



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Administration Defends Nuclear Modernization](#)

1. [Iran, World Powers Fail to Reach Moscow Breakthrough](#)
2. [U.S. Think-Tank Sees More Iran Site "Sanitization" Work](#)
3. [Iran Enriching Uranium at Fast Pace despite Stuxnet](#)
4. [Hillary Clinton: Nuclear Iran would Start Regional Arms Race](#)
5. [IAEA Access to Iran Military Complex a Priority, Amano Says](#)
6. [Japan to Make More Plutonium despite Big Stockpile](#)
7. ['National Security' Amendment to Nuclear Law Raises Fears of Military Use](#)
8. [Gov't Responds to Report that Japan Will Pursue Nuclear Armament](#)
9. [Tokyo's Nuclear Move Worries Neighbors](#)
10. [The Big Threat: Nuclear Material Continues to Go Missing in India](#)
11. [Rogozin in Climbdown Over Long-Range Bomber](#)
12. [Putin: U.S.-Russia Joint Missile Defense Is Only Way Forward](#)
13. [2 Russian Professors Convicted of Divulging Missile Secrets to China](#)
14. [Russia to Take on 'High Risk' Defense Research Projects](#)
15. [Sweden on Alert, Explosives Found Near Nuke Plant](#)
16. [Administration Defends Nuclear Modernization](#)
17. [US, Israel Developed Flame Virus to Slow Down Iran's Nuclear Program: Western Officials](#)
18. [Iran: Israel, U.S. Plan Fresh Cyber Attacks After Nuclear Talks in Moscow](#)
19. [Threat of Bio Terrorism: India Building Its First Bio-Radar](#)
20. [New Bird-Flu Study Shows Virus's Pandemic Potential](#)
21. [A Cut Too Far](#)
22. [Disarmament Should Not Be the Driver of U.S. Nuclear Policy](#)
23. [US Behind the Iran Nuclear 'Crisis'](#)
24. [New START Is Working to Enhance US National Security](#)
25. [Is AirSea Battle Obsolete?](#)
26. [\[Editorial\] No Nukes for Japan](#)
27. [Britain's Nuclear Deterrent](#)

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.1009, 22 June 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

Egyptian Gazette – Egypt

Iran, World Powers Fail to Reach Moscow Breakthrough

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

Wednesday, June 20, 2012

Iran and world powers Tuesday failed to narrow differences over the Iranian nuclear drive after bruising talks in Moscow held amid threats of a crippling oil embargo or even military action against Tehran.

However the Iranian negotiating team and the world powers led by EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton succeeded in keeping talks alive by agreeing a process for future meetings.

The United States and Israel have repeatedly refused to rule out air strikes on Iran against its nuclear programme, which the West suspects is a cover for a bid for nuclear weapons, and the Moscow meeting was seen as a crucial last test for the viability of talks.

"It remains clear that there are significant gaps between the substance of the two positions," Ashton told reporters in a late night news conference after nine hours of talks on the second and final day.

There had been "tough and frank" exchanges with the delegation led by chief Iranian nuclear negotiator Saeed Jalili, said Ashton, who represented the world powers known as "P5+1" -- permanent UN Security Council members Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States, plus Germany.

Ashton said the world powers reaffirmed their demands for Iran to stop enriching uranium to 20-percent purity, ship out the existing stock of such material, and shut down its heavily-fortified Fordo enrichment facility.

"The choice is Iran's," she said.

"We expect Iran to decide whether it is willing to make diplomacy work, to focus on reaching agreement on concrete confidence-building steps, and to address the concerns of the international community."

Uranium enrichment is at the centre of the decade-long Iranian nuclear crisis as the process can be used both to make nuclear fuel but also to make highly-enriched uranium for the explosive core of an atomic bomb.

Iran insists its nuclear drive is peaceful and aimed at producing energy for a growing population, as well as for much-needed medical isotopes that help fight cancer.

"The fact is that they (Iran) did begin to address the substance for the first time but there is a very long way to go."

Jalili called the talks "more serious and more realistic" than the rounds held earlier this year in Istanbul and last month in Baghdad.

He also floated the possibility that the supply of nuclear fuel from abroad could form part of a deal in the future.

But in an indication that Iran still wanted to enrich uranium to 20 percent, he said: "We insisted on the fact that the enrichment of uranium for peaceful purposes to all levels is the right of the Islamic Republic."

Jalili also warned that the widescale oil export sanctions that the European Union and the United States were now both set to impose against Iran risked derailing the negotiating process.

"If a path against this approach is started and certain actions disturb this approach, it will definitely affect the result of these talks," he said.

"Any wrong move, and any move not on this approach will definitely not be constructive, and will have an appropriate response."

But a senior US administration official, speaking on condition of anonymity after the talks, said that there would be no softening of the sanctions against Tehran.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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



"I don't think the differences have narrowed," said the official.

"I think what is correct to interpret is that Iran has a choice to make. They have provided a lot of information -- as have we -- and they need to reflect on the choice they make."

France said after the talks that sanctions on Iran will be tightened unless Tehran negotiates seriously.

"Pressure should now increase on Iran with the European Union fully applying from July 1 the oil embargo decided on in January," French Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius said in a statement released in Paris. "The sanctions will continue to be tightened as long as Iran refuses to negotiate seriously."

The stamina-busting final day negotiations were also marked by bilateral talks involving Iran and Russia which apparently stepped in during the afternoon to ensure the negotiating process stayed on track.

Ashton said an expert-level meeting would take place on July 3 in Istanbul, followed by another meeting between the deputies of herself and Jalili.

A higher-level meeting involving herself and Jalili would follow at an unspecified later date and location, she added.

<http://213.158.162.45/~egyptian/index.php?action=news&id=26275&title=Iran,%20world%20powers%20fail%20to%20reach%20Moscow%20breakthrough>

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

Chicago Tribune

U.S. Think-Tank Sees More Iran Site "Sanitization" Work

By Fredrik Dahl, Reuters

June 20, 2012

VIENNA (Reuters) - A U.S. security institute published new satellite imagery on Wednesday which it said appeared to show further activity, including removing earth, to clean up an Iranian military site the U.N. nuclear watchdog wants to inspect.

Parchin, which Iran says is a conventional military complex, is at the center of Western allegations that Iran has conducted experiments - possibly a decade ago - that could help develop atom bombs. Iran denies any such ambition.

The Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS) published the latest satellite picture a day after Iran and six world powers failed to make progress on their decade-old nuclear dispute during two days of talks in Moscow.

Iran has so far refused to grant the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to the Parchin facility as part of the U.N. agency's long-stalled investigation into suspected nuclear bomb research in the Islamic Republic.

Western diplomats say they believe Iran may be trying to clean the sprawling site of any incriminating evidence before possibly allowing IAEA inspectors to go there.

Iran has dismissed the allegations, but IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano earlier this month said satellite images indicated that buildings were being demolished and soil removed at Parchin, about 30 km (20 miles) southeast of Tehran.

"I think there is real concern for what the Iranians are doing at Parchin," one Western envoy said on Wednesday.

IRAN DISMISSES ALLEGATIONS

ISIS last month published imagery which it said increased concerns that Iran was trying to "destroy evidence" of suspected past research relevant for developing a nuclear weapons capability, including the razing of two small buildings.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

On Wednesday, the think-tank posted a picture from June 7 on its website which "shows what appears to be further sanitization activity" at the site in the Parchin complex where Iran is suspected to have conducted high explosive tests.

"The image shows heavy machinery tracks and earth displacement throughout the site," ISIS, which monitors Iran's nuclear program closely, said.

Debris from one of two razed buildings that were visible in a May 25 image "has now been consolidated into piles", it said.

"There is evidence of earth moving machinery and excavation activity near the second demolished building north of the building suspected to contain the high explosive testing chamber," ISIS added.

ISIS founder David Albright after testifying at a congressional hearing in Washington on Iran, told Reuters that the "cleansing activity" shown in the satellite imagery increases mistrust about Iran's nuclear activities.

"I tend to think that something has taken place there and they are trying to hide it," Albright said.

Iran has dismissed allegations aired about Parchin as "childish" and "ridiculous" and earlier this month accused the IAEA of behaving like a Western-manipulated spy agency.

An IAEA report last November said Iran had built a large containment vessel in 2000 at Parchin in which to conduct explosives tests that the U.N. agency said were "strong indicators of possible weapon development".

It said a building was constructed around a large cylindrical object, a vessel designed to contain the detonation of up to 70 kg of high explosives. Diplomatic sources say the suspected tests likely took place about a decade ago.

ISIS said: "If Iran has nothing to hide, its activities at this site add a further layer of suspicion and negatively impact efforts to build confidence in the peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear program."

Additional reporting by Tabassum Zakaria in Washington.

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/sns-rt-us-nuclear-iran-parchinbre85j13g-20120620,0,6213254.story>

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

Emirates 24/7.com – U.A.E.

Iran Enriching Uranium at Fast Pace despite Stuxnet

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Iran's uranium enrichment effort has picked up speed in the past three years and has not been crippled by cyber sabotage from the Stuxnet virus, experts told US lawmakers on Wednesday.

As a result, Iran could produce enough fissile material needed for a nuclear weapon within four months, if the leadership decided to go ahead, the experts told the House Armed Services Committee.

Based on the findings of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), "it's clear that Iran could produce a nuclear weapon very quickly should it wish to do so," said Stephen Rademaker of the Bipartisan Policy Center, a Washington think tank.

Iran has produced 3,345 kilos of uranium enriched to 3.5 percent, according to the IAEA, which if it was enriched further would provide enough uranium for at least two atomic bombs, Rademaker said.

If the Iranian leadership made the decision to produce an atomic weapon, "it would take them 35 to 106 days to actually have the fissile material for a weapon," he said.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security (ISIS), told the same hearing that "it would take Iran at least four months in order to have sufficient weapon grade uranium ... for a nuclear explosive device."

Uranium 235 must be enriched close to 90 percent for use in an atomic bomb.

The director of national intelligence, James Clapper, has said that it was "technically feasible" Tehran could produce a nuclear weapon in one or two years.

More than 9,000 Iranian centrifuges are churning out 158 kilograms of 3.5 percent enriched uranium a month, three times the production rate compared to mid-2009, when the Stuxnet virus struck the program, Rademaker said.

The enrichment rate is "three times the rate of production prior to the Stuxnet virus, which many people have suggested somehow crippled their program."

"So Stuxnet may have set them back, but not by very much, at least not sufficiently," he added.

