, inexperienced Kim Jong-un, believed to be in his late 20s.

“The most (important) thing that we have to watch carefully is if he makes mistakes. I don’t think the split within North Korea is between reformers and hard-liners. The split is between those who are loyal to this continued family cult, personality, and those who might not be loyal to it,” he said.

“And the only way that split happens is if there are mistakes that are made. Kim Jong-un is now 28 or 29 years old. They (in that age range) make mistakes.”

Pointing out that Pyongyang’s ultimate goal is to establish itself as a nuclear-weapon state, the former White House advisor during the George W. Bush administration indicated that the six-party talks may not work well in achieving denuclearization.

“I don’t think North Korea is interested in bargaining away their nuclear weapons. They wanted to establish themselves as a nuclear weapon state that has a ballistic missile capability to reach the U.S. That is their ultimate security guarantee,” he said.

“People make the mistake of saying they are willing to negotiate, they are willing to give away their nuclear weapons program. No! They are willing to give you this, but they are not going to give you all the rest (of other nuclear programs).”

Regarding concerns here that given the approaching U.S. presidential election in November, domestic politics may affect Washington’s consistent policy toward the impoverished state, Cha said that North Korea “does not matter that much.”

He, however, argued that Obama’s strategy concerning the North was not successful.

“I don’t think this agreement with North Korea is giving them a major foreign policy success that could help Obama’s reelection. I mean North Korea doesn’t matter that much for U.S. domestic politics”, he said.

“Obama may see two nuclear tests and two missile tests before he finishes his term in office, which was more than what Bush saw. He only got one missile test and one nuclear test. Obama is an engagement person. I don’t think that strategy worked at all.”



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

The author of “Alignment Despite Antagonism: The U.S.-Korea-Japan Security Triangle,” Cha touched on the importance of regional security cooperation.

Although historical obstacles still hamper cooperation between South Korea and Japan, he underscored the need to move forward with a “pragmatic” standpoint.

“You cannot overcome historical animosity between Japan and Korea. But you have to cooperate pragmatically. What policymakers have to do is to cooperate, despite that, on whatever issues ... trade, security threats or climate change,” he said.

“They can’t allow themselves to get completely paralyzed by these historical things that happened a hundred years ago”.

<http://www.koreaherald.com/national/Detail.jsp?newsMLId=20120426001313>

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

Korea Times – South Korea  
April 27, 2012

## 'North Korean Provocations Born from Stroke'

By Kim Young-jin

North Korea’s recent hard line behavior took root four years ago following a stroke suffered by late leader Kim Jong-il, a long trajectory that makes continued recalcitrance all the more likely, a former U.S. official warned Thursday.

Evans Revere, who served as acting U.S. assistant secretary of state for East Asian and Pacific Affairs, said he was told as much during a dinner with a North Korean diplomat in late 2008, months after Kim suffered a stroke that reportedly left him gravely ill.

That meeting came the day after then-U.S. President-elect Barack Obama, who had signaled he would engage the North, was voted in.

“I gave him the best argument I could for the real hope and expectation that we could put things on a different track. But the answer I got back was ‘It’s out of the hands of people like us (North Korean diplomats),’” Revere said in an interview.

“The regime was already hunkering down, getting ready for what could be a very difficult, complicated transition. They were already starting to move in a much tougher and more hard line direction. We’re seeing the result of all that now.”

The North conducted long-range missile and nuclear tests shortly after Obama took office.

Watchers say after the stroke, Kim fast-tracked the succession process of his youngest son Kim Jong-un, whose fledgling regime has been dialing up tensions since taking over after his father’s December death.

Following its latest rocket launch earlier this month, which led to a U.N. Security Council presidential statement condemning it, Pyongyang has reportedly been making preparations for a third nuclear test at a site in the northeast of the country. China, the North’s benefactor, surprised some by quickly backing the statement.

The North has threatened to retaliate against such moves.

The launch, which Pyongyang insists was to put a satellite into orbit for scientific reasons, also broke a deal with Washington under which it stood to gain food aid in return for moves to slow its nuclear weapons program.

Analysts say the Obama administration is seeking to break the North’s pattern of raising tensions and negotiating for concessions. Seoul, meanwhile, modified its rules of engagement to respond to further provocations following the 2010 shelling of Yeonpyeong Island.

Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012

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

Revere, who has met with North Korean officials in recent weeks, said the behavior has brought the North to a critical and dangerous juncture.

He predicted if the North carried out the rocket launch, it would likely encounter a strong response from an increasingly frustrated international community.

"It's a delicate moment. North Korea needs to step back and assess the damage they are doing. Based on past experience, they won't. So it's going to get a bit difficult," Revere, now a nonresident senior fellow with the Brookings Institution, said.

He added Washington would be under more pressure to find other options to deal with the North such as new sanctions to undermine the regime.

This week, Pyongyang threatened to "blow up" Seoul for the Lee Myung-bak administration's alleged defamation of the North's April 15 celebrations for the 100th anniversary of country founder Kim Il-sung's birth.

"It is very important that North Korea has no doubt whatsoever that South Korea is prepared to defend its territory and people. It's also important for the United States to support its ally," he said.

[http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/04/116\\_109860.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/04/116_109860.html)

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

Times of India

## **After Agni-V Launch, DRDO's New Target Is Anti-Satellite Weapons**

By Rajat Pandit, Tamil News Network (TNN)

April 21, 2012

NEW DELHI: After testing the over 5,000km Agni V missile, which went up to 600km into space during its parabolic trajectory, the Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) now feels it can fashion deadly anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons in double-quick time.

"Agni V's launch has opened a new era. Apart from adding a new dimension to our strategic defence, it has ushered in fantastic opportunities in, say, building ASAT weapons and launching mini/micro satellites on demand," DRDO chief V K Saraswat said on Friday. The ASAT weapon would include marrying Agni V's propulsion system with the "kill vehicle" of the under-development two-tier BMD (ballistic missile defence) system that has been tested a few times to track and destroy hostile missiles both inside (endo) and outside (exo) the earth's atmosphere.

"An ASAT weapon would require to reach about 800km altitude... Agni V gives you the boosting capability and the 'kill vehicle', with advanced seekers, will be able to home into the target satellite," he said.

The top defence scientist was, however, quick to stress that the government had not given its nod for the ASAT programme. "India does not believe in weaponization of space. We are only talking about having the capability. There are no plans for offensive space capabilities," he said. The fact, however, remains there is a re-think on the entire issue ever since China shocked the world by using an ASAT weapon to destroy an old satellite in 2007.

Beijing has set a scorching pace in developing advanced ASAT capabilities with "direct-ascent" missiles, hit-to-kill "kinetic" and directed-energy laser weapons. The defence ministry in 2010 had even drafted a 15-year "Technology Perspective and Roadmap", which held development of ASAT weapons "for electronic or physical destruction of satellites (2,000km altitude above earth's surface) and GEO-synchronous orbits" a thrust area.

Consequently, apart from directed energy weapons, defence scientists are focusing on "space security" to protect India's space assets from electronic or physical destruction. Another spin-off from Agni V test is that the DRDO feels it can work towards launching mini-satellites for battlefield use if an adversary attacks the country's main satellites.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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 mini-satellites will provide communication, navigation and some sort of GPS to armed forces for a limited time," said Saraswat.

Agni-V in itself is a stronger booster shot for India's dissuasive deterrence posture, bringing as it can the whole of China under its strike envelope. An even more potent missile with MIRV (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles) warheads is in the pipeline, which is likely to be named Agni-VI.

Holding there was "no government cap" on missile ranges, Saraswat said Agni-V's "over 5,000-km range" was sufficient to take care of India's current threat perceptions. "We have no problem in augmenting the range if in the future, threat perceptions change. We are not in a missile race with anyone. We are building missiles to mitigate our threats," he added.

[http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-04-21/india/31378237\\_1\\_asat-anti-satellite-agni-v](http://articles.timesofindia.indiatimes.com/2012-04-21/india/31378237_1_asat-anti-satellite-agni-v)

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

DAWN.com – Pakistan

## **Pakistan Successfully Test Fires Hatf IV Ballistic Missile**

By Agencies

April 25, 2012

ISLAMABAD: Pakistan on Wednesday successfully test-fired the Hatf IV (Shaheen 1A) missile which is a nuclear-capable intermediate-range surface-to-surface ballistic missile, DawnNews reported.

"Pakistan today successfully conducted the launch of the intermediate range ballistic missile Hatf IV Shaheen-1A weapon system," ISPR said in a statement.

According to a statement issued by the ISPR, the 'Shaheen 1A' missile is an upgraded version of the 'Shaheen 1' with a longer range.

Shaheen 1 is estimated to have a payload capacity of 1,000 kilograms and a range of 750 kilometres. The exact range of the missile was not revealed, but retired General Talat Masood, a defence analyst, told AFP intermediate range ballistic missiles could reach targets up to 2,500 to 3,000 kilometres away, which would put almost all of India within reach.

The test missile's impact point was in the Indian Ocean.

