



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Seeking Kremlin Engagement, NATO Weighs Next Nuclear Posture Steps](#)

1. [Clinton: US 'Not Setting Deadlines' for Iran](#)
2. ['Frustrated' IAEA Wants Immediate Access to Iran Site](#)
3. [Speaker Underscores Iran's Strong Opposition to N. Weapons](#)
4. [AP Exclusive: New Intelligence on Iran Nuke Work](#)
5. ['Iran Currently Not on the Verge of Developing Nukes'](#)
6. [2.7 Tril. Won Set Aside to Counter North's Nuclear, Artillery Threats](#)
7. [S.Korea, US Troops Practice Occupying N.Korea: Report](#)
8. [Korea, US Near Deal on Ballistic Missile Range: Source](#)
9. [Former USFK Commander Warns against North's Nuclear and Missile Threats](#)
10. [China Multiplies Its War Toys, India Plays Catch-Up](#)
11. [More Teeth for Jaguar: Nearly 120 of the Indian Air Force Jets Are being Modernised](#)
12. [Putin: Romney Justifies Russian Stance on U.S. Missile Shield](#)
13. [The Arms Race Gets Dirty: Russian Scientist Files Patent For New Biological Weapon](#)
14. [No German Pledge on Nuclear-Capable Aircraft Modernization](#)
15. [Seeking Kremlin Engagement, NATO Weighs Next Nuclear Posture Steps](#)
16. [Concerns over Review of Trident](#)
17. [U.S. Missile Defense Strategy Is Flawed, Expert Panel Finds](#)
18. [U.S. Military Overestimates Value of Offensive Cyberweapons, Expert Says](#)
19. [Libya Makes 'Arrests' in Deadly U.S. Consulate Attack](#)
20. [Al-Qaeda Link to Consulate Attack](#)
21. [China's Interest Is Guarding Its Subs](#)
22. [Report: U.S. Unable to Keep Up with CBRN Threats](#)
23. [Media: China Must Enhance Strategic Nuclear Forces](#)
24. [The Future of Conventional Prompt Global Strike](#)
25. [Nonproliferation Requires Enforcement](#)
26. [A Strong Military Doesn't Mean a Strong Nation](#)
27. [Chris Stevens Died At the Hands of Militants, Not an Offended Mob](#)

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.1024, 14 September 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.



Jerusalem Post – Israel

Clinton: US ‘Not Setting Deadlines’ for Iran

US secretary of state says world has more time for Iran sanctions, adds negotiations “by far the best approach” to nuclear program.

By BLOOMBERG

September 10, 2012

The US is “not setting deadlines” for Iran and still considers negotiations as “by far the best approach” to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said late Sunday.

While Clinton said in an interview that economic sanctions are building pressure on Iran, Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu said last week the sanctions aren’t slowing Iran’s nuclear advances “because it doesn’t see a clear red line from the international community.”

Asked if the Obama administration will lay out sharper “red lines” for Iran or state explicitly the consequences of failing to negotiate a deal with world powers by a certain date, Clinton said, “We’re not setting deadlines.”

“We’re watching very carefully about what they do, because it’s always been more about their actions than their words,” Clinton said in the interview with Bloomberg Radio after wrapping up meetings at an Asia-Pacific forum in Vladivostok, Russia.

While the US and Israel share the goal that Iran not acquire a nuclear weapon, Clinton said there is a difference in perspective over the time horizon for talks.

“They’re more anxious about a quick response because they feel that they’re right in the bull’s-eye, so to speak,” Clinton said. “But we’re convinced that we have more time to focus on these sanctions, to do everything we can to bring Iran to a good-faith negotiation.”

IAEA meeting approaching

A high-level meeting of the United Nations’ atomic agency is just days away, and US officials have said it will be an important moment to take stock of Iran’s nuclear progress and the pressure the international community should exert to halt it. The International Atomic Energy Agency reported last month that Iran raised the uranium-enrichment capacity at its underground Fordow facility and increased stockpiles of medium-enriched uranium, a step short of nuclear-bomb material.

In the past week, Clinton has been to both China and Russia, speaking with leaders of both nations to seek unity in their Iran stance. Afterward, she said China and Russia share the US’s firm view that Iran must be stopped from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Leaders from the six powers involved in negotiations with Iran are expected to attend the annual UN General Assembly in New York this month.

“It’s a very challenging effort to get them to move in a way that complies with their international obligations,” Clinton said of the Iranians. “But we believe that is still by far the best approach to take at this time.”

Every option on the table

Asked about pressure from Israel to give Iran an ultimatum to dismantle disputed aspects of its nuclear program within months, Clinton said the US has “always said every option was on the table, but we believe in the negotiation,” and are at the same time stepping up pressure from sanctions.

Asked what Israel was telling the Obama administration behind closed doors, Clinton said, “I don’t think that there’s any difference in their public and their private concerns.”



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“They feel that it would be an existential threat if Iran were a nuclear-weaponized state, and no nation can abdicate their self-defense if they feel that they’re facing such a threat,” she said.

At the same time, Clinton said Israel has supported the Obama administration’s effort to unite the international community behind the toughest sanctions ever.

“The sanctions, we know, are having an effect,” she said.

Since April, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council -- the US, the UK, France, China and Russia - plus Germany, have engaged in three rounds of diplomacy with Iran. Even with pressure from an array of new US and EU sanctions on energy, trade, banking and shipping, the talks have failed so far to persuade Iran to suspend aspects of its nuclear program.

Oil Exports

Iran losing billions

Clinton has said that Iran, which depends on oil for more than half of its government revenue, is losing billions of dollars from lost oil sales due to sanctions.

Iranian oil exports dropped 66 percent in July from a year earlier, to less than 1 million barrels a day, as the US and the European Union tightened sanctions, according to a report by Rhodium Group, citing customs data. Rhodium estimates exports at about 940,000 barrels a day, compared with 1.7 million barrels a day in June and 2.8 million in July 2011, the New York-based economic research group said Sept. 5 in an e-mailed report.

The chief negotiator for the six world powers negotiating with Iran, European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton, last spoke with her Iranian counterpart, Saeed Jalili, more than a month ago, and said at the time more progress was needed to close the gap before any return to talks.

Over the weekend, Ashton met with EU foreign ministers in Cyprus, and said new sanctions on Iran were under consideration.

<http://www.jpost.com/IranianThreat/News/Article.aspx?id=284485>

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

Daily Times – Pakistan

Tuesday, September 11, 2012

‘Frustrated’ IAEA Wants Immediate Access to Iran Site

** West seeks to step up pressure on Iran at IAEA board meeting*

** Iran says Canada is ‘extremist government’*

VIENNA: The head of the UN nuclear watchdog pressed Iran on Monday to grant his inspectors immediate access to the Parchin military site, where they believe Tehran may have conducted explosives tests relevant to the development of nuclear weapons.

Yukiya Amano, director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, also said it was “frustrating” that the IAEA and Iran had made no concrete progress in talks that began in January aimed at allaying concern about suspected atom bomb research. Western powers may seize on his statement to a closed-door session of the IAEA’s 35-nation governing board to strengthen their case for further international pressure on Tehran, one of the world’s largest oil producers.

Amano made his comments one day after Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said that Israel and the United States were in discussions on setting a “red line” for Iran’s nuclear work, which Tehran says is entirely peaceful. Israel, believed to be the only nuclear-armed state in the Middle East, sees the possibility of Iran developing an atomic bomb as a threat to its existence and has said it may use military means if diplomacy and sanctions fail. European Union heavyweights Britain, France and Germany called last week for new sanctions and Canada has unexpectedly severed

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



ties with Iran. "Without Iran's full engagement, we will not be able to start the process to resolve all outstanding issues, including those concerning possible military dimensions to its nuclear programme," Amano said, according to a copy of his speech.

Iran's envoy to the IAEA, Ali Asghar Soltanieh, told reporters that Tehran would "continue" to cooperate with the UN agency but that its national security must be taken into consideration. He said discussions were under way this week about the possibility of having another meeting with the IAEA. The UN agency was not immediately available for comment. Iran says its nuclear programme is aimed at producing electricity, not making nuclear bombs. At the week-long IAEA board meeting, the United States and its Western allies want to isolate Iran further by adopting a resolution rebuking it for stonewalling the IAEA's investigation into its nuclear activities. But it is unclear whether China and Russia - who are also part of a group of six world powers trying to find a diplomatic solution to the long-running dispute - would agree to such a move, diplomats say. Beijing and Moscow have criticised unilateral Western steps to punish Iran.