According to The New York Times, President Barack Obama, and his predecessor in the White House, George W. Bush, approved the use of the Stuxnet virus to disrupt Iran's nuclear program, in the first known sustained US cyber attack.

Stuxnet -- a complex virus developed jointly with Israel -- sowed confusion at Iran's Natanz nuclear plant, the Times reported, but the virus later accidentally spread outside of Iran, appearing in computer systems in other countries.

Some analysts and former US military officers have touted cyber attacks as a more effective weapon against Iran's nuclear ambitions than bombing raids, which they say would carry big risks without causing permanent damage to the program.

US intelligence agencies believe Iran's leadership has not yet decided to pursue nuclear weapons, even as the regime presses ahead with uranium enrichment and other activities that could provide the capability to create an atomic arsenal.

"We really don't know if they're going to decide to build a nuclear weapon, but the indications are at least that they're on a trajectory to do so," Albright said.

If Iran decided to start producing weapons-grade uranium, either the UN nuclear watchdog or US intelligence likely would detect the move within one to three weeks, he added.

Wednesday's congressional hearing came after two days of tense talks between world powers and Iran in Moscow that failed to produce a breakthrough over Tehran's disputed nuclear program.

Iran remains opposed to any halt of its sensitive uranium enrichment work while the United States and five other major powers are not ready to lift sanctions on Tehran.

Former US senator Chuck Robb, who also testified at the House hearing, said diplomacy could only succeed if Iran believed there was a genuine threat of military force if they failed to compromise.

Robb said "it is a credible threat of force when pursued together with diplomacy and sanctions that proves the best hope for peace."

<http://www.emirates247.com/news/world/iran-enriching-uranium-at-fast-pace-despite-stuxnet-2012-06-21-1.463910>

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

CBS News

June 21, 2012

Hillary Clinton: Nuclear Iran would Start Regional Arms Race

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

(CBS News) A nuclear armed Iran would start a regional arms race that would destabilize the region, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said.

"If Iran has a nuclear weapon, I can absolutely bet on it and know I will win, they will be in the market within hours. And that is going to create a cascade of difficult challenges for us and for Israel and for all of our friends and partners," Clinton told Charlie Rose in a joint interview conducted Wednesday with former Secretary of State James Baker.

Baker said he supported the administration's current efforts to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon but then bluntly said "at the end of the day, if we don't get it done the way the administration is working on it now, which I totally agree with, then we ought to take them out."

Clinton, as a sitting diplomat, was more cautious in her language, saying "we are working hard" on the issue when Rose turned the microphone to her for an immediate response.

"I think Jim and I both would agree that everybody needs to know, most particularly the Iranians, that we are serious that they cannot be allowed to have a nuclear weapon," she said.

"It is not only about Iran and about Iran's intentions, however one tries to discern them, it's about the arms race that would take place in the region with such unforeseen consequences, because you name any country with the means anywhere near Iran that is an Arab country," said Clinton.

http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-505267_162-57457633/hillary-clinton-nuclear-iran-would-start-regional-arms-race/

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

Bloomberg Business Week

IAEA Access to Iran Military Complex a Priority, Amano Says

By Zoltan Simon

June 21, 2012

Iran granting access to its military complex of Parchin remains a "matter of priority" for nuclear inspectors, International Atomic Energy Agency Director General Yukiya Amano said.

"Satellite imagery indicates that they are undertaking quite important activities" at Parchin, Amano told reporters in Budapest today after meeting Foreign Minister Janos Martonyi. "In the past we did not see such active activities."

Western powers contend Iran is hiding a nuclear-weapons program, and the U.S. and Israel have declined to rule out the possibility of military strikes against atomic installations. Iran insists its nuclear work is peaceful.

The IAEA has said Iran has failed to provide "credible assurances" about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities -- necessary to conclude its program is exclusively peaceful. In November, the Vienna-based United Nations organization reported that Parchin may have been the site of experiments on a trigger for a nuclear weapon.

Iran and world powers failed to reach a breakthrough in the nuclear row during two days of talks in Moscow that ended yesterday. A central issue in the negotiations is whether Iran will stop producing 20 percent enriched uranium, a level of purity a step short of bomb grade, and move current stockpiles out of the country to show that it isn't seeking the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-06-21/iaea-access-to-iran-military-complex-a-priority-amano-says>

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

Seattle Times

Friday, June 1, 2012

Japan to Make More Plutonium despite Big Stockpile

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

Last year's tsunami disaster in Japan clouded the nation's nuclear future, idled its reactors and rendered its huge stockpile of plutonium useless for now. So, the industry's plan to produce even more has raised a red flag.

By ERIC TALMADGE and MARI YAMAGUCHI, Associated Press

TOKYO — Last year's tsunami disaster in Japan clouded the nation's nuclear future, idled its reactors and rendered its huge stockpile of plutonium useless for now. So, the industry's plan to produce even more has raised a red flag.

Nuclear industry officials say they hope to start producing a half-ton of plutonium within months, in addition to the more than 35 tons Japan already has stored around the world. That's even though all the reactors that might use it are either inoperable or offline while the country rethinks its nuclear policy after the tsunami-generated Fukushima crisis.

"It's crazy," said Princeton University professor Frank von Hippel, a leading authority on nonproliferation issues and a former assistant director for national security in the White House Office of Science and Technology. "There is absolutely no reason to do that."

Japan's nuclear industry produces plutonium - which is strictly regulated globally because it also is used for nuclear weapons - by reprocessing spent, uranium-based fuel in a procedure aimed at decreasing radioactive waste that otherwise would require long-term storage.

The industry wants to reprocess more to build up reserves in anticipation of when it has a network of reactors that run on a next-generation fuel that includes plutonium and that can be reused in a self-contained cycle - but that much-delayed day is still far off.

Japanese officials argue that, once those plans are in place, the reactors will draw down the stockpile and use up most of it by 2030.

"There is no excess plutonium in this country," said Koichi Imafuku, an official at the Agency for Natural Resources and Energy. "It's not just lying around without purpose."

In the meantime, the country's post-Fukushima review of nuclear policy is pitting a growing number of critics who want to turn away from plutonium altogether against an entrenched nuclear industry that wants to push forward with it.

Other countries, including the United States, have scaled back the separation of plutonium because it is a proliferation concern and is more expensive than other alternatives, including long-term storage of spent fuel.

Fuel reprocessing remains unreliable and it is questionable whether it is a viable way of reducing Japan's massive amounts of spent fuel rods, said Takeo Kikkawa, a Hitotsubashi University professor specializing in energy issues.

"Japan should abandon the program altogether," said Hideyuki Ban, co-director of a respected anti-nuclear Citizens' Nuclear Information Center. "Then we can also contribute to the global effort for nuclear non-proliferation."

Von Hippel stressed that only two other countries reprocess on a large scale: France and Britain, and Britain has decided to stop. Japan's civilian-use plutonium stockpile is already the fifth-largest in the world, and it has enough plutonium to make about 5,000 simple nuclear warheads, although it does not manufacture them.

Because of inherent dangers of plutonium stockpiles, government regulations require industry representatives to announce by March 31 how much plutonium they intend to produce in the year ahead and explain how they will use it.

But, for the second year in a row, the industry has failed to do so. They blame the government for failing to come up with a long-term policy after Fukushima, but say they nevertheless want to make more plutonium if they can get a reprocessing plant going by October.

Kitayama Yoshida, a spokesman for the Federation of Electric Power Companies, said the plutonium would be converted into MOX - a mixture of plutonium and uranium - which can be loaded back into reactors and reused in a cycle. But technical glitches, cost overruns and local opposition have kept Japan from actually putting the moving parts of that plan into action.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

In the meantime, Japan's plutonium stockpile - most of which is stored in France and Britain - has swelled despite Tokyo's promise to international regulators not to produce a plutonium surplus.

Its plutonium holdings have increased fivefold from about 7 tons in 1993 to 37 tons at the end of 2010. Japan initially said the stockpile would shrink rapidly in early 2000s as its fuel cycle kicked in, but that hasn't happened.

Critics argue that since no additional spent fuel is being created, and there are questions about how the plutonium would be used, this is not a good time start producing more. They also say it makes no sense for Japan to minimize its plutonium glut by calling it a "stockpile" rather than a "surplus."

"It's a simple accounting trick," said Edwin Lyman, a physicist with the Union of Concerned Scientists. "It's laughable. And it sends the wrong signal all around the world."

Officials stress that, like other plutonium-holding nations, Japan files a yearly report detailing its stockpile with the International Atomic Energy Agency. But it has repeatedly failed to live up to its own schedules for how the plutonium will be used.

From 2006 until three years ago, the nuclear industry said the plutonium-consuming MOX fuel would be used in 16-18 conventional reactors "in or after" 2010. In fact, only two reactors used MOX that year. By the time of the earthquake and tsunami last year, the number was still just three - including one at the Fukushima plant.

In response to the delays, the industry has simply revised its plans farther off into the future. It is now shooting for the end of fiscal 2015.

"There really is a credibility problem here," said Princeton's von Hippel, who also is a member of the independent International Panel on Fissile Materials. "They keep making up these schedules which are never realized. I think the ship is sinking beneath them."

http://seattletimes.nwsourc.com/html/nationworld/2018328413_apasjapanawashinplutonium.html

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

'National Security' Amendment to Nuclear Law Raises Fears of Military Use

June 21, 2012

THE ASAHI SHIMBUN

Supporters of an amendment quietly slipped into Japan's nuclear power law saying it should contribute to "national security" are denying it could provide cover for military use of nuclear technology.

The provision, which says nuclear safety should be guaranteed not only to defend lives, people's health and the environment but also to "contribute to Japan's national security," became part of the Atomic Energy Basic Law on June 20.

Critics say the change to the 1955 basic law, known as the "constitution" of nuclear energy use in Japan, was made without proper debate on the sidelines of political maneuvering in the Diet.

However, it could have far-reaching consequences for Japan's nuclear stance and heighten international concern about the nation's nuclear recycling program of extracting plutonium from spent nuclear fuel.

A provision mentioning a "contribution to Japan's national security" was also included in the Aerospace Basic Law of 2008, which fueled calls to use artificial satellites for defense purposes.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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



A law enacted on June 20 to establish a new nuclear regulatory commission to replace the Nuclear and Industrial Safety Agency also said the commission should "contribute to Japan's national security." None of the changes were widely discussed before they were passed by the Diet.

During a session of the Upper House Environment Committee on June 20, one lawmaker asked: "Is this intended to pave the way for (Japan's) nuclear armament?"

Masayoshi Yoshino, a Lower House member from the opposition Liberal Democratic Party and one of the initiators of the provision, said the objective was precisely the opposite. "Diversion to military purposes is not on our minds," he said.

