



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Schwartz Stands Behind U.S. Nuclear Deterrent](#)

1. [New Image Reportedly Depicts Iran's Military Nuclear Testing Site](#)
2. [Iran Sees Success in Stalling on Nuclear Issue](#)
3. [Iran to Send Observation Satellite into Orbit in Days](#)
4. [Iran, IAEA to Resume Talks Next Week after Two-Day Negotiations](#)
5. [Reports: Iran Installs New Centrifuges at Underground Nuclear Plant](#)
6. [Plans to Strike Iran Ready: US Diplomat](#)
7. [China, Japan, S. Korea Warn N. Korea Off Atom Test](#)
8. [S.Korean Military Against Redeployment of U.S. Nukes](#)
9. [U.S. Skeptical of Seoul's Longer-Range Missile Ambition: Ex-Official](#)
10. [US Denies Tactical Nuke Redeployment in Korea](#)
11. [North Korea Upgrading Missile Launch Site](#)
12. [North Korea Resumes Work on Nuclear Reactor: Report](#)
13. [Pentagon Study Says China Military Getting Stronger](#)
14. ['India's Nuclear Doctrine Closest in Spirit to China's'](#)
15. [India Can Respond to Any Pak 'Misadventure': Lt Gen Singh](#)
16. [Blueprints of Russia's Advanced N missile May Have Been Leaked](#)
17. [Russian Convicted of Passing Military Secrets](#)
18. [Experts Report Massive Cost Increase](#)
19. [Top Republican Opposes Caps to U.S. Missile Shield](#)
20. [James Cartwright Calls For Deep Cuts In Nuclear Arms](#)
21. [Schwartz Stands Behind U.S. Nuclear Deterrent](#)
22. [Obama Could Block Bill Over New START Restrictions](#)
23. [House Votes to Limit Obama on Nuclear Weapons Reductions, Cooperation with Russia](#)
24. [N.Korea Comes Closer to Triggering Nuclear Arms Race](#)
25. [Tactical Nuclear Weapons](#)
26. [Beyond India's Second-Strike Ability](#)
27. [End Region's Cold War Structure](#)
28. [For Russia, Nato Has Started an Arms Race](#)
29. [Unilateral Cuts to U.S. Nuclear Arsenal Only Encourages Enemies](#)
30. [Why Europe Still Needs Nuclear Deterrence](#)
31. [New Proposal for Additional Cuts in U.S. Nuclear Arsenal is DOA](#)

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.1,003, 18 May 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

Ha'aretz Daily – Israel

New Image Reportedly Depicts Iran's Military Nuclear Testing Site

Drawing obtained by Associated Press is said to come from inside the Parchin military base near Tehran, provided by a country tracking the Islamic Republic's nuclear program.

By The Associated Press

May 13, 2012

An image said to come from inside an Iranian military site shows an explosives containment chamber of the type needed for nuclear arms-related tests that UN inspectors suspect Tehran has conducted at the site. Iran denies such testing and has neither confirmed nor denied the existence of such a chamber.

The image was provided to The Associated Press by an official of a country tracking Iran's nuclear program who said the drawing proves the structure exists, despite Tehran's refusal to acknowledge it.

The official said he could not discuss the drawing's origins beyond that it was based on information from a person who had seen the chamber at the Parchin military site, adding that going into detail would endanger the life of that informant. His country, a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, is severely critical of Iran's assertions that its nuclear activities are peaceful and asserts they are a springboard for making atomic arms.

A former senior IAEA official said he believes the drawing is accurate. Olli Heinonen, until last year the U.N. nuclear agency's deputy director general in charge of the Iran file, said it was "very similar" to a photo he recently saw that he believes to be the pressure chamber the IAEA suspects is at Parchin. He said even the colors of the drawing matched that of the photo.

After months of being rebuffed, IAEA and Iranian officials meet starting Monday in Vienna, and the IAEA will renew its attempt to gain access to the chamber, allegedly hidden in a building. Any evidence that Iran is hiding such an explosives containment tank, and details on how it functions, is significant for IAEA investigations.

Beyond IAEA hopes of progress, that two-day meeting is being closely watched by six powers trying to persuade Iran to make nuclear concessions aimed at reducing fears that it may want to develop atomic arms as a mood-setter for May 23 talks between the six and Tehran in Baghdad.

Warnings by Israel that it may attack Iran's nuclear facilities eased after Iran and the six - the United States, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany - met last month and agreed there was enough common will for the Baghdad round. But with the Jewish state saying it is determined to stop Iran before it develops the capacity to build nuclear weapons, failure at the Iraq talks could turn such threats into reality.

The IAEA has been stonewalled by Iran for more than four years in attempts to probe what it says is intelligence from member states strongly suggesting that Iran secretly worked on developing nuclear weapons.

It first mentioned the suspected existence of the chamber in a November report that described "a large explosives containment vessel" for experiments on triggering a nuclear explosion, adding that it had satellite images "consistent with this information."

It did not detail what the images showed. But a senior diplomat familiar with the IAEA's investigation who has also seen the image provided to the AP said they revealed a cylinder similar to the image at Parchin. Subsequent photos showed a roof and walls going up around the cylinder that then hid the chamber from satellite surveillance.

IAEA chief Yukiya Amano said in March that his agency has "credible information that indicates that Iran engaged in activities relevant to the development of nuclear explosive devices" at the site. Diplomats subsequently told the AP that the experiments also appear to have involved a small prototype neutron device used to spark a nuclear explosion - equipment that would be tested only if a country was trying to develop atomic weapons.

Iran has strenuously denied conducting such work ... and any intentions to build nuclear weapons ... but has been less clear on whether the structure where it allegedly took place exists.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



The senior diplomat familiar with the IAEA investigations said the Iranians have refused to comment "one way or the other" on that issue to agency experts. He and others interviewed by the AP demanded anonymity because their information was privileged, and the official providing the drawing and other details on the structure also demanded that he and his country not be identified in return for sharing classified intelligence.

Attempts to get Iranian comment were unsuccessful. A copy of the diagram was attached to an email sent to Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's chief delegate to the IAEA, with a note that the AP would be asking for reaction. Subsequent phone calls over the weekend went to his voice mail.

The technology used for the suspected multipoint explosives trigger experiments is similar to that employed in manufacturing tiny industrialized diamonds, and the IAEA believes former Soviet scientist Vyacheslav Danilenko - an expert in such diamond-making - helped Iran with designing the chamber.

Diplomats say Danilenko has told the agency that he did not work on such a chamber, but his son in law, identified by the diplomats as Vladimir Padalko, told the IAEA that the container was built under Danilenko's direct supervision. Repeated attempts by the AP and other media organizations to contact the two men have been unsuccessful since the IAEA revealed Danilenko's suspected involvement in November.

The official who provided the drawing also shared the following information on the chamber:

Origins

Built in the early 2000s by Azar AB Industries Co. in the city of Arak and then transported to Parchin. Both the senior diplomat familiar with the IAEA investigations and Heinonen, the former senior IAEA official, confirmed this. Company officials did not answer calls seeking comment.

Size

Volume: 300 cubic meters, or about 10,600 feet. Diameter: 4.6 meters, or 15.09 feet. Length: 18. 8 meters, or 61.68 feet. The senior diplomat confirmed the measurements.

Equipped with

A vacuum pump used to remove air from the chamber to minimize pressure that could damage the structure during an explosion; a compressor that shoots water into the chamber after testing to flood and clean it; a septic tank that receives the waste; an elevation system to suspend the explosives in the upper part of the chamber during testing; and a neutron detection system outside the explosion chamber to measure neutron emissions. The senior diplomat said these features would make sense, or such testing, but could not verify they existed, suggesting they may have been added after the Iranians put up the superstructure shielding the chamber from satellite surveillance.

Time frame

The official said the chamber was used for detonation experiments in 2003, 2005 and 2006. Two officials familiar with the investigations said the first date appeared to be valid but they had no information of subsequent experiments. The United States believes Iran stopped working on a concerted nuclear weapons program at various sites after 2003, while the IAEA suspects Tehran is continuing some work but in a much less organized way than before 2003.

The scientists

Seyed Ashgar Hashemi-Tabar, described as "an expert in measuring detonation phenomena" and not previously identified. Acting on information from the same official, the AP previously named other scientists allegedly involved as Fereydoun Abbasi, the current head of Iran's nuclear agency, who escaped an assassination attempt in 2010; Darius Rezainejad, who was killed by a car bomb last year; and Reza Ibrahimy.

Inspecting the site at Parchin, southeast of the capital, Tehran, was a key request made by senior IAEA teams that visited Tehran in January and February. Iran rebuffed those demands and subsequent ones — the most recent within



the last two weeks — as well as attempts by the nuclear agency to question Iranian officials and secure other information linked to the allegations of secret weapons work.

At the same time, the IAEA has voiced alarm at unexplained "activity" at the site — a term diplomats familiar with the agency's concerns say stands for attempts to clean up any evidence of the kinds of experiments the agency suspects were carried out.

A second senior diplomat familiar with the investigation recently told the AP that spy satellite images shared with the agency show what seems to be water streaming from the building housing the chamber. He said it also depicts workers removing bags of material from that building and put on vehicles outside.

A third senior diplomat said that the apparent cleanup was continuing in early May, the last time he had seen the images.

Iran has scoffed at suggestions of a cleanup in general and of testing a neutron device in particular, with Foreign Ministry spokesman Ramin Mahmanparast asserting that nuclear contamination cannot be washed away. But experts challenge that assertion.

A cleanup "could involve grinding down the surfaces inside the building, collecting the dust and then washing the area thoroughly," said David Albright, whose Institute for Science and International Security in Washington looks for signs of nuclear proliferation. "This could be followed with new building materials and paint.

"It could also involve removing any dirt around the building thought to contain contaminants," Albright said in a statement emailed to selected recipients. "These types of activities could be effective in defeating environmental sampling."

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/middle-east/new-image-reportedly-depicts-iran-s-military-nuclear-testing-site-1.430170>

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

New York Times
May 14, 2012

Iran Sees Success in Stalling on Nuclear Issue

By THOMAS ERDBRINK

TEHRAN — As Iran starts a critical round of talks over its nuclear program, its negotiating team may be less interested in reaching a comprehensive settlement than in buying time and establishing the legitimacy of its enrichment program, Iranian officials and analysts said.

That is because though Iran finds itself under increased financial pressure from tightening sanctions, officials here argue that their fundamental approach has essentially worked. In continually pushing forward the nuclear activities — increasing enrichment and building a bunker mountain enrichment facility — Iran has in effect forced the West to accept a program it insists is for peaceful purposes. Iranians say their carefully crafted policy has helped move the goal posts in their favor by making enrichment a reality that the West has been unable to stop — and may now be willing, however grudgingly, to accept.

"Without violating any international laws or the nonproliferation treaty, we have managed to bypass the red lines the West created for us," said Hamidreza Taraghi, an adviser to Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who is close to the negotiating team.

Iran's envoys met on Monday with officials with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna to discuss the agency's desire to inspect facilities that it suspects have been used to test explosives capable of detonating a nuclear charge, which Iran denies. The talks, however, are also seen as an informal precursor to talks scheduled this month in Baghdad, between Iran and the United States and other nations.



While there remains a significant gap in trust between the two sides — and little likelihood that Iran will give the I.A.E.A. the access it wants to a military site — Iran’s public posture fuels a sense that both sides are searching for a way to declare victory and defuse the crisis. For the West, officials have said that success, at least in the short term, would mean a deal that has Iran ship all its medium-enriched uranium out of the country, which would increase the amount of time needed to make bomb-grade material.

In Tehran, Mr. Taraghi was promoting a narrative that might pave the way for public, and political, acceptance of a compromise over a program that has broad public support, even among competing political factions. Enrichment is seen as a matter of national sovereignty and pride.

Mr. Taraghi ticked off Iran’s successes. First, he said, Western countries did not want Iran to have a nuclear power plant, but its Bushehr reactor was now connected to the national grid. Second, the West had opposed Iran having heavy-water facilities, he said, but it now has one in Arak.

Third, the West had said no to any enrichment.

“But here we are, enriching as much as we need for our nuclear energy program,” Mr. Taraghi said with a smile, referring to the thousands of cascades of centrifuges spinning for years in the half-underground facility in Natanz. Since January, dozens more centrifuges have been online in the Fordo mountain bunker complex, near Qum, built to withstand a heavy attack.