Russia last week starkly warned Israel and the United States against attacking Iran and said it saw no evidence that Tehran's nuclear programme was aimed at developing weapons. In contrast, the IAEA has voiced mounting concern that Iran may be conducting research and development relevant to the assembly of a nuclear warhead. "Iran is not providing the necessary cooperation to enable us to conclude that all nuclear material in Iran is in peaceful activities," Amano told the IAEA board.

He said "activities" that had taken place at the Parchin facility - a reference to suspected clean-up work there - would have an "adverse impact" on the IAEA's investigation, if and when it was allowed to go there. Iran has so far refused access. Western diplomats citing satellite images as evidence that Iran has for several months carried out apparent "sanitisation" work at Parchin to remove any evidence of illicit activity. Iran told the agency in a letter last month that the allegation of nuclear-linked work at Parchin, located southeast of the capital Tehran, was "baseless", Amano said. "However, the activities observed further strengthen our assessment that it is necessary to have access to the location at Parchin without further delay in order to obtain the required clarifications," he said.

http://www.dailytimes.com.pk/default.asp?page=2012%5C09%5C11%5Cstory_11-9-2012_pg14_1

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

FARS News Agency – Iran
September 11, 2012

Speaker Underscores Iran's Strong Opposition to N. Weapons

TEHRAN (FNA) - Iranian Parliament Speaker Ali Larijani reiterated Tehran's steadfast opposition to the acquisition and possession of nuclear arms, but at the same time stressed Iran's right to access peaceful nuclear energy.

"Based on the religious teachings and the Supreme Leader's Fatwa (religious decree) which has banned nuclear arms and Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), the Islamic Republic of Iran has not sought and will not seek the production and proliferation of such weapons," Larijani said, speaking in a meeting with Chairman of China's Standing Committee of the National People's Congress Wu Bangguo here in Tehran on Monday.

He stressed Iran's inalienable right to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, and added, "The Islamic Republic of Iran, as one of the founders of a nuclear-free Middle-East, believes that like other member states of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Iran's access to peaceful and knowledge-based nuclear technology is its inalienable right."

Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamenei issued a fatwa on April 17, 2010 declaring that the production, stockpiling, and use of nuclear weapons are all haram (religiously prohibited).

"Iran is not after a nuclear bomb. Why would Iran want a nuclear bomb? Moreover, when an atomic bomb is detonated, it does not just kill enemies. Rather, it kills innocent people as well, and this goes against Islamic beliefs and the principles of the Islamic Republic of Iran. An atomic bomb does not discriminate between good and bad people,



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

and it is not something that the Islamic Republic would use. The Islamic Republic is relying on something that is not affected by bombs, foreign invasions and other such things. Such things only strengthen what the Islamic republic is relying on. The Islamic republic is relying on the people," a part of the fatwa said.

Analysts believe that the fatwa of the Leader of the Islamic Revolution can well serve as a beacon of light for Washington in order to find its way out of darkness and ignorance.

The fatwa issued by the Supreme Leader forbidding the production, proliferation and use of nuclear bombs is to be considered a political milestone in Iranian history and one which can salvage the Islamic nation from the spate of external threats and plots.

Fatwa is a religious decree issued by a Muslim leader against a specific issue and it is incumbent upon all Muslims to abide by it. However, in this particular case, the issuance of the fatwa has not only religious but political force as well as the leader in the Islamic Republic is the prime decision-maker.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=9106062906>

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

Denver Post

AP Exclusive: New Intelligence on Iran Nuke Work

By GEORGE JAHN, Associated Press

September 11, 2012

VIENNA—The U.N. atomic agency has received new and significant intelligence over the past month that Iran has moved further toward the ability to build a nuclear weapon, diplomats tell The Associated Press.

They say the intelligence shows that Iran has advanced its work on calculating the destructive power of an atomic warhead through a series of computer models that it ran sometime within the past three years.

The diplomats say the information comes from Israel, the United States and at least two other Western countries and concludes that the work was done sometime within the past three years. The time-frame is significant because if the International Atomic Energy Agency decides that the intelligence is credible, it would strengthen its concerns that Iran has continued weapons work into the recent past—and may be continuing to do so.

Because computer modeling work is normally accompanied by physical tests of the components that go into a nuclear weapons, it would also buttress IAEA fears outlined in November that Tehran is advancing its weapons research on multiple fronts.

"You want to have a theoretical understanding of the working of a nuclear weapon that is then related to the experiments you do on the various components," said David Albright, whose Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security is a frequent go-to source on Iran for Congress and other U.S. government branches. "The two go hand-in-hand."

Such computer mock-ups typically assess how high explosives compress fissile warhead material, setting off the chain reaction that results in a nuclear explosion. The yield is normally calculated in kilotons.

Any new evidence of Iranian research into nuclear weapons is likely to strengthen the hand of hawks in Israel who advocate a military strike on Iran. They argue that Tehran is deliberately stalemating international efforts at engagement while continuing its clandestine weapons work.

Iran denies any interest in nuclear weapons and says suspicions that it ever tried to develop them are based on fabricated U.S, Israeli and other intelligence. At the same time, it has blunted IAEA efforts to investigate such claims for more than five years.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



It also has scoffed at Western allegations that it is enriching uranium to make the core of nuclear warheads, saying it seeks only to create reactor fuel. But it refuses to accept offers of such fuel from abroad and is now producing material that is easier to turn into weapons-grade uranium than its main, lower-enriched stockpile.

The revelations come as Israeli officials are expressing growing alarm over what they see as continuing Iranian progress toward nuclear arms.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu engaged this week in a strident public exchange with the U.S. administration, calling on Sunday for "red lines" to be set for Iran. The calls were rebuffed, and on Tuesday, Netanyahu declared that "those in the international community who refuse to draw a red line on Iran don't have a moral right to place a red light before Israel."

Netanyahu said that sanctions were hurting Iran's economy but not nearly enough to compel it to stop the nuclear program, and said negotiations by the international community with Iran on the issue had failed.

Israel's position is that airtight sanctions are needed against Iran's central bank and oil exports. Because Asian nations in particular keep buying Iranian oil the country remains a top OPEC oil exporter, even though there are signs that its revenues are down and, with the currency plummeting, standards of living in Iran have fallen.

The comments from Netanyahu were the latest suggestion that Israel is considering taking military action on its own to at least slow down Iran's program. That prospect could badly rattle world markets and spark wider war, and is opposed not only in most Western capitals but also among many in Israel's security and political establishment. But Israeli officials have said that with Iran moving facilities underground its window of opportunity is closing while the world dithers with an inadequate sanctions regime.

Although some of the new information was said to have been supplied by the United States, it appears to run counter to the stated U.S. position that Iran shut down wide-ranging secret research and development of the components of a nuclear weapons program in 2003. At the same time the U.S. fears that Iran continues to move toward the threshold of making such arms by enriching uranium.

Ali Asghar Soltanieh, Iran's chief IAEA delegate, cut short a telephone request for comment, saying he could not talk because he was in a meeting. In Tehran, meanwhile, Foreign Ministry spokesman Rahmin Mehmanparast told reporters that Iran will start answering the agency's "questions and concerns" only when "our rights and security issues" are recognized.

IAEA spokeswoman Gill Tudor said the agency would not comment. But four of six diplomats who spoke to the AP on the issue said an oblique passage in the IAEA's August Iran report saying "the agency has obtained more information which further corroborates" its suspicions alludes to the new intelligence.

All six demanded anonymity because they were not authorized to discuss classified information member countries make available to the IAEA.

Two of them said the new information builds on what the agency previously knew, not only because the research was apparently performed past 2009 but also because it reflects that Iran has allegedly moved closer to the overall ability to develop a nuclear weapon.

The IAEA first outlined suspicions in November that Iran was working on calculating the yield of a nuclear weapon, as part of a 13-page summary of Iran's suspected nuclear weapons work that it said was based on more than 1,000 pages of research and intelligence from more than 10 member nations.

It said then that "the modeling studies alleged to have been conducted in 2008 and 2009 by Iran ... (are) of particular concern," adding that the purpose of such studies for calculating anything other than nuclear explosion yields is "unclear to the agency."

Albright, of the Institute for Science and International Security, said such computer-run modeling is "critical to the development of a nuclear weapon."

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



Associated Press writers Dan Perry in Jerusalem and Nasser Karimi in Tehran contributed.

http://www.denverpost.com/nationworld/ci_21514924/ap-exclusive-new-intelligence-iran-nuke-work

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

The Hindu – India
September 13, 2012

'Iran Currently Not on the Verge of Developing Nukes'

Press Trust of India (PTI)

WASHINGTON: Iran is not currently on the verge of developing a nuclear weapon, the White House has said noting that the US would know if they were to make a move to developing such a weapon.