Yoshino said the provision was necessary because responsibilities to prevent diversion of nuclear materials for military and terrorist purposes will be transferred to the new nuclear regulatory commission, which is expected to be set up by September.

Under the current setup, ensuring the security of nuclear materials rests with the science and technology ministry and other organizations.

Nuclear policy minister Goshi Hosono said: "The safeguards are in place to prevent nuclear proliferation. The word 'security' precisely means the prevention of nuclear proliferation."

However, the physicist Michiji Konuma, professor emeritus at Keio University and a member of the Committee of Seven for World Peace, a Japanese group that is calling for the scrapping of the amendment, said: "If they insist that it's all about safeguards, why don't they say so explicitly? They used a cryptic expression and left room for stretched interpretation."

The "national security" provision was added to Article 2 of the Atomic Energy Basic Law, which stipulates that the research, development and use of nuclear power should be conducted "under democratic management and in an autonomous manner," and that the results should not be secret.

The revised law retains the wording that the use of nuclear power should be limited to peaceful purposes.

This article was compiled from reports by Akira Ozeki and Seiji Tanaka.

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind_news/politics/AJ201206210061

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

Dong-A Ilbo – South Korea

Gov't Responds to Report that Japan Will Pursue Nuclear Armament

June 21, 2012

The South Korean government on Thursday hurriedly began to collect information about a Japanese news report saying the upper house of Japan's parliament passed a bill to strengthen its nuclear regulations after adding a highly controversial clause of "security guarantee" to the bill.

Seoul seemed embarrassed because it was unaware of the clause that the Japanese Diet inserted at the last minute without undergoing public debate.

Han Hye-jin, a spokeswoman of South Korea's Foreign Affairs and Trade Ministry, told reporters that South Korea was closely watching the situation in Japan while trying to figure out what exactly the clause meant and what impact it would have.

Government officials in Seoul showed a cautious attitude, saying it is "almost impossible" for Japan to use its nuclear development for military purposes.



"It is impossible for the Japanese people, who are extremely sensitive about building a new nuclear power plant since the Fukushima meltdown last year, to condone Japan's nuclear armament," one official said. "The Japanese media might have exaggerated the meaning of 'security guarantee.'"

Experts also downplayed the notion that Japan will pursue nuclear armament.

"There are people in Japan who urge that their country get nuclear arms but they comprise a minority," said Lee Won-deok, a professor of international politics at Kookmin University in Seoul. "Few politicians would dare take steps for nuclear armament despite the political risk ahead of national elections."

At a time when the arms race is heating up in Northeast Asia because of North Korea's nuclear development, Japan's discussion of nuclear armament, per se, could serve as a major factor escalating tension on the Korean Peninsula. Because China is actively building up its military, certain experts say Japan's right-wing groups and politicians will likely press for nuclear armament on the basis of the added clause.

Due to such possibilities, voices in South Korea warn that Seoul might lose out in a nuclear race while advising denuclearization. The fears could boost those who urge Seoul to get nuclear sovereignty.

Rep. Chung Mong-joon, former chairman of South Korea's ruling Saenuri Party and a presidential hopeful, said earlier this month that Seoul should possess nuclear weapons in the face of Pyongyang's claim that it is a nuclear state.

"Peace cannot be secured without the balance of fear, or nuclear weapons for nuclear weapons," he said.

<http://english.donga.com/srv/service.php3?bicode=060000&biid=2012062272868>

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

Korea Herald – South Korea

Tokyo's Nuclear Move Worries Neighbors

June 22, 2012

By Shin Hyon-hee

Japan's recent amendment to its atomic energy law is rekindling fears about its formidable nuclear and missile technologies that experts say could quickly turn it into an atomic weapons power.

Its parliament on Wednesday passed the revision to the Atomic Energy Basic Act including "national security" among its goals. The revision was the first in 34 years.

"The safe use of atomic power is aimed at contributing to the protection of the people's life, health and property, environmental conservation and national security," the revised text reads.

In separate space agency legislation, the Diet also deleted a phrase that confined its activities to "peaceful purposes." With the revision, the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency would be allowed to help develop spy and early warning satellites.

Despite political and legal constraints at home and abroad, the modified laws prompted anxiety that it could provide legal justification for Japan's development of atomic weapons.

Tokyo is estimated to have up to 1,400 kilograms of highly enriched uranium and about 30 tons of plutonium extracted spent fuel from reprocessing facilities in Japan, the U.K. and France.

With its technological prowess, it has the potential to create roughly 6,000 Hiroshima-level bombs, physical scientists and nuclear experts say.

"Given its top-notch science technology and skills to transport and fire long-range rockets, Japan can make hundreds of warheads to mount on them in just six months to one year if it insists," Son Yong-woo of the University of North Korean Studies told The Korea Herald.



“That’s the reason for grave concern. North Korea’s nuclear crisis has come a long way to trigger such a bad impact.”

Japan has built up its nuclear capability since the late 1950s while pursuing civilian space programs. It successfully put its first rocket into orbit in 1970 and mastered the nuclear fuel cycle in the 1980s — from producing to loading for electricity, to disposing and reprocessing.

Japan’s hardliner politicians including some right-leaning Liberal Democratic Party lawmakers have been pushing to develop nuclear military capability, a call that is gaining greater backing in the face of China’s rapid emergence and North Korea’s constant saber-rattling.

Former prime minister Taro Aso often called for a national debate on whether Japan should have fission bombs. Tokyo’s outspoken Governor Shintaro Ishihara is one of the most prominent nuclear weapons advocates.

“All our enemies, China, North Korea and Russia — all close neighbors — have nuclear weapons. People talk about the cost and other things but the fact is that diplomatic bargaining power means nuclear weapons,” Ishihara said in a 2011 interview with *The Independent*.

The Atomic Energy Basic Act, a regulatory and institutional framework for its nuclear activities, laid a legal framework for Japan’s three non-nuclear principles in which it commits to “not possessing, producing or permitting the introduction of nuclear weapons.” It also formed the basis for the 1992 Joint Declaration on Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, which North Korea is criticized for breaching.

The phrase of national security guarantee was not included in the initial proposal by the Cabinet but later inserted at the request of the LDP during parliamentary debate, *The Tokyo Shimbun* daily reported.

Japanese pacifists protested that the revision could lead to the nation’s diversion of nuclear energy to military purposes.

“We cannot rule out the possibility for practical military use. The amendment harmed the national interest and is a source of calamity,” said Committee of Seven for World Peace, founded by Hideki Yukawa, a physicist and Japan’s first Nobel Prize laureate who has been spearheading an international anti-nuclear crusade.

Tokyo officials downplayed such concerns and rebuffed any intention to divert nuclear power for military applications.

“Japan has never wavered in its commitment to the peaceful use of atomic power and the three non-nuclear principles. The government has no goal at all for its military use,” Chief Cabinet Secretary Osamu Fujimura said Thursday.

Any development of atomic devices would face obstacles. Tokyo is bound to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, an international accord aimed at preventing the spread of atomic weapons and related technology. All nuclear plants worldwide are also under heavy scrutiny by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

“In principle, it would be not as easy for Japan to transform into a nuclear-armed country as mentioned in some news reports given its membership of the NPT,” Foreign Ministry deputy spokesperson Han Hye-jin told reporters in Seoul.

Japan is likely to face pressure from Seoul, Washington, Beijing and other countries to provide a more convincing account for the recent series of steps toward nuclear armament.

Japan was one of the last nations to sign the pact in 1970 and ratified it six years later only when the U.S. promised not to interfere with Tokyo’s acquisition of plutonium and pursuit of independent reprocessing capabilities at its commercial power plants.

Under a 1968 agreement, the U.S. provided the enriched uranium for Japanese reactors until it approved Tokyo’s reprocessing in Europe and own facilities and breeder reactors.

Public confidence in nuclear energy remains fragile in the aftermath of the Fukushima meltdown. Until the March disaster, Japan was the world’s third-largest nuclear power producer, after the U.S. and France, sourcing more than 30



percent of its electricity from 54 reactors.

<http://view.koreaherald.com/kh/view.php?ud=20120622001028&cpv=0>

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

Daily News & Analysis (DNA) – India

The Big Threat: Nuclear Material Continues to Go Missing in India

Tuesday, June 19, 2012

By Iftikhar Gilani, DNA

New Delhi – As the world is transfixed by the impending horrors of nuclear plants or materials falling into terrorist hands in Pakistan, the situation in India is no different. A joint study conducted by British and Indian experts suggest there is clear danger from chemical, biological and radiological (CBR) materials falling into wrong hands within India's borders.

While releasing the report prepared jointly by the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI) and the Delhi-based Observer Research Foundation (ORF), former Union home secretary GK Pillai said the government woke up to CBR threats after discovering disappearance of 14,000 tonnes of chemicals in Madhya Pradesh three years ago.

Declaring that transportation of such materials is still an issue in India, he expressed apprehension that the bulk of the stolen chemicals may have gone into making explosives by Maoists and contractors engaged in illegal mining.

After the Union home ministry decided to declare ammonium nitrate an explosive chemical as terrorists increasingly started using it in making bombs, it was found that a British era rule has vested this authority with the department of industrial policy and promotion (DIPP). The department subsequently agreed to take up the responsibility and include the chemical in the family of explosives.

While the Mayapuri incident in Delhi, where Cobalt 60 was found in a scrap deal shop attracted much media attention, several other incidents have gone unnoticed.

Besides, 90 employees of the Kaiga Atomic Power Station in Karnataka were affected by Tritium, when it got mixed with drinking water in 2009. "These incidents show while elaborate security structures have been put in place to prevent radioactive material falling into the hands of malicious actors, thus far it has not provided to be completely foolproof," concludes the study.

The report warned that terrorist organisations may seek to carry out CBR attacks in future by detonating a radiological dispersal device ('dirty bomb'); by carrying out an armed assault on an industrial facility handling CBR materials or on vehicles transporting material; or by infiltrating facilities to steal CBR materials or to sabotage the site.

Pillai admitted that for the government, CBR threats so far had been of "low priority importance". Noted strategic expert Dr C Raja Mohan believes that while India is raising WMD-related issues at various international forums, not much work has been done on the domestic aspects of the issue.

The ORF-RUSI study found that site security at facilities and industries handling CBR materials is variable. Large industrial sites, particularly under the protection of the Central Industrial Security Force, are well-protected with robust security and safety arrangements, but this is not mirrored in all medium- and small-scale facilities, some of whom have employed private security agencies that are not adequately trained. The study suggested greater standardisation of site security with well-developed practical plans for implementation.