The ISPR statement further added that Director General Strategic Plans Division Lieutenant General Khalid Ahmed Kidwai was also present at the test site.

Lieutenant General Kidwai congratulated scientists and engineers on the successful launch, and the accuracy of the missile in reaching the target and said that the improved version of Shaheen 1A would further consolidate and strengthen Pakistan's deterrence abilities.

Pakistan's arsenal includes short, medium and long range missiles named after Muslim conquerors.

Pakistan's most recent missile test came last month with the launch of the short-range nuclear-capable Abdali, while in April 2008 it tested the Shaheen II, or Hatf VI, missile with a range of 2,000 kilometres.

President Asif Ali Zardari and Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani congratulated the scientists working on the program over the success of the missile test.

The launch comes days after India announced that it had successfully test-launched a new nuclear-capable, long-range missile. The Agni-V has a range of 5,000 kilometres.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



India's missile test last week brought a muted international response, with China downplaying its significance, insisting the countries were partners not rivals, and Washington calling for "restraint" among nuclear powers.

This was in sharp contrast to the widespread fury and condemnation that greeted North Korea's unsuccessful test launch of a long-range rocket on April 13.

<http://dawn.com/2012/04/25/pakistan-successfully-test-fires-hatf-iv-ballistic-missile/>

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

Bangkok Post – Thailand

## Reagan Era Envoy Found Pakistan 'Lied' on Nukes

26 April 2012

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

US officials concluded in the 1980s that Pakistan was lying about its nuclear program but muted criticism due to Islamabad's support against the Soviets in Afghanistan, declassified documents showed.

The memos to be released Thursday reveal some of the behind-the-scenes drama between the United States and Pakistan during Ronald Reagan's presidency, foreshadowing current-day debates in the uneasy war partnership.

The documents included an account of a secret mission in June 1982 by a US envoy who confronted Pakistani military ruler Mohammed Zia ul-Haq with a letter from Reagan and said the United States had "incontrovertible" proof that Pakistan was seeking nuclear weapons.

The emissary, veteran US diplomat and translator Vernon Walters, said that Zia was "extraordinarily courteous, relaxed" and explained that he had no knowledge of nuclear weapons development but would check with his subordinates.

"Either he really does not know or is the most superb and patriotic liar I have ever met," Walters wrote to the State Department.

The documents, some obtained after requests under the US Freedom of Information Act, were released to the National Security Archive at George Washington University, which made them available to AFP in advance.

Pakistan tested an atomic bomb in 1998 days after its arch-rival India. The United States banned assistance to Pakistan in 1990 -- soon after the Soviets left Afghanistan -- after concluding that it was developing nuclear weapons.

But Reagan exempted Pakistan from a law requiring sanctions, named after then senator Larry Pressler, even though the memos said that officials knew that the country was moving toward nuclear weapons.

The documents showed that the Reagan administration was genuinely concerned about Pakistan's nuclear program, fearing it would trigger instability, and repeatedly warned Zia that Congress could cut off assistance.

"There is overwhelming evidence that Zia has been breaking his assurances to us. We are absolutely confident that our intelligence is genuine and accurate," then secretary of state George Shultz wrote in a November 1982 memo to Reagan.

But Shultz recalled the "essential role" played by Zia in Afghanistan, where US and Pakistani agents funneled weapons to Islamic guerrillas who successfully fought a Soviet invasion.

"A rupture of our relationship would call into question a central tenet of this administration's foreign policy -- strong support for our friends," Shultz wrote, calling the Afghan effort "the most visible evidence of the US commitment to counter Soviet military thrusts worldwide."

The memos said that as far back as 1982, US intelligence detected that Pakistani agents were seeking suspicious items from countries including Belgium, Finland, Japan, Sweden and Turkey.



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

Years later, such efforts were discovered to be the work of scientist Abdul Qadeer Khan, the father of Pakistan's nuclear bomb. He is also accused of running a vast international black market of nuclear goods.

One secret assessment said that Pakistan was already believed to have enough for one nuclear weapon by October 1985 with assistance from China.

The US memos acknowledged that Pakistan was unlikely to comply with US pleas on its nuclear program in light of its concern over India, with which Pakistan has fought three full-fledged wars since independence in 1947.

The documents said that the United States was also urging "restraint" from India, which had strained relations with Washington during the 1980s.

Despite the criticism of its nuclear program, the United States resumed assistance to Pakistan to the tune of nearly \$20 billion after it again offered support in Afghanistan following the September 11, 2001 attacks.

But relations have repeatedly plunged into crisis due to the presence of Osama bin Laden and other militants on Pakistani soil and Islamabad's fears that US ties will again sour once troops leave Afghanistan in 2014.

<http://www.bangkokpost.com/news/asia/290554/reagan-era-envoy-found-pakistan-lied-on-nukes>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Repeats Iskander Deployment Threat**

24 April 2012

Moscow reiterated on Tuesday it may deploy Iskander theater ballistic missiles in the Baltic exclave of Kaliningrad that will be capable of effectively engaging elements of the U.S. missile defense system in Poland.

The missile defense system in Poland does not jeopardize Russia's nuclear forces, Army General Nikolai Makarov, chief of the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces, said.

"However, if it is modernized...it could affect our nuclear capability and in that case a political decision may be made to deploy Iskander systems in the Kaliningrad region," he said in an interview with RT television.

"But that will be a political decision," he stressed. "So far there is no such need."

NATO members agreed to create a missile shield over Europe to protect it against ballistic missiles launched by so-called rogue states, for example Iran and North Korea, at a summit in Lisbon, Portugal, in 2010.

Russia has strongly criticized NATO's reluctance to provide written, legally binding guarantees that its European missile shield will not be directed against Moscow.

President Dmitry Medvedev has ordered an array of measures to strengthen the country's missile defense capabilities to counter NATO's shield, including the deployment of Iskander missiles on the border with Poland.

MOSCOW, April 24 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20120424/173017483.html>

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

Azeri-Press Agency (APA) – Azerbaijan

## **Russian Military Concedes Iran, N. Korea Nuclear Threat**

24 April 2012

Baku-APA. Russia's military leadership has for the first time acknowledged a nuclear threat from Iran and North Korea.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



"The threat is always there, so we closely monitor the nuclear program developments of many countries," Army General Nikolai Makarov, the chief of the General Staff, told RT television.

"The analysis that we conducted together with the Americans confirms that, yes, there is a probability that the threat exists. And we agreed that it is necessary to create a missile defense system," Makarov said.

The Russian Defense Ministry has previously held that there is no nuclear threat to Europe and Russia from Iran and North Korea, because they do not have the capacity to build nuclear weapons or deliver them.

"Many countries that claim not to possess nuclear weapons do in fact have them," Makarov said.

"Certainly, if it gets into the hands of extremists, it represents a threat to international security," Makarov said.

He added that in order to counter these threats, Russia is ready to work together with other countries.

"Let's solve this problem. Let us work together to get rid of the threats that may arise, not only for Europe but for Russia because we too are part of Europe," the general said.

North Korea has conducted two underground nuclear weapon tests, in 2006 and 2009.

Earlier in April South Korean media reported that intelligence indicated North Korea was preparing a third in a row underground nuclear test. The information was based on satellite photographs of North Korean test site, where underground nuclear test had been previously conducted.

U.S. and other Western countries suspect Iran of developing nuclear weapons under the guise of peaceful nuclear energy program. Tehran denies the charges, saying its nuclear program is aimed at meeting the country's electricity needs.

<http://en.apa.az/news.php?id=170330>

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

RT – Russia

## **Reshuffles as Medvedev Sacks Air Force Chief**

27 April 2012

President Dmitry Medvedev has relieved the Russian Air Force Commander of his post and fired him from the military in a move that could end in the Air Force's merger with the Air and Space Defense Forces.

The Kremlin press service reports that Air Force Chief Aleksandr Zelenin was fired from his post and from the military service by presidential decree, but does not elaborate on the reasons.

Russian media reported earlier that the country's Air Force could soon cease to exist as a separate branch of the military forces, merging with the relatively young Air and Space Defense Force. The process could be seen as already underway, as some of the Air Force's bases were put under the direct command of military districts in 2008-2009.

An unnamed source in Russia's Defense Ministry told Interfax news agency that Zelenin's dismissal was connected with old age, and suggested that the former commander will be offered a high position in some defense industry holding.

Apart from the changes in the Air Force command, Medvedev dismissed the Ground Forces Commander Aleksander Postnikov-Streltsov from his post, appointing him deputy chief of General Staff. Former commander of the Central Military District Vladimir Chirkin was made head the Ground Forces.

These appointments are seen by Russian experts as planned and routine rotation. The chairman of the Public Council with the Defense Ministry, editor-in-chief of the National Defense magazine Igor Korotchenko told RIA Novosti news agency that Medvedev sought to refresh the top brass and allow a new generation of Russian generals to realize their potential.