“We know that they are not currently on the verge of developing a nuclear weapon. We would know if they were to make a so-called breakout move towards developing such a weapon,” the White House Press Secretary, Jay Carney, told reporters travelling with the US President, Barack Obama, on Air Force One from Washington to Las Vegas, Nevada on Wednesday .

Mr Obama, Mr Carney said, has also made clear that there is time and space to pursue a diplomatic resolution to this problem through sanctions and other means, as well as diplomacy, to pressure the Iranian regime into forsaking its nuclear weapons ambitions.

“We have the capacity to monitor the Iranian nuclear program. And we know that they are not currently on the verge of developing a nuclear weapon. We would know if they were to make a so-called breakout move towards developing such a weapon,” Mr Carney said.

At the same time, the US President has made clear that the window of opportunity to resolve this diplomatically will not remain open indefinitely, he said.

“Our efforts to sanction Iran punitively, to isolate Iran, to make the regime pay a high price for its obstinacy continue. The President and the Prime Minister are in total agreement on the policy objective here,” he said.

Responding to questions, Mr Carney said Israel, as a sovereign nation, has a right to defend itself.

“The President of the United States is committed to Israel’s security. We have an unprecedented deep and broad relationship with Israel under this administration when it comes to military and intelligence matters. We have provided unprecedented levels of assistance to Israel in the effort to achieve security for Israel, and we will continue to do that,” he said.

Mr Carney reiterated that there will be no meeting between Mr Obama and the Israeli Prime Minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, in New York later this month, mainly because of scheduling conflict.

“The President will be in New York at the United Nations General Assembly early in that week; the Prime Minister does not arrive until later in that week. There was not logistically an opportunity for the two leaders to meet in New York. A meeting was never requested in Washington, therefore it could not have been denied,” he said.

“I think it is important to note, within the context of this discussion in the press, that it is proof of the incredibly close and vital relationship between our two nations and between our two governments that when this issue arose, the President of the United States picked up the phone and called Prime Minister Netanyahu and spoke to him for an hour,” he said.

“That demonstrates the kind of relationship we have, and it reinforces something that I think sometimes is forgotten, which is there is no leader with whom President Obama has met and spoken with more frequently as President than Prime Minister Netanyahu,” he said.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



"And that, again, is reflective of the kind of relationship we have with Israel," Mr Carney said.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/article3892332.ece>

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

Korea Times – South Korea
September 11, 2012

2.7 Tril. Won Set Aside to Counter North's Nuclear, Artillery Threats

The defense ministry will spend 2.7 trillion won (\$2.3 billion) over the next five years to secure tactical weapons to counter threats of North Korea's nuclear and artillery attacks, the state-run procurement agency said Tuesday.

The Defense Acquisition and Procurement Agency (DAPA) held a meeting presided over by Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin and approved the 61.4 trillion won budget for the 2013-2017 defense plan that mainly called for bolstering the nation's missile system, officials said. It submitted an earlier version in April.

The revised version centers on increasing spending on two types of indigenously developed ballistic missiles, the Hyunmoo-2A with a range of 300 kilometers and the Hyunmoo-2B with a range of 500 kilometers, for the Army's missile defense command, the DAPA said in a statement.

The ballistic missiles have been developed to extend the reach and offensive capability of Korea to balance the large number of ballistic missiles deployed by the North.

Pyongyang unsuccessfully tried to launch a rocket in April, which was seen as a long-range missile test in disguise. The international community remains concerned about North Korea's development of ballistic missiles, especially those that can carry nuclear bombs.

In Tuesday's meeting, the DAPA said it gave a briefing on the current status of South Korea's fighter jet program to pick one of the three fighter jets -- Lockheed Martin's F-35A, EADS's Eurofighter Typhoon and Boeing's F-15 Silent Eagle.

With overseas flight tests under way, the DAPA is currently having a second round of negotiations regarding price, technology transfer and set-off programs, DAPA spokesman Baek Yoon-hyun said in a briefing.

"It seems that the flight evaluations will be completed by the end of October as announced earlier this year," Baek said. "But we plan to take our time until we fulfill our goal."

His remarks came as many have questioned whether the government can meet its original October timetable to pick one of the three bidders for the project worth upward of 8.3 trillion won to replace the South Korean Air Force's aging fleets. (Yonhap)

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/09/205_119688.html

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

Global Times – China

S.Korea, US Troops Practice Occupying N.Korea: Report

September 11, 2012

By Agencies

South Korean troops practiced a war scenario involving the occupation and stabilization of North Korea during a joint military drill with the US last month, a report said Tuesday.

The two allies, who staged a similar stabilization exercise in 2010, upgraded it to strengthen the role of the South Korean army in the event of an "emergency situation in the North," Dong-A Ilbo newspaper said.



It cited an unnamed senior government official, who said the manoeuvre, called Wind of Freedom, involved humanitarian assistance for North Koreans after occupying the Communist state and restoring administrative services.

The exercise was part of the annual Ulchi Freedom Guardian drill held from August 20-31 and involving tens of thousands of both South Korean and US troops.

The North has habitually condemned the drill as a provocative prelude to war.

"The practice... for the first time let the South Korean military lead overall operations to potentially stabilize the North, with the back-up by the US," said a military source quoted by Dong-A.

The two nations will stage a similar drill during an annual Key Resolve joint drill to be held early next year, the newspaper added.

Seoul's defense ministry spokesman declined to comment, saying details of military drills were confidential.

In 2010, Walter Sharp, the then commander of the 28,500 US troops stationed in the South, said the two allies needed to hold "realistic exercises" for "anything that could happen in Korea" including stability operations.

<http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/732618.shtml>

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

Korea Times – South Korea
September 12, 2012

Korea, US Near Deal on Ballistic Missile Range: Source

WASHINGTON (Yonhap) -- Korea and the United States have almost completed their talks on Seoul's push for expanding its ballistic missile range, an informed source here said Tuesday.

"Related negotiations on the range issue itself are almost done," the source told Yonhap News Agency, requesting anonymity. "The two sides are in consultations over additional matters such as cooperation on missile defense."

The source said Seoul and Washington are also seeking the best timing to announce the results of their sensitive missile talks.

Korea is banned from developing ballistic missiles with a range of more than 300 kilometers (186 miles) and a payload heavier than 500 kg (1,102 pounds) under a 2001 deal with the U.S.

Seoul has been seeking to extend the range of its missiles to at least 800 kilometers in order to cover all of North Korea, which is armed with missiles of various ranges.

In its final months in power, South Korea's Lee Myung-bak administration apparently believes that a deal on longer-range missiles will be one of its key diplomatic and political achievements to help broaden support from the ruling camp's conservative base.

The U.S. has been tepid, however, citing concerns over a negative impact on its nonproliferation efforts.

China is also keeping a wary eye on South Korea's drive.

Nonetheless, it appears difficult for the U.S. to ignore its Asian ally's continued request.

The source refused to specify the newly agreed range of South Korea's ballistic missiles.

The White House also said it has "no information to provide."

Another source said the U.S. is expected to allow South Korea to develop ballistic missiles with a range up to around 550 km and instead expand comprehensive deterrence against North Korea's missile threats.



U.S. officials have emphasized the importance of partnerships with South Korea and other allies in regional missile defense networks.

"We are also continuing to discuss BMD bilaterally with the Republic of Korea," Frank A. Rose, deputy assistant secretary of state at the Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance, said in Berlin, Germany, said earlier this week, using the official name for South Korea.

BMD stands for ballistic missile defense.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/09/205_119714.html

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

September 13, 2012

Former USFK Commander Warns against North's Nuclear and Missile Threats

By Kim Eun-jung

SEOUL, Sept. 13 (Yonhap) -- North Korea's Kim Jong-un may carry out a nuclear or missile test to bolster his leadership at home and abroad, a former chief of U.S. Forces Korea said Thursday, calling on Seoul to beef up its missile defense system to counter growing threats from the belligerent North.

"(Kim) has made clear that he will continue to develop nuclear weapons capabilities and increase even more, and continue to develop ballistic missiles," Walter Sharp said at an interview with Yonhap News Agency during his visit to Seoul at the invitation of the Korea Retired Generals and Admirals Association. "If you look at history, especially in the last four or five years, the indication would be that there's probably more coming."

Sharp, who served as the Combined Forces Command chief from 2008-2011, urged the young leader to take a different path from his father, Kim Jong-il, to become a member of the international community, saying the communist state has not made substantive changes despite signs of economic reforms to develop the moribund economy and raise living standards.

The retired general, who now consults for several think tanks in Washington D.C., said the need to strengthen Seoul's missile capability took on new urgency after Pyongyang's latest long-range rocket launch in April, though it failed.