Since India faces a serious battle against terrorism from Naxals, insurgent and separatist groups such as United Liberation Force of Assam (ULFA), and other international terrorist groups such as Lashkar-e-Taiba and Jaish-e-Mohammad, CBR threats needs to be taken care of more seriously, the report said.

http://www.dnaindia.com/india/report_the-big-threat-nuclear-material-continues-to-go-missing-in-india_1703764



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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Rogozin in Climbdown over Long-Range Bomber

19 June 2012

Russia's Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin said on Tuesday he was in favor of development of the PAK DA long-range bomber for the country's air force, just hours after saying the project was unnecessary, in apparent contravention of President Putin's call last week for domestic aerospace industry to develop just such an aircraft.

"I am for PAK DA but it should not be a copy of the B-2. We need to look at the horizon and develop hypersonic long-range aviation, civil and military," Rogozin said on his Twitter blog on Tuesday afternoon. The B-2 is an American long-range stealth bomber developed by Northrop, which became the most expensive aircraft ever built and is in service with the U.S. Air Force in very small numbers.

Earlier on Tuesday, Rogozin, who has special responsibility for the military-industrial complex, insisted Russia has no need to develop a new long-range bomber to replace its existing fleet.

Rogozin was repeating a statement he made to Russian media reports earlier this month. He said then that he saw no need for PAK DA, an acronym for future long-range aircraft in Russian, to replace the air force's ageing Tu-95MS cruise-missile carriers and Tu-160 supersonic bombers.

"These aircraft will not get anywhere. Not ours, not theirs," Rogozin said in an interview with Izvestia in June.

"I'm ready to insist on my point of view," Rogozin said on Tuesday on his Twitter blog. "With modern air defense systems, these targets will be destroyed on the way," he said.

In May, Rogozin called on Russia's defense industry to develop hypersonic air-breathing weapons as a future strike system. He picked out American development work in the X-51, Falcon, HiFire and HyFly programs as examples of what he described as the perspective threat posed by U.S. hypersonic development work.

"The undertaking of this work allows us to lay the basis for creation of a national competitor in hypersonic weapons," he said.

Development of such a weapon should be discussed at the highest levels of state, he said.

Last Thursday, President Vladimir Putin ordered initial development of the new long-range bomber for strategic aviation. Speaking during a conference on defense orders, Putin said: "We have to develop work on the new PAK DA long-range bomber aircraft for Long-Range Aviation. I know how expensive and complex this is. The task is not easy from a scientific-technical standpoint, but we need to start work," Putin said.

If Russia did not start work soon on the project, it could miss the boat, Putin said.

Defense Minister Anatoly Serdyukov said previously that a new aircraft assembly line in Russia's Kazan plant (KAPO) would build PAK-DA and the new Antonov An-70 propfan transport aircraft. The same plant previously built the Tu-95MS and Tu-160.

The Defense Ministry is due to hold a meeting to discuss development of the new bomber later in June.

"The comments from Putin and Rogozin appear to reflect sharply differing opinions – unusually being aired in public – as to the desirability of pursuing a bomber replacement for the Tu-160 and Tu-95 in the strategic strike role," said Douglas Barrie, air warfare analyst for the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies.

"In the long term the Russian Air Force's role in the nuclear triad – beyond the Tu-160 and the Tu-95 – would seem to rest on the acquisition of the PAK DA, though the aircraft would also have utility in the tactical environment. A



programme such as PAK DA would be expensive, and whether this could be accommodated within available likely funding also remains in question," he added.

Currently, only Russia and the United States operate intercontinental range bomber aircraft. Most other nuclear-capable nations rely solely on intercontinental ballistic missiles, based on submarines or in land-based silos, or cruise missiles. The United States has expressed an interest in successor systems to its B-1, B-2 and B-52H long-range bombers.

MOSCOW, June 19 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20120619/174119742.html

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

Kyiv Post – Ukraine

Putin: U.S.-Russia Joint Missile Defense Is Only Way Forward

June 20, 2012

By Reuters

LOS CABOS, Mexico - Russian President Vladimir Putin reiterated Moscow's strong opposition to the U.S. missile defense system on June 19, saying that President Barack Obama's re-election would not end the dispute and insisting on joint development of the shield.

"I think that the missile defense issue will not be solved regardless of whether Obama is elected or not," he told reporters at the end of Group of 20 summit in Mexico.

"I think that something can radically change only in the case if the U.S. agrees with our proposal which says that Russia, Europe and U.S. were equal participants of this process," said Putin.

Moscow says the interceptors that the United States and NATO are deploying as part of the system will be able to destroy Russian warheads in flight by about 2018, upsetting the post-Cold War balance of power.

Washington maintains that the missile defense system - which is to be deployed in four phases by about 2020 - is intended to counter a potential threat from Iran and poses no risk to Russia.

<http://www.kyivpost.com/content/russia-and-former-soviet-union/putin-us-russia-joint-missile-defense-is-only-way-.html>

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

Minneapolis Star Tribune

2 Russian Professors Convicted of Divulging Missile Secrets to China

By Associated Press

June 20, 2012

MOSCOW - A Russian court on Wednesday convicted two professors of a St. Petersburg university of handing over missile secrets to China, the latest in a string of espionage cases that reflected underlying tensions between Moscow and Beijing despite declarations of cooperation and friendship.

The St. Petersburg City Court found Yevgeny Afanasyev and Svyatoslav Bobyshev guilty of treason and sentenced them to 12 1/2 and 12 years in prison respectively, according to the Interfax news agency.

The two professors of St. Petersburg's Baltic State Technological University were accused of selling confidential information related to Russia's latest intercontinental ballistic missile, the Bulava, to representatives of China's military intelligence. The two men have been in custody since their arrest in March 2010.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

After decades of Cold War-era rivalry, Moscow and Beijing have developed what they call a strategic partnership after the 1991 Soviet collapse. China also has become a major customer for Russian weapons industries, although Russian arms exports have drained in recent years as China has sought to produce unlicensed copycat versions of Russian weapons.

Russia also has refrained from providing China with some of the latest military technologies, and a number of Russian scientists have been convicted of spying for China in recent years.

The Bulava, designed to equip a new generation of Russian nuclear submarines, suffered a string of failures during its development phase but recent test launches went successfully.

Interfax said that the professors were accused of providing the Chinese with technological details related to the Bulava's underwater launch during their trip to China in 2009. It said that Chinese intelligence also sought information about the land-based Topol-M and Iskander missiles.

<http://www.startribune.com/world/159721415.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia to Take on 'High Risk' Defense Research Projects

21 June 2012

The Russian Foundation for Advanced Research Projects in the Defense Industry will finance high-risk projects, a deputy prime minister said on Thursday.

"I believe that the foundation will take on all high-risk and fundamental research projects in the military-industrial complex," said Dmitry Rogozin, who oversees the defense related sectors of industry.

President Vladimir Putin has submitted to parliament a bill on the foundation's establishment, which is expected to become Russia's answer to the United States Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA).

The foundation will be tasked with informing the country's leadership on projects that can ensure Russian superiority in defense technology.

It will also analyze the risks of any Russian technological backwardness and technological dependence on other powers.

ST. PETERSBURG, June 21 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20120621/174160894.html

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

Atlanta Journal-Constitution

Thursday, June 21, 2012

Sweden on Alert, Explosives Found Near Nuke Plant

By Louise Nordstrom, Associated Press (AP)

STOCKHOLM (AP) — Security was ramped up at Sweden's three nuclear power plants Thursday after explosives were found on a truck at the southwestern Ringhals atomic power station. Police said they were investigating possible sabotage.

Bomb sniffer dogs detected the explosives during a routine check Wednesday afternoon by security staff while the truck was in the power plant's industrial area near its high security enclosure. Police declined to describe the amount or type of explosive material found.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

Bomb technicians said the material lacked a detonating device, meaning there was no danger of an imminent explosion.

Four nuclear reactors are at Ringhals, 70 kilometers (45 miles) south of Sweden's second-largest city, Goteborg. The plant is controlled by energy companies Vattenfall and E.ON.

Police spokesman Tommy Nyman said officers were investigating possible sabotage but had no suspects. He said the driver of the truck had been unaware of the explosives placed in the vehicle and was not suspected of being involved.

"An outsider has obviously placed them on the truck," Nyman said. "We're talking to the truck driver and are trying to map out her movements within the (Ringhals) premises throughout the day."

The area surrounding the truck was evacuated and cordoned off.

The Swedish Radiation Safety Authority said the explosive material was found on the truck "en route from the Ringhals industrial park into a protected area ... and did not enter the facility."

Ringhals officials said an explosion on the truck would not have caused "any serious damage" to the site but did not elaborate on how they came to that assessment.

Sweden has 10 nuclear reactors at the country's three power plants: Ringhals, Forsmark and Oskarshamn — providing about half of the country's electricity.

The country also has a four-stage security risk scale for the plants, with four representing the highest security alert.

Ringhals was rated at one — situation "normal" — but after the incident, the nuclear authority said it raised the security alert by a notch to 2, on a four-grade scale, meaning that security has been increased at all the plants.

In 1980, the Nordic country decided to phase out the use of nuclear energy after Swedes voted for that in a referendum. But two years ago, the center-right government overturned that decision, citing the lack of viable long-term environmentally friendly alternatives, a move that paved the way for old reactors to be replaced by new ones.

Security at Swedish nuclear plants has also been criticized.

In 2010, Greenpeace activists managed to break into the Forsmark power plant site by climbing a fence and staging a demonstration there. Twenty-nine Greenpeace activists from Germany, Poland, Britain, France and the Nordic countries were convicted and fined.

The Swedish nuclear industry has also come under fire for the lack of some safety precautions while operating the reactors. Last year, a fire broke out in a Ringhals reactor after the staff had left a vacuum cleaner in the containment building.

<http://www.ajc.com/news/nation-world/sweden-on-alert-explosives-1461712.html>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

Administration Defends Nuclear Modernization

By DONNA CASSATA, Associated Press

Thursday, June 21, 2012

WASHINGTON, (AP) -- The Obama administration insisted on Thursday that it is modernizing the nation's nuclear arsenal in the face of withering criticism from Republicans that it is moving slowly in anticipation of President Barack Obama's push for further reductions.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

Officials from the Energy, Defense and State departments provided the Senate Foreign Relations Committee with an update on the implementation of the U.S.-Russian pact, commonly known as the New START treaty, reducing both sides' nuclear warhead limit to 1,550.