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

<http://rt.com/politics/medvedev-air-force-defense-098/>

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

Los Angeles Times

## **Pentagon Reshapes Spy Service**

*Intelligence agents will be shifted from focusing on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to other rising priorities around the globe, a defense official says.*

By David S. Cloud, Washington Bureau

April 23, 2012

WASHINGTON— The Pentagon will reorganize its spy service to target national security threats around the globe after a decade of focusing chiefly on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, a senior defense official said Monday.

The official said several hundred case officers and analysts at the Pentagon's Defense Intelligence Agency would be shifted to the new Defense Clandestine Service.

The fledgling service is supposed to work closely with CIA officers based at U.S. embassies overseas to collect and distribute intelligence on foreign terrorist networks, nuclear proliferation and other difficult targets, the official said.

The initiative, which Defense Secretary Leon E. Panetta approved last week, aims to boost the Pentagon's role in recruiting and running spies, a mission the CIA has dominated for decades, as well as put more military case officers and analysts in trouble spots.

The defense official, who described the plan in exchange for anonymity, said the new spy service was expected to grow "from several hundred to several more hundred" officers in coming years.

"You have to do global coverage," the official said.

Some of the new spies are likely to be assigned to targets that are intelligence priorities, including parts of Africa and the Middle East where Al Qaeda and its affiliates are active, the nuclear and missile programs in North Korea and Iran, and China's expanding military.

The CIA, a civilian agency, and the DIA, a combat support and intelligence agency, long have clashed over their respective roles and responsibilities. But U.S. military and intelligence missions have increasingly merged in counterterrorism operations since 2001, from the raid on Osama bin Laden's compound in Pakistan to drone strikes in Yemen.

It's not clear whether the DIA's new spy service will overlap with the CIA's National Clandestine Service, or serve as an adjunct to it.

"I'm not sure what they are supposed to achieve that the CIA doesn't," said Joshua Foust, a former DIA analyst on the Middle East. "This seems like a territorial thing. 'Hey, the CIA has this, why don't we have it too?'...I'm pretty skeptical that it's necessary or good."

The change has been in the works since a classified study last year by the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, which oversees all 16 U.S. intelligence agencies, concluded that the military needed better human intelligence-gathering.

The Pentagon is not seeking extra money or manpower. At least for now, DIA personnel will be shifted to focus on new priorities "as we look to come out of war zones and anticipate the requirements over the next several years," the defense official said.

The realignment comes as a new DIA chief takes over. Army Lt. Gen. Michael T. Flynn, who has extensive experience in special operations and now serves as assistant director of national intelligence, is known as an iconoclast in the intelligence community.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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

While heading military intelligence in Afghanistan, Flynn wrote an influential paper in January 2010 for a Washington think tank that sharply criticized how intelligence was collected and used. He faulted the DIA and other agencies for focusing too much on tactical threats and for ignoring politics and demographics of the war.

"Eight years into the war in Afghanistan, the U.S. intelligence community is only marginally relevant to the overall strategy," Flynn wrote. "The vast intelligence apparatus is unable to answer fundamental questions about the environment in which U.S. and allied forces operate and the people they seek to persuade."

*Ken Dilanian in the Washington bureau contributed to this report.*

<http://www.latimes.com/news/nationworld/nation/la-na-pentagon-spies-20120424,0,2748053.story>

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

Hartford Courant – Hartford, CT

## **Republicans Eye Missile-Defense Site on East Coast**

Jim Wolf, Reuters  
April 25, 2012

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - Republicans who control the House of Representatives' Armed Services Committee called on Wednesday for studies on what could become a third missile-interceptor site in the United States, this one on the East Coast.

The plan would require the secretary of defense to conduct an environmental impact review by December 31, 2013, on "possible locations on the East Coast of the United States for the deployment of a missile defense site."

U.S. forces currently deploy a combined total of 30 operational missile interceptors in silos in Fort Greely, Alaska, and Vandenberg Air Force Base in central California.

The three-stage interceptors are part of a layered shield against limited numbers of missiles that could be fired by a country like North Korea or Iran, some day potentially carrying a nuclear warhead.

The proposed step toward a third site is to be considered Thursday by the Armed Services subcommittee on strategic forces, an early stage of the crafting of the annual defense authorization bill that guides military policy.

The proposal was made public by Representative Howard McKeon, chairman of the full committee, and Representative Michael Turner, the subcommittee head. Such legislation is likely to be adopted by the full, Republican-controlled committee. It would have to be meshed with a companion defense authorization bill in the Democratic-controlled Senate, which has not yet put one together.

It was not immediately clear whether the Obama administration would support such steps toward an East Coast missile site.

The House Republicans' measure would require the Pentagon's Missile Defense Agency to develop a plan for the deployment of an East Coast site to be operational not later than the end of 2015.

Advocates of an East Coast site have said it would bolster the Boeing Co.-managed ground-based shield against any intercontinental ballistic missiles that could be fired from Iran. One likely site is Fort Drum in northern New York state, according to experts.

"The committee is aware that a cost effective missile defense site located on the East Coast of the United States could have advantages for the defense of the United States from ballistic missiles launched from the Middle East," the bill said.

Baker Spring, a missile-defense expert at the Heritage Foundation think tank, said current U.S. capabilities for countering long-range missiles were geared chiefly toward North Korea, providing greater defense of the western

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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

United States than the east.

Reporting By Jim Wolf; Editing by Eric Beech.

<http://www.courant.com/news/politics/sns-rt-us-usa-missilebre83o1id-20120425,0,4857760.story>

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

Nextgov

## Draft House Measure Demands Nuclear Capability in New Bomber from Get-Go

April 26, 2012

By Elaine M. Grossman, *Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- A key panel of the House Armed Services Committee has drafted legislation that would require the Defense Department to ensure its future bomber has a nuclear-weapons capability immediately upon fielding.

If passed into law, the provision would toss out existing Air Force plans to phase in a nuclear capability only after a conventional-only Long Range Strike bomber is initially fielded in the 2020s. The measure is included in the Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee's draft text for the fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill, which the panel was marking up at press time on Thursday.

"The secretary of the Air Force shall ensure that the next-generation long-range strike bomber is certified to use both conventional weapons and strategic nuclear weapons as of the date on which such aircraft achieves initial operating capability," reads the subcommittee markup, released on Wednesday.

The full House Armed Services Committee is scheduled to consider its version of the same spending-authorization bill on May 9, after the chamber takes a one-week recess, according to a panel spokesman. The committee has the authority to alter provisions drafted by its subcommittees, but typically very few changes are made before a lengthy defense authorization bill is sent to the House floor.

Gen. Norton Schwartz, the Air Force chief of staff, explained last year that a dual-capable design would enable the aircraft to carry nuclear weapons from the start. However, to save costs and facilitate testing, the service would certify the bomber for nuclear missions some unspecified number of years after first fielding a conventional-only aircraft.

"We are going to phase this in a way that will initially introduce conventional capability, which is easier to test, less costly to test," Schwartz said in Nov. 2 testimony before the House Armed Services Committee. "And then as we get closer to the time when the B-52 and the B-2 [bombers] begin to age out, we will well in advance of that certify the [new] airplane for nuclear operation."

At the time, some lawmakers were already expressing dismay at the service approach.

"I'm concerned about a de-emphasis on the nuclear role," Representative John Fleming (R-La.) said at the House hearing. Combined with an array of other deep cuts to the defense budget, the delay in equipping the new bomber with nuclear arms "obviously makes this world a more dangerous place," he said.

Schwartz, the top Air Force officer, has since said his service must keep the cost of the new bomber capped at \$550 million per aircraft or risk seeing the project canceled.

Defense officials anticipate that the new stealthy bomber will be piloted either remotely or by humans in the cockpit. The aircraft is to feature futuristic capabilities for defeating enemy radar systems and destroying incoming missiles with lasers.

Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012

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



The House panel said, though, that it was “discouraged that the Air Force is unable to clearly articulate when the new long-range strike bomber will become certified for nuclear operations after attaining initial operating capability status.”

Headed by Representative Todd Akin (R-Mo.), the subcommittee did endorse service plans to maintain today’s dual-capable bomber fleets at existing levels. Sixteen B-2s and 44 B-52s are available today for nuclear missions, according to atomic weapons analysts Hans Kristensen and Robert Norris.

The House lawmakers, however, rejected the Air Force perspective when it came to qualifying the new flying platform for its nuclear combat responsibilities.

“The committee does not believe that test and evaluation master plan affordability should be the limiting factor for certification,” according to the draft House Armed Services markup.

The top Democrat on the House Armed Services Committee, Representative Adam Smith (Wash.), has said he would consider the possibility of calling for the future bomber to be capable solely of conventional missions, particularly given mounting pressures to cut federal spending.

More than 40 House lawmakers have joined Representative Edward Markey (D-Mass.) in sponsoring legislation that would prohibit development of a nuclear-capable bomber over the next decade as part of a proposed \$100 billion reduction in nuclear spending over that time period.