"He (Kim) has continued to advocate the military first policy. Considering the rhetoric that has come out from North Korea, military threats have been very strong since he's been the leader of North Korea," the 60-year-old said. "I think South Korea is moving in the right direction of increasing missile capability. I think it should be continued and be increased even more.

Following the North's rocket launch, Seoul's defense ministry has revised a mid-term budget plan to spend 2.7 trillion won (US\$2.3 billion) on buying hundreds of home-built ballistic missiles and other weapons in the next five years to target North Korea's nuclear weapons facilities and missile bases.

The U.S. stations 28,500 troops in South Korea, and guarantees a nuclear "umbrella" in case of any atomic attack. In return, Seoul maintains a 300-kilometer and 500-kilogram limit on its missile capabilities under a guideline.

With growing consensus to expand the range, talks have been underway between Seoul and Washington to increase the missile range and payload.

When asked how the missile guideline should be revised, Sharp refused to go into detail, saying "a holistic perspective" approach should be taken considering South Korea's military, diplomatic and economic relations with other countries.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Regarding conservative groups' call for the delay of Seoul's plan to retake wartime operational control of its troops in 2015, Sharp said the issue should be discussed by the next government of the two nations to make it less swayed by politics.

"I know there are many groups that are calling for this (operational control transition) not to happen in 2015," Sharp said. "My thought is that this ought to be a point of discussion very early in the next president of Korea and the next United States president's term of office."

South Korean President Lee Myung-bak's single five-year term ends in February next year, while U.S. President Barack Obama is running in the November race for another four years in office.

Under a 2007 deal, Seoul had been scheduled to take over wartime control of its armed forces from Washington in 2012, but the two sides agreed to delay the transfer by three years after the North's sinking of a South Korean warship in March 2010.

The U.S. has held wartime command of South Korean troops since the beginning of the 1950-53 Korean War, which ended in an armistice, not a peace treaty. Seoul regained peacetime control of its military in 1994.

"Very often, it has been politicized. I think it's not the right way," he said. "I think discussing it in the early term will not make it political because it will be far away from an election."

Sharp tried to dispel worries among South Koreans that the U.S. will "abandon" Korea upon the transition of the wartime operational control, saying U.S. troops will continue to fulfill the obligation to maintain peace in the region.

"It is staying in the foreseeable future. The thought that the U.S. will leave without transition: the thought is wrong," he said. "I'm very confident that the U.S. will live up to those obligations, now or in the future, regardless of the situation."

Touching on the U.S.'s growing emphasis on the Asia-Pacific region, he expressed concern over the growing territorial disputes that could dampen military, diplomatic and economic relations between the major Asian nations, including Japan and China.

"The U.S. has been very clear on the fact that territorial issues need to be resolved without gunfire," he said. "They need to be resolved peacefully by people coming to the table and working together diplomatically."

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2012/09/13/95/0301000000AEN20120913001500315F.HTML>

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

Hindustan Times – India

China Multiplies Its War Toys, India Plays Catch-Up

By Rahul Singh, Hindustan Times
New Delhi, September 08, 2012

In 2009, the Indian Army carried out top-secret war games — codenamed Divine Matrix — aimed at analysing China's threat to the country. The conclusion: China could attack India by 2017, and there was a possibility of Pakistan stirring the pot by trying to trouble India at the same time.

Three years later, while there are no immediate signs of hostility on either border, a rare visit by China's defence minister to India last week has thrown into focus the latter's military capabilities to defend itself in a volatile neighbourhood, where India has fought five wars since Independence.

While Beijing hailed General Liang Guanglie's visit to India — the first by a Chinese defence minister in eight years — as "successful", our military experts have cautioned against taking the eyes off the ball on the security implications of China's rapidly modernising military.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



Pakistan, they say, is not even seeded in the game. “We have adequate deterrence against Pakistan, but the policy of dissuasion against China needs to be upgraded to credible deterrence so that Beijing can’t spring a surprise. We are not quite there yet,” says strategic affairs expert Brig Gurmeet Kanwal (retd).

STOCKING UP

With its defence outlay for 2012 officially pegged at \$106.41 billion (Rs. 5.85 lakh crore), but actual military spending suspected to be twice as much, China is buffing up its war stores with strategic missiles, space-based assets, aircraft carriers, fighter jets and warships.

China’s focus has shifted from land forces to air force and navy to expand its military reach.

India’s defence outlay of \$35.09 billion (Rs. 1.93 lakh crore) pales before China’s military spending. Islamabad, meanwhile, will spend \$6 billion (Rs. 33,000 crore) on defence this year, not factoring in American aid.

India hasn’t ignored the possibility of a two-front war at a time when Beijing’s strategic intentions remain unclear.

Defence minister AK Antony told Parliament in May that his ministry would seek an additional outlay of \$8.18 billion (Rs. 45,000 crore) from the Centre, factoring in “changed threat perception”, a euphemism for the possibility of China and Pakistan coming together.

If such a scenario were to crop up, the Indian strategy would revolve around defeating Pakistan and holding China, experts said.

The proposed increase will take India’s defence expenditure from 1.9% of the GDP to 2.35%. The country’s defence spending averaged 1.59% of the GDP from 1947 to 1962, when our army suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the Chinese.

Experts have argued India’s defence spending ought to be around 3% of the GDP to keep up with China’s military build-up.

NEED FOR SPEED

New Delhi is pumping billions into fighting machines such as stealth jets, modern fighter, aircraft carriers, nuclear-powered submarines, submarine hunter planes, special operations aircraft and attack helicopters. But the pace of induction needs to be sped up.

Former IAF chief Air Chief Marshal Fali Major says, “One-party autocracy is the secret behind China’s swift military upgrade. Democracies will have their delays.”

STRENGTH IN NUMBERS

China is hard to beat in terms of sheer numbers. The People’s Liberation Army Air Force (PLAAF) reportedly operates upwards of 3,500 aircraft, though much of the inventory consists of outdated designs. In comparison, the IAF has a fleet of 600-plus fighters.

But the PLAAF is fast ridding itself of obsolete platforms from the 1960s and inducting fighters such as Sukhoi-30s and JF-17 Thunder light combat aircraft.

“China may be upgrading rapidly but let’s not place it on a huge pedestal. The IAF can hold its own in a head-to-head comparison,” says Major.

The People’s Liberation Army Navy (PLAN), too, is numerically superior to the Indian Navy. Compared to our 135 warships, the Chinese fleet has close to 400 vessels, but the PLAN lacks robust blue-water capabilities to deploy forces far away from its shores.

EXPANDING FOOTPRINT

China is aggressively working on expanding its footprint in the Indian Ocean region, which the Indian Navy regards as its own backyard. The PLAN’s first aircraft carrier Varyag — bought from Russia in 1998 — is currently undergoing sea trials.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

China eventually wants to deploy four to five carriers, an ambition that symbolises its growing maritime appetite.

Former navy chief Admiral Sureesh Mehta says, "We currently have an edge but the equation may change in a decade when the PLAN stabilises its integral air elements. They have also made significant advances in building new destroyers. We can't afford to fall behind in fleet modernisation."

There are other flanks that need to be covered as well. The army has not bought a single new artillery gun since the Bofors scandal exploded in the late 1980s. The \$4 billion (Rs. 22,000 crore) artillery modernisation plan has failed to take off.

Kanwal warns: "Firepower is a serious handicap. Also, we don't have a mountain strike corps, limiting our capability to take the war deep into Chinese territory."

<http://www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/NewDelhi/As-Dragon-multiplies-its-war-toys-India-plays-catch-up/Article1-926844.aspx>

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

Daily Mail – U.K.

More Teeth for Jaguar: Nearly 120 of the Indian Air Force Jets Are being Modernised

By Gautam Datt

September 9, 2012

The Indian Air Force (IAF) has lit the afterburners to make its Jaguars fighting fit for modern warfare and increase their service life.

The Jaguars, the only aircraft with the IAF capable of carrying nuclear weapons other than the Mirage-2000s, are being fitted with autopilots, next generation avionics and lethal armaments under an ambitious modernisation programme that will see the fighters flying well after 2030.

Nearly 120 Jaguars are being modernised. So far, the IAF has procured autopilots for 55 Jaguars and talks for 95 more, which includes spare autopilots, are underway, according to information shared by the government in Parliament.

The upgradation of the Ambala-based fighter jets, in service for more than four decades, is being carried out by the Hindustan Aeronautics Limited (HAL) at a cost of more than Rs 3,000 crore.