Mr. Taraghi and other officials say their policy has forced the United States to accept enrichment, though five resolutions by the United Nations Security Council have called for it to suspend it. Obama administration officials dispute that view.

But some Iranian and Western officials have hinted that the White House may now be willing to accept some level of enrichment activity, in return for highly intrusive inspections and other guarantees. Tehran, too, may be willing to compromise, ending its enrichment up to 20 percent, a level at which it is easier to enrich it to weapons grade.

Even before a preliminary meeting in Istanbul last month, the head of Iran’s nuclear agency, Fereydoon Abbasi, announced that Iran was willing to stop enriching uranium up to 20 percent. Iran has said it was enriching uranium in order to power up a 43-year-old American-designed medical reactor to produce medical isotopes used to treat cancer.

Mr. Taraghi also said that in the Istanbul talks, Iran had managed to convince the West of the importance of a religious edict, or fatwa, by Ayatollah Khamenei, against the possession of nuclear weapons. He said that doing so helped sell its position that it is not pursuing nuclear weapons. “The West is secular, they do not believe that religious decisions are more important for us than political ones. This took some convincing from our side,” he said. American officials describe it differently, saying that they brought up the fatwa in an effort to offer the Iranians a face-saving way to reach a compromise.

Iran’s negotiators left the Istanbul meeting believing they had scored a major victory. “We have managed to get our rights,” said Mr. Taraghi in his office in downtown Tehran. “All that remains is a debate over the percentage of enrichment.”

But it is not clear from either Washington or Tehran where optimism ends and posturing for negotiations begins. American officials say no compromise on nuclear enrichment was offered in the Istanbul talks, which potentially sets the Iranian side up for major disappointment.

Instead, last week the United States called upon Iran to take “urgent, practical steps,” without specifying what, before the meeting in Baghdad, on May 23.

Empowered by the opinion that escalating sanctions mixed with military threats have intimidated the Iranians, Western officials have leaked several central demands they might make at the Baghdad talks.

One is for Iran to allow United Nations inspectors back into the Parchin military complex, to investigate accusations by Western intelligence agencies that Iran has been working on triggers for a nuclear weapon. There are also demands for



Iran to close the Fordo complex, which is under I.A.E.A. supervision. And, if any deal is to take place, Western powers want the Islamic Republic to sign a voluntary agreement under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, allowing wider inspections.

United States officials have said they could imagine an enrichment program on Iranian soil — but only years from now and only under a series of conditions, including: full answers to all I.A.E.A. questions about possible work on weapons technology; allowing the I.A.E.A. to conduct inspections without warning at declared and suspected sites; and suspension of enrichment until these commitments are fulfilled.

“This illustrates that the nuclear case is just another pretext for trying to keep us down,” said Aziz Shah Mohammadi, an expert formerly connected with Iran’s National Security Council, which, together with Ayatollah Khamenei, maps out Iran’s nuclear policy. “Therefore, we view each round of negotiations as a separate phase, not as leading to an all-out solution,” he said.

Independence from the West is a pillar of the Islamic Republic’s ideology, which makes it very hard for Iran’s leaders to compromise on issues such as closing nuclear sites or foreign inspections beyond the current agreements under the nonproliferation treaty, analysts here said.

Rather, expect the country to start a new nuclear project, if talks fail, one analyst said. “Wait for our leaders to announce, for example, a new mountain bunker so Fordo will be forgotten,” he said, asking to remain anonymous because he was not authorized to discuss this topic. “In case of failure we will try to hold out again until better opportunities for reaching our goals arise.”

Mr. Taraghi did not want to consider the possibility of the talks failing, though he said Iran would have demands of its own in Baghdad, including an end to sanctions against its Central Bank.

“We view the nuclear episode as a heavy retreat for the Western powers,” he said. “But acceptance of our nuclear program takes time, we understand that.”

David E. Sanger contributed reporting from Washington.

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/15/world/middleeast/iran-sees-success-in-stalling-on-nuclear-issue.html?_r=1&pagewanted=all

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

FARS News Agency – Iran
Wednesday, May 15, 2012

Iran to Send Observation Satellite into Orbit in Days

TEHRAN (FNA) - Iran is readying to launch an experimental observation satellite later this month, Defense Minister Ahmad Vahidi said.

Vahidi had earlier informed that Iran intends to send Fajr satellite into orbit in the near future, and he told reporters on Monday that the satellite would launch in less than two weeks now.

"The Fajr satellite will be launched on Khordad 3 (May 23)," the director of the Aerospace Industries Mehdi Farahi said.

It will be the fourth satellite sent into space since 2009 by Iran.

The UN Security Council has imposed on Iran an almost total embargo on space technologies since 2007.

The Fajr (Dawn) satellite was presented by the Iranian officials as "an observation and measurement" satellite weighing 50 kilos (110 pounds), built by Sa-Iran, a company affiliated to the defense ministry.

Fajr, which is equipped with solar panels, has an expected life of 18 months, longer than the three previous observation equipment or experimental communications satellite already put into orbit by Iran.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Iran has so far launched Omid in February 2009, Rassad in June 2011 and Navid in February 2012.

Farahi said that Fajr would be launched by Safir-B1 rocket which is able to place a load of 50 kilos on a low orbit of 300 to 450 kilometers (186-279 miles).

Iran has an ambitious space program. Two week ago, the country announced that it would send more living creatures into the space by the next three months.

"Given the good support that has been offered by the government, we will have a program for sending living creatures into space," Head of the Iranian Space Agency Hamid Fazeli said.

"The preliminary steps have already been taken and the living creatures will be sent into the space by the next two or three months," Fazeli added.

He further announced that Iran will send Fajr (Dawn), Tolou (Sunrise) and Elm-o Sana'at (Promise of Science and Industry) satellites into orbit this year.

Iran has already sent small animals into space - a rat, turtles and worms - aboard a capsule carried by its Kavoshgar-3 rocket in 2010.

The Islamic republic, which first put a satellite into orbit in 2009, has outlined an ambitious, but fully home-grown, space program and has, thus far, made giant progress in the field despite western sanctions and pressures against its advancement.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=9102112105>

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

Xinhua News – China

Iran, IAEA to Resume Talks Next Week after Two-Day Negotiations

May 16, 2012

VIENNA, May 15 (Xinhua) -- The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said Tuesday that its representatives will meet again with Iranian officials over nuclear issues after ending their two-day talks.

The negotiations were held behind closed doors in Iran's permanent representative office in Vienna and in the absence of reporters.

During these two days, the IAEA and Iran discussed a number of options to take the agency's verification process forward in a structured way, IAEA Deputy Director General Herman Nackaerts told reporters after the meetings.

"The primary focus of our discussions was how to clarify issues related to possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program. We had a good exchange of views and we will meet again on Monday," Nackaerts said in a statement.

On Monday, the IAEA called on Iran to allow inspectors access to sites, people and documents the agency seeks to address concerns that the country might have been working on nuclear weapons.

The talks were reported to be less about concrete questions regarding Iran's nuclear facilities, and more about the terms on which the inspectors should be able to work.

Western countries have long suspected Iran of seeking nuclear weapons capabilities, an allegation strongly denied by Iranian officials who insist the country's nuclear program is purely for energy needs and medical research.

One issue figured prominently in recent IAEA-Iran talks is the agency's demand for access to Iran's Parchin military site southeast of Tehran.

An IAEA report on Iranian nuclear issue cited information that Iran had built a large containment chamber at Parchin to conduct high-explosives tests suspected of relating to nuclear weapons research works.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



Iran's envoy to the IAEA Ali-Asghar Soltanieh has said that access to Parchin would only be granted if Iran and the IAEA agree on certain conditions.

The IAEA said its previous two rounds of talks earlier this year in Tehran over the possible military dimensions of its nuclear activities failed to achieve concrete results.

However, talks between Iran and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council as well as Germany in Turkey's Istanbul in April raised new hope of a negotiated settlement of the long-standing Iranian nuclear issue.

The six countries and Iran will hold next round of nuclear talks in Iraqi capital Baghdad on May 23.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2012-05/16/c_131590110.htm

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

The Hill
DEFCON Hill Blog

Reports: Iran Installs New Centrifuges at Underground Nuclear Plant

By Carlo Munoz
May 16, 2012

Iran has installed 20 new centrifuges into its underground nuclear plant near Tehran days before key negotiations over the country's nuclear program are slated to begin this month.

Tehran has yet to use the centrifuges, which are designed to produce the highly enriched uranium needed to build an atomic weapon, according to reports by the *Jerusalem Post*.

However, Western diplomats confirmed on Wednesday they were in place at the underground plan near the Shi'ite Muslim holy city of Qom.

The officials, attached to the United Nations inspection team tasked with keeping tabs on the program, claim the Qom plant is still only producing uranium enriched by 20 percent.

At that level, all the uranium can be used for is energy purposes. Uranium must be enriched by 90 percent for use in a nuclear weapon.

But the addition of the new centrifuges means that it is likely only a matter of time before Iran is able to obtain weapons-grade fissile material, according to one official.

"It is still going strong. I hear it is unchanged," the official said. "But with installation work going on, at some point there will be an increase."

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has repeatedly claimed the country's nuclear work is strictly geared toward peaceful means.

But in February, Ahmadinejad announced the country had successfully developed its own nuclear fuel rods and was using them in reactors located in Tehran.

News of the centrifuges is only the latest indication that Tehran is looking to bolster its nuclear work. The disclosure comes at a particularly interesting time, as Iranian diplomats are preparing to reopen negotiations with the West over its nuclear ambitions.

Iran and members of the P5+1 group — the five permanent United Nations Security Council members and Germany — are set to meet in Baghdad this month.

The Baghdad meeting is the second round of nuclear talks between the two groups, which began in April.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

That round of talks in April yielded little progress and has prompted some on Capitol Hill to demand the United States take a harder line against the Iranian program.

Sen. John McCain said on Monday that he was "not optimistic" that any progress will be made during the talks in Baghdad.

"We have seen this movie before" the Arizona Republican said, suggesting the United States team up with Israel to draft a new set of "red lines" on Iran's growing nuclear program.

Those new red lines would be a way to pressure Tehran into opening up those efforts to the international community. It could also theoretically bring an armed conflict with Iran a step closer to reality.

Red lines are essentially U.S. or Israeli-imposed limits on how far Iran can go in terms of advancing their nuclear program.

Should Iran cross any one of these red lines, it could trigger a military response by either Washington or Tel Aviv.

A long-standing red line set by the United States is that Tehran cannot move its self-proclaimed nuclear enrichment program into a full-fledged weapons development effort.

<http://thehill.com/blogs/defcon-hill/policy-and-strategy/227789-reports-iran-installs-new-centrifuges-at-underground-nuclear-plant->

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

Saudi Gazette – Saudi Arabia

Plans to Strike Iran Ready: US Diplomat

May 18, 2012

By Agencies

DUBAI – US plans for a possible military strike on Iran are ready and the option is "fully available", a US diplomat said, days before Tehran resumes talks with world powers which suspect it of seeking to develop nuclear arms.

The United States has said it considers military force a last resort to prevent Iran using its uranium enrichment to make a bomb. Iran insists its nuclear program is for purely civilian purposes.

"It would be preferable to resolve this diplomatically and through the use of pressure than to use military force," Ambassador Dan Shapiro said in remarks broadcast Thursday.

"But that doesn't mean that option is not fully available – not just available, but it's ready. The necessary planning has been done to ensure that it's ready," said Shapiro.

The United States, Britain, France, Russia, China and Germany have been using sanctions and negotiations to try to persuade Iran to curb its uranium enrichment, which can produce fuel for reactors, medical isotopes, and, at higher levels of purification, fissile material for warheads.

Meanwhile, Tehran's chief nuclear negotiator said Thursday ahead of crunch talks with world powers in Baghdad next week that Iran rejected Western pressures over its nuclear activities and said will never give up its rights.

"If we participate in the negotiations... it is because of our resistance (to Western powers). Thanks to our resistance, we have defended the rights of the Iranian people," Saeed Jalili said in a speech broadcast on local television.

"The Iranian people will never give up even an iota of their rights," Jalili added, in reference to Tehran's nuclear drive which the West suspects is masking a weapons program. Tehran vehemently denies the charge. After a 15 month hiatus, Iran and the P5+1 powers - Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States plus Germany - held their first talks in Istanbul in mid-April, which were described as "positive."