In related news, the same House subcommittee also moved to block a Navy blueprint for phasing its future nuclear-armed submarine into the fleet as today’s Ohio-class vessels begin to retire. The Navy must “maintain a minimum of 12 ballistic missile submarines in the fleet,” the panel’s defense authorization legislation states.

This mandate conflicts with a recent Navy shipbuilding plan that has the service operating for 14 years, mostly during the 2030s, with less than its planned complement of a dozen nuclear-armed submerged craft.

An anticipated two-year delay in developing and fielding the Ohio class replacement submarine is expected to force a dip to just 10 Trident D-5 missile-carrying vessels, and the Navy will not reach 12 such boats again until 2042, according to service plans.

Of a total 12 submarines, 10 vessels could be at sea at any one time, according to recent Navy testimony.

Today there are 14 nuclear-armed Ohio-class submarines, of which four are typically kept at sea and on alert at any given time. The Pentagon’s 2010 Nuclear Posture Review said the White House would “consider reducing from 14 to 12 Ohio-class submarines” by 2020, without affecting the number of deployed warheads aboard the vessels.

In an opening statement as the mark-up process began on Thursday, Akin called the two-year delay in the new submarine effort “the most worrisome part of the budget request.”

The Navy has determined there is only “moderate risk” associated with the dozen-plus years in which it will field just 10 ballistic missile submarines, the subcommittee head noted. Akin said that judgment is flawed.

“We cannot afford to take any unwarranted risk in this most important capability for national security, and so are mandating that the Navy retain no fewer than 12 of these submarines to provide adequate undersea nuclear capability,” he said in released remarks.

The Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee stated in its draft bill that as of fiscal 2013, which begins on Oct. 1, “the secretary of the Navy may not retire or decommission a nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine if such retirement or decommissioning would result in the active or commissioned fleet of such submarines consisting of less than 12 submarines.”

At a House Armed Services Committee hearing earlier this year, another key lawmaker expressed qualms about the Navy fielding plan for the new vessel, sometimes dubbed SSBN(X).



“When you lose two years” in the developmental schedule, Strategic Forces Subcommittee Chairman Michael Turner (R-Ohio) said on Feb. 16, “certainly everyone has concerns as to what’s going to be your overall operational effect.”

[http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng\\_20120426\\_4252.php?oref=topnews](http://www.nextgov.com/nextgov/ng_20120426_4252.php?oref=topnews)

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

Chicago Tribune

## Russia Says Many States Arming for Cyber Warfare

April 25, 2012

\* *Russian-sponsored gathering rallies support for UN treaty*

\* *U.S. opposes attempts to restrict use of web*

\* *Russia says cyber attacks are new level of confrontation*

By Adrian Croft, Reuters

GARMISCH-PARTENKIRCHEN, Germany, April 25 (Reuters) - Russia has stepped up its campaign for a globally binding treaty on cyber security, warning that many states are acquiring cyber warfare capabilities that, if unleashed, could subvert economies and bring down critical infrastructure.

Hosting a gathering of experts in the German Alps to try to rally support for its controversial proposals for a U.N. convention to crack down on Internet crime and terrorism, Russia said 120 countries now conducted online war games to try to understand the Internet's military potential.

"We won't use nuclear weapons - it is a Doomsday weapon. But when we have a situation where we have millions of hacker attacks on our money, on our private computers, it means that it is a new form, a new level of confrontation," said Andrey Krutskikh, Russia's recently appointed special coordinator on information technology in its foreign ministry.

Russia has been hosting such meetings in Germany - which it likes to call the cyber equivalent of Davos - for the past six years. This year it is trying to drum up support for a treaty that would classify "information warfare" as a crime against international peace and security.

Under Moscow's proposals - which are being resisted by a number of Western countries who regard them as an attack on free speech - governments would aim to "maintain a balance between fundamental human rights and the effective counteraction of terrorist use of the information space".

The Russian proposals have made little headway, however, due to a philosophical gulf between Western nations and more authoritarian countries over whether it is possible or desirable to curb the open culture of the Internet.

There was no breakthrough at this week's meeting in Germany either, but Krutskikh, who is leading Moscow's campaign, said agreeing such a treaty should be "a top priority."

The Stuxnet computer worm that affected Iranian nuclear facilities in 2009-10 had done "enormous damage", he added, and a wide range of critical infrastructure around the world could be a target for cyber attack too.

"It could be a metallurgical plant - there are countries quite dependent on one plant and if this plant is put out of order the economy and the society of that country could collapse. It could be banking systems ... (or) private phones," he told Reuters on the sidelines of the meeting in the picturesque German mountain resort of Garmisch-Partenkirchen.

Krutskikh said hacking attacks on Russian sites were in the "hundreds of thousands, if not millions, every day ... It is a test of vulnerabilities which is a dramatically serious matter".

WESTERN SCEPTICISM



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

Highly-publicised episodes, from the blocking of U.S. and British government websites by activist hacker groups Anonymous and LulzSec to this week's suspected cyber attack on Iran's main oil export terminal, have shown the vulnerabilities of the Internet.

In November, a U.S. intelligence report to Congress warned that China and Russia are using cyber espionage to steal U.S. technology secrets to bolster their own economic development and that poses a threat to U.S. prosperity and security.

"We cannot deny that attacks come from (the geographical territory of) Russia, but they come from the UK, they come from everywhere," Krutskikh said.

Asked who was responsible for the attacks on Russian computer systems, he said he believed states experimented with such probing, but "mostly it could be hooligans".

Western experts at the meeting said Moscow's proposals, put forward last September, were vague, risked undermining free speech and stood little chance of being widely adopted.

Karl Rauscher, chief technology officer of the EastWest Institute, a security thinktank, told the meeting that the proposed treaty's call for states to "refrain from slander as well as from using insulting or hostile propaganda to ... interfere in the internal affairs of other states" clashed with U.S. first amendment rights to free speech.

He said the vast quantity of information being put on the internet made it impossible to censor.

Other experts who spoke at the meeting said there was no international agreement on the definition of terms such as "terrorist", used in the treaty.

Russia's proposals have already been rejected by the United States and Britain, which says attempts to restrict the free flow of information are doomed to fail. No U.S. officials took part in the forum.

Krutskikh said Russia was not discouraged by opposition to its ideas, however, and would try to make progress in other discussion fora, such as a United Nations expert group on information security that is set to meet later this year.

*Editing by Andrew Osborn.*

[http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-04-25/business/sns-rt-germany-cyber16e8fp40m-20120425\\_1\\_cyber-attack-cyber-security-hacker-attacks](http://articles.chicagotribune.com/2012-04-25/business/sns-rt-germany-cyber16e8fp40m-20120425_1_cyber-attack-cyber-security-hacker-attacks)

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

Washington Post  
OPINIONS

## **Nuclear Weapon Reductions Must Be Part of Strategic Analysis**

By Henry A. Kissinger and Brent Scowcroft  
April 22, 2012

A New START treaty reestablishing the process of nuclear arms control has recently taken effect. Combined with reductions in the U.S. defense budget, this will bring the number of nuclear weapons in the United States to the lowest overall level since the 1950s. The Obama administration is said to be considering negotiations for a new round of nuclear reductions to bring about ceilings as low as 300 warheads. Before momentum builds on that basis, we feel obliged to stress our conviction that the goal of future negotiations should be strategic stability and that lower numbers of weapons should be a consequence of strategic analysis, not an abstract preconceived determination.

Regardless of one's vision of the ultimate future of nuclear weapons, the overarching goal of contemporary U.S. nuclear policy must be to ensure that nuclear weapons are never used. Strategic stability is not inherent with low numbers of weapons; indeed, excessively low numbers could lead to a situation in which surprise attacks are conceivable.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



We supported ratification of the START treaty. We favor verification of agreed reductions and procedures that enhance predictability and transparency. One of us (Kissinger) has supported working toward the elimination of nuclear weapons, albeit with the proviso that a series of verifiable intermediate steps that maintain stability precede such an end point and that every stage of the process be fully transparent and verifiable.

The precondition of the next phase of U.S. nuclear weapons policy must be to enhance and enshrine the strategic stability that has preserved global peace and prevented the use of nuclear weapons for two generations.

Eight key facts should govern such a policy:

First, strategic stability requires maintaining strategic forces of sufficient size and composition that a first strike cannot reduce retaliation to a level acceptable to the aggressor.

Second, in assessing the level of unacceptable damage, the United States cannot assume that a potential enemy will adhere to values or calculations identical to our own. We need a sufficient number of weapons to pose a threat to what potential aggressors value under every conceivable circumstance. We should avoid strategic analysis by mirror-imaging.

Third, the composition of our strategic forces cannot be defined by numbers alone. It also depends on the type of delivery vehicles and their mix. If the composition of the U.S. deterrent force is modified as a result of reduction, agreement or for other reasons, a sufficient variety must be retained, together with a robust supporting command and control system, so as to guarantee that a preemptive attack cannot succeed.