The Senate ratified the treaty in December 2010 after weeks of contentious debate and assurances from Obama that he would provide robust funding to modernize the remaining nuclear weapons. Republicans said that 1 1/2 years later they see little evidence of any commitment.

"It seems like things are being slow-walked," said Sen. Bob Corker, R-Tenn. "And I almost wonder whether as the president is announcing further reductions, the reason that much of the modernization is being slow-walked is that there's no intention to follow through, and they actually hope to come up with more reductions so that much of the modernization that we're talking about does not have to take place."

Sen. Johnny Isakson, R-Ga., alluded to Obama's comments in March when an open microphone caught him telling then Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he would have more room to negotiate after the November election.

"I really need to understand the president's remarks to Dmitry Medvedev a few months ago when behind his hand when he thought the mike was off he said, 'Let us get this election behind us and I'll be more flexible.' I understood that statement to be in reference to missile defense, but I don't totally know," Isakson said. "But we cannot afford to be in the business we are in on this committee or as a country and be counting on one representation for meeting commitments while on the other hand we're seeing a wink and a nod to the other side."

Thomas D'Agostino of the Energy Department told the panel that the administration is making significant investments, working to improve 80 percent of the stockpile. He also said they are focused on infrastructure.

"It's about spending the dollars wisely and doing it in a way that we can ensure that the taxpayers are getting what they need and we continue to support the stockpile and get that done," D'Agostino told the panel.

In its 2012 budget, the administration requested \$7.6 billion for the 10-year modernization plan, an amount welcomed by Republicans. But GOP lawmakers said the administration did little to make its case for the request, didn't resist when Congress cut the amount and now are content with the lower amounts as a threshold. The final spending bill for 2012 provided \$7.2 billion.

An updated report to the annual defense bill recommended \$7.9 billion for the fiscal year beginning Oct. 1. The administration requested \$7.6 billion.

"They put no effort whatsoever into trying to make that happen. None. Zero," Corker said in an interview.

The administration officials rejected the criticism and dismissed suggestions that the open-mike conversation involving Obama and Medvedev amounted to a secret deal to undermine missile defense.

Rose Gottemoeller of the State Department said the treaty will leave the United States and Russia with the lowest number of deployed nuclear warheads since the 1950s, the first full decade of the nuclear age. She said it has led to 25 short-notice inspections of missiles, bomber bases, facilities and test ranges.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/n/a/2012/06/21/national/w103757D01.DTL>

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

Tehran Times – Iran

US, Israel Developed Flame Virus to Slow Down Iran's Nuclear Program: Western Officials

By Tehran Times Political Desk

In Print: Thursday, June 21, 2012

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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



TEHRAN – The United States and Israel have collaborated in the development of a sophisticated computer virus nicknamed Flame that collected intelligence in preparation for cyber sabotage aimed at slowing Iran’s nuclear program, the Washington Post on Tuesday quoted Western officials with knowledge of the effort as saying.

The massive piece of malware secretly mapped and monitored Iran’s computer networks, sending back a steady stream of intelligence to prepare for a cyber warfare campaign, according to the officials.

The effort, involving the National Security Agency, the CIA and Israel’s military, has included the use of destructive software such as the Stuxnet virus to cause malfunctions in Iran’s nuclear-enrichment equipment.

The emerging details about Flame provide new clues to what is thought to be the first sustained campaign of cyber sabotage against an adversary of the United States.

“This is about preparing the battlefield for another type of covert action,” said one former high-ranking U.S. intelligence official, who added that Flame and Stuxnet were elements of a broader assault that continues today. “Cyber-collection against the Iranian program is way further down the road than this.”

Flame came to light last month after Iran detected a series of cyber attacks on its oil industry. The disruption was directed by Israel in a unilateral operation that apparently caught its American partners off guard, according to several U.S. and Western officials who spoke on the condition of anonymity.

There has been speculation that Washington had a role in developing Flame, but the collaboration on the virus between the U.S. and Israel has not been previously confirmed. Commercial security researchers reported last week that Flame contained some of the same code as Stuxnet. Experts described the overlap as DNA-like evidence that the two sets of malware were parallel projects run by the same entity.

Spokesmen for the CIA, the NSA and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, as well as the Israeli Embassy in Washington, declined to comment.

The virus is among the most sophisticated and subversive pieces of malware to be exposed to date. Experts said the program was designed to replicate across even highly secure networks, then control everyday computer functions to send secrets back to its creators. The code could activate computer microphones and cameras, log keyboard strokes, take screen shots, extract geolocation data from images, and send and receive commands and data through Bluetooth wireless technology.

Flame was designed to do all this while masquerading as a routine Microsoft software update; it evaded detection for several years by using a sophisticated program to crack an encryption algorithm.

“This is not something that most security researchers have the skills or resources to do,” said Tom Parker, chief technology officer for FusionX, a security firm that specializes in simulating state-sponsored cyber attacks. He said he does not know who was behind the virus. “You’d expect that of only the most advanced cryptomathematicians, such as those working at NSA.”

Over the recent years, Iran has been the target of several major cyber attacks.

In September 2010, it was reported that the Stuxnet worm, which is capable of taking over power plants, had infected many industrial sites in Iran.

Iranian officials confirmed that some Iranian industrial systems had been targeted by a cyber attack, but insisted that no crashes or serious damage to the country’s industrial computer systems had been reported and said Iranian engineers had rooted out the problem.

In April 25, 2011, Iranian officials announced that the country had been targeted by a new computer worm named Stars.

Later, news agencies reported that another computer worm named Duqu had targeted some Iranian organizations and companies.



On May 28, Reuters reported that security experts had discovered a new data-stealing spyware virus dubbed Flame that had lurked inside thousands of computers across the Middle East for as long as five years.

On May 30, Ali Hakim-Javadi, the Iranian deputy minister of information and communications technology, announced that Iranian experts had created the required anti-virus software to clean the systems infected by the Flame virus.

<http://tehrantimes.com/politics/98929-us-israel-developed-flame-virus-to-slow-down-irans-nuclear-program-western-officials->

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

Ha'aretz Daily News – Israel

Iran: Israel, U.S. Plan Fresh Cyber Attacks After Nuclear Talks in Moscow

Speaking to Press TV, Iranian Intelligence Minister says Tehran successfully foiled the attack, allegedly planned with U.K., but that conspirators were still bent on striking.

By Oded Yaron and Haaretz

June 21, 2012

The United States, Israel, and Britain planned to launch a cyber attack against Iran following the latest round of nuclear talks in Moscow, Tehran's Intelligence Ministry claimed on Thursday.

Speaking to the Iranian state run television network Press TV, Iranian Intelligence Minister Heidar Moslehi said: "Based on obtained information, the U.S. and the Zionist regime along with the MI6 planned an operation to launch a massive cyber attack against Iran's facilities following the meeting between Iran and the P5+1 in Moscow."

According to Moslehi, the alleged attempt to strike Iran's nuclear facilities failed over Iranian measures, adding: "They still seek to carry out the plan, but we have taken necessary measures."

The top Iranian official's comments came after, earlier this week, Moscow hosted the latest round of P5+1 nuclear talks, which ended in the apparent breakdown of talks.

Speaking with Haaretz, a Western diplomat who asked to remain anonymous in light of the sensitivity of the talks said that one major obstacle revealed by the Moscow talks relates to the underground facility for uranium enrichment in Fordo, near the city of Qom.

According to the diplomat, the Iranians responded only in a broad, vague fashion to demands that it limit its enrichment of uranium to a level of 20 percent and move such uranium outside the country, and they refused to discuss the Fordo plant at all. The Iranians claimed that Fordo is not a military facility, so it should not be included in the talks.

"We learned that Fordo is a taboo subject for the Iranians, and that it is the flagship of their nuclear project," the diplomat said.

Comments by Iran's intelligence minister on Thursday also came following the recent uncovering of the so-called Flame malware, which a Washington Post report on Tuesday claimed was geared at mapping Iran's computer networks and monitor computers of Iranian officials.

According to the report, the virus was designed to provide intelligence to help in a cyber campaign against Iran's nuclear program, involving the National Security Agency, the CIA and Israel's military.

Speaking on new virus a few weeks ago, Eugene Kaspersky, the head of the Kaspersky computer security firm, said that an inspection of Flame's code revealed loopholes, which could have been used to spy on the virus' operators.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/diplomacy-defense/iran-israel-u-s-plan-fresh-cyber-attacks-after-nuclear-talks-in-moscow-1.440202>



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

Indian Express – India

Threat of Bio Terrorism: India Building Its First Bio-Radar

By Express News Service - BANGALORE

21st June 2012

India has started building its one of the first bio-radars as the threat of bio-terrorism looms large over the country. It is conceived to act as an early warning system.

The Defence Bioengineering and Electromedical Laboratory (DEBEL) will be attempting to make a bio-radar with the help of nano technology as indicated by the Scientific Adviser to the Defence Minister and Director General of the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) V K Saraswat.

He said that their R&D efforts would try to build this product to avert a biological or chemical attack. Elaborating further, DEBEL's Director V Padaki said the components of the bio-radar would detect the existence of any quarantine material and communicate it to the control room. This, he said, would give an indication of the quarantine material and also prepare to counter a biological or chemical attack.

He also said that they were using nanosensors as nano gave a far better surface area than a conventional sensor. Highlighting DEBEL's area of focus, he said that the laboratory was nearing completion of the Integrated Life Support System (ILSS), a part of the Onboard Oxygen Generation System developed for the Light Combat Aircraft (LCA-Tejas). He said that it would help in providing higher flight endurance for the soon to be inducted aircraft.

Speaking on other variant of Tejas, the LCA -Navy, which is currently undergoing trials here, Saraswat said that the aircraft would be headed to Goa for shore trials and ski-jump trials by December this year. He said that they would assess the data from its first 5-7 flights and constantly upgrade their levels of functioning to optimum efficiency.

On the Airborne Early Warning and Control (AWAC) Systems, he said that the first of the Embraer from Brazil would land in India by July this year. "All the radar arrays and building blocks for this have been realised," he said and pointed out that the programme was going according to schedule.

He said that they would try to get the system ready by January 26, 2013.

<http://newindianexpress.com/cities/bangalore/article547278.ece>

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

Wall Street Journal

June 22, 2012

New Bird-Flu Study Shows Virus's Pandemic Potential

By GAUTAM NAIK

In a new experiment showing how the virus that causes bird flu might spark a human pandemic, scientists induced five genetic changes in the bug, transforming it into a type capable of airborne transmission between mammals.