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

US President Barack Obama warned Iran in March that time was running out to resolve the standoff through diplomacy.

But Jalili was defiant on Thursday, insisting that sanctions and international pressure were not affecting Iran's determination.

"Those who think they can pressure Iran with these sanctions are wrong... because the sanctions have allowed us to make progress," he said. He argued that the conditions imposed on Iran at talks in Geneva in 2009 for the delivery of uranium enriched to 20 percent for its Tehran research reactor had in fact forced it to produce the nuclear fuel itself.

"We told them: 'If you do not give us the fuel, we will produce it ourselves.' I will never forget the smiles from certain members of the P5+1. But in less than two years we produced the fuel, and we are using it today."

Iran currently enriches uranium to 3.5 percent and to 20 percent. The former it says is to power its Bushehr nuclear electricity plant and the latter it says is to generate medical isotopes in its Tehran research reactor.

<http://www.saudigazette.com.sa/index.cfm?method=home.regcon&contentID=20120518124367>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

China, Japan, S. Korea Warn N. Korea Off Atom Test

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

13 May 2012

China, Japan and South Korea warned North Korea Sunday they will not tolerate further nuclear tests, the South Korean president said, amid fears that Pyongyang is preparing a third atomic blast.

Lee Myung-Bak made the remark after talks in Beijing with Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao and Japanese Prime Minister Yoshihiko Noda that also saw the trio decide to start free-trade area negotiations before the end of this year.

"Our three countries agreed that we will not accept further nuclear tests or further provocations from North Korea," Lee told reporters after meeting with his two counterparts for 90 minutes.

The Northeast Asian leaders had been expected to put Pyongyang's nuclear and rocket programmes high on the agenda for Sunday's summit.

Fears of a third North Korean nuclear test have grown after a failed rocket launch by Pyongyang last month that the United States and its allies said was a disguised ballistic missile test banned under UN resolutions.

Satellite photos have recently shown work in progress at the Punggye-ri nuclear test site.

Noda called on the three countries to strengthen co-operation in order to "further prevent provocations" by North Korea in future.

Wen had warned earlier Sunday that the region faced many "unstable" factors that made the situation hard to predict.

"The various parties need to use their wisdom, keep patient, and display goodwill to the greatest extent so as to ease confrontation and return to the right track of dialogue and negotiations," the Chinese premier said.

China, long the North's key ally, has been an advocate of seeking to put a stop to the isolated regime's nuclear ambitions via multilateral talks.

The three leaders also agreed to start talks this year on a free-trade area, saying it would boost the economies of the entire region.

The issue has been on the trilateral agenda for the past decade, beginning with an agreement among the three in late 2002 to launch a feasibility study on a free-trade area.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



Wen said closer regional economic integration, in response to a slow global recovery and an overall rise in trade protectionism, would help unlock new growth potential.

"Northeast Asia is the most economically vibrant region in the world. So there is huge potential for our three countries to have closer trade and investment cooperation," he told reporters.

"The establishment of a free-trade area will unleash the economic vitality of our region and give a strong boost to economic integration in East Asia."

China, Japan and South Korea combined would have the world's largest economy — ahead of the European Union — when measured by purchasing power parity, which takes into account differences in living costs across nations.

"Today, as we look at the global financial crisis, some countries are still pursuing protectionist ideas and have expanded them," South Korea's Lee said.

"I'm worried about this. By comparison, I believe the agreement between the three countries is an important thing."

In Sunday's meeting, the three nations also signed an investment agreement concluded earlier this year after 13 rounds of negotiations stretching over five years.

"To further facilitate mutual investment, it is important to have a legal framework. It will help our businesses and mutual investment," Lee said.

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/kt-article-display-1.asp?section=international&xfile=data/international/2012/May/international_May432.xml

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

Chosun Ilbo – South Korea

May 14, 2012

S.Korean Military Against Redeployment of U.S. Nukes

The Defense Ministry believes an amendment adopted by the U.S. House Armed Services Committee to redeploy tactical nuclear weapons in the Korean Peninsula will hurt attempts to resolve the North Korean nuclear weapon issues.

A military source said on Sunday, "If the U.S. redeploys nuclear weapons here, it means that we are abandoning the Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula adopted by the two Koreas in December 1991. This can only mean that we are removing the solid grounds to persuade North Korea to give up its own nuclear weapons."

But he added that redeployment of nuclear weapons is unrealistic because the U.S. must have destroyed much of the forward-based nuclear weapons it withdrew from South Korea in 1991.

However, some retired generals have long called for re-nuclearization of the South to secure an effective deterrent.

South Korea and the U.S. came up with an extended deterrence strategy to counter North Korea's nuclear program after the U.S. withdrew the tactical nuclear weapons from the South. This includes a U.S. nuclear "umbrella" that would see tit-for-tat counterattack if South Korea sustains a nuclear attack, and a response to a North Korean nuclear attacks or threats of a nuclear attack with conventional weapons.

The U.S. has reportedly devised a plan to use B61 nuclear bombs carried by fighter jets and bombers in Guam and Tomahawk cruise missiles fired by nuclear-powered submarines. Their power is around 100 to 200 kilotons, equivalent of 100,000 to 200,000 TNT and one-tenth of a strategic nuclear weapon.

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/05/14/2012051401329.html

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea
May 16, 2012

U.S. Skeptical of Seoul's Longer-Range Missile Ambition: Ex-Official

By Lee Chi-dong

WASHINGTON, May 15 (Yonhap) -- The United States is skeptical of South Korea's push to extend its ballistic missile range, according to a former top Pentagon official.

Michele Flournoy, who served as undersecretary of defense for policy until February, emphasized that countering North Korea's missile threats is a matter to be handled from the perspective of the alliance.

"We should approach that as a problem for the alliance. We should look at not only what capabilities does South Korea need but also what capabilities do we as an alliance need," she told Yonhap News Agency after a forum Tuesday on U.S. defense strategy at the American Enterprise Institute.

Flournoy, who while in office took part in a sensitive discussion with Seoul on that matter, said South Korea can explore ways to maximize the effect of the alliance before using its resources to build its own extended-range missile system.

"We have such a close alliance, and political commitment is so rock-solid," she said. "I think that there are better ways to solve the problem."

South Korea is prohibited from developing ballistic missiles with a range of more than 300 kilometers (186 miles) under a 2001 deal with the U.S.

Seoul has been seeking to develop longer-range missiles in order to cover all of North Korea, which is armed with missiles of various ranges.

President Lee Myung-bak has said that South Korea needs to advance its ballistic missile capability.

On the Pentagon's budget cuts and pivot towards Asia, Flournoy said there will be no major change in its policy on the Korean Peninsula.

"This is adding an additional dimension which now make us more active in Southeast Asia and the Indian Ocean," she said.

She added the alliance with South Korea will remain a cornerstone of U.S. defense strategy.

Flournoy, now a member of the board of directors of the Center for a New American Security, was the highest-ranking female official at the Pentagon.

Some say she may become the secretary of defense if President Barack Obama is re-elected.

She refused to comment on that possibility.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2012/05/16/13/0401000000AEN20120516000100315F.HTML>

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

Korea Times – South Korea
May 16, 2012

US Denies Tactical Nuke Redeployment in Korea

By Chung Hee-hyung

The U.S. government confirmed Monday that it has no plans to deploy tactical nuclear weapons in South Korea. It is the first official denial from the Obama administration concerning the issue after Republicans from the House of Representatives called for "redeploying tactical nuclear weapons to the Western Pacific region."

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



“Our policy remains support for a nonnuclear Korean Peninsula, so we don’t have any plans to change that policy,” State Department Spokeswoman Victoria Nuland said at a press briefing. “Tactical nuclear weapons, in our view, are unnecessary for the defense of South Korea. So we don’t have any plans or intentions to deploy them there.”

The South Korean government also overtly rejected using nuclear weapons as a means of putting pressure on the North. “We are in accord with the United States on this issue, and have never discussed the deployment of nuclear weapons with the U.S. government,” an official from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade stated, Wednesday. “The South Korean government would adhere to the spirit of the 1992 denuclearization agreement.”

Both Koreas issued a joint statement in 1992 in which they vowed to rid the Korean Peninsula of all nuclear weapons to “eliminate the threat of possible nuclear war.” Shortly before the agreement, the United States withdrew its “nuclear umbrella” for South Korea when it removed the last remaining tactical nuclear weapons from its key ally.

Paik Hak-soon, a research fellow at the Sejong Institute, said that deploying nuclear weapons would only embolden North Korea to stick to its only remaining option, sustaining the increasingly fragile regime against outside pressure.

“It would amount to abandoning the country’s efforts to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula. Moreover, in the face of international sanctions, North Korea would do all it could to accelerate its nuclear and long-range missile development.”

Another Foreign Ministry official explained why the government did not want to put nuclear weapons on its soil. South Korea was demanding the North’s denuclearization from a “morally superior” position, and that it would be “undesirable” to redeploy nuclear weapons that the United States already pulled out in 1991, the official said on May 13.

The United States may have a more practical reason for not deploying tactical nuclear weapons. Having more than its fair share of domestic and foreign policy challenges, the current administration may have little appetite for adding to its list of problems by triggering yet more tension in Korea.

President Obama is facing a presidential election which most experts agree will be the toughest reelection campaign for an incumbent president since Jimmy Carter. The presence of more than 90,000 U.S. troops in Afghanistan has failed to bring about a decisive outcome against the Taliban insurgency, and Iran shows little sign of giving up its nuclear program.

Given this situation, the Obama administration may simply wish that North Korea not embark upon yet another round of provocations and remain quiet instead - at least until the upcoming election. It is likely that calls for nuclear weapon deployment may dissipate by that time.

North Korea has repeatedly conducted nuclear tests and satellite launches despite strong sanctions from the international community, most recently its rocket launch in April 28. Though a spectacular failure, the test stimulated Chung Mong-joon, a conservative politician bidding for the ruling Saenuri party’s presidential nomination, to declare that the country should consider reintroducing tactical nuclear weapons.

Republicans in the House Armed Services Committee made a similar request to bolster deterrence against potential threats from North Korea. The amendment to the 2013 National Defense Authorization Act mandates the Defense and State Departments to inform Congress of the viability of “re-fielding nonstrategic nuclear arms” in the area.

The writer is a Korea Times intern.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/05/116_111097.html

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

London Telegraph – U.K.

North Korea Upgrading Missile Launch Site



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

North Korea has started work to upgrade its Musudan-ri missile launch site and potentially make the facility capable of firing an intercontinental ballistic missile.

By Julian Ryall
16 May 2012

Apparently undeterred by the catastrophic failure of what Pyongyang claims was a rocket putting a satellite into orbit in April from its facility at Tongchang-ri, North Korea is now investing in a larger launch pad at its alternative launch site, diplomatic sources told media in South Korea and Japan.

Officially known as the Tonghae Satellite Launching Ground, Musudan-ri is in the far north-east of the Korean Peninsula and was originally used in the 1990s to test-fire Scud missiles that it built based on Soviet designs.

The site underwent a major upgrade in the 1990s, including the construction of a missile assembly facility, and the site was used to launch numerous weapons, including the intermediate-range Taepodong-1 missile.

In April 2009, North Korea attempted to put the Bright-Star-2 satellite into orbit from Musudan-ri atop a Taepodong-2 rocket. In spite of North Korean claims that the launch had been a success, international space agencies were unable to find any evidence the satellite had reached orbit.

North Korea conducted a series of engine combustion tests for long-range missiles at the site from late 2011 and, with the regime defying world opinion for its last launch, the analysts believe the next missile could be fired from Musudan-ri.

As recently as May 6, North Korea vowed to push ahead with what it claims are peaceful space and nuclear programmes. It added that it intends to put a geostationary satellite into orbit in the future.

Pyongyang's defiance came after the United States, China, Russia, France and Britain issued a statement expressing "serious concern" at North Korea's activities and called on the regime to "refrain from any further actions which may cause grave security concerns in the region, including any nuclear tests."