Fourth, in deciding on force levels and lower numbers, verification is crucial. Particularly important is a determination of what level of uncertainty threatens the calculation of stability. At present, that level is well within the capabilities of the existing verification systems. We must be certain that projected levels maintain — and when possible, reinforce — that confidence.

Fifth, the global nonproliferation regime has been weakened to a point where some of the proliferating countries are reported to have arsenals of more than 100 weapons. And these arsenals are growing. At what lower U.S. levels could these arsenals constitute a strategic threat? What will be their strategic impact if deterrence breaks down in the overall strategic relationship? Does this prospect open up the risk of hostile alliances between countries whose forces individually are not adequate to challenge strategic stability but that combined might overthrow the nuclear equation?

Sixth, this suggests that, below a level yet to be established, nuclear reductions cannot be confined to Russia and the United States. As the countries with the two largest nuclear arsenals, Russia and the United States have a special responsibility. But other countries need to be brought into the discussion when substantial reductions from existing START levels are on the international agenda.

Seventh, strategic stability will be affected by other factors, such as missile defenses and the roles and numbers of tactical nuclear weapons, which are not now subject to agreed limitations. Precision-guided large conventional warheads on long-range delivery vehicles provide another challenge to stability. The interrelationship among these elements must be taken into account in future negotiations.

Eighth, we must see to it that countries that have relied on American nuclear protection maintain their confidence in the U.S. capability for deterrence. If that confidence falters, they may be tempted by accommodation to their adversaries or independent nuclear capabilities.

Nuclear weapons will continue to influence the international landscape as part of strategy and an aspect of negotiation. The lessons learned throughout seven decades need to continue to govern the future.

*Henry A. Kissinger was secretary of state from 1973 to 1977 and national security adviser from 1969 to 1975. Brent Scowcroft was national security adviser from 1975 to 1977 and 1989 to 1993.*

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/nuclear-weapon-reductions-must-be-part-of-strategic-analysis/2012/04/22/gIQAKG4iaT\\_story.html?tid=pm\\_opinions\\_pop](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/nuclear-weapon-reductions-must-be-part-of-strategic-analysis/2012/04/22/gIQAKG4iaT_story.html?tid=pm_opinions_pop)



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

Wall Street Journal  
OPINION/Review & Outlook  
April 23, 2012

## India's Missile Warning

*The threat depends mainly on the regime, not the weapon itself.*

By the Editorial Board

Page – A14

India successfully test-fired a long-range ballistic missile on Thursday capable of carrying a nuclear warhead as far as Shanghai. The event deserves more scrutiny than it's received, though not for the reasons offered by the theologians of parchment arms control.

The test marks a significant advance in global missile proliferation, which surely vindicates those in the U.S. who have pushed antimissile defenses. India's Agni 5—Agni is the Hindu god of fire—is capable of carrying MIRVed, or multiple, independently targetable, warheads. The missile also puts India closer to being able to develop antisatellite weapons, and the Agni 5 appears to be launchable from mobile platforms. All of this makes the missile a fearsome deterrent against foreign attack.

It's clear that India will eventually be able to turn the Agni 5 into an intercontinental missile capable of reaching Europe and the U.S. This is a harbinger of missile proliferation to come, and it shows that the dominance that the U.S. and Russia have long enjoyed in missile technology and the high ground of space will soon be challenged.

The launch also underscores the folly of arms-control treaties in controlling proliferation. India has never signed the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty even as it has become a formidable nuclear power. The world's missile technology control regime has forced India to develop its own launch and guidance technology, though we also suspect it's received help on the sly from Russia and others.

The point is that a continental power like India is going to pursue weaponry that it believes to be in its own security interests, regardless of the wishful treaties of Western diplomats. That's especially true given China's claims to Indian territory and Beijing's bullying of its neighbors.

Yet it's also worth noting that few people laid awake Thursday night worrying about this new Indian missile. A State Department spokesman called on "all nuclear-capable states to exercise restraint regarding nuclear capabilities" but added that "India has a solid nonproliferation record."

The Chinese Foreign Ministry noted that "India and China are not rivals but cooperative partners," though China is one presumptive target of the Indian missile. Pakistan, India's traditional rival whose government was advised in advance of the launch, had no immediate official response at all.

This restrained reaction is strikingly different from the global alarm over North Korea's recent failed ballistic-missile launch, to say nothing of the anxiety provoked by Iranian missile tests and nuclear program. The difference is that no one in the West believes that India poses an aggressive military threat. India is a robust democracy whose nuclear weapons are intended as a deterrent, and not even hawks in the People's Liberation Army can credibly argue that Delhi would contemplate a nuclear first strike.

The crucial nonproliferation point is that the threat is less from the weapons than from the kind of regime that holds them. The arms control evangelists, including many in the Obama Administration, believe that the spread of weaponry is its own threat, whether the finger on the button belongs to David Cameron, Kim Jong Eun or Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

But the real threat is that weapons of mass destruction and the means to deliver them will be acquired by tyrants who lack any domestic restraints and might well use them to dominate or destroy their neighbors. The world will be a safer

Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012

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





place if fewer nations have nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles. But the danger grows exponentially when those weapons are in the hands of a Hitler, Brezhnev or Iran's Revolutionary Guards.

The Indian launch might also cause some soul-searching in Beijing. Chinese officials sometimes sound as if their bullying regional policy will eventually have all of the Asia-Pacific region under their sway. But in practice the result has been the opposite, driving Japan, the Philippines, even Vietnam and Burma closer to the U.S. as a countervailing regional power. India's missile launch is another sign that its neighbors feel the need to deter any Chinese aggression.

As for the U.S., India's test underscores the need for robust investment in missile and satellite defenses with deployments before genuine threats arrive. It also shows the need to redouble the efforts to quarantine and deny WMD to rogue states, in contrast to treaties that provide an illusion of nonproliferation.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303513404577354223384037042.html>

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

Times of India – India  
OPINION/Op-Ed

## India's Nuclear Choices

*After the Agni V test, important decisions about the country's deterrence doctrine must be made*

By Shashank Joshi & Frank O'Donnell

April 23, 2012

Last week's Agni V missile test should be a source of pride and strategic comfort for India. However, it also throws up challenging questions about the direction in which the country wants to take its nuclear weapons programme; questions that are far too important to leave to the scientists or even a narrow coterie of policymakers.

There is no doubt that this test and the technological advance it represents will strengthen nuclear deterrence and strategic stability in Asia. Nearly 40 years after India's first nuclear test at Pokhran, and a quarter-century after the first Indian nuclear warhead was put together in the late 1980s, India has finally put Beijing and Shanghai within the reach of its nuclear forces. The mobility and range of the Agni V makes it India's most survivable missile yet.

Once it is inducted, Indian policymakers can be absolutely certain that, even in the worst-case scenario of a devastating nuclear attack on the Indian homeland, the country will retain the means of retaliation.

Diplomatically, too, the Agni V is a symbol of India's changed place in the world. In 1994, the United States pressured India to suspend testing of the Agni series after just three test flights. India formally suspended the programme at the end of 1996, although it resumed testing in 1997.

The muted American response to the test of the Agni V, despite Washington's concern over the missile programmes of Iran and North Korea, is indicative of the rapid improvement in the US-India bilateral relationship over the past 15 years. Some Indians sneer at the efforts made by successive Indian governments to improve ties with Washington. These sceptics should consider the diplomatic nightmare that India would have faced had it conducted this test 15 years ago.

However, the most important question is whether this missile heralds a new plateau in India's nuclear ambitions, or merely serves a bridge to a yet more advanced arsenal.

Following its 1998 nuclear tests, India released a semi-official draft nuclear doctrine committing to a policy of 'no-first use' and 'credible minimum deterrence'. In 2003, an official doctrine was issued along similar lines. Since that doctrinal statement, however, the Indian government has said little about what it sees as necessary to attain credibility, whether in terms of numbers or weapons systems. In the absence of a new doctrinal direction, the future of the Agni V will shed some light on India's nuclear intentions.



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

In the years since 2003, it became apparent that credible minimum deterrence would be a highly elastic concept. It was never quite clear how much the arsenal size and posture of India's two nuclear neighbours, Pakistan and China, would determine India's own nuclear needs. Pakistan's arsenal is estimated at 90-110 warheads and China's at 170, the latter bolstered by an ICBM of over 11,000 km range.

Indian analysts have expressed particular concern over the adverse missile balance with China. The test of the Agni V is the culmination of many years of cumulative research and development, and is not directly related to the immediate state of the Sino-Indian relationship. However, that relationship has been especially turbulent in recent years.

Consequently, the Agni V has been imparted with political status and symbolism much greater than prior missiles. Even as questions over Indian military readiness remain worryingly open, the ripening of India's second-strike capability will provide reassurance to India about the strategic balance. Yet India would do well not to get caught in the intellectual trap of thinking that nuclear deterrence is a numbers game. China's numerical or qualitative advantage - or Pakistan's, for that matter - counts for basically nothing.

This is where India has choices to make. An Agni V deployed in modest numbers, and accompanied by political signals that the system's development represents the maturity of India's nuclear forces, would most closely accord with the initial spirit of credible minimum deterrence.