The findings signal how the virus, which has killed nearly 60% of about 600 people known to have been infected in more than a dozen countries since 2003, could pose a much greater public-health risk in the future. Two of the mutations the scientists created already circulate in birds and people, and natural evolution could bring about the remaining three, researchers said.

The findings appear in the journal *Science*, which on Thursday published several papers and commentaries about the virus—also known as H5N1. The studies were funded by the U.S. National Institutes of Health and other groups.



The genetic-alteration paper in *Science* is one of two experiments whose planned publication sparked fears it would give terrorists a blueprint for making a biological weapon. The first such paper described an alternative genetic technique for creating a pandemic version of H5N1 and appeared in *Nature* in May.

A government advisory panel that had recommended against the papers' being made public reversed course after learning about findings in the work that could help health agencies better monitor for bird flu. If officials know which bird-flu genetic signatures to look for, they can obtain swabs from people infected with H5N1 and see whether the critical mutations have started to accumulate.

The flu-surveillance benefit of the research "far outweighs the risk of nefarious" use posed by terrorists or anyone else pursuing a biological-weapons program, said Anthony Fauci, director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, part of the NIH. Dr. Fauci and NIH director Francis Collins co-authored one of the commentaries in *Science* examining the benefits and risks of flu research.

The authors of the latest studies cautioned they can't predict when or if the remaining three genetic mutations might emerge. Nor are these the only possible mutations that could start a pandemic, they said. "We only know that it's within the realm of possibility that the [three mutations] could evolve in a human or other mammalian host," said Derek Smith of the University of Cambridge. In one of the *Science* papers, co-authored by Dr. Smith, a 15-year analysis of surveillance data found that two of the five mutations seen in the lab-engineered viruses had occurred in several existing bird flu strains.

The H5N1 virus can move from birds to people through close contact. But it isn't yet efficient at jumping from person to person, a necessary ingredient for triggering a pandemic.

Examining the benefits and risks of flu research the latest studies also indicate that the risk of an H5N1-pandemic may be greater than previously believed.

In the experiment published in *Nature* in May, scientists combined H5N1 and swine flu and came up with a hybrid bug that could leap from mammal to mammal. That experiment was based on the long-held notion that a pandemic strain is more likely to emerge when a flu virus mixes its genes with another virus in an animal host, such as a pig. But one of the *Science* studies suggests that such "re-assortment" may not be necessary to give rise to a pandemic strain, and that it might emerge from mutations in H5N1 alone.

Scientists first changed three amino acid molecules of H5N1 in a way they believed would boost the bug's affinity for human hosts, then infected ferrets with the mutated virus. Ferrets are a good model because they sneeze like humans and show similar symptoms when infected by flu.

The researchers swabbed the noses of the infected ferrets and used virus samples from their bodies to infect another round of ferrets, thus "passaging" the virus several times through different ferrets. At each stage, they took tissue samples from the ferrets to see how H5N1 was evolving.

"After about 10 passages, we found the virus had acquired the ability to transmit" from animal to animal, said Ron Fouchier of the Erasmus Medical Center in Rotterdam, Netherlands, and study co-author. That suggests that "in humans it would take a low number of transmissions for the mutations to accumulate."

Five mutations gave the virus the ability to jump from ferret to ferret: three of the initial amino-acid changes; plus two that emerged through evolutionary selection in the animals' bodies.

Four of the genetic substitutions were in hemagglutinin, a protein on the surface of H5N1 that helps it to enter host cells. The fifth was in the polymerase 2, a protein that helps the virus replicate its genetic material.

Most of the infected ferrets recovered from the lab-made virus. The animals succumbed only when large doses of the mutant virus were introduced directly into their throats. Experiments also suggested the engineered virus responded to an antiviral drug and to antibodies from ferrets that had received experimental H5N1 vaccines. People infected with H5N1 are treated with antivirals.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304441404577480700820235514.html>

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

Washington Free Beacon
OPINION/Commentary

A Cut Too Far

Obama set to seek deeper cuts in nuclear arsenal

By Bill Gertz

June 19, 2012

President Obama has decided to seek deeper cuts in deployed strategic nuclear weapons to as few as 1,000 warheads, sharply below the target of 1,550 warheads required under a 2010 U.S.-Russia arms treaty, U.S. officials said Monday.

Critics say the steep cuts, which the administration will seek in new talks with a growing anti-U.S. government in Moscow, would undermine U.S. strategic deterrence for the United States and its allies in Asia and Europe.

The lower warhead levels also would be contrary to recent congressional testimony from a strategic forces commander who said further cuts would weaken the ability to deter nuclear states like Russia and China.

A U.S. strategic nuclear force posture of 1,000 strategic warheads has not been seen since the early 1950s. At the height of the Cold War, both the United States and the Soviet Union had as many as 30,000 nuclear weapons.

The deeper nuclear cuts are outlined in a forthcoming report the Pentagon calls the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) implementation study, dubbed the mini-NPR, and reflect President Obama's announced 2009 effort to completely eliminate all nuclear weapons. The announcement comes despite reports that Russia and China are engaged in a major buildup of their nuclear forces, and North Korea and Iran are developing nuclear arsenals.

A Pentagon spokesman declined to comment on the mini-NPR study results. Other officials said the study results would be made public in the next few days.

The officials confirmed the new projected warhead levels after they were first reported Friday by Japan's Kyodo news agency.

U.S. officials also said the forthcoming mini-NPR report will rule out steeper cuts of between 800 and 300 warheads. The lowest number is fewer than are currently estimated to be in China's warhead arsenal.

Before retiring in 2011, U.S. Strategic Command commander Gen. Kevin P. Chilton told Congress that warhead levels of around 1,550 warheads under New START are needed for strong deterrence against nuclear threats. "I think the arsenal we have is exactly what is needed today to provide the deterrent," he said.

Gen. Robert Kehler, the current Strategic Command leader, said last month that he is worried about cuts in both warheads and funding needed for modernizing aging nuclear weapons and infrastructure.

Under difficult fiscal constraints, nuclear forces that need modernizing include delivery systems, weapons life extension programs, stockpile monitoring, naval reactor design work, and upgrades for nuclear command and control, Kehler said during a talk at the Council on Foreign Relations.

If further cuts are made, "we will have to go back and do what we did with this round of reductions: completely review what those impacts could be and make the appropriate recommendations," the four-star general said.

"Of all the elements of the nuclear enterprise, I'm most concerned with the potential for declining or inadequate investment in the nuclear weapons enterprise itself, some declining investment that would result in our inability to sustain the deterrent force," he said.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

“Our weapons are aging, and we face the continued erosion of the nuclear enterprise’s physical and intellectual capital.”

Without investments for modernizing nuclear arms and infrastructure, “maintaining the long-term credibility and viability of the nation’s nuclear deterrent will not be possible,” Kehler said.

Former United Nations Ambassador John Bolton, a former State Department arms control undersecretary, said he is very worried that deeper cuts will harm U.S. security.

“Levels under the New START agreement are already too low,” Bolton told the *Free Beacon*. “Going below that reflects blind ideology, not strategic analysis of U.S. defense needs. This is what a second Obama term will bring.”

President Obama was overheard during a meeting with then-Russian President Dmitri Medvedev telling the Russian leader that he would have “more flexibility” in strategic talks with Russia after his presumed reelection. The comment was widely viewed as the president offering additional concessions to Moscow beyond many already made as part of the administration’s conciliatory “reset” policy toward Russia.

Frank Gaffney, head of the Center for Security Policy that advocates the Reagan administration defense policy of peace through strength, said the further warhead cuts would weaken U.S. security.

“This is of a piece with the Obama administration’s program to rid the world of nuclear weapons, starting with ours,” Gaffney said in an interview.

Gaffney said new warhead cuts would add to other national security problems caused by the administration, including what he termed a “defective” New START treaty; a failure to follow through on nuclear modernization promises; efforts to permanently prevent testing of new weapons; and the decline of the nuclear industrial base.

“The Nuclear Posture Review implementation study will make plain that this is a matter of ideology and not national security,” Gaffney said.

The *Free Beacon* first reported Feb. 14 that the president directed the Pentagon to examine cutting nuclear forces to as few as 300 warheads, less than communist China’s growing nuclear force.

The presidential directive for the mini-NPR was sent from the White House in August and called for military and policy officials to examine three warhead levels: 1,100 to 1,000; between 700 and 800; and between 300 and 400 warheads.

The study was the first time a president had ordered basing strategic warheads on specific levels. In the past, warhead levels were matched to maintaining deterrence against foreign threats, mainly the Soviet Union, later Russia, and more recently China and North Korea.

There are currently an estimated 5,000 warheads in the U.S. arsenal. Under the 2010 New START arms treaty with Russia, U.S. deployed strategic warhead levels will be cut to 1,550. After the treaty was signed, the administration disclosed that Russian warhead levels had already been lowered to 1,550.

Pentagon spokesman George Little said in February that the details for the mini-NPR were classified. However, he stated that the president had tasked the Pentagon to “develop several alternative approaches to deterrence and stability, to include illustrative force size and postures to best support those alternatives.”

The Pentagon was evaluating the alternatives based on the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review.

Retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Thomas McInerney said the administration is seeking to unilaterally disarm U.S. nuclear forces, something that is “the most dangerous thing I have ever seen an American President attempt to do.”

“This is not the time to embark on such a dangerous path, with China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea increasing their nuclear forces,” he said.

President Obama said in a major speech in Prague, Czech Republic in 2009 that the United States should eliminate all nuclear weapons.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 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

Bill Gertz is senior editor of the Washington Free Beacon. Prior to joining the Beacon he was a national security reporter, editor, and columnist for 27 years at the Washington Times.

<http://freebeacon.com/a-cut-too-far/>

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

Heritage Foundation
OPINION/The Foundry

Disarmament Should Not Be the Driver of U.S. Nuclear Policy

By Baker Spring
June 19, 2012

Recent news articles, including one by journalist and author [Bill Gertz](#), indicate that the Obama Administration will soon release an update to a previous study of U.S. nuclear weapons policy that will recommend that the number of strategic nuclear warheads in the U.S. arsenal be reduced to between 1,000 and 1,100. If the reporting is accurate, this proposal will reduce the number of strategic nuclear warheads in the U.S. arsenal by about 50 percent.

What is key to understand about the reporting on the pending study by the Obama Administration is how everything is focused on the numbers of warheads. In all likelihood, the reporting accurately reflects the views of the Obama Administration, because it is evident that its highest policy priority is to get the numbers on a downward trajectory to bolster its policy for achieving U.S. nuclear disarmament. In short, the numbers are derived, first and foremost, from disarmament considerations.