There are still concerns that the North may be planning a third nuclear test.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/northkorea/9269360/North-Korea-upgrading-missile-launch-site.html>

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

The West Australian – Australia

North Korea Resumes Work on Nuclear Reactor: Report

By David Chance, Reuters
May 17, 2012

SEOUL (Reuters) - North Korea has resumed construction work on an experimental light water reactor (ELWR) in a move that could extend its capacity to produce more material for nuclear weapons, website 38North reported on Thursday.

Based on April 30 satellite images, work halted in December at the reactor had now re-started, said the website (<http://38north.org>), run by the U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins University and former U.S. State Department official Joel Wit.

The construction activity comes as Pyongyang has stepped up progress towards conducting a third nuclear test, perhaps using highly enriched uranium for the first time, despite warnings from the United States and China.

"Pyongyang's construction of an ELWR which the North Koreans have indicated is the prototype for additional reactors as well as a uranium enrichment facility at Yongbyon, is an important indication of the North's intention to move forward with the expansion of its nuclear weapons stockpile in the future," 38North said.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



It said the reactor could be operational in 1-2 years and that North Korea had almost completed the reactor containment building, based on the satellite images.

North Korea says it needs nuclear power to provide electricity, but has also boasted of its nuclear deterrence capacity and has traded nuclear technology with Syria, Libya and likely Myanmar and Pakistan.

It became the first country to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 2003 and has denied international inspectors access to its nuclear facilities, renegeing on a February 29 deal to do so after it announced plans to launch a long range rocket, in defiance of U.K. Security Council resolutions.

TWO PATHS TO NUCLEAR WEAPONS

North Korea is not presently making any plutonium, but may be producing highly enriched uranium, according to nuclear expert Siegfried Hecker, who was shown centrifuges for use in an enrichment program by North Korea in 2010.

38North said the new ELWR, when operational, could produce enough material for an additional nuclear bomb each year.

A highly enriched uranium program running alongside this could allow North Korea to significantly increase the number of nuclear devices it could produce, giving it a dual track to nuclear weapons as the country has big reserves of uranium.

Hopes for a rapprochement between North Korea, under its new leader Kim Jong-un, and Washington were dashed by the April rocket launch, which Washington says was aimed at developing technology to mount a nuclear warhead on a missile.

Key to whether North Korea presses ahead with a third nuclear test is China, the main economic and political backer for the isolated state that is one of the most sanctioned in the world.

China chided North Korea over the rocket launch and has warned of the consequences of a third test, but unless it chooses to cut off economic aid and trade it has little leverage.

It condemned North Korea's first nuclear test in October 2006, carried out in defiance of China's public pleas, and it supported a U.N. resolution that authorized sanctions. It backed sanctions again after the North's second test in May 2009.

In 2003, China briefly cut off fuel to North Korea after a missile test, but it cited technical problems.

The timing of any third test is not yet clear, but satellite images have shown tunneling at the site of previous tests.

A senior official with close ties to both Pyongyang and Beijing recently told Reuters that the test could be readied soon.

Created by David Chance; Editing by Michael Perry

<http://au.news.yahoo.com/thewest/a/-/world/13709939/north-korea-resumes-work-on-nuclear-reactor-report/>

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

New York Times
May 18, 2012

Pentagon Study Says China Military Getting Stronger

By JOHN H. CUSHMAN Jr.

WASHINGTON — China is pressing a long-range modernization of its military, part of a strategy aimed at maximizing its leverage over Taiwan, extending its influence farther abroad, but avoiding conflict around its borders or with the United States, the Pentagon said on Friday in an annual report to Congress.



Chinese leaders, the report asserted, view this as a time to “focus on internal development while avoiding direct confrontation,” although they expect tension, competition, and territorial flare-ups from time to time, and they do not expect the status quo, however satisfactory they find it, to last indefinitely.

The United States, decades ahead technologically, spends much more, and in pivoting its strategy toward Asia and the Pacific, “seeks to build a military-to-military relationship with China that is healthy, stable, reliable, and continuous,” the annual report said.

Two months ago, Beijing announced an 11.2 percent increase in its annual military budget to roughly \$106 billion. While economic comparisons and analysis have always been difficult, there is no doubt that the past few decades have seen steady expansion in China’s military spending, and the Pentagon’s estimate is that China is investing more than it says, but still only about a fourth of what the United States spends each year on the military.

For its money, China is getting more weapons, and better ones.

Its air force is “transforming into a force capable of offshore offensive and defensive operations,” the report said, with prototypes of a stealth fighter seen starting last year. Other areas of investment include defenses against ballistic missiles, early warning and air-defense missiles, and their land and naval equivalents.

In many ways, the modernization shows a Chinese military that has watched what the United States has done in the past generation or two, and is exploring the same avenues of growth. From the restructuring of its army to the new ascendancy of information technologies in warfare, there are parallels.

To be sure, there are profound differences, as the People’s Liberation Army, or P.L.A., plays a distinct role in Chinese society, government, and economic affairs.

The two militaries are already operating more frequently in overlapping territories, and the 2012 report traced the same themes as last year’s, but a bit more succinctly.

In the past year, it noted, the P.L.A. “deployed assets to support noncombatant evacuation operations from Libya, extended its presence in the Gulf of Aden for a third year of counterpiracy operations, took on leadership roles in United Nations peace operations, and conducted medical exchanges and a service mission to Latin America and the Caribbean using the P.L.A. Navy’s hospital ship.”

These are examples of what the Chinese call “new historic missions” for the P.L.A., and while they are generally not threatening to other nations, they demonstrate a new assertiveness that the Pentagon, and some allies of the United States, look upon warily.

“China’s actions in 2011 with respect to ongoing land and maritime territorial disputes with neighbors,” the report said, “reflected a mix of contentment with the status quo, renewed efforts to reassure wary neighbors, and continued willingness (particularly through the use of paramilitary maritime law enforcement assets) to assert Chinese claims.” This has been especially notable in the South China Sea, where tensions with the Philippines continue.

However, “China notably took steps to ease relations with Japan and dampen suspicion among rival South China Sea claimants after China’s assertive posture in 2010 increased regional tensions. These steps included high-level engagement with Tokyo and confidence-building measures with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), even as Chinese maritime law enforcement assets continued to defend Chinese claims in disputed areas,” the report said.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/19/world/asia/pentagon-study-says-china-military-getting-stronger.html>

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

The Hindu – India
Mumbai, May 12, 2012



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

'India's Nuclear Doctrine Closest in Spirit to China's'

But Pakistan's doctrine is antithetical to India's, says Menon
By Shoumojit Banerjee

The nuclear deterrence between India and China was essentially stable in nature and was likely to remain so in the near future despite India and China pursuing their nuclear programmes with increasing technological sophistication.

This was stated by National Security Adviser Shivshankar Menon while speaking at the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre here on Friday on the occasion of National Technology Day.

India's nuclear doctrine was closest in spirit to China's. The Communist behemoth had never made a direct nuclear threat against India so far, he noted.

This was further augmented by the fact that the East Asian state had concentrated on the survivability of its nuclear arsenal by focussing on technological enhancements like developing multiple independent re-entry vehicles and manoeuvrable re-entry vehicles — moves made by a nation that did not regard its nuclear arsenal as a “war-fighting weapon.”

Technology and its changes had always been prime drivers of the security calculus. India's nuclear capabilities were built primarily for deterrence, and not as a war-fighting weapon, he pointed out.

Nuclear blasts

Referring to India's nuclear blasts at Pokhran in Rajasthan in 1974 and 1998, he emphasised that their purpose was to build a credible minimum deterrence (by using nuclear weapons politically, than as war weapons) while wrenching free of an expensive arms race.

India was the first nuclear weapon state to publicly announce and debate a nuclear doctrine. Possession of nuclear weapons made it less vulnerable to nuclear coercion and political blackmail. On the contrary, Mr. Menon said, Pakistan's doctrine was antithetical to India's. He pointed out Islamabad's readiness to employ nuclear weapons if certain thresholds were crossed.

He also touched upon the darker effects of the information and communications technology (ICT) revolution in the post-Cold War society, drawing on the lethality of terror groups such as the al-Qaeda and the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT).

Urging the country's think tank to start treating technology security as a national goal, he said the ICT revolution had vested non-state actors and individuals with immense power and estimated that more than 120 smaller countries in the world that viewed ICT as an equaliser had developed capabilities for waging cyber warfare.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/article3409182.ece>

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

Sakaal Times – India

India Can Respond to Any Pak 'Misadventure': Lt Gen Singh

Acquisition of Weapons of Mass Destruction by extremists, biggest concern

PRINCIPAL CORRESPONDENT

Wednesday, May 16, 2012

PUNE: India is fully capable of responding to any 'misadventure' by Pakistan even though it is a nuclear state, General Officer Commanding-in-Chief (GOC-in-C), Headquarters Southern Command, Lt Gen A K Singh said here on Tuesday.

"Since the 1998 nuclear tests, India and Pakistan have been through limited war (Kargil) and a major military crisis (Indian Army exercise Operation Parakram), making it clear that the nuclearisation of both the countries has not made conventional war between them an obsolete concept," Lt Gen Singh said.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

He was delivering the Gen B C Joshi Memorial lecture at the Pune University MBA (PUMBA) campus, organised jointly by department of Defence and Strategic Studies, University of Pune and Southern Command. His topic was 'Perspective on war in 21st century'.

"Acquisition of nuclear weapons by Pakistan has not altered the strategic balance in the subcontinent, and it has not been able to neutralise India's conventional war fighting superiority. Notwithstanding the nuclear deterrence in place, there is adequate strategic space for India to respond to a Pakistani misadventure, which might arise out of its miscalculated confidence," the Army Commander said.

Nuclear capability may limit the objective, scope and intensity of war and despite views to the contrary, the nuclear threshold would not be as fragile and low as made out by many strategists and academicians.

"The biggest concern for nation states is the acquisition of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) by non-state actors (extremist groups). How will the dynamics of deterrence, coercion and escalatory control work against non-state actors? It is a nightmare scenario and remains a very real threat," the GoC-in-C said.

In order to be effective against non-state players, deterrence, coercion and escalatory control must rely on international protocols to prevent proliferation through sanctions and other tough measures.

"Most important, international cooperation among the intelligence agencies to detect moves by identified non-state actors to acquire WMD, so that timely counter action can be initiated. Future wars will be hybrid, and conventional forces the world over will have to constantly adapt and evolve to face new challenges," he added.

<http://www.sakaaltimes.com/20120516/4714859823928211356.htm>

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

Brahmand Defence & Aerospace News – India

Blueprints of Russia's Advanced N missile May Have Been Leaked

Press Trust of India (PTI)

May 15, 2012

MOSCOW (PTI): The blueprints of Bulava, Russia's most lethal and advanced submarine launched nuclear missile, which carries up to 10 warheads may have been leaked out, the country's authorities fear.

A defence employee has been accused of leaking sensitive information about the intercontinental missile with a strike range of upto 8,000 kms, to a foreign intelligence service, Ria Novosti news agency reported citing a report in the Kommersant daily.

The leaked information includes the Bulava missile's guidance and control system.

"There is conclusive evidence of his guilt," a law enforcement source was quoted by the daily as saying.

Details of the case have not been disclosed because it involves state secrets, the news report stated.

Experts suggest the company in question could be the Yekaterinburg-based Avtomatika Science and Production Association, which has been developing the missile's control and guidance system.

The man is due to go on trial at the Sverdlovsk Region Court, which will take place behind closed doors due to the sensitive nature of the case.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) SLBM, developed by the Moscow Institute of Thermal Technology (since 1998), carries up to 10 MIRV warheads and has a range of over 8,000 kilometres. The three-stage ballistic missile is designed for deployment on Borey-class nuclear submarines.

<http://brahmand.com/news/Blueprints-of-Russias-advanced-N-missile-may-have-been-leaked/9483/1/13.html>

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russian Convicted of Passing Military Secrets

18 May 2012

Sverdlovsk regional court on Friday sentenced an employee at a Russian defense firm to eight years in prison for passing secrets on the latest Russian weapons to a foreign intelligence service, the press service of the court reported.

The Kommersant daily reported on Monday that these secrets concern the guidance and control systems of the Bulava intercontinental missile.

“Sverdlovsk regional court declared the sentence of Alexander Gniteev, who was convicted of treason felony. The court sentenced him to eight years in a maximum security penal colony,” the statement reported.

Experts suggest the company in question could be the Yekaterinburg-based Avtomatika Science and Production Association, which has been developing the missile’s control and guidance system.