By contrast, if the Agni V is seen as a 'bridge' to a much more diverse and sizeable Indian arsenal, and its production and deployment eventually takes place in large numbers, this could herald a strengthening of the more assertive strand in Indian nuclear thinking.

There are two risks. The first is that bureaucrats and scientists, rather than elected politicians and a well-informed public, make these choices. Last year, MIT professor Vipin Narang, writing for the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, warned that "DRDO's press releases and post-test comments unnecessarily - and dangerously - confuse India's nuclear posture".

Perhaps India should build on the Agni V test to make longer-range missiles, as DRDO director V K Saraswat promised to do last week, but this has big financial, diplomatic and strategic implications - and is therefore a matter for political leaders. A national security strategy and nuclear posture review - like those we see in other nuclear weapons states - would be a good start.

The second danger is that we begin to see all technological advances as desirable. To be sure, anything that makes India's missiles more survivable - for example, increasing their mobility on the ground - is unambiguously a good thing. But other improvements mentioned by Saraswat, like MIRV technology that puts multiple warheads on a single missile, presents trade-offs: the missiles will pack a greater punch, but could generate fears that India is abandoning credible minimum deterrence.

As India's former army chief, General K Sundarji, once observed, "In war-fighting, whether conventional or nuclear, whilst calculating relative strengths, more is always better. But for deterrence, more is not better if less is adequate". As India rightly celebrates the improvement of its national deterrent, this is sound advice.

*Joshi is a research fellow at the Royal United Services Institute and a doctoral candidate at Harvard University.  
O'Donnell is a doctoral candidate at King's College, London.*

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/home/opinion/edit-page/Indias-nuclear-choices/articleshow/12825780.cms>

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

Christian Science Monitor  
OPINION/Analysis

## **Why Is North Korea Threatening to Conduct a Nuclear Test?**

*First, to make up for the embarrassment of the failed missile; second, the regime's past nuclear tests didn't go very well.*

Issue No. **1,000**, 27 April 2012

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



By Donald Kirk, Correspondent  
April 25, 2012

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA: North Korea today signaled its determination to go through with a third nuclear test in the face of warnings from friends and foes alike.

Today on the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the North Korean armed forces, Vice Marshal Ri Yong-ho said North Korea now had mobile weapons that were strong enough to strike targets in the US.

That boast appeared to refer to North Korea's development of long-range missiles that should theoretically be able to deliver a nuclear warhead as far as the US West Coast. Mr. Ri indicated the North's intention to miniaturize nuclear devices in order to fit them on the missile by claiming that the North could deal a devastating defeat in "a single blow."

The North Korean rhetorical blast, as reported by Pyongyang's Korean Central News Agency, is the latest in a flood of invective, most of it directed against South Korea's President Lee Myung-bak and his government. The rhetoric leaves little doubt for most analysts that North Korea sees the test as needed to compensate for the humiliation suffered on April 13 when its vaunted long-range rocket broke up and plunged into the Yellow Sea 90 seconds after it was launched.

North Korea also has more practical military and political reasons for wanting to conduct the test in defiance of diplomatic efforts to persuade its new leader, Kim Jong-un, to call off the project.

"There's a military imperative," says Mark Fitzpatrick, a former US State Department official now with the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London. Mr. Fitzpatrick says the North's first two underground nuclear tests, in October 2006 and again in May 2009, "did not go very well."

Although North Korea did manage to explode nuclear devices on both occasions, they were so small as to have been viewed by scientists elsewhere as a possible failure.

### **What North Korea wants**

North Korea's top priority now is to be able to miniaturize a warhead in order to send it to a target on a missile rather than drop it as a bomb from a plane. "They want to get something small enough to fit on a Rodong," says Mr. Fitzpatrick, at a conference here staged by the Asan Institute, a local think tank financed by the Hyundai business empire.

Yet another issue is the need to convince the North Korean people that Kim Jong-un is a strong leader, capable of controlling a military establishment with 1.2 million troops while solidifying his power over the country.

"Having failed on the missile, they've got to do something that goes boom," says Fitzpatrick.

The decibel level of the North Korean rhetoric is beginning to raise alarm here among analysts who fear the North may challenge South Korea with incidents to which the South will have to respond militarily.

President Lee has vowed that South Korean forces will strike back militarily if the North stages an attack similar to the shelling of Yeonpyeong Island in the Yellow Sea in November 2010 in which two marines and two civilians were killed. That attack came 10 months after the sinking in nearby waters of a South Korean navy ship in which 46 sailors were killed.

Motivating factors for a third nuclear test, says Kim Tae-woo, president of the Korea Institute for National Unification, are North Korea's desire to demonstrate its place as a full-fledged nuclear power as well as the need to intimidate both the US and South Korea.

A demonstration of North Korea's nuclear prowess, according to North Korean logic, would result eventually in the US agreeing to negotiations that might again result in promises of food aid.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



After this month's missile test, President Obama suspended plans to ship 240,000 tons of food to North Korea, but Kim Tae-Woo believes that the US might still be inclined to return to negotiations after the next presidential election.

Intimidation of South Korea also appears as key to North Korea's strategy. North Korea wants to prove, "We are dominating North-South Korean relations," says Kim Tae-woo.

That strategy assumes special importance considering that South Koreans in December elect a successor to President Lee, barred by the South's constitution from seeking a second five-year term. The conservative Park Geun-hye, daughter of South Korea's long-ruling Park Chung-hee, assassinated in 1979, is likely to be the conservative candidate but faces a tough fight from whoever wins the nomination of the opposition Democratic United Party.

### **China 'on the hot seat'**

The question many observers ask is whether China, as the source of most of North Korea's fuel and much of its food, can play a role in dissuading North Korea from investing so heavily in missiles and nuclear devices.

"The Chinese are on the hot seat," says Christopher Hill, former US envoy in negotiations with North Korea, now at the University of Denver.

Mr. Hill sees little real difference between policies under Kim Jong-un and those led by his father, Kim Jong-il, who died in December. "The idea that Kim Jong-un is going to back out of this system is a little far-fetched," he says. "You have a military-first system where the military calls the shots."

If only "the US and China would work together and resolve this problem," Hill says, "it would have an enormous impact on Sino-US relations."

In the meantime, analysts try not to be overly alarmed by North Korean rhetoric. "As long as it's just words, everything's fine," says Scott Snyder of the Council on Foreign Relations. "We will be concerned if it escalates into actions."

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Asia-Pacific/2012/0425/Why-is-North-Korea-threatening-to-conduct-a-nuclear-test-video>

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

Slate Magazine  
OPINION/Future Tense

## **It's Time for the U.S. To Finally Sign the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty**

*A recent report removes all of the legitimate scientific objections to ratifying the agreement.*

By Lawrence Krauss

Wednesday, April 25, 2012

Yesterday, word leaked out that North Korea, the world's most closed society, is getting ready to perform its third nuclear weapon test, following earlier tests in 2006 and 2009. If true, it would come on the heels of a recent failed rocket test (supposedly a step toward the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the United States) and saber-rattling threatening to reduce the South Korean government to "ashes."

In response, White House spokesman Jay Carney warned North Korea against "engaging in any more hostile or provocative actions." As we watch to see what North Korea does next, this is an opportune time for the United States to reassess its own policies on nuclear tests—not only because of the political landscape, but also because of changes in science.

One of the simplest first steps toward escaping the nuclear menace that has haunted us for more than 65 years would be to encourage a worldwide ban on the testing of nuclear weapons. It is hard to see a downside to such a move, as it would also help constrain the ability of current non-nuclear states to develop nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, the U.S.



Congress, in its infinite wisdom, has managed to block implementation of an international Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty for the past 15 years.

The obligations of the treaty, ratified by 157 countries, are clear:

1. Each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, and to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control.
2. Each State Party undertakes, furthermore, to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

But despite the fact that Bill Clinton was the first of 72 leaders to sign the proposed CBTB on Sept. 24, 1996, at the United Nations, and even though the United States has itself not carried out a nuclear weapons test since Sept. 23, 1992, Congress has consistently refused to ratify the agreement. The primary objections are that the treaty could damage the safety and viability of our existing arsenal; make it difficult to detect tests or explosions carried out by other countries; and threaten the United States supremacy in nuclear technology if other countries engage in covert testing to develop new technologies.

But much has changed since Congress last explicitly voted down the CTBT in 1999. On March 30, the National Academy of Science presented a landmark report, based on a comprehensive study by the National Research Council and carried out at the request of the Office of the Vice President and the White House Office of Science and Technology. The authors examined all technical objections raised to the CTBT, and their conclusions are unambiguous. As stated in the Executive Summary:

Provided that sufficient resources and a national commitment to stockpile stewardship are in place, the committee judges that the United States has the technical capabilities to maintain a safe, secure, and reliable stockpile of nuclear weapons into the foreseeable future without nuclear-explosion testing. ... As long as the United States sustains its technical competency, and actively engages its nuclear scientists and other expert analysts in monitoring, assessing, and projecting possible adversarial activities, it will retain effective protection against technical surprises. This conclusion holds whether or not the United States accepts the formal constraints of the CTBT.