Autopilots would lessen pilot workload, freeing them from physically flying the jet during long flights though, in an ultimate test of IAF top guns, six Jaguars flew all the way to Alaska for a joint exercise with the US Air Force in 2004.

The government is also reviving a plan to re-engine the aircraft with a more powerful powerplant. The IAF feels the Jaguars, powered by Rolls Royce Adour-811 turbofan engines, are underpowered, and wants a more powerful engine for the fighters.

But its hunt for a new power-plant has not been easy. In 2010, its bid for more than 250 turbofans for the Jaguars could not take off as one of the contenders - Rolls Royce, which offered its upgraded Adour MK-821 engine - backed out leaving only Honeywell's F124IN engine in the fray.

The Indian government prefers to avoid single-vendor bids in military acquisitions.

The Jaguar's cockpit is going to completely transform. It's going to turn all glass. There will be digital MFDs (multifunction displays) replacing the traditional analog gauges and dials, and pilots will have fly-by-wire controls.

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/indiahome/indianews/article-2200832/More-teeth-jaguar-Nearly-120-Indian-Air-Force-jets-modernised.html?ito=feeds-newsxml>

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Putin: Romney Justifies Russian Stance on U.S. Missile Shield

11 September 2012

U.S. presidential candidate Mitt Romney's recent criticism of Russia justifies Moscow's approach toward the mooted American missile shield in Europe, Russian President Vladimir Putin said on Tuesday.

Two weeks ago Romney accused incumbent President Barack Obama of being a weak negotiator and caving into Russian pressure by "walking away" from plans to build a missile defense system in Eastern Europe. Earlier in the year he called Russia the "number one geopolitical foe" for the United States.

"He [Romney] has once again confirmed the rectitude of our [Russian] approach to the issue of missile defense...He enhanced our negotiating positions on this sensitive and important issue," Putin said.

Putin also said that the fact that Romney considers Russia an enemy "is a minus," but he is grateful to Romney for his "frankness."

"I am grateful that he forms his position so freely," Putin said, adding that he is ready to work with Romney in case the latter wins this year's presidential election.

Negotiations between Russia and the United States on the missile defense project have stalled over Washington's reluctance to give Moscow legally-binding guarantees that the shield will not be used against it.

Washington and NATO say they need the shield to counter the threat of missile attacks from Iran. Russia says the project could pose a threat to its national security and has threatened a host of countermeasures.

SOCHI, September 11 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20120911/175905891.html>

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

Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty – Czech Republic

September 13, 2012

The Arms Race Gets Dirty: Russian Scientist Files Patent For New Biological Weapon

Just a few short months after U.S. President Barack Obama indicated a willingness to negotiate with Russia on making further cuts to the two countries' respective nuclear arsenals, it now seems that Moscow could be well placed to open up a new front in the arms race.

That's because St. Petersburg scientist Aleksandr Semenov has reportedly filed a patent for a terrifying new "biological" weapon that could strike fear into the heart of any enemy.

According to the plans he submitted for review in Russia, Semenov wants to design a tank shell whose explosive payload would also include the solid waste produced by the armored vehicle's crew. (As the above diagram clearly illustrates, crew members would simply deposit the waste into a shell compartment directly, before sealing it and firing it at the enemy.)

Semenov appears convinced that the weapon could signify a major advance in the history of conventional warfare.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



"Nuclear weapons are history," the Czech news website Aktualne.cz quotes him as saying. "They are absolute and destroy everything around them. The same applies to bacteriological and chemical weapons. We are proposing alternative armaments, which are not lethal. They are humane and they do not breach any UN conventions."

According to Marc Abrahams, who received an English translation of the patent documentation and wrote about it in "The Guardian," this innovative new weapons system would be ideal for use under battle conditions, where tank crews often spend long periods trapped in the confined space of their armored vehicles.

Not only would it have a "psychological positive effect" on the tank crew by sparing them from having to endure the stench of their own feces, it would undoubtedly have "additional military-psychological and military-political effects" on any combatant who was unfortunate enough to be in the line of fire.

The use of such missiles may also conceivably put a damper on the much-vaunted use of "shock-and-awe" tactics in modern warfare, as any combatant who tried to use them to scare the s**t out of their enemy could find such an approach counterproductive.

<http://www.rferl.org/content/new-weapon-tank-firing-feces-biological-weapon-russia-patent/24707767.html>

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

Arms Control Now – Washington, D.C.

No German Pledge on Nuclear-Capable Aircraft Modernization

Posted on September 12, 2012 by Daryl G. Kimball

By Oliver Meier

On September 5 the *Berliner Zeitung* reported that at the May 2012 NATO summit Germany had silently reneged on its goal to advocate withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from Germany and committed to spend 250 million Euro to keep nuclear-capable Tornado flying until at least 2024.

The report caused a stir of media reports and reactions in the German press and allegations that Berlin had "reversed its previous pledge to remove U.S. bombs from German soil."

In fact, Germany has not committed to aircraft modernization. Officials interviewed by *Arms Control Now* argued that there is no official estimate of the costs of keeping the Tornado in service beyond 2020 and that therefore no such contribution could be pledged.

A senior NATO official speaking on Sept. 10 with *Arms Control Now* dismissed the numbers contained in the *Berliner Zeitung* as "nonsense." He said that "only the text of the DDRR report was discussed at the summit", referring to the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review report. Further details, such as the Tornado's retirement date or life-extension costs, were not on the table in Chicago, he said.

A senior German official confirmed that at the Chicago summit Berlin made no promises on a specific date until which German dual-capable aircraft would be kept in service and that the government did not commit to spending a specific amount on keeping the Tornado flying. "On these particular issues the German government entered no new commitments beyond those contained in the DDRR report," the official said.

While the government in Chicago has agreed to "ensure that all components of NATO's nuclear deterrent remain safe, secure, and effective for as long as NATO remains a nuclear alliance," it thus has yet to take hard decisions to keep Germany in the nuclear business and will have to explain this policy to a German public that is largely anti-nuclear.

It is believed that the United States still deploys 180-200 tactical nuclear weapons in Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey. Büchel airbase in Germany probably hosts 10-20 of these weapons. Under nuclear sharing arrangements, some of the B61 free-fall bombs deployed in Europe would be delivered by host nation aircraft in times of war.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The German government repeatedly stated that it intends to keep nuclear-capable *Tornado* aircraft in service at least until 2020 but has so far refused to give a specific date when the planes will be phased out. The successor aircraft *Eurofighter* is not nuclear-capable and the government has stated that it “has not examined the suitability of the *Eurofighter/Typhoon* as a nuclear weapons delivery system.”

The German Foreign Office reacted to the news reports by stating that government and the Foreign Minister “continue to work towards a reduction and withdrawal of substrategic weapons in Germany.”

So what happened? Apparently, the report in the *Berliner Zeitung* was based on an article by Karl Heinz-Kamp in the September issue of the German journal *Internationale Politik*. Kamp, who teaches at the NATO Defense College in Rome, argues in the *IP* that it would cost Germany, well, 250 million Euro to keep the Tornado flying until 2024. But Kamp does not give a source for his estimate and does not repeat these numbers in the *Berliner Zeitung*, even though he is cited in the article. Kamp’s numbers were then apparently combined with claims that Germany has reversed course on its pledge to advocate withdrawal of U.S. nukes, based on the DDPF report adopted at the summit.

Thus, the *Berliner Zeitung* article does not contain any news. But the piece – and particularly the reactions to it – demonstrate three things. First, while Germany has committed itself to nuclear sharing at the Chicago summit, the difficult decisions on funding and modernization of nuclear delivery vehicles still lie ahead for the government. Without new investments, the Tornado will be unable to deliver the newer B61-12, which will replace current nuclear bombs and are expected to arrive in Europe around 2019, well before the Tornado would be retired.

Second, the government’s line that modernization of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe “is a national decision of the USA and should be regarded in isolation from the question of nuclear sharing within NATO,” will be hard to maintain. Elke Hoff, defense spokeswoman of the Liberal Party (the party of Foreign Minister Guido Westerwelle) in response to a question about the wisdom of replacing existing bombs in Europe with the more modern and more accurate B61-12, stated flatly: “We have no influence on this.”

But Gernot Erler, senior member of the German Bundestag and foreign policy expert of the opposition Social Democrats, said that modernization is a “heavy burden for future arms control talks” and that the new weapons would blur the line between tactical and strategic nuclear weapons. He promised that Social Democrats would put the issue on the agenda of Parliament this fall.

Finally, involvement in nuclear sharing is still an issue that can attract a lot of attention in Germany. Even though the *Berliner Zeitung* article contained no original news, the story was quickly picked up by all major news media in Germany. It is thus likely that the debate on the future of nuclear sharing will continue in the run-up to the September 2013 Parliamentary elections.