The court also fined Gniteev 100,000 rubles (\$3,216). He will also face stringent travel restrictions after he serves out his sentence.

The verdict has not yet entered into force and may be appealed.

The Bulava (SS-NX-30) SLBM, developed by the Moscow Institute of Thermal Technology (since 1998), carries up to 10 MIRV warheads and has a range of over 8,000 kilometers (5,000 miles). The three-stage ballistic missile is designed for deployment on Borey-class nuclear submarines.

YEKATERINBURG, May 18 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20120518/173527564.html

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

Der Spiegel – Germany

May 16, 2012

US Nuclear Weapons Upgrades

Experts Report Massive Cost Increase

By Markus Becker

The cost of modernizing US nuclear weapons, including those stationed in Germany, has risen sharply, according to estimates. Several independent experts told SPIEGEL ONLINE that the bill for renewing the B61 atomic bomb will rise to \$6 billion. The project will also upset Russia, they say.

The B61 is the last remnant of the Cold War in Germany. An estimated 10 to 20 of the atomic bombs are thought to remain in storage at a German Air Force base in Büchel, a village in the Eifel mountains of western Germany. Should war break out, the Tornado aircraft belonging to the German Air Force could immediately be armed with the weapons for sorties under US control.

But the fact that such a scenario is considered extremely unlikely has not prevented the US from embarking on an effort to upgrade the stockpile, as it is doing with much of its nuclear arsenal. The Life Extension Program (LEP) for the B61 -- of which there are between 160 and 200 in Europe -- is considered to be the most difficult and expensive of all. In 2010, the Department of Energy requested almost \$2 billion (€1.6 billion) for the project, to be spent over four years. Later, the number rose to \$4 billion.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



Now, the total is expected to be closer to \$6 billion, as several experts have reported independently. The first to write of the exploding costs was Hans Kristensen of the Federation of American Scientists (FAS). Other experts are not surprised. "The \$6 billion estimate for B61 LEP is consistent with our estimates," wrote executive director of the Arms Control Association in Washington, Daryl Kimball, in an email.

In late April, several senators demanded that funding be cut to the B61 refurbishment program, at least until the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), which is responsible for the upgrades, presents a detailed timeline and funding plan. That the costs for the project are now three times the original estimate is not likely to meet with euphoria in Washington. The NNSA also hinted to SPIEGEL ONLINE that the expenses threaten to be higher than anticipated. "We are formally validating costs and expect to have something in the coming months," NNSA spokesman Josh McConaha said.

'Unproven Technologies'

The costs are not the only element of the refurbishment program which has experts shaking their heads. Many are uncomfortable with the sheer extent of the B61 modernization program. The NNSA wants to revamp old components, install new safety mechanisms and detonators and make improvements to the design all at the same time. Such an all-encompassing renewal effort has never been tried before, says the Union of Concerned Scientists, a group which is critical of nuclear weapons. They also warn that some of the new parts, including the detonators, are not yet ready for prime time. "You read that right," wrote UCS experts Nickolas Roth and Stephen Young on the group's website. "The multi-point safety and new detonators are unproven, immature technologies."

In short, the project -- should it succeed despite the high costs and technical hurdles -- is not merely limited to extending the weapons' lifespans, but would be akin to creating a new weapon altogether. Should the improved B61 weapons find their way back to bases in Europe in 2019 as planned, they "will in essence be a strategic bomb," FAS expert Kristensen told SPIEGEL ONLINE. "They will be able to hold at risk targets that the weapons in Europe currently cannot hold at risk."

Tactical atomic weapons like the B61 are designed to be deployed against enemy soldiers on the battlefield. They tend to be much less powerful than strategic nuclear weapons, which can be deployed to neutralize an enemy country's nuclear arsenal or even destroy entire cities. The modernized B61, Kristensen fears, could change from being a tactical weapon to a strategic one.

The B61 modernization program envisions modifying four existing bomb models (or "mods") -- the 3, 4, 7 and 10 -- into one, the B61 Mod. 12. An important new feature is a new tailkit with controllable flaps. The new system would dramatically increase the bomb's precision.

Provoking Russia

The new B61-12 will be able to carry four different warheads, which range in strength from 0.3 to 45 kilotons of TNT. As a comparison, the bomb dropped on Hiroshima at the end of World War II had a strength of 15 kilotons. "This weapon can do the same amount of damage militarily as the very high-yield weapon attached to the B61-7," says Kristensen. Götz Neuneck, from the Institute for Peace Research and Security Policy, likewise warns of the "drastically improved mission capabilities" of the B61.

In addition to the upgrades, the bombs are also to be carried by the stealth fighter F-35, which is currently in development. The weapon and the fighter jet are to be perfectly compatible, such that the F-35 -- also known as the Joint Strike Fighter -- will be able to stow two of the bombs in its hold. Such a capability could provoke new trouble with Russia, which is already unhappy with the planned European missile defense shield.

"I'll bet there are hardliners in the Kremlin who are already now looking at this issue and saying 'aha, this is another example of NATO saying one thing and doing another,'" says Kristensen. "There are always irritants. This is going to be another one."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

ACA director Kimball agrees. "Deployment of the B61-12 in Europe would complicate the effort to bring Russia to the tactical nuclear weapons negotiating table," he says. Neuneck also echoes the sentiment. The B61-12, he says, would greatly impede negotiations on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and would put an end to efforts to withdraw all atomic weapons from Europe.

Whereas most concerns are focused on the B61-12 with the largest warhead, the smallest warheads with a strength of just 1.5 kilotons or even 0.3 kilotons could likewise present considerable dangers. "If you have increased accuracy, it opens up new possibilities for also using the lower yields for missions," says Kristensen. The biggest advantage is less radioactive fallout. "The pressure and the heat from the explosion gets closer to ground zero, exactly where it has to go off. You don't have to use as much explosive power and there is less fallout. It's a cleaner nuclear attack."

Neuneck also says that the "smaller size and increased accuracy" of the mini-nukes "would make their actual use more likely."

A More Credible Threat

The US government has long sought to develop such miniature atomic weapons. Strategic nuclear weapons have long since become so powerful that their deployment no longer seems likely. As such, they no longer represent much of a threat. Smaller atomic weapons, many politicians and military leaders believe, would pose more of a credible threat because of the increased likelihood that they would actually be used.

The development of such weapons, however, has repeatedly failed to overcome objections from the US Congress. A majority of congressmen and women believe their development is simply too dangerous because they would lower the barriers for use. In 2005, the administration of US President George W. Bush had to abandon plans for the development of such mini-nukes.

In the current Nuclear Posture Review, which guides US nuclear weapons doctrine, it states that the military capabilities of the warheads are not to be altered. "And that's true" says Kristensen. "But it says nothing about whether they will improve the accuracy of this weapon by putting a new tail pin on it." As in the case of the new tail guidance system on the B61. "There is a backdoor to modernization that is being actively used."

When it comes to Germany and other European countries, the B61 problem could solve itself. Germany's military, the Bundeswehr, intends to mothball its Tornado fleet in 2020. Its successor, the Eurofighter, will not be able to carry atomic weapons as it is currently designed. Modification costs would have to be paid by Germany itself. "Given the current domestic policy debates, there would seem to be little support for new airplanes," says Neuneck.

In the end, the high costs of the modernization program could ultimately kill it. That, at least, is the hope of Richard Burt, a former US ambassador to Germany and a leading member of the Global Zero initiative. "We seriously doubt whether this LEP program will be pursued to the end," Burt told SPIEGEL ONLINE. "It might well be postponed indefinitely given the reported cost overrun."

An end to the B61, whether for technical or cost reasons, would be welcome news to most experts. "US nukes in Europe have no military utility," says Burt, who as Washington's chief negotiator in 1991, was a key player in initiating talks with the Soviet Union on the START treaty. Instead, the Americans would be more likely to deploy intercontinental ballistic missiles stationed on US soil or atomic weapons based on submarines. As such, Kristensen demands in a recently published report, the US should withdraw all tactical nuclear weapons from Europe no matter what the Russians do.

ACA expert Kimball says it is "tragic that the B61s based in Europe are irrelevant to NATO's defense." He says their destructive capability is so massive that it makes their use incredible. "Neither US nor European taxpayers should be asked to waste more money to upgrade the system."

<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/upgrading-us-nuclear-weapons-more-expensive-than-planned-a-833586.html>

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

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

Hartford Courant – Hartford, CT

Top Republican Opposes Caps to U.S. Missile Shield

May 15, 2012

* *Senator Kyl opposes assurances to Moscow, Beijing*

* *NATO to advance "interim" missile defense at Chicago Summit*

* *Putin wants guarantees Russia's nuclear missiles not targeted*

By Jim Wolf, Reuters

WASHINGTON, May 15 (Reuters) – A top Republican in the Senate urged President Barack Obama on Tuesday to refrain from giving Russia and China any assurances about possible limits to U.S. missile defenses, days before a NATO summit in Chicago.

The Obama administration should make no pledge that would pre-empt a U.S.-led shield capable of thwarting any missile "that might be launched at us," not just an accidental launch or one from a nation like Iran or North Korea, Senator Jon Kyl said in an interview with Reuters.

Moscow opposes an emerging NATO shield in Europe for fear it could weaken Russia by gaining the capability to shoot down nuclear-tipped missiles that Russia relies on as a deterrent to attack.

Obama was caught on camera March 26 assuring then-Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he would have more "flexibility" to deal with such Russian concerns after the November 6 U.S. presidential election.

"I don't think the president is going to get away with not talking about this until after the election," said Kyl of Arizona, the No. 2 Republican in the Senate, in charge of rounding up votes.

"He's going to have to talk about it during the campaign or allow those of us who are skeptical to assume, correctly, that he has every intention of imposing those limits."

Both former President George W. Bush, a Republican, and Obama, a Democrat, have sought to persuade Russia that missile-defense plans for Europe are designed only against the kind of limited attack that could potentially be launched by Iran or another Middle East country.

Shortly after taking back the Russian presidency this month, Vladimir Putin demanded that the United States give "firm guarantees" that the U.S.-engineered NATO shield would not be aimed at Russia.

NATO is set to declare, at a summit in Chicago Monday and Tuesday, a limited capability to protect Europe against ballistic missiles now that it has completed the first stage of the four-phase project due to wrap up by about 2020.

Russia's top military officer, Chief of General Staff Nikolai Makarov, has threatened to carry out a pre-emptive strike on US-led NATO missile defense facilities in Eastern Europe if Washington continues developing the shield without Russian approval.

Kyl, elaborating on a guest column in the Wall Street Journal, said offering Russia any assurances about the scope of the program would be a serious mistake, and the same holds for China, he told Reuters by telephone.

Kyl favors development of space-based interceptors as potentially the most cost-effective missile-defense approach.

Building ever more capable defenses "remains the best and most moral course for the United States to dissuade anyone from getting the idea that they could gain advantage over the United States," he said.

Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, a private research group, described Kyl's approach as "unhelpful." He said successive U.S. administrations had failed to convince Russia that limited U.S. missile defenses were indeed limited.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

Kyl's stance would prompt Moscow to "overreact even more" to the system being built in Europe, Kimball said.

Editing by Anthony Boadle.

<http://www.courant.com/topic/sns-rt-nato-summitmissiles-kyll1e8gfdg3-20120515,0,6039693,full.story>

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

Huffington Post

James Cartwright Calls For Deep Cuts In Nuclear Arms

By Andrea Stone

May 15, 2015

WASHINGTON -- A blue ribbon commission headed by a former commander of U.S. nuclear forces Tuesday called for an end to "Cold War thinking" and a sharp reduction in America's arsenal of nuclear weapons to better fit security threats in the 21st century.

A report by the Global Zero U.S. Nuclear Policy Commission, headed by former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff James "Hoss" Cartwright, urged "an urgent and transformational change in U.S. nuclear force structure, strategy and posture" over the next 10 years. It recommended reducing the U.S. nuclear arsenal to 900 warheads from nearly 5,000 currently, a reduction it said would cut spending on nuclear weapons programs by as much as \$100 billion over the next decade.