Currently, the U.S. has about 2,000 warheads in the strategic arsenal. The precise number is not provided in data declarations released by the State Department, because the declarations only provide the accountable warheads under the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START).

The Administration's misplaced priorities are exceedingly dangerous, because the most important consideration in the pending study should not be U.S. nuclear disarmament, but how to maximize the deterrent value of the U.S. nuclear arsenal. Arms control should be the means to this end, not an end in itself.

It is disturbing, but not surprising, that the reporting on the pending study fails to mention in any way the many nuclear policy issues that should be addressed. These issues include: 1) the targeting policy for the nuclear force; 2) the survivability of the nuclear force and its support network; 3) the proper yield of the warheads; 4) the proper structure for both the U.S. strategic and short-range, or "tactical," nuclear forces; 5) integration of the strategic nuclear force with strategic defenses; 6) the kill capacity of the weapons in the force against the strategic forces of the enemy; 7) the consequences of de-alerting the strategic and tactical nuclear forces; 8) the cost effectiveness of the proposed nuclear force compared to alternatives; 9) the effect on earlier commitments to modernize the U.S. nuclear weapons infrastructure; and, 10) integrating nuclear and conventional strike systems in the broader U.S. arsenal.

Nevertheless, it is important for Congress to recognize that these other important issues could still be addressed in the pending study. Their inclusion, however, will not mean that the study avoids serious flaws. Congress should make sure the answers provided by the study are not merely being used to justify the number the Administration wants in service to its disarmament goal. The news reports provide initial evidence that this is the flawed approach the Administration is using.

As a result, these news reports should be causing all sorts of alarm bells to go off in Congress. Disarmament should be one area of consideration in the pending nuclear study, not the central driver for arriving at recommendations.

Maintaining an effective deterrent should be the highest priority, and Congress should make it clear now—before the study is released—that it will move to block specific proposed steps where it is evident that these steps are the result of putting disarmament considerations first.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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



Baker Spring is the F.M. Kirby Research Fellow in National Security Policy at The Heritage Foundation. He specializes in examining the threat of ballistic missiles from Third World countries and U.S. national security issues.

<http://blog.heritage.org/2012/06/19/disarmament-should-not-be-the-driver-of-u-s-nuclear-policy/>

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

China Daily – China

OPINION

US Behind the Iran Nuclear 'Crisis'

June 20, 2012

By Ma Xiaolin (China Daily)

Page - 9

No wonder the new round of talks in Moscow on the Iranian nuclear issue didn't achieve any concrete progress, frankly speaking, no one is confident of solving a matter concerning Iran's core interests through the talks. Especially as the United States has just heightened tensions by issuing new trade sanctions that include China and Singapore.

Actually, the Iranian nuclear issue is not only a matter of nuclear proliferation, it also reflects the lack of strategic mutual trust between the US and Iran. It is the US that has pushed Iran to seek to become a nuclear state, also it is the US has sensationalized Iran's nuclear program as a global issue.

In 1957, in order to compete with the former Soviet Union in the Middle East, the United States and Iran signed a civil nuclear cooperation agreement as part of the US Atoms for Peace program. In 1963, Iran signed the Limited Test Ban Treaty and in 1968 the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

But ties between the US and Iran soured after the Islamic revolution in 1979 and Iran turned to the USSR for help.

In 2003, one year after the Iranian nuclear program became news headlines worldwide, the Iranian government signed the protocol allowing snap inspections of nuclear facilities by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

However, the US continued to put pressure on what it called a "rogue state". In 2005 Mahmoud Ahmadinejad was elected president and adopted a hardline nuclear policy, saying in 2009 that Iran would not retreat "one iota" on its right to a nuclear program. That's how the Iranian nuclear problem turned into a "crisis".

Today the crisis is so deep that a basic question is ignored: Does Iran have the capacity to produce nuclear weapons? The answer, according to experts, is not as certain as the US claims. For weapons use, at least 90 percent pure uranium is required, but Iran cannot even produce 20 percent pure uranium for medical and experimental use. Even if they make breakthroughs one day they will still need to conduct nuclear explosion tests and acquire other technologies to develop a useable weapon.

Even Iran's intention of developing nuclear weapons is in doubt. In February Iran's supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei openly said that nuclear weapons of mass destruction are contrary to Islamic teachings and the state does not intend to own them.

In its fight against the US, Iran uses some flexible terms such as "nuclear rights" and "nuclear capacity". The intention is clear: Iran wants to emphasize its independence and sovereignty, while leaving some room for developing nuclear weapons if necessary and ensuring domestic order by emphasizing external pressure and antagonism.

The US and its Middle East allies must be fully aware that Iran has no capability to produce nuclear weapons. So the question becomes: Why do they keep making a fuss over Iran's nuclear program?

The US has its own agenda in exaggerating the Iran nuclear crisis: to prevent an external enemy from becoming a nuclear state, and maintaining, even strengthening, the military dependency of other Middle East countries on the US, so as to export weapons to them and keep military bases in their domains.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Israel has different reasons, primarily because it faces an actual security threat as Ahmadinejad, who has said he would like to "wipe" Israel off the map, has long-term plans for training Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Palestine. Also it is widely believed to have a regional monopoly on nuclear weapons, which it wants to maintain, and it wants to shift the world's attention from Palestine.

For the Sunni-led Arabic states, a nuclear-armed Iran is viewed as more of a threat than Israel, as Iran is the only nation that is overwhelming Shiite.

We don't need to worry about an Israeli or US attack on Iran at least before the Syria crisis comes to an end. The US and its Arab allies want Syria to become the first domino to fall, and are trying to keep Iran from intervening in the Syrian crisis. Obviously, this is both an easier and "more moral" path because Syria has opposition groups calling for humanitarian assistance. They would not risk an all-out Arab-Israeli war before the situation in Syria is resolved.

The US will not truly implement its sanctions against China and Singapore either, because it does not want to face too many opponents. After all, no matter if the US wants to or not, it has to seek cooperation with, rather than opposition from, China to solve many international issues.

The author is an observer of Middle East affairs.

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/opinion/2012-06/20/content_15513634.htm

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

The Hill

OPINION/Congress Blog

New START Is Working to Enhance US National Security

By Terri S. Lodge, American Security Project

June 20, 2012

The New START Treaty is one year old, and the results are in. This Treaty, the result of years of negotiations between the United States and Russia, works. New START enhances U.S. national security, bringing U.S. nuclear policies in line with the security challenges of the 21st century.

Yet there are rumblings that some Senators are unhappy with nuclear weapons funding provisions and will seek to halt New START implementation as a result. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee will hold a New START hearing this week. The hearing will show that the Treaty, regardless of funding issues, deserves support.

There are five key benefits to the New START Treaty. First, New START enhances US nuclear force planning. Without the treaty, the U.S. would be flying blind, with no way of understanding Russia's nuclear plans. The U.S. military would have to plan for a "worst case scenario" and spend more money on nuclear capabilities than necessary. With the Treaty, the U.S. military can avoid wasting money on unneeded nuclear weapons at a time when military resources are stretched thin.

Second, New START verification measures enhance transparency regarding our U.S. and Russian deployed strategic systems. Data exchanges provide each side with information on numbers, locations, and other details of nuclear forces. On-site inspections and data exchanges allow the U.S. to verify the size and composition of the Russian nuclear arsenal. The Treaty also guarantees that U.S. national technical means of surveillance, such as satellites, are not subject to Russian interference, and the United States will have a variety of tools at its disposal for monitoring Russian compliance.

Since the treaty entered into force over one year ago, the U.S. and Russia have each conducted 23 on-site inspections and exchanged thousands of data notifications. These verification measures provide critical insight into Russian nuclear forces. Our relationship with Russia has its ups and downs. The treaty's transparency means both nations can understand each other's strategic forces activities, no matter the state of U.S.-Russia relations.

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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



Third, U.S. nuclear modernization is preserved under New START. Much has been made of nuclear modernization funding, or lack thereof, but the New START Treaty itself does not stipulate the “right level” of modernization funding. Indeed, one of the benefits of the treaty is that it provides for strategic stability between the U.S. and Russia, without impacting U.S. or Russian force modernization programs or limiting funding for nuclear infrastructure upgrades.

Under the New START Treaty, Congress is free to fund necessary modernization efforts to keep the nuclear enterprise safe and secure, while policymakers are free to plan nuclear weapons reductions and adjust the nuclear force structure to reflect 21st century priorities.

Fourth, the Treaty does not limit U.S. missile defense programs. Claims of a secret missile defense deal in the treaty are the stuff of fantasy, not reality. There is no secret missile defense deal as part of New START. U.S. negotiators understood that no treaty can limit U.S. missile defense programs. Since the ratification of New START the U.S. has advanced its missile defense plans while pursuing a missile defense cooperation agreement with Russia. A possible cooperation agreement would allay Russian concerns about U.S. missile defense initiatives but not limit U.S. plans.

Finally, the success of New START provides a sounds basis for future nuclear negotiations. Reductions in tactical nuclear weapons, where Russia has a large advantage, could be the next step. The Congress attached a provision in the New START resolution of ratification directing the Administration to pursue reductions in U.S. tactical nuclear weapons deployed in Europe.

The Treaty also sets the stage for a new treaty further reducing the strategic nuclear forces of both sides. Many agree that further reductions are desirable and practical, considering the success of New START, our excess strategic forces and their waning utility in the face of more urgent threats.

Former defense and national security officials, including former STRATCOM commanders, have endorsed this approach to updating U.S. nuclear policy. The recent Global Zero Commission brought some of these officials together, from General James Cartwright to Senator Chuck Hagel to Ambassador Thomas Pickering. The Commission Report highlighted the strategic irrelevance of nuclear weapons and called for steep nuclear reductions, using the New START treaty as a starting point.

The New START Treaty still has its critics. But the charges leveled at the treaty are based partly political rhetoric and partly in misunderstanding of the treaty provisions. An impartial look at the evidence sets the record straight. One year of New START implementation has enhanced U.S. interests. And it will continue to benefit U.S. national security as policymakers build on the treaty’s success to bring U.S. nuclear policy into the 21st century.

Lodge is the director of nuclear security at the nonpartisan American Security Project. She has worked in the nuclear field for over 30 years.

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/233801-new-start-is-working-to-enhance-us-national-security>

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

The Diplomat – Japan

OPINION/Flashpoints

Is AirSea Battle Obsolete?

By Harry Kazianis

June 21, 2012

China’s development of a highly capable Anti-Access/Area Denial (A2/AD) battle plan to deter, slow, or deny U.S. forces from entering a contested geographic area or combat zone has been well covered in *The Diplomat* by myself and others. It makes sense for American military planners to assess the challenges such a strategy will present as Chinese forces begin to deploy over greater distances.