<http://armscontrolnow.org/2012/09/12/no-german-pledge-on-nuclear-capable-aircraft-modernization/>

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

National Journal

Seeking Kremlin Engagement, NATO Weighs Next Nuclear Posture Steps

By Elaine M. Grossman

September 13, 2012

WASHINGTON -- Defense and foreign-ministry officials from NATO’s 28 member nations are meeting in the capital of Slovakia this week to quietly explore how they will pursue nuclear deterrence policies embraced last May at an alliance summit in Chicago.

The two-day, closed-door meeting beginning on Thursday comes as alliance leaders and member nations weigh prospects for engaging Russia on sought-after reductions in its mammoth, domestic-based arsenal of nonstrategic nuclear weapons.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



To date, Moscow has shown little interest in pulling back or dismantling its tactical atomic arms, despite a widely held view that the warheads have little or no battlefield utility. Nonstrategic or tactical nuclear weapons are typically short-range arms, such as land-based missiles with ranges of less than 300 miles and air- and sea-launched weapons with ranges of less than 400 miles.

NATO this week declined to release an agenda or participant list for the Bratislava forum. Those taking part, though, are senior diplomatic, civilian, and military officials with nuclear policy responsibilities in their member-nation governments or at NATO headquarters, *Global Security Newswire* has learned.

Several alliance officials and other sources spoke on condition of not being named in this article because they were not authorized to address the matter publicly.

The annual NATO Nuclear Policy Symposium is expected to be little more than an airing of national positions about lingering concerns, as member states wrestle with a pair of competing perspectives laid out at their Chicago meeting, these sources said.

On the one hand, NATO signaled after the May summit that, for now, it would maintain the status quo in its nuclear forces, which it said combine with conventional arms and missiles defense to “meet the criteria for an effective deterrence and defense posture.”

On the other hand, the alliance professed a readiness “to consider further reducing its requirement for nonstrategic nuclear weapons assigned to the alliance.”

The allies said they would contemplate such tactical nuclear reductions “in the context of reciprocal steps by Russia.” NATO drew some barbs for this new proviso, with critics charging the organization had effectively ceded to Russia veto power over how the alliance would manage its own nuclear force levels.

Some longstanding NATO members appear ready to move toward denuclearization, while some newer alliance states do not. Several Baltic and Central European nations are arguing that U.S. nuclear forces in Europe continue to play an important role in warding off threats, and NATO’s consensus-based decision-making process has amplified their voice.

The disparity in views reflects varying levels of confidence among Eastern and Western European allies as to whether NATO conventional forces alone represent a sufficient political and military deterrent to the possibility of a resurgent Russia. Countries closest to Russia’s borders tend to sense most keenly their potential vulnerability.

If NATO takes concrete steps to reduce its reliance on tactical nuclear arms based in Europe -- a possibility the alliance said in Chicago its political body would now study -- the North Atlantic Council must grapple with how member nations would divvy up the resultant burdens for defense, said Hans Kristensen, who directs the Federation of American Scientists’ Nuclear Information Project.

No one is expecting that this week’s confab will come anywhere near resolving internal differences over such weighty questions. So Washington’s interest is in nudging along the discussion and, to a certain extent, allowing all sides to vent steam, a number of issue experts said.

On the sidelines of the conference, though, NATO could make some real headway on a proposed diplomatic package aimed at engaging Russia on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, according to sources.

Alliance officials appear interested in teeing up proposal specifics for approval by NATO defense ministers during their next gathering in Brussels on Oct. 9 and 10, and by foreign ministers at their next meeting slated for Dec. 4 and 5, also in the Belgian capital.

The focus is on a draft set of transparency and confidence-building measures that NATO intends to propose to Russia that could lend each side greater insight into the other’s tactical nuclear weapons posture in Europe, issue experts said this week.



For the time being, this would be in lieu of negotiations aimed at actually reducing a lopsided standoff in Europe, seen by many in the alliance as a remnant of the Cold War.

Following a number of unilateral reductions over the years, the United States today maintains nearly 200 nonstrategic nuclear-armed B-61 gravity bombs at six bases in five nations: Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey. Russia has an estimated 2,000 tactical nuclear weapons at bases within its own borders, according to independent tallies by nuclear experts Kristensen and Robert Norris.

For its part, France has resisted calls for alliance-wide tactical nuclear reductions, seeking to avoid any uptick in international pressure to cut its own national arsenal of 300 nuclear arms. In the run-up to the Chicago conference, the French government succeeded in limiting the scope of pondered alliance reductions in the organization's Deterrence and Defense Posture Review to "nuclear weapons assigned to NATO," or, in other words, U.S. nuclear arms.

As part of a bid to reduce its defense spending, the United Kingdom in June unilaterally committed to chopping 40 warheads from its nuclear stockpile, leaving it with 180 weapons, 120 of which would remain active.

The Kremlin's limited interest in tactical nuclear reductions stems largely from its reliance on atomic weapons to offset technological and numerical advantages in NATO's conventional military posture, according to officials and experts.

"Since neither side wants to reduce its nonstrategic forces because of disparity or to compensate for conventional inferiority, NATO is now limiting itself to pursuing softer issues such as transparency and confidence-building measures," Kristensen said at a recent conference in Switzerland. "These are important and worthwhile steps but they will not in and of themselves result in reductions of nonstrategic nuclear weapons."

Proposed transparency efforts might include declarations of the atomic arms that NATO and Russia have fielded on the continent, as well as possibly their storage locations, according to expert assessments.

Confidence-building steps under possible consideration could include dialogue about nuclear doctrine or perhaps even unilateral actions to relocate or dismantle some of these arms, issue specialists say.

NATO nations have decided, though, that they will not publicize their proposed list ahead of sharing it with the Kremlin, said Steven Pifer of the Brookings Institution. Rather than attempt to score political points, the intent is to discuss the list with Russian leaders in a quiet diplomatic effort to explore which, if any, specific initiatives might be feasible.

The Atlantic partners have decided they do not want to "put the Russians in a corner," but rather would pursue in good faith the potential for a new cooperative regime, Pifer said in a Tuesday interview.

On the thornier issue of negotiating reciprocal reductions to NATO and Russian nonstrategic nuclear forces, the alliance in 2010 laid the initial groundwork for its own arsenal cuts when it "cleaned out" of its "Strategic Concept" prior references to the tactical warheads as "an essential political and military link" assuring Washington's commitment to Europe's defense, Kristensen said.

NATO should not make too much of the Kremlin's rejection to date of discussing tactical nuclear arms reductions, said Pifer, citing a quip he heard recently: "The Russians are going to say no until they say yes."

Internal alliance debate continues over whether NATO should accept Moscow's desired restrictions on its missile defense plans in exchange for pullbacks or reductions in tactical atomic arms.

"I think the Russians are playing a waiting game," the former U.S. ambassador said, noting that Washington's plans for ballistic missile defenses could change significantly if Republican presidential nominee Mitt Romney wins the November election.

In casual remarks heard on a live microphone in Seoul, South Korea, President Obama last March told then-Russian President Dmitry Medvedev that he would have "more flexibility" to discuss potential missile defense options "after my election" in November. Former Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin succeeded Medvedev as president in May.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Whether any future arms control deal on missile defenses – viewed unlikely until early next year at the soonest -- might also include nonstrategic offensive weapons has yet to be determined.

Issue experts differ on whether any such grand bargain would be a good idea for the United States and its allies, even if Russia were willing.

“I do not support the U.S. modifying its missile defense plans in Europe to achieve a reduction in Russian [tactical nuclear forces] because I don’t think that gambit is worth it or that it will work,” said Frank Miller, a former Defense policy official now at the Scowcroft Group.

At the same time, he said, “it would take a political decision in Moscow that they want to take a new tack.”

Meantime, NATO is not constrained from taking whatever action it deems necessary, in Miller’s view. The alliance statement about “reciprocity” does not actually preclude the alliance from making any unilateral changes to its deployed atomic forces as it sees fit, rather than await action from Moscow, he said in an interview.

“Do the Russians really care about reciprocating? No,” Miller said. “Do the Russians really care about U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe? No.”

Miller also said the Kremlin is unlikely to be drawn into an agreement in which it would significantly cut its nonstrategic atomic weapons.

“Will Russia be magnanimous and volunteer to reduce [its] forces by 50 percent?” he asked. “No.”