"The strategy inherited from the Cold War, which remains in place, artificially sustains nuclear stockpiles that are much larger than required for deterrence today," the report said. "The actual existing threats to our two countries (and the globe) cannot be resolved by using our nuclear arsenals. No sensible argument has been put forward for using nuclear weapons to solve any of the major 21st century problems we face -- threats posed by rogue states, failed states, proliferation, regional conflicts, terrorism, cyber warfare, organized crime, drug trafficking, conflict-driven mass migration of refugees, epidemics or climate change. A large standing Cold War-like nuclear arsenal cannot productively address any of these dangers."

The expert panel, brought together by the international arms-control advocacy group Global Zero, included former Republican senator Chuck Hagel, former chief START negotiator Richard Burt, former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations Thomas Pickering and former Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic for NATO, retired Gen. Jack Sheehan.

Their blueprint comes as President Barack Obama weighs options to shrink the number of nuclear weapons under the New START treaty with Russia that was ratified by the Senate in December 2010. Under the agreement, each country would be limited to 1,550 strategic nuclear warheads and 800 delivery vehicles.

But there is nothing stopping the Pentagon or the Kremlin from going lower and the Cartwright group lays out in its 26-page report how the two largest nuclear powers could disarm even further. The experts call for renewed arms negotiations with Russia that would reduce the U.S. arsenal to 900 total strategic nuclear weapons on modified alert, with half deployed and half kept in reserve. Instead of the current hair-trigger system that provides leaders just minutes to decide whether to launch or respond to an attack, the deployed warheads would be "de-alerted" to require from 24 hours to 72 hours to ready missiles for launch.

The panel of military and diplomatic experts urged the elimination of all U.S. tactical nuclear weapons over the next 10 years. "Their military utility is practically nil," the report said.

As for hostile countries that possess or are pursuing nuclear weapons, namely Iran and North Korea, "vigilant missile defenses and conventional forces kept on constant alert" are the answer, according to the report.

But Russia, as well as China, "are not enemies of the United States," the report stated. It noted that Russia wasn't included in a recent survey of policy experts as being among the top 20 contingencies directly threatening the U.S.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

homeland -- despite Mitt Romney's insistence that it is "our number one geopolitical foe." The Republican candidate, who has promised to increase defense spending, not cut it, has said he would review the implementation of New START if elected president.

While the report maintained that, "mutual assured destruction no longer occupies a central psychological or political space in the U.S.-Russian relationship," there may be more fundamental barriers to turning the recommendations into reality: politics.

In keeping with its post-Cold War theme, the experts recommended eliminating land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), part of the traditional nuclear triad that includes submarines and bombers. "ICBMs in fixed silos are inherently targetable," the report said. Because they must be fired within minutes to avoid being destroyed by incoming enemy missiles, their "rapid reaction posture ... runs a real risk of accidental or mistaken launch," it said.

The report called for a two-pronged nuclear defense instead, made up of 10 Trident ballistic missile submarines armed with 720 strategic missile warheads (360 deployed, 360 reserve) and 18 B-2 bombers armed with 180 gravity bombs (90 deployed, 90 reserve). Plans for upgraded ICBMs would be scrapped. All existing silo-based ICBMs in North Dakota, Montana and Wyoming would be dismantled or converted to conventional munitions.

Good luck with that. As reported by The Huffington Post last month, members of Congress from rural states that are home to America's land-based nuclear arsenal are likely to go ballistic at any efforts to uproot the missiles in their midst.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/15/james-cartwright-nuclear-arms_n_1519404.html

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

Air Force Times

Schwartz Stands Behind U.S. Nuclear Deterrent

By Marcus Weisgerber - Staff writer
Wednesday May 16, 2012

The Air Force's top officer on Wednesday criticized a report conducted by an influential retired general that recommends the U.S. reduce its nuclear stockpile.

The study was led by retired Marine Gen. James Cartwright, who oversaw the military's nuclear weapons during his military career and stepped down last year as the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It called for cutting the strategic nuclear stockpile to 900 warheads. The report also calls for eliminating U.S.-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, which are operated by the Air Force.

"I don't agree with his assessment nor the study," Gen. Norton Schwartz said Wednesday at an event at the Brookings Institution in Washington.

Schwartz said the combination of land-based and sea-based ICBMs, and strategic bomber aircraft serve as a deterrent.

"Why do we have a land-based deterrent force? It's so that an adversary has to strike the homeland," he said.

Cartwright's report, which was conducted for Global Zero, an international organization that advocates for the elimination of nuclear weapons, states that with a reduced nuclear inventory of 900 warheads, only 450 should be deployed.

The deployed warheads should be "de-alerted" and require 24 hours to 72 hours to become "launch ready," the report states.

The New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty between the U.S. and Russia allows for 1,550 deployed nuclear warheads.

<http://www.airforcetimes.com/news/2012/05/air-force-norton-schwartz-stands-behind-nuclear-deterrent-051612d/>

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



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

Global Security Newswire

Obama Could Block Bill Over New START Restrictions

May 16, 2012

The fiscal 2013 defense authorization bill being considered in the House of Representatives could face rejection by President Obama if it retains language restricting implementation of a bilateral nuclear arms control treaty with Russia, the White House warned on Tuesday (see *GSN*, May 11).

The legislation would establish Obama's adherence to spending pledges for updating the nation's nuclear complex as a prerequisite to the completion of atomic arsenal curbs mandated under the New START accord, Reuters reported (see *GSN*, April 27).

The administration in 2010 announced a 10-year, \$85 billion nuclear weapons complex spending plan as it sought to secure Senate endorsement of New START. The pact, which entered into force in February 2011, requires Moscow and Washington by 2018 to reduce their respective deployed strategic arsenals to 1,550 warheads and 700 delivery devices.

The speed and schedule of funding previously backed by the administration are not presently suitable, according to some government sources (David Alexander, Reuters, May 15).

The authorization proposal "would set onerous conditions on the administration's ability to implement the treaty" as well as "onerous conditions on the president's ability to retire, dismantle, or eliminate nondeployed nuclear weapons," the White House said in prepared comments.

One portion of the legislation "raises constitutional concerns as it appears to encroach on the president's authority as commander in chief to set nuclear employment policy -- a right exercised by every president in the nuclear age from both parties," the statement adds.

"If the final bill presented to the president includes these provisions, the president's senior advisers would recommend that he veto the bill," the White House said (White House release, May 15).

The Obama administration has taken issue with other aspects of the legislation, which would reverse funding curbs recommended by the Defense Department and allow for almost \$4 billion more in appropriations than the Pentagon had requested, Reuters reported (Alexander, Reuters).

"The overall funding level supported by [the proposal] would violate the Budget Control Act of 2011, the bipartisan agreement reached between the Congress and the president to put the nation on a sustainable fiscal course," the White House said. "If the cumulative effects of the bill impede the ability of the administration to execute the new defense strategy and to properly direct scarce resources, the president's senior advisers would recommend to the president that he veto the bill."

The White House also protested measures in the legislation addressing U.S. missile defense operations, including plans for constructing an East Coast interceptor installation.

"Section 223, which would require a missile defense site on the East Coast of the United States, is premature because the administration has not identified a requirement for a third U.S.-based missile defense site, nor assessed the feasibility or cost in a cost-constrained environment," according to the statement. "This section also would mandate the inclusion of a plan to deploy an appropriate missile defense interceptor for such a site in the budget request for FY 2014, an unwarranted intrusion on executive branch decision making."

The bill from the GOP-led House would also impact the program for deploying U.S. antimissile assets to Europe under the "phased adaptive approach" program, which is part of a broader NATO effort to protect the continent from potential missile threats posed by nations such as Iran.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Three sections "would limit funding for missile defense equipment and construction supporting the EPAA -- the U.S. voluntary national contribution to NATO missile defense -- thereby hindering its implementation and limiting protection of U.S. Forces, allies, and partners in NATO Europe," the White House said. "Finally, section 1236 would unnecessarily impede the president's exclusive authority to conduct discussions with the Russian Federation on cooperative missile defense matters both bilaterally and in the NATO context, would limit the reciprocal exchange of data that could benefit U.S. and allied security, and would be impractical to implement" (White House release).

Responding to Defense Secretary Leon Panetta's recent suggestion over the \$554 billion legislation's potential to prompt political stalemate, House Armed Services Committee Chairman Howard McKeon (R-Calif.) in written remarks noted the Pentagon chief's previous assertion that moves to eliminate \$487 billion in anticipated defense funding over 10 years had led the department "right to the razor's edge," according to Reuters (Alexander, Reuters).

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/obama-could-block-spending-bill-over-new-start-restrictions/>

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

The Hill

Floor Action Blog

House Votes to Limit Obama on Nuclear Weapons Reductions, Cooperation with Russia

By Pete Kasperowicz

May 18, 2012

The House on Friday voted to limit the Obama administration's flexibility to reduce the U.S. nuclear stockpile or work with Russia on nuclear nonproliferation activities.

Approval of the Republican amendments to the National Defense Authorization act (NDAA) were a measure of retaliation against President Obama, who was caught telling Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he would have "more flexibility" on European missile defense after the 2012 election.

Republicans took that as a sign Obama would weaken plans for a missile defense system in Europe to satisfy Russia, and as a further indication that Obama might act to reduce the capacity of the U.S. to wage nuclear war. After Obama's open microphone gaffe, Obama reiterated that he does support a smaller U.S. nuclear weapons arsenal.

In early Friday morning debate, Rep. Tom Price (R-Ga.) brought forward an amendment that prohibits the President from making unilateral reductions to U.S. nuclear weapons, and cited Obama's comments to Medvedev as the reason for his amendment. Price's amendment was approved 241-179, and was supported by eight Democrats.

Shortly after that, Rep. Trent Franks (R-Ariz.) brought forward his language to limit the availability of funds for nuclear nonproliferation activities with the Russian Federation until the government confirms that Russia has taken steps to reduce weapons proliferation. That language passed in a 241-181 vote.

In the same series of votes, the House turned away two nuclear-related amendments from Rep. Hank Johnson (D-Ga.) that went the other way. One of these would have required the Secretary of Defense to report by early 2013 on whether nuclear weapons reductions are in the national security interests of the United States. This amendment failed 175-245.

Johnson's other amendment would add a finding to the bill that the deployment of tactical nuclear weapons to South Korea would destabilize the region, but the House voted it down, 160-261.

<http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/house/228305-house-votes-to-limit-obama-on-nuclear-weapons-reductions-cooperation-with-russia>

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

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

Chosun Ilbo – South Korea
OPINION/Editorial
May 14, 2012

N.Korea Comes Closer to Triggering Nuclear Arms Race

The U.S. House Armed Services Committee on Thursday adopted an amendment that urges the Obama administration to redeploy tactical nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula. The amendment to the defense authorization bill, passed by a vote of 32-26, supports "steps to...redeploy tactical nuclear weapons to the Western Pacific region."

A tactical nuclear weapon is a small warhead with a 10-20 kiloton explosive yield that can be mounted on artillery shells or short-range missiles to be used on a battlefield, as opposed to strategic nuclear weapons that are designed to annihilate huge populations. The U.S. Forces Korea used to have around 200 tactical nuclear weapons, but all of them were withdrawn following former President Roh Tae-woo's decision in 1991 to denuclearize Korea. The move was designed to persuade North Korea, which was under suspicion at that time of developing nuclear arms, to scrap those attempts.

But over the ensuing 20 years, North Korea has developed nuclear weapons and is gearing up to conduct its third nuclear test. There have been calls within South Korea over the years to either develop a home-grown nuclear bomb or at least have U.S. troops redeploy tactical nuclear weapons. But Washington wanted to keep the Korean Peninsula free of nuclear weapons. Only in early 2011 did Gary Samore, the White House special assistant on arms control and weapons of mass destruction, say the U.S. would be willing to redeploy tactical nuclear weapons here if Seoul wanted it.

In Japan, Osaka Mayor Toru Hashimoto and Tokyo Governor Shintaro Ishihara are the two most popular candidates for the top government post for publicly insisting on Japan's right to possess nuclear weapons. There is even talk that the two politicians may join hands to form a party. In the past, Japanese politicians who made such claims were treated as lunatics, but thanks to North Korea's nuclear weapons program, such figures are now at the center of attention.

Maybe North Korean leader Kim Jong-un is too politically naïve to realize the danger of his father's nuclear legacy. But China must know how serious it would be if the U.S. redeploys nuclear weapons here and Japan pushes to develop its own nukes. How much longer will Beijing continue to tacitly approve Kim Jong-un's plans to conduct a third nuclear test?