While the conclusions of the NAS report do not come as a great surprise to many technical experts who have long advocated for the CTBT, this is the first time a high-level, nonpartisan technical group has made such a comprehensive, conclusive analysis.

Of course, it would be naive to assume that Congress has failed to ratify the CTBT only because of legitimate technical concerns. In all such issues of national security, politics plays a dominant role—and Republican politicians in particular are loath to appear either soft on defense or willing to take orders from other countries. Nevertheless, now that the apparent technical obligations against ratifying the CTBT have been all but removed, we can begin to re-energize the political campaign for U.S. ratification.

Early in his presidency, Obama voiced support for a test ban, saying in a 2009 address, “the United States has a moral responsibility to act. We cannot succeed in this endeavor alone, but we can lead it, we can start it.”

He is right: The United States needs to lead here. If we do not forgo the right to test our own vast arsenal, it is hypocritical to vilify North Korea for testing nuclear weapons or Iran for possibly trying to manufacture them. Of course, ratifying the CTBT would not guarantee that North Korea or Iran would respond appropriately. They probably won't—at least not right away. But, other than Pakistan and Israel, the United States is the only nuclear weapons state that has not ratified the treaty. Ratification by the United States, though not exactly snatching the current moral high ground, would at least help establish some additional credibility in working with the rest of the international community to stem activities by future rogue states. By continuing to hold out, the United States isn't making itself, or the rest of the world, any safer.

*Lawrence M. Krauss is Foundation Professor and Director of the Arizona State University Origins Project. His most recent book is A Universe from Nothing.*

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



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

*This article arises from Future Tense, a collaboration among Arizona State University, the New America Foundation, and Slate. Future Tense explores the ways emerging technologies affect society, policy, and culture.*

[http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future\\_tense/2012/04/comprehensive\\_nuclear\\_test\\_ban\\_treaty\\_the\\_u\\_s\\_should\\_ratify\\_it\\_now\\_.html](http://www.slate.com/articles/technology/future_tense/2012/04/comprehensive_nuclear_test_ban_treaty_the_u_s_should_ratify_it_now_.html)

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

South Asia Analysis Group (SAAG)

OPINION/Analysis

Paper no. 5017

25 April 2012

## **China and India's Agni-V**

By Bhaskar Roy

It was no surprise that China would convey its displeasure to India testing its 5000 Km nuclear capable ballistic missile on April 19. What may be a little surprising though that Chinese Foreign Ministry's spokesman Liu Weiwin underplayed the development stating "China and India are, both large and emerging economies, and cooperative partners rather than rivals".

Unlike in the past Liu refrained from cautioning India about arms race or proliferation. This was left to the official media to do, thereby maintaining a degree of deniability. It may be noted that pressed for a clarification Chinese officials and senior media personnel admit that media outlets like the People's Daily (The Communist Party mouthpiece), the Xinhua News agency, and English language China Daily overwhelmingly represent the official line. There are at times independent views, but these also cannot contradict what the party and the state lay down.

Therefore, the editorial in the Global Times (April 09) on the Agni-V missile test, republished by the Xinhua and the China Daily, can be taken as official position. The Global Times is a subsidiary of the People's Daily.

The editorial, "India being swept up by missile delusion" uses all angles to berate and demoralise India. It said that India is a poor country and lacks infrastructure construction, and that India's increased military spending by 17 percent in 2012 and had made it the largest weapons importer in the world. To an extent these are facts. This is one of old Chinese practice highlighting India's lagging economic development while telling the South Asian countries that India was an expansionist and hegemonic power threatening them militarily. But such propaganda does not work any longer. On the one side is China's huge military spending which has quadrupled in the last decade. Beijing is using its military threat against countries in its periphery with which it has territorial disputes. Experts say China may start military strikes against some of these countries to establish its so-called territorial rights. The doctrine is 'limited war under information technology conditions'. On the other side India is an emerging economy which does not threaten any country and is helping its neighbours in economic development. For example, New Delhi gave Bangladesh a one billion dollar, very low interest, development assistance last year. While China is being increasingly feared, India is being admired for its economic development and peaceful attitude even by its arch enemy, Pakistan.

The editorial apparently revealed something which may have been disturbing the Chinese authorities in recent years. It said that the "Indian public opinion has long seen China as its reference point for military development", and "the society (Indian) is highly supportive of developing nuclear power".

Following the 1962 debacle when Chinese attacked India along the borders and retained some captured territory with them, the Indian military suffered a psychological set back. Within the government, the approach was not to provoke China. The public was kept uninformed of Chinese transgressions. This may explain the reason for the slow approach to infrastructure construction along the borders. Money was another constraint. The cold war distrust of the USA in India allowed China to create a strong hold in the anti-US intellectual groups in India who, at the same time, became advocates of China, often arguing against India. Some Chinese loyalists are still around finding excuses even for China supplying arms to India's north-east militants and separatists.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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



Following the Bofors field gun import scandal, one of the finest in its category in the world, Indian officials responsible for military imports went into a cocoon. No one wanted to get his hands sullied in the murky world of military trade with visible and not so visible middle men, bribery and corruption. While Indian military modernization dwindled, China's grew exponentially.

But things in India has changed rather rapidly not only in terms of defence acquisition but also indigenization. Defence Minister A.K. Anthony, a no nonsense man, is credited with this change of approach. But the Chinese are equally if not more concerned with that they perceive as a growing concern in India on China's strategy to constrain India in more ways than one. Beijing authorities are well aware of the power of people's voice in a democracy to shape the country's policies. They blame the Indian free media basically for educating the people of China's containment strategy against India, making Pakistan a stand-alone nuclear state to keep India under pressure, China's strong opposition to the Indo-US nuclear deal among many other things. The Chinese feel that they can manage Indian officials, but people's opinion in a democracy is a matter the Chinese are not familiar with and are disturbed about.

China is actually sensitive about the strategic partnership between a rising India and the US. Particularly disturbing to them is India-US military relations, high technology transfer to India from the US, joint military exercises and strategic collaboration. The US-Japan-India trilateral dialogue is seen as a meeting of minds between the three on how to deal with China's growing political and military status, and have put India squarely with the two countries to 'besiege' China (The People's Daily, Feb 21, 2012).

While China concedes that India's Look East policy started long before the USA's Asia 'pivot' early this year, it believes that the US has been persuading India to enter the Asia Pacific region. The India-Japan defence cooperation and India-South Korea new partnership are similarly viewed. History conscious China has also taken note of India's historical and friendly relations with most of the South East Asian countries, and The People's Daily (April 09, 2012) remarked that India upset China by enhancing its strategic cooperation with countries in the Asia Pacific Region.

The Global Times editorial warned India not to get carried away by its Agni-V missile and not to use its new strength by being "arrogant" in dealing with disputes with China, as China was a much stronger nuclear power. It also cautioned India not to cooperate with the "western allies" in containing China.

For China to determine the Agni-V as an offensive weapon which can reach most parts of China is rather churlish. China's nuclear capable missiles from the DF-21 to DF-31 series cover India many times over. It has armed its closest ally and India's sworn enemy Pakistan, with nuclear capability. It has now reportedly made a new 4000 Km missile to specially target India. Yet, it calls all its military modernization as defensive. This charade is not acceptable. China's worry is that India may have achieved a new parity in deterrence, and as India acquires a nuclear triad like that of China, its strength at the high table of negotiations may be neutralized. India's nuclear doctrine is credible deterrence and no first use. Beijing need not raise dust over this. India is not interested in achieving China's nuclear power, but it wants to ensure peace. In fact, Agni-V came 10 years late at least while considering China's reaction. But it has ultimately come.

The People's Daily (Feb 21, 2012) also republished an article from the influential Shanghai newspaper, the Liberation Daily, that India-China relations was being adjusted by the USA's strategic adjustment in the Asia Pacific Region, thereby cautioning India that 'if you are with the US you are not with us'. Yet, China itself is pursuing on independent adjustment policy with the US which, if successful, will reduce countries like India into the third tier of importance. It is well known that since 1949, the People's Republic of China recognized the USA as the country to work with. The Soviet Union was always seen as an adversary. But the anti-Communist Macarthyism in the US did not allow their relationship to grow. China still hopes to see the world divided between US and Chinese influence regions, but then Americans appear to have grown out of the flash of President Barack Obama's G-2 (US and China) concept of the world.

China's concept of good relation with India has become more complex, though they see and invite India into cooperative relationship in a variety of ways. India has gone more than a step forward to meet China.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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

Unfortunately, China has put riders. These include India's Look East policy, the Dalai Lama issue, India's considered position on the border issue, India-US relations, and India enhanced security relations with Asia Pacific countries to name a few.