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/seeking-kremlin-engagement-nato-weighs-next-nuclear-posture-steps-20120913>

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

Herald Scotland – U.K.
Friday, September 14, 2012

Concerns over Review of Trident

QUESTIONS were raised last night over the credibility of David Laws carrying out a review of the possible alternatives to Britain's Trident nuclear deterrent, given that he is a "part-time Education Minister" who is not based at the Ministry of Defence.

By MICHAEL SETTLE, UK POLITICAL EDITOR

Thomas Docherty, the Labour MP for Dunfermline and West Fife, who sits on the Commons Defence Committee, asked what access Mr Laws would have to sensitive defence information, necessary to take an informed view of the alternatives to Trident.

"Will he be a member of the National Security Committee? Does he have MoD security clearance? Will he have access to civil servant support? What access will he have to the Chief of the Defence Staff and other heads of the services?" asked the backbencher, who is to table a number of parliamentary questions.

Mr Docherty told The Herald: "For two years, the Liberal Democrats have championed this review as a serious, thoughtful and credible piece of work. Having sacked a well-regarded defence minister in Nick Harvey, this review has been handed to a part-time Education Minister.

"It raises serious questions about how much taxpayers' money will be spent on a political sop to the Liberal Democrats."

The review of alternatives to Trident is part of the Coalition Agreement and was being undertaken by LibDem Sir Nick, who, until this month's reshuffle, was the armed forces minister.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



He himself has raised concerns about whether his colleague, working out of the Education Department and the Cabinet Office, would have sufficient time to devote to the Trident review.

"He is a very able man, he has got a very empirical mind but I hope that that isn't going to suffer from having somebody not actually on the case," he said.

A LibDem party spokesman dismissed concerns over Mr Laws's ability to undertake the review, saying: "He will be able to carry out the review very effectively."

Mr Laws is expected to complete the review early next year.

<http://www.heraldscotland.com/politics/political-news/concerns-over-review-of-trident.18875847>

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

New York Times
September 12, 2012

U.S. Missile Defense Strategy Is Flawed, Expert Panel Finds

By WILLIAM J. BROAD
Page – A3

After two years of study, a panel of top scientists and military experts working for the National Research Council has concluded that the nation's protections against missile attack suffer from major shortcomings, leaving the United States vulnerable to certain kinds of long-range strikes.

In a report, the panel suggested that President Obama shift course and expand a system inherited from President George W. Bush, setting aside parts of an antimissile strategy he initiated in 2009. By doing so, the panel said, the nation's defenses would be better prepared to defeat the long-range missiles that the report suggests Iran may be developing.

It is the first time that the research council — an arm of the National Academy of Sciences, chartered by Congress to give scientific and technical advice to the government and considered the nation's preeminent group of scientists — has weighed in on the nation's overall plans for defeating missile attacks.

"For too long, the U.S. has been committed to expensive missile defense strategies without sufficient consideration of the costs and real utility," said L. David Montague, the panel's co-chairman and a retired president of Lockheed Martin Missiles and Space. The Pentagon must strengthen its technical analyses, he added, so it "can better evaluate new initiatives."

Mr. Montague, an engineer by training, is an independent consultant and one of the few members of the 16-person panel whose roots lie in the defense industry. The others are scientists, engineers, and weapons experts from universities, think tanks and national laboratories, including the nuclear weapons lab at Livermore, Calif.

In its highly technical, 260-page report, the panel recommends an overhaul that would make the antimissile system "far more effective," including new sensors and interceptors, as well as an additional base for interceptors in Maine or New York; existing ones are in California and Alaska.

The report calls the plan affordable, saying it could fit within current antimissile spending -- which runs about \$10 billion a year -- if the military eliminated what the panel describes as costly and unneeded systems.

The assessment is a major blow to President Obama's strategy of playing down the long-range defenses he inherited from President Bush and focusing instead on defenses in Europe against shorter-range Iranian missiles. He articulated the shift in September 2009, calling the envisioned system "stronger, smarter and swifter."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

But the report, released Tuesday, faults the results of this strategy as weak. It says the domestic defenses currently in place can probably handle crude missiles fired from North Korea but criticizes the antimissile arms as “fragile” and full of “shortcomings that limit their effectiveness against even modestly improved threats.”

The report gives Mr. Obama’s European shift conditional approval if planned advances materialize. But it recommends that the plan’s final phase -- intended to protect the United States from long-range Iranian missiles -- be scrapped in favor of the panel’s proposal for a stronger domestic system.

In short, the panel would undo part of Mr. Obama’s shift and strengthen Mr. Bush’s antimissile approach, creating more of a hybrid.

Philip E. Coyle III, a former national security official in the Obama White House and former director of weapons testing at the Pentagon, said the panel’s report revealed an antimissile proclivity for “producing and fielding hardware rather than facing up to physical realities.”

The report comes as worries rise over Iran’s nuclear program and fears that Tehran might one day decide to develop warheads for its rapidly growing fleet of missiles. Today, its missiles are short and medium range. The new report looks ahead a decade or more to what it calls the “likely development” of Iranian missiles designed to rain warheads down on the United States.

Since the 1980s, when President Ronald Reagan began the modern hunt for defenses against long-range missiles, Washington has spent more than \$200 billion devising ways to zap incoming enemy warheads that move at speeds in excess of four miles per second. Critics have long ridiculed the aim as delusional, saying that any country smart enough to make intercontinental ballistic missiles could also make simple countermeasures sure to foil any defense.

In a nod to critics, the new report identifies enemy countermeasures as the main obstacle of the domestic antimissile system, with many of its recommendations aimed at creating improved technologies to meet the challenge.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/12/science/us-missile-defense-protections-are-called-vulnerable.html>

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

National Defense Magazine
September 13, 2012

U.S. Military Overestimates Value of Offensive Cyberweapons, Expert Says

By Yasmin Tadjdeh

Efforts by the U.S. military to develop offensive cyberweapons will be futile unless better technologies are developed to identify the perpetrators of a computer network attack, experts said Sept. 13.

“In general, the notion that you can preempt a cyber-attack by using offensive methods is greatly exaggerated,” said Martin Libicki, senior management scientist at RAND Corp.

One of the biggest obstacles to fighting back after a cyber-attack is attribution, Libicki said during a cybersecurity conference at the National Press Club, in Washington, D.C.

Another concern is that there can be misinterpretation following an attack, Vincent Manzo, analyst at the National Defense University’s Center for Strategic Research said.

In order to stop cyber-attacks, better deterrents are needed, he said.

The predominantly used deterrent currently available is the judicial system, and not traditional military force, Libicki said.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 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

“We think of deterrents as traditionally being reserved for ... things that look like acts of war,” Libicki said. “Generally speaking, it would be historically unprecedented to respond to espionage with violence or the use of force.”

Military leaders have spoken about their attempts to develop offensive cyber weapons as means to deter or respond to attacks. “I tend to be skeptical about cyber deterrents,” Libicki said. “I’m not saying we should never hit back, but I would need a lot more indication that a threat to hit back would be all that useful,” Libicki said. “It does no good to threaten that if Al-Qaida takes down the American power supply that we’ll take down Al-Qaida’s power supply, because they don’t have a power supply to take down.”

With nuclear weapons, deterrence worked because countries were so horrified at the consequences, Libicki said.

“One of the reasons that nuclear deterrents worked was because we never had to make good on that threat. The consequence of being hit with a nuclear weapon were so awful to contemplate that nobody not only wanted to get hit by a nuclear weapon, but they didn’t even want to get 10 steps within getting hit with a nuclear weapon,” said Libicki.

With the technology that is currently available, the U.S. government’s ability to offensively thwart an attack needs work, he said.

Lt. Gen. Michael Basla, vice commander of Air Force Space Command, said at the Cyber 1.2 conference in April that offensive cyber operations are far down a list of nine missions that the command must carry out. While he did not divulge too many details, he listed “deployable cyber-attack system” and “network attack system” as two programs the command was working on.

Libicki also cautioned that hacker attacks on U.S. critical infrastructure may not be as big a risk as government and industry prognosticators have predicted, Libicki noted.

“Something that can take down a poorly defended system in one place may have absolutely no effect on a well defended system somewhere else. It is for this reason that we can only speculate about what a cyber-attack will be,” said Libicki. “[But] it’s a real stretch to say any terrorist could take down a power plant in this country.”

<http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/blog/Lists/Posts/Post.aspx?ID=887>

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

Daily Star – Lebanon

Libya Makes 'Arrests' in Deadly U.S. Consulate Attack

September 13, 2012

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

BENGHAZI, Libya: Libya has made several arrests over an attack on the US consulate in Benghazi that killed the ambassador and three other U.S. nationals, the deputy interior minister told AFP Thursday.

"The interior and justice ministries have begun their investigations and evidence gathering and some people have been arrested," Wanis al-Sharif said.