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/05/14/2012051401341.html

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

Korea Times – South Korea
OPINION/Editorial
May 14, 2012

Tactical Nuclear Weapons

Redeployment to threaten peace and stability

A U.S. congressional committee's passage last week of an amendment on redeploying tactical nuclear weapons on the Korean Peninsula is creating subtle ripples both at home and abroad as North Korea is poised to conduct a third nuclear test.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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 U.S. House Armed Services Committee passed an amendment to the 2013 defense bill Thursday that calls for the reintroduction of tactical nuclear weapons to South Korea. The bill also requires Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Defense Secretary Leon Panetta to submit a report on the feasibility and logistics of redeploying such weapons.

Apparently, Republicans want to send a clear message that China should act decisively to make North Korea stop its nuclear weapons development. The North carried out two underground nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009 and is allegedly preparing for a third.

For now, the possibility that the sensitive weapons will be redeployed here appears slim. The Obama administration is clearly negative on the redeployment, backing a nuclear-free peninsula. Even if the bill passes the House, the Democrats-controlled Senate is certain to vote it down.

South Korea's Ministry of National Defense also opposes redeployment, saying efforts by Seoul and Washington to force North Korea to halt its nuclear weapons development won't be justified.

But the situation can change completely if the Republican Party wins the presidential election in November. In that scenario, the 1992 declaration on nuclear-free Korean Peninsula will be nullified and the role of the six-party talks on North Korea's denuclearization will be questioned.

The amendment is viewed as leverage the U.S. can use in efforts to pressure China to get North Korea to give up nuclear weapons. U.S. officials have been complaining about Beijing's lukewarm attitude toward North Korean provocations.

Some experts see the amendment as part of the Republicans' campaign strategy in the run-up to the presidential poll. That is, the Republican Party is seeking to get tough with North Korea in an effort to criticize Obama's foreign policy in the midst of rising conservatism.

Domestically, the conservative minor opposition Liberty Forward Party urged the government to consider redeployment as a way to counter North Korea's nuclear and conventional missile threats. Rep. Chung Mong-joon, one of the ruling Saenuri Party's presidential contenders, also raised the issue, noting that the North is a de-facto nuclear power and redeploying tactical nuclear weapons is the only way to change Pyongyang's approach toward Seoul.

North Korea, for its part, should know that its missile and nuclear weapons programs have triggered the recent debate on redeploying tactical nukes on the peninsula. At a time when most experts believe that the North won't give up its nuclear weapons program, it might be absurd just to wait for the six-way denuclearization talks to resume.

Nonetheless, redeploying nuclear weapons now makes little sense because it could threaten peace and stability on the peninsula. Rather, it would be reasonable to resort to the six-party talks with patience.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2012/05/137_110946.html

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

Japan Times – Japan

OPINION

Monday, May 14, 2012

Beyond India's Second-Strike Ability

By HARSH V. PANT

Special to The Japan Times

LONDON — There was a sense of déjà vu when, days after India successfully test-fired its nuclear-capable, 5,000-km-range Agni-V ballistic missile, Pakistan responded by test-firing an "improved version" of its nuclear-capable Hatf-4 intermediate range ballistic missile.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



At a time when Indo-Pakistan ties seem to be improving, these tests have struck a jarring note. Though both New Delhi and Islamabad informed each other of their impending tests — in accordance with a 2005 pact stipulating that the two neighbors would give due warning to each other before missile tests — recent events underscore the continuing security dilemma between them.

There is a bigger story behind India's test that also needs to be recognized. With its latest test, India has gained entry into an elite club of nations that includes only five other states — United States, Russia, China, France and Israel. And it marks a culmination, in many ways, of efforts that started in 1983 as part of India's Integrated Guided Missile Development Program.

From the first test of Agni-I in 1989, it has certainly been an eventful road for India's missile program. It was time for Agni-V when the 3,500-km-range Agni-IV was tested in November 2011.

Though it will take a few more tests before the missile becomes operational and inducted into the armed forces, the message is clear — India's second-strike capability is safe and secure.

India's no-first use nuclear doctrine relies fundamentally on a credible second-strike nuclear capability.

The Agni-V, by bringing the Chinese heartland into India's missile orbit, makes the Sino-Indian nuclear dynamic more stable than before. India's Agni-III has already been deployed very close to the Chinese border to give India a credible second strike capability.

Now, for the first time, India has demonstrated a missile range that can cover China. This will give Indian military planners greater flexibility in the deployment of their missile arsenal. The test was psychologically important for India, boosting its confidence to deal with China as an equal.

China is already at a much advanced stage in its missile capability. China's nuclear arsenal is more than double India's estimated 100 warheads, and it continues to deploy both land- and submarine-launched ballistic missiles. China's reaction has been predictable, underscoring once again the disdain that sections of the Chinese elite feel toward India.

Although officially China just emphasized that India and China are not rivals, the state-run Global Times was openly dismissive of Indian claims, arguing that India "should be clear that China's nuclear power is stronger and more reliable," and "for the foreseeable future, India would stand no chance in an overall arms race with China."

India has no need to enter into an arms race. It needs to be more sophisticated in its response.

Though sections of the media have portrayed Agni-V as an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), technically Agni-V is not. It is an intermediate range ballistic missile; there is a good reason for New Delhi to underline the fact that India is not yet ready for an ICBM.

So far, India has been successful in crafting a narrative about its missile program that gives it a defensive orientation. India wants a missile capability to strengthen deterrence; there is no need to antagonize the rest of the world by suggesting a capability that it can strike at will any corner of the world. While this might satisfy some hypernationalists, it would also generate apprehensions about India's true intentions and make the Indian narrative of its peaceful rise problematic.

What message India sends out to the rest of the world is especially important at a time when India is seeking membership in global export control regimes — the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Australia Group, and the Wassenaar Arrangement — based on its impeccable nonproliferation credentials.

The reaction of the U.S., underlining India's "solid nonproliferation record," is also very instructive considering the distance that U.S.-India ties have traveled in the last few years. India is widely considered a responsible nuclear power and the logic of India's tests is well understood.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The U.S. today welcomes India's rise as a balancer in the Asia-Pacific and as a powerful democratic partner at a time when America's traditional allies in the West no longer have the will and the ability to carry the burdens of global power.

So, while India's focus remains firmly on China, Pakistan continues with its obsession with India. The latest missile test merely underscores an already well-established reality that Pakistan maintains a credible deterrence against India.

The more confident Pakistan is about its nuclear posture, the better it is for the region as it will bring greater stability in Indo-Pakistan ties. The real problem today is not Pakistan's nuclear capability but the reluctance of the Pakistani security establishment to unequivocally renounce terrorism as an instrument of state policy. The recent tests in South Asia do nothing to change that reality.

Harsh V. Pant teaches at King's College London.

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/text/eo20120514a4.html>

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

China Daily – China

OPINION

End Region's Cold War Structure

May 15, 2012

By Wang Junsheng (China Daily)

The nuclear program of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea has had a negative effect on Northeast Asia security.

In order to improve its external environment, the DPRK is endeavoring to develop nuclear weapons. But this has only further isolated it from the international community and increased its feeling of insecurity. Its relations with the United States, Japan and the Republic of Korea have deteriorated and its friendly relations with China are being tested. And in the face of its increasing isolation, the DPRK has adopted an even harder line.

As a result, Japan and the ROK have felt increasingly insecure and taken their own hard lines and strengthened the trilateral security mechanism with the US, which has further entrenched the regional Cold War structure.

This in turn has enhanced China and Russia's strategic distrust of the US, ensuring the Cold War structure is maintained in Northeast Asia.

The mechanism for multilaterally managing the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue is the Six-Party Talks. However, although the Six-Party Talks have been in progress for nine years they have still not achieved their main aims of denuclearizing the Korean Peninsula and ensuring regional stability.

This is because the primary goal of the DPRK is to normalize its diplomatic relations with the US, and it is willing to deteriorate the regional situation in order to achieve this; and because the ROK, the country most directly concerned, always seems to lose the opportunity to solve the problem because of diplomatic mistakes. China, Russia and the US, meanwhile, are competing for the leading role in Northeast Asia. While for Japan, the tensions are an excellent excuse for it to achieve its dream of political and military power.

There is also a serious trust deficit among the six countries, as there are territorial and historical issues between China and Japan, China and the ROK, Japan and the ROK, and suspicion exists between the US and China.

Therefore, it is not because the DPRK leadership has diplomatic capability that the talks cannot achieve their aim, but because the other five countries lack mutual trust and have differing policy priorities, which means they do not take a common strategy toward the DPRK.

To move forward and defuse tensions the countries involved need to take a number of steps:

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

First, each country has to honestly review their previous policy toward the Korean Peninsula nuclear issue. They should find their common interests and focus on those. From this perspective, persuading the DPRK to halt further development of its nuclear program is in line with the interests of all the other countries.

Second, there needs to be greater strategic mutual trust, between China and the US in particular. China doesn't have the intention to challenge US interests in Northeast Asia and both countries will be the losers if the DPRK successfully conducts a third nuclear test. They need to try and work together. China has publicly stated that it welcomes the US making positive efforts to promote peace, stability and prosperity in the region. The US should be very cautious about imposing sanctions against the DPRK and staging joint military exercises with the ROK and Japan.

Third, Japan and the ROK should pay more attention to the necessity for practical coordination with China. Although the US has taken a leading role in their trilateral efforts, denuclearization of the peninsular will only be achieved with the help of China. Trilateral coordination between China, Japan, and the ROK, would also be conducive to weakening the region's Cold War structure.

When the time is ripe the six countries can build up the Northeast Asia Security Forum by gradually raising the level to foreign ministry forum, defense secretary forum, or even a top leaders' summit .

The author is a research scholar at the Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies, affiliated to the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences.

http://usa.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2012-05/15/content_15292069.htm

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

London Telegraph – U.K.

OPINION

For Russia, Nato Has Started an Arms Race

This online supplement is produced and published by Rossiyskaya Gazeta (Russia), which takes sole responsibility for the content.

By Yevgeny Shestakov, special to Russia Now
15 May 2012

The Russian public believes the Nato alliance is playing a foul game that threatens the country's security, says Yevgeny Shestakov.

Sergei Lavrov, the Russian foreign minister, arrived for the Russia-Nato meeting in Brussels just five minutes after US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Their planes were parked side by side. "Hello, Hillary", the Russian minister hailed his American counterpart, as he descended the ramp. "Hello, Sergei", Clinton beamed, as she got into her car. And with a welcoming gesture, she invited Lavrov into the back seat, so that they could drive to the hotel together.

Well actually, no, it didn't really go like that. Given the current state of Russian-American relations, neither the Russian foreign minister nor the American Secretary of State would agree to go to the Russia-Nato meeting in the same car. For most Russians, the alliance is still the number one enemy, although the Russian military does not officially consider Nato countries to be potential enemies.

Dmitry Rogozin, Russian deputy prime minister in charge of modernising the defence industry, posts daily progress reports on his Twitter page. Hundreds of billions of roubles are set aside for the defence programme, which is planned for decades ahead. But these staggering figures, which will affect the lives of future generations, give people a sense of pride rather than provoke dismay over money that could otherwise have been used for social programmes.

Opinion polls show that most Russians approve of the official plans to spend budgetary funds on modernising defence. Why? The answer is simple: the Russian public does not trust Nato, believing that the alliance is playing a game that threatens Russia's security.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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



These fears are not without foundation. Moscow points out that the alliance is establishing its presence close to Russian borders. New military bases are being set up in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania. Nato patrols the airspace above the Baltic states, which was not the case before they joined the alliance. The combined military budgets of the Nato states are multiples of what Russia spends on defence.

Nato's conventional forces in Europe outnumber those of Russia. The American military is developing new types of weapons, including offensive systems that will be deployed in Europe and might change the balance of power in the region.

Despite Russia's assistance to the alliance in Afghanistan, the American military is building major military bases there without any prior consultation with Moscow. These bases, Russian experts say, are strategically important for controlling Central Asia. The Pentagon's bases will remain in Afghanistan even after most Nato troops leave the country, a prospect Russia does not relish.

Yet the greatest irritant in the relations between Moscow and Nato is ballistic missile defence. The fact that both the US and Nato leadership refuse to offer Russia legal guarantees that these systems are not targeting Moscow's nuclear potential forces Russia to take retaliatory measures. All that Washington is ready to do is "to offer safeguards in a political format". Moscow, however, does not consider such political promises sufficient: in military affairs, it is the defence potential and not the intentions that matter.