All these issues cannot be dealt with in one basket. Each has its individual characteristics. It would be best for China not to try and dictate India's foreign relations which mean interfering in India's internal affairs. Purely bilateral relations between India and China must be resolved amicably for larger regional and international interface. But pin-pricking by China on visa issue for Indian Kashmiris and the like will not help. China is right to realise that there is an effective Indian public opinion.

The Chinese official media has launched a propaganda blitz of the Agni-V issue. One question for the Chinese government and media. Why is China's huge military modernization labelled 'defensive', while India's on Agni-V missile is projected as offensive?

<http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/papers51/paper5017.html>

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

The Hill

OPINION/Congress Blog

## Iranian Cyber Threat Cannot Be Underestimated

By Rep. Patrick Meehan (R-Pa.)

April 26, 2012

As the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, Iran has successfully attacked U.S. interests for three decades, most notably in Beirut in 1983 and at Khobar Towers in 1996, when it killed a combined 260 of our servicemen. It seems willing to do anything to accomplish its goal of securing a nuclear weapon. Last fall, it was revealed that the Iranian government had sponsored a terrorist attack to assassinate the Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States in Washington, D.C. This brazen attack, and the growing, unconventional and enterprising Iranian threat, should surprise no one.

Today, we face the latest threat from an emboldened Iran: a cyber attack. While most grasp the cyber threat posed by China and Russia, few are aware that Iran has increased its cyber capabilities, as evidenced by a recent \$1 billion investment in new technology.

Our nation's senior intelligence officials and technology executives have acknowledged the cyber threat posed by Iran. According to the director of National Intelligence, Gen. James Clapper, "Iran's intelligence operations against the United States, including cyber capabilities, have dramatically increased in recent years in depth and complexity." Speaking about the general cyber threat, FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III forewarned, "...the cyber threat...will be the number one threat to country." There is every reason to suspect an Iranian cyber attack on the United States could expand from our security and intelligence infrastructure to the personal and financial security of American citizens. In fact, Google Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt recently cautioned, the "Iranians are unusually talented in cyber warfare for reasons we don't fully understand."

If Iran is willing to blow up a Washington restaurant and kill innocent Americans, we would be naïve to think Iran would never conduct a cyber attack against the U.S. Homeland. As tensions continue to rise with the West over Iran's illicit nuclear program, the risk of an Iranian miscalculation also increases. In the event of a U.S. or Israeli attack on Iranian nuclear facilities, former Director of the National Counterterrorism Center Michael Leiter assessed that a cyber attack conducted by Tehran against the U.S. would be "reasonably likely."

Knowing that it cannot compete with the United States military conventionally, Iran has spent the last three decades mastering the use of asymmetric warfare. As technology has advanced, Iran has also taken advantage and placed cyber capabilities into its asymmetric warfare arsenal. This isn't an academic question. Recently, Iran has tested its cyber

Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012

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

attack capabilities on Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and a major Israeli financial institution. It is expanding its cyber reach in a very public way. The Iranians feel they “owe us one” because of perceived U.S. involvement in the Stuxnet attack against nuclear facilities throughout Iran.

Given our dependence on computer networks and the increasingly integrated nature of technology for everyday living, we must take the cyber threat from Iran seriously. That is why I partnered with Rep. Dan Lungren (R-Calif.), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Cybersecurity, Infrastructure Protection, and Security Technologies to convene a hearing on this important issue. Our goal is to start a public discussion about Iran’s increasing cyber threat to ensure the U.S. government and private industry are aware and take appropriate steps to mitigate the Iranian cyber threat. We underestimate it at our peril.

*Rep. Meehan (R-Pa.) is Chairman of the House Homeland Security Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence.*

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/223901-iranian-cyber-threat-cannot-be-underestimated-meehan>

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

The Moscow Times – Russia

OPINION/Analysis

## **The U.S. Obsession with Absolute Security**

26 April 2012

By Ruslan Pukhov

The United States is stepping up the creation of its missile defense system, which is based on two key elements. The first is the land- and sea-based Standard SM-3 interceptors, which are to be deployed in Europe and, at some point in the future, in Asia. The second consists of a limited number of the more high-energy GBI interceptors, already deployed in the United States.

Officially, the main purpose of the system is to defend against the potential intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM, and intermediate-range missile threat from Iran and North Korea. It is said that the system is not targeted against Russian or Chinese ICBMs. Washington has always argued that it is building a limited missile defense system that does not jeopardize the nuclear deterrence capability of the other nuclear powers.

There is no doubt that in its current form, the U.S. missile defense system does not pose a threat to Russia's strategic nuclear forces. Nor will it pose such a threat in the next 10 to 15 years.

The number of U.S. missile defense interceptors is limited. So is its ability to intercept high-speed targets such as ICBMs. That is why the system cannot intercept any significant proportion of the Russian ICBMs. The 30 GBI interceptors that have already been deployed in the United States can probably take out no more than seven or eight single-warhead ICBMs, such as the Topol or Topol-M.

The SM-3 interceptors that will be deployed in Europe probably lack any capability against ICBMs and their warheads at the midcourse and terminal phases of their trajectory. It is possible that the SM-3 Block IB interceptors, which are scheduled for deployment in 2015, will have some capability against ICBMs, especially during the terminal phase, but that capability will probably be limited. But in 2020-25, the United States plans to deploy about 200 SM-3 Block IIB interceptors, which will be able to take out about 50 ICBM warheads.

Although the U.S. missile defense system is, in the short term, targeted against pariah states, it is obvious that this is only half of the truth. The true goals behind the large-scale missile defense program are far more ambitious.

The broader reason for the long-term U.S. missile defense program is Washington's desire to make the United States completely secure against all missile attacks. That aspiration for complete invulnerability is at the core of Washington's strategy for national security.

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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

After the Soviet Union developed strategic missile capability in the early 1960s, the United States' period of complete invulnerability against a nuclear attack abruptly ended. That came as a massive shock to the American psyche and worldview, and the United States has still not overcome the consequences of that shock. It is no wonder that the country's political and military strategists have always aimed to restore the absolute invulnerability that the United States once enjoyed. This is possible if the United States develops advanced missile defense technologies.

This is why Moscow believes all U.S. assurances that the missile defense system "will not be aimed against Russia" to be empty and absurd. How can they be taken seriously if the ultimate goal of all U.S. missile defense programs is to achieve a complete defense of U.S. territory to all nuclear missile strikes — something that would eventually negate Russia's strategic nuclear capability.

Based on current projections, the U.S. missile defense system will remain "limited" for another 20 years. It is estimated that during that period the system will lack the numbers and performance characteristics to pose any real threat to the Russian strategic nuclear forces. But after 2030, the growing size and improving performance of the U.S. missile shield will put serious pressures on Russia's strategic nuclear forces.

Russia regards preserving its strategic nuclear deterrence capability as an absolute national security imperative in the face of the much greater integrated military and economic potential of the United States, NATO and China. Russia's strategic nuclear forces enable it to maintain its status as a great power, as well as a "great equalizer" vis-a-vis the military capabilities of other global powers. The country's nuclear arsenal makes it possible to pursue a policy of military deterrence without maintaining a huge and expensive conventional army. Finally, its nuclear deterrent serves as a guarantee that Russia will not be dragged into an armed conflict against its own will.

That is why in the long run the development of the U.S. missile defense program is a threat to the very foundations of Russia's national security.

At the same time, however, Russia lacks any real instruments to prevent the United States from implementing its missile defense plans or even to slow their progress. There is a solid consensus among many Americans and in the political establishment that the United States must attain maximum, total security against all missile attacks, including those that could be launched by Russia and China.

Moscow has nothing to offer Washington in return for abandoning its pursuit of absolute security through missile defense. Remember the 1986 summit in Reykjavik, when Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev offered U.S. President Ronald Reagan complete nuclear disarmament in return for abandoning the Strategic Defense Initiative, Reagan's enormous program for global missile defense. It was not surprising that Reagan turned down the offer.

The United States' pursuit of an advanced global missile defense system is tightly intertwined with the idea of U.S. global dominance. This goes to the very heart of U.S. foreign and defense policy. For that reason, all negotiations with the United States on limiting missile defense issues end up going nowhere, something we have witnessed over the past several years, if not the past three decades. Given that Russia is the weaker party in bilateral relations, there is no compelling reason for Washington to tie its hands on an issue it considers central to its military and national security strategy just for the sake of good relations with Russia.

For this reason, it is equally hopeless for Russia to try to extract any binding commitments from the United States on missile defense by linking the issue to strategic nuclear reductions. Nor is there much point in negotiating with Washington about developing joint missile defense projects.

Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger once said, "Absolute security for one state means absolute insecurity for all others." It was laudable that Kissinger openly acknowledged this axiom. Now, Russia has to take the necessary measure to make sure that Kissinger's axiom doesn't become reality.

*Ruslan Pukhov is director of the Center for Analysis of Strategies and Technologies and publisher of the journal Moscow Defense Brief.*

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/the-us-obsession-with-absolute-security/457650.html>

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

*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

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

**Issue No. 1,000, 27 April 2012**

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