But it’s also clear that the United States should develop its own symmetrical and asymmetric strategies to counter such threats. A joint operational concept of AirSea Battle combined with a strong cyber component could damage, deter,

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



and destroy any Chinese A2/AD capabilities and ensure U.S. maritime access. A newly reconstituted “AirSeaCyber” operational concept would give U.S. forces the best chance to defeat Chinese or any other nations’ A2/AD forces now and in the future.

Of course, the present Joint Operational Access Concept does make strong mention of cyber operations. However, an even stronger emphasis on cyber warfare is needed beyond present day convention. In short, AirSea Battle as an operational concept might already be obsolete.

The first component of a refocused AirSeaCyber operational concept would be defensive: the hardening of all U.S. airfields in range of Chinese ballistic or cruise missiles. U.S. and allied air forces as currently organized are in large part unprotected from Chinese missile strikes. Kadena Air Base in Okinawa has a total of 15 shelters, enough for at most 30 fighters if one packs two into each. The Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Futenma, also located on Okinawa, has no aircraft shelters whatsoever. There are also surprisingly no shelters at MCAS Iwakuni and Yokota Air Base on Honshu, or Andersen Air Force Base either. Chinese forces could quickly deal a fatal blow to U.S. and allied aircraft sitting out in the open. This can be remedied with hardened shelters for U.S. and allied planes and essential equipment.

A second vital element of AirSeaCyber would be the fully funded procurement of a new long range bomber. Such a weapon is being conceptualized to replace the B-52, B-1 and possible B-2 platforms. This system should have an optional unmanned component, carry large payloads of precision guided conventional or nuclear ordinance, and have longer ranges than present B-2 bombers with reduced need for in-air refueling. The aircraft should also be able to conduct deep strikes against Chinese command and control capabilities (C2), disabling many Chinese weapons systems. The cost of such a bomber per unit has been assessed at \$ 550 million per unit, compared to the B-2 at \$1.07 billion per unit.

U.S. underwater naval assets would play a pivotal part in AirSeaCyber. Chinese forces lack proper operational deployment, equipment, and training in areas of Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW). American attack (SSNs) and guided missile submarines (SSGNs) would have tremendous capacity to attack Chinese naval assets, launch guided missile strikes on coastal or inland targets, as well as deny access to the near seas. American planners must therefore continue to design, fund, and deploy Virginia-class attack submarines with increased payloads of Tomahawk cruise missiles. This will be of increased importance as Ohio class SSGNs start to retire around 2029.

As Chinese planners rely heavily on asymmetric warfare strategies, American tacticians, if developing AirSeaCyber, must also prepare to utilize such abilities. Cyber warfare offers proportionally the strongest asymmetrical capabilities at the lowest possible cost. Almost all of China’s military C2 and deployed weapons systems rely on computer hardware and software. As Chinese planners develop networked joint operations for multi-domain warfare, they also open their systems for exploitation by U.S. cyber-attack. American technology experts must begin long range studies of Chinese hardware, software, computer networks, and fiber optic communications. This will allow U.S. cyber command to deploy malware, viruses, and coordinated strikes on fiber-based communications networks that would launch any Chinese offensive or defensive operations. Cyber warfare, if conducted in coordination with standard tactical operations, could be the ultimate cross-domain asymmetrical weapon in modern 21st century warfare.

Asymmetrical warfare must also extend beyond the cyber domain and into modern combat operational domains. Larger next generation air and sea-based drone weapons could be utilized for intelligence gathering as well as offensive operations as part of AirSeaCyber. One new approach could be to utilize smaller submersible drones to gather intelligence outside of Chinese ports or in the near seas if possible hostilities appear imminent. Such undersea drones could be armed with small packages of torpedoes or possibly cruise missiles, and could strike rapidly. In theory, such a weapon could be developed with an extended loitering capability of several months while being highly cost effective.

These are only a sample of capabilities that could be utilized to create a joint operational concept that transitions from present AirSea Battle ideas into a more focused AirSeaCyber operational concept. Such notions are compliant with current fiscal realities, utilize modern military technologies, and take advantage of current Chinese weaknesses. Any operational concept that will guide America’s armed forces in the future is obsolete without intense conceptualizations



of cyber warfare. U.S. military planners must develop cross domain symmetrical and asymmetrical capabilities as nations such as North Korea, Syria, Iran, and others are intently studying Chinese A2/AD capabilities. It should be the policy of U.S. strategic planners to develop an AirSeaCyber concept to negate any such abilities.

Harry Kazianis is assistant editor of The Diplomat. He has previously served as deputy editor of E-International Relations and policy analyst at the Foreword Report. His area of expertise is security studies with a strong regional focus on the Asia-Pacific, naval affairs and asymmetric warfare.

<http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2012/06/21/is-airsea-battle-obsolete/>

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

Hankyoreh – South Korea
OPINION/Editorial

[Editorial] No Nukes for Japan

June 22, 2012

Japan has raised the possibility of arming itself with nuclear weapons. Right-wingers there have periodically talked about the need for nuclear armament as part of an effort to “normalize” the country through amendment of Article 9 to the Peace Constitution which prohibits military activity.

But this is the first time that possibility has been raised in law. We cannot help being astonished by this behavior from a country that still draws concerns and apprehension from its neighbors with its failure to fully atone for its history.

On June 15, the National Diet of Japan added a phrase to the supplementary provisions of its Atomic Energy Commission Establishment Act stating that ensuring safety in the use of nuclear power “contributes to guaranteeing security.” It is the first revision in 34 years to the basic guidelines of the Atomic Energy Basic Act, which has been called the “Nuclear Power Constitution.” What the country has done is open a legal avenue to nuclear armament.

Judging from the lame manner in which Japan crafted the law, it seems fully aware that it is not aboveboard. Not only that, but its content was not even made public until the House of Representatives passed it on June 20. This appears to be some kind of ploy to avoid public opposition and criticism. Still, Japan does show clear signs of intending to become a military power. Similarly insensible is the deletion of a proviso limiting space activity to “peaceful purposes” in a simultaneous amendment of the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency Act.

Japan does face many hurdles before it can acquire nuclear weapons. It will be hard-pressed to get past its three non-nuclear principles barring the production, possession, or introduction of nuclear weapons, or the Peace Constitution, anti-nuclear sentiment within the country, its alliance with the US, and the concerns of neighbors. But judging from the way it previously broadened the scope of its Self-Defense Force’s activities through amendments of its Vicinity Contingency Law (1999), Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law (2001), and Iraq Reconstruction Law (2003), it is inadvisable to let down our guard.

Japan has led the way over the years in diplomatic efforts to promote peaceful use of nuclear power, emphasizing its status as the only country in the world to have suffered atomic bombing. And in recognition of this, it earned special treatment from the international community, becoming the only country without nuclear weapons allowed to operate facilities for reprocessing nuclear fuel. It has also applied intense pressure on North Korea in its own nuclear development program. In that sense, its latest actions are both a repudiation of its own values and a form of international fraud.

Japan needs to understand just how upset its neighbors are with its ahistorical and unreflective stance. Seoul, for its part, should send a clear early warning against these actions that threaten regional peace.

http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_editorial/539122.html

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The Economist – U.K.
OPINION/Editorial

Britain's Nuclear Deterrent

Divided over Trident

The coalition is at odds over plans for new nuclear submarines

June 23rd, 2012

THE announcement this week by Philip Hammond, the defence secretary, that he was placing a £1.1 billion (\$1.7 billion) order with Rolls-Royce for nuclear reactors to power the successors to Britain's fleet of four Vanguard-class ballistic missile submarines set off a flurry of controversy. Getting rid of the country's nuclear weapons has at times divided the Labour Party in fratricidal acrimony. These days, however, the divisions are felt most keenly within the coalition government.

The Tories are committed to maintaining the nuclear deterrent in roughly its existing form. That means replacing the ageing Vanguard boats around the middle of the next decade. The American Trident II missiles they carry will remain in service until at least 2042. Mr Hammond, who is bound by an agreement with the Liberal Democrats not to commit to a renewal of Trident during this parliament, argues that no firm decision on replacement will be made until after the general election in 2015. But the ground must be prepared now if the timetable is not to slip. Although Mr Hammond's announcement did not breach the letter of the agreement, it has strained an already uneasy relationship.

Characteristically, Tories complain, the Lib Dems seem to favour a kind of nuclear "soft power" —an inherently absurd idea. The Lib Dems say they want to keep the deterrent for now, but they would like to find a cheaper and less powerful alternative to the mighty Trident system. To that end, Nick Harvey, a Lib Dem junior defence minister, is earnestly looking into other options. Labour's leader, Ed Miliband, also shows signs of drifting away from the robust pro-Trident (and thus very New Labour) position of his predecessors, Gordon Brown and Tony Blair, hinting that he would also prefer not to replace the current deterrent with a "like-for-like" system.

Sadly, the supposed alternatives are not promising. Land-based ballistic missiles are inherently risky. Their vulnerability to attack means they would have to be kept on a hair trigger. Keeping two aircraft armed with nuclear-tipped cruise missiles permanently aloft would be expensive and carry a significant danger of nuclear accident. In practice, the only non-Trident option worth considering would be a submarine-based cruise-missile system. Yet even this is questionable.

In the first place, the price would almost certainly prove far higher than the 5-6% of the defence budget over its lifetime that keeping Trident going will cost. The Trident missiles are already bought and paid for. If Britain were to build a cruise missile, it would have to be long-range (at least 2,500 miles to give the sub firing it enough sea room to hide in) and probably hypersonic (for it to have a better chance of not being shot down). That would be costly. The nuclear version of America's 30-year-old Tomahawk cruise missile is soon to be scrapped. It is also slow and its range inadequate. Worse still, cruise missiles are inherently destabilising: an adversary cannot distinguish between a nuclear and a conventionally armed cruise missile.

What might save a little money would be building three rather than four boats. This could undermine so-called "continuous at-sea deterrence", which currently requires three subs and a spare. If so, it would be a false economy. Potential enemies would know when Britain did not have a boat on patrol and have an incentive to attack pre-emptively. But the new reactors will not require regular refuelling, which might make continuous deterrence possible with three boats in the future.

There are respectable arguments both for and against Britain staying in the nuclear-deterrent business (this newspaper remains in favour). But the idea that a cheaper yet still effective "Trident-lite" option exists is dishonest.

<http://www.economist.com/node/21557361>

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

Issue No. 1009, 22 June 2012

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