Moscow has always tried to avoid becoming involved in an arms race. With respect to missile defence, Moscow has consistently advocated the so-called sectoral approach, whereby Nato and Russia would divide zones of responsibility and pool their defence efforts in countering common missile threats. That would save billions of defence euros for all the participants in the group.

Yet Nato has turned down the Russian offer under pressure from the US, the reason being the treaty signed by Nato in the Cold War. Under its Article 5, the alliance must protect its members independently, without counting on Russia's potential. Nato has no intention of changing that article to bring it into line with current reality and avoid a new arms race.

On the contrary, many Nato countries are modernising their armed forces. The talk about these changes being routine and not threatening anybody does not convince Moscow. Russia has to take steps to ensure its own security under the new conditions and make sure it does not become "a colossus with feet of clay" in the eyes of its western neighbours. Allocating considerable resources to modernise the defence industry is an inevitable response to the military initiatives taking place in Europe.

Is there any way to put a brake on this arms race? Yes, of course. At the Russia-Nato ministerial meeting in Brussels, Moscow suggested as a first step that, at its Chicago summit, Nato pledges its "adherence to the rules of international law" in its final declaration. Such a commitment would mean that the alliance would respect the jurisdiction of existing international institutions, and renounce the independent use of force unless it was authorised by a relevant UN Security Council resolution.

Even so, it cannot be ruled out that Nato will pointedly refuse to change its agreement with the current international crisis-response mechanisms. If the refusal is articulated, it would turn Nato, in Russia's eyes, into the main threat to international stability. Such a turn of events would force Russia to think about creating military counterweights to Nato. That would put paid to any chances of stopping the arms race in Europe.

All of the programmes for co-operation between Moscow and Nato would be gradually curtailed, as public opinion in Russia would reject any form of co-operation with a potential enemy. And this is not merely words. The recent Russian decision to open a transit centre in Ulyanovsk to deliver non-military cargoes to the coalition forces in Afghanistan has triggered strong protests at grassroots level.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Nato's refusal to recognise the world order and its demonstrative refusal to reckon with Russia's geopolitical interests render meaningless any joint initiatives aimed at countering common threats. They merely fuel the arms race that many European countries want to avoid.

Yevgeny Shestakov is editor of the international politics desk at Rossiyskaya Gazeta.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/sponsored/russianow/opinion/9266927/Russia-Nato-arms-race.html>

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

Commentary Magazine

OPINION

Unilateral Cuts to U.S. Nuclear Arsenal Only Encourages Enemies

By Max Boot

May 16, 2012

Retired generals have been noticeably silent even as the threat of sequester, with devastating consequences for American military preparedness, draws nearer. Perhaps they are afraid they will be derided as "militarists" for standing up for a strong defense. Retired generals are more likely to be applauded for calling for defense cuts, especially to programs they once oversaw—a "man bites dog" story that provides predictable fodder for the news media.

Thus, retired Gen. James Cartwright, a former commander of U.S. Strategic Command (guardian of the nation's nuclear arsenal) and former vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is garnering headlines for suggesting a unilateral cut to the U.S. nuclear arsenal that would be far below the limits negotiated with Russia in the last START agreement. That agreement limits the U.S. and Russia to 1,500 deployed warheads, down from the previous total of 2,200. Cartwright, along with other retired worthies gathered by Global Zero, an organization with the utopian goal of eliminating all nuclear arms, now claims we could go down to 900 warheads, of which only half would be deployed. This, in sum, would be a 70 percent reduction in our deployed nuclear arsenal.

Perhaps that would be a wise course of action if other nations around the world were eliminating their nuclear arsenals. But that is far from the case. India and Pakistan continue to build up their nuclear arsenals and the ballistic missile forces, aircraft, and other means of delivering them. So do China and North Korea. Russia maintains a sizable array of nuclear arms, including a large number of short-range nukes that are not covered by START. Meanwhile, Iran is bidding to acquire its own nukes which could trigger a destabilizing arms race in the Middle East.

It is hard to see how, under those circumstances, a further diminution of the U.S. nuclear arsenal will aid the cause of global peace. Will Iran and North Korea follow the U.S. lead? Hardly. Instead, unilateral American cuts will play into a narrative of American decline and weakness—which will only encourage our enemies to build up their offensive arsenals. And not only our enemies. Our friends, from South Korea to Saudi Arabia, depend on American nuclear protection. If there is any doubt about the ability or willingness of the U.S. to respond with devastating force to potential nuclear threats, our allies will acquire nuclear weapons of their own—as destabilizing a development as it is possible to imagine.

Weighed against the benefits of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, what are the costs? Not very high. The cost of maintaining our current arsenal is in dispute, but it is roughly \$20 billion a year. That is a paltry amount in the context of a \$3.8 trillion federal budget. Moreover, we would only save a small portion of that \$20 billion by cutting our deployed nuclear forces because of the considerable fixed costs we will continue to incur for communications networks, missile launchers, submarines, and other systems, which will need to remain in operation whether or not they are supporting nuclear or conventional weapons delivery.

A unilateral nuclear cut, with an ultimate objective of "nuclear zero," may sound like a worthy and high-minded policy, but in fact it is a dangerous, destabilizing move because other nations will not follow the American lead. The U.S. nuclear arsenal has helped keep the peace since 1945; we give up that advantage at our peril—and the world's.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

Max Boot is a leading military historian and foreign-policy analyst. The Jeane J. Kirkpatrick Senior Fellow in National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York, he is also a contributing editor to the Weekly Standard and the Los Angeles Times, as well as a regular contributor to the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Commentary, and other publications.

<http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/05/16/unilateral-cuts-to-u-s-nuclear-arsenal-encourages-enemies/>

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

Project Syndicate

OPINION/Commentary

Why Europe Still Needs Nuclear Deterrence

By Imants Liegis, Linas Linkevičius, Janusz Onyszkiewicz

17 May 2012

RIGA/VILNIUS/WARSAW – In recent months, we have joined discussions led by former United States Senator Sam Nunn, former British Minister of Defense Lord Desmond Browne, and others to find a way to reduce nuclear weapons in Europe. Although we fully endorse the aim of working towards a world free of nuclear arms, we firmly believe that NATO must remain a nuclear alliance so long as these weapons continue to exist around the world.

At NATO's summit in Chicago this month, determining the appropriate mix of conventional, nuclear, and missile-defense capabilities to ensure a reliable level of nuclear deterrence will undoubtedly be an important item on the agenda. But, even before those discussions take place, it is abundantly clear that there are a number of powerful reasons for maintaining NATO's current mix of capabilities, including the presence of US nuclear weapons in Europe.

For starters, there remains an overwhelming disparity between the US and Russia on non-strategic nuclear weapons in Europe, with roughly 200 for the former and an estimated 2,000 for the latter. Every effort must be made to reduce these numbers, but only by reciprocal measures.

Indeed, there are serious doubts that unilateral withdrawals by NATO would encourage Russian President Vladimir Putin to review his country's deepening reliance on nuclear deterrence. Given that our countries are very close to Russia's deployed nuclear arsenal, an increasing nuclear disparity between NATO and Russia resulting from NATO reductions would be of paramount concern to our fellow citizens.

That ongoing disparity should and must remain a concern for NATO as a whole. Let us not forget that, only a few years ago, Russia and Belarus conducted joint military exercises according to a scenario that included a nuclear attack on Poland.

Second, it seems unlikely that there will be much progress in talks with Russia on reducing tactical nuclear weapons in the near future, and certainly not until after November's presidential election in the US. We regret this. Our countries welcomed the ratification in 2011 of the New START agreement between the US and Russia – a positive outcome of US President Barack Obama's policy towards Russia of reducing strategic nuclear weapons, and we hope that there will be no backtracking on this treaty.

But the fact is that there is no follow-on process in sight to make good on this goal. Moreover, missile-defense cooperation has stalled over fundamental differences in political approaches, and Putin has indicated that he will not attend the NATO-Russia summit in Chicago.

Nunn has rightly pointed out that US/NATO and Russian threat perceptions will never completely overlap. Yet a great number of the threats facing the two sides are increasingly shared and can often best be confronted together. For this reason, we need to continue to engage our Russian partners with patience, transparency, and a view to enhancing mutual trust and confidence.

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

Finally, reducing the presence of US tactical nuclear weapons in Europe would add to the concerns expressed by many European leaders about America's long-term commitments to the continent. Thanks to US leadership, Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, and other European countries have enjoyed historically unsurpassed security since joining NATO, but that security should not be taken for granted.

All of the NATO allies must understand that the global security landscape is changing. Cyber threats and energy security have come to the fore. The situation in the Asia-Pacific region requires moving US troops who were once based in Europe to Australia. But we believe that the ongoing reductions of US conventional forces in Europe should not yet be compounded by any possible reduction in America's nuclear capabilities there. This would weaken the transatlantic link that is essential for Europe's security and NATO's cohesion.

Nuclear disarmament needs to remain high on NATO's agenda, but new and creative approaches are needed if disarmament is to enhance, rather than undermine, the Allies' security. Only those approaches that ensure reciprocity, transparency, cohesion, and undiminished security for all of NATO's members have a chance at success.

Imants Liegis, Latvia's former Minister of Defense, is now Chairman of the European Affairs Committee of Parliament. Linas Linkevičius is a former defense minister of Lithuania. Janusz Onyszkiewicz, a former Polish Minister of Defense, is a Chairman of the Council of Euro-Atlantic Association.

<http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/why-europe-still-needs-nuclear-deterrence>

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

Defence Professionals (defpro)
OPINION/ Early Warning Blog, Lexington Institute

New Proposal for Additional Cuts in U.S. Nuclear Arsenal is DOA

By Daniel Goure, Ph.D.
May 18, 2012

Global Zero -- an organization whose sole reason for existence, as its name clearly indicates, is to promote the elimination of all nuclear weapons -- has published a new report calling for deep reductions in the U.S. arsenal of strategic nuclear weapons. Despite the prestigious credentials of the report's authors, including the former head of U.S. Strategic Command, General James Cartwright, this proposal is "Dead on Arrival." In fact, the entire Global Zero idea is, to borrow from the popular commercial, so "thirty seconds ago."

The goal of Global Zero is as dead as that of fiscal austerity in the European Union and basically for the same reasons. Both have been overtaken by political events. In the case of EU austerity it was the election of Socialist Francois Hollande as the President of France. Vladimir Putin's return to the Russian presidency has done the same for further reductions in nuclear weapons.

Within days of taking office, an event itself marred by Russian government thugs beating up peaceful demonstrators, Putin declared that his top policy goal was a union with two former Soviet republics, Belarus and Kazakhstan. One more step, the reabsorption of Ukraine, and the recreation of the old empire will be essentially complete. Putin is a staunch defender of the killer regimes in Iran and Libya, a vocal opponent of the Obama Administration's plan to deploy missile defenses in Europe, and an advocate for a new Russian "blue water" navy. Putin turned Russia from a rising new democracy into an authoritarian state dominated by a class of corrupt bureaucrats, businessmen, security officials and courtiers. Reset is dead and Putin's election killed it.

More important from the perspective of nuclear arms control, President Putin is a proponent of Russia as a world power. But, with an economy 75 percent dependent on oil and gas revenues, the demographic profile of a North Korea or Zimbabwe and a conventional military that can only beat the likes of Georgia or a Baltic nation, Putin knows that Russia's sole claim to a global position comes from its nuclear arsenal. Putin and the Russian military want, need and

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 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

will retain a large arsenal both of strategic and theater nuclear weapons. Anything like meaningful reductions in Russian nuclear forces simply will not be on Moscow's agenda.

The notion that in a world where Iran and North Korea are pursuing a nuclear weapons capability, China's defense budget is rising by double digits every year, NATO allies are cutting their defense budgets and a dictator is trying to recreate the old Russian/Soviet empire, the United States should unilaterally cut its nuclear arsenal borders on the surreal. If this is what passed for strategic thought from senior military leaders in the late Bush and early Obama Administrations, then both presidents were ill-served.

<http://www.defpro.com/news/details/35576/?SID=c3cc0f971c32ec16771378613e7a8f4e>

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

Issue No. 1,003, 18 May 2012

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