He declined to give any details of the number of people in custody or their backgrounds "so as not to hamper the smooth running of the investigation."

Initial reports said that Ambassador Chris Stevens and the three other Americans were killed by a mob outside the consulate in Libya's second largest city late on Tuesday as they tried to flee an angry protest against a US-produced movie deemed offensive to Islam.

But it is now believed Stevens died from smoke inhalation after becoming trapped in the compound when suspected Islamic militants fired on the building with rocket-propelled grenades and set it ablaze.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



US officials are investigating the possibility that the assault was a plot by Al-Qaeda affiliates or sympathisers, using the protest against the film as a cover to carry out a coordinated revenge attack on Tuesday's anniversary of the September 11, 2001 attacks in the United States.

The finger of blame initially fell on hardline Sunni Islamists of the Salafist group Katibat Ansar al-Sharia (Brigade of the Supporters of Sharia).

But in a statement Thursday, the group condemned "the accusations without any verification or investigation" which had emerged against it in the Libyan media.

<http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Middle-East/2012/Sep-13/187755-libya-makes-arrests-in-deadly-us-consulate-attack.ashx#axzz26MzhyGj2>

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

Brisbane Times – Australia

Al-Qaeda Link to Consulate Attack

September 14, 2012

By Gopal Ratnam, Tarek El-tablawy

CAIRO: The four-hour assault on the US diplomatic mission in Benghazi may have been orchestrated by groups tied to al-Qaeda, politicians said as officials began to investigate the attack that killed the ambassador Christopher Stevens and three others.

The attack in Libya bore the hallmarks of al-Qaeda and may have been carried out by the group's North Africa affiliate to mark the anniversary of the September 11, 2011, terrorist attacks on the US, according to the Republican congressman Mike Rogers, chairman of the House Intelligence Committee.

"It certainly appears to me the significance of this date was important," Mr Rogers said.

The US President, Barack Obama, called the leaders of Egypt and Libya to request help in securing American diplomatic offices. "The President said that he rejects efforts to denigrate Islam but underscored that there is never any justification for violence against innocents," a White House statement said.

Early reports portrayed the protest in Libya as a spontaneous reaction to an anti-Islamic video posted on YouTube. The video, which ridicules the prophet Muhammad, also sparked unrest in Egypt, Yemen and Tunisia.

Protesters in Cairo set fire to two police vehicles as authorities tried to keep demonstrators away from the US embassy yesterday. The clashes have injured 14 policemen, and 24 protesters had been arrested, the Interior Ministry said yesterday.

The Egyptian President, Mohammed Mursi, vowed not to allow further attacks on foreign embassies in Cairo.

In Yemen protesters tried to storm the US embassy but were repelled by police firing warning shots and using water cannon. Witnesses said the protesters set fire to embassy vehicles and chanted anti-Jewish slogans.

The Pentagon sent 50 US Marines from Europe to Tripoli, Libya's capital, to safeguard the US embassy and help evacuate American personnel from Libya.

Standing outside the fire-gutted compound, the property's landlord, Mohammad al-Bishari, said Mr Stevens and the US State Department computer specialist Sean Smith died from inhaling smoke from a fire set by the assailants.

Mr Bishari said the attack began with assailants carrying assault rifles, rocket-propelled grenades and the black flag of Ansar al Sharia - the Partisans of Sharia - moving from two directions. "Whatever they didn't loot, they burned."

Libya's Prime Minister, Mustafa Abushagur, told Al Arabiya television his government had a plan to confront armed groups.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"This plan deals with the current challenges, including irresponsible armed groups" like the one behind the attack on the American consulate, he said. "This is unacceptable in Libya, unacceptable to the people and our values, because these people are guests in our country."

Libya's ambassador to the US, Ali Aujali, apologised to the American people and said his government would seek out those responsible for the attack.

Bloomberg, McClatchy Newspapers, Associated Press, Agence France-Presse

<http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/world/alqaeda-link-to-consulate-attack-20120913-25v7d.html>

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

Canberra Times – Australia

OPINION/Op-Ed

China's Interest Is Guarding Its Subs

September 10, 2012

By Michael Richardson

The tug-of-war over the South China Sea is seen mainly as a struggle among rival claimants - China, Taiwan and several South-East Asian states - for control of valuable fisheries as well as sea bed oil, natural gas and mineral resources.

China's claim to about 80 per cent of the 3.5 million square kilometre sea and its hundreds of atolls, rocks and reefs, has also alarmed outside seafaring and trading nations, including the United States, Australia and Japan.

They regard the South China Sea as an international maritime highway with free navigation for seaborne trade, unimpeded movement of naval vessels, and unfettered over-flight for military aircraft.

But recent developments in China's nuclear weapons program suggest there is another important dimension to China's increasing assertiveness in enforcing its claimed jurisdiction in the semi-enclosed sea: protecting a new generation of nuclear-powered submarines armed with atomic warheads and based at Sanya on China's Hainan Island.

Okazaki Institute in Tokyo special research fellow Tetsuo Kotani says, "Without understanding the nuclear dimension of the South China Sea disputes, China's maritime expansion makes little sense."

One of the new generation subs was first spotted by a commercial satellite at Sanya in 2008. It was tied up to a pier that analysts said was China's first and so far only demagnetising facility for submarines. Demagnetisation is conducted before deployment to remove residual magnetic fields in the metal of a sub to make it harder to detect by hostile submarines, surface ships and anti-submarine aircraft.

Initially, these new generation Chinese subs and the nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles they could launch while submerged would be able to target potential adversaries in the Asia-Pacific and US bases in the region.

Eventually, with longer-range intercontinental missiles, they could cover the whole of the US from launch points in the deep waters of the South China Sea without having to venture too far from their rock shelter tunnels bored into a mountain that forms part of the Sanya naval base for China's South Sea Fleet. This would give China a more effective deterrent against nuclear attack, one that operated from under the sea in addition to land-based nuclear missiles.

In recent years, China has built up a relatively small but increasingly impressive arsenal of approximately 140 nuclear ballistic missiles either concealed in silos or mounted on special launch vehicles and moved around to different hiding places on land.

Each carries a single nuclear warhead. But earlier this month, a newspaper controlled by the ruling Chinese Communist Party reported that China was developing the capability to do what Russia and the US have the technology to do - put multiple warheads on its intercontinental ballistic missiles, each capable of hitting different targets. This could greatly increase the number of China's operational nuclear weapons and overwhelm any missile defence system.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 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

At the same time, China is building a fleet of new JIN-class nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs), known as Type-094. Two are in operation, a third is under construction and may already have been launched, and at least two more are expected to be built.

Meanwhile, China is hoping to complete testing of the JL-2 nuclear-tipped missile for the Type-094 sub, which can carry 12 of the missiles. The US Defence Department's annual report to Congress in May on China's armed forces and military strategy noted that while the JL-2 program had faced repeated delays, it "may reach initial operating capability" within the next two years, giving the Chinese Navy "its first credible sea-based nuclear" deterrent.

In addition to adding a nuclear dimension to China's interests in the South China Sea, having a sea-based nuclear deterrent may pose serious control problems for the Central Military Commission which supervises the country's nuclear arsenal. The commission and the Chinese Navy have no experience in operating SSBNs in either peacetime or during a crisis. Yet remaining submerged and out of communication for lengthy periods is essential if SSBNs are to remain undetected.

So for the foreseeable future, China's land-based nuclear missile force is expected to be the mainstay of the country's deterrent and retaliatory strike capability against the continental US or other faraway targets.

But that will be cold comfort for any regional adversary of China that might soon be targeted by a new SSBN fleet armed with nuclear ballistic missiles.

The writer is a visiting senior research fellow at the Institute of South East Asian Studies in Singapore.

<http://www.canberratimes.com.au/opinion/chinas-interest-is-guarding-its-subs-20120909-25m2b.html>

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

Foreign Policy

OPINION/The E-Ring Blog

Report: U.S. Unable to Keep Up with CBRN Threats

Posted By Kevin Baron

Monday, September 10, 2012

The U.S. cannot afford to develop defenses to all of the possible chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons being developed today, according to the results of a blue-ribbon study. More alarming, the U.S. has a "poor understanding" of its adversaries' intentions for ever using them, and an even lesser handle on how to stop them.

As a result, the National Research Council is calling on Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Chemical and Biological Defense Gerald Parker to take some "bold moves" to get his house in order.

"The U.S. simply cannot afford to deal with all threats on an individual basis, and there is no universal solution - it has to choose which problems to solve," the National Research Council said, in the findings of a study released Monday.

The panel reviewed DOD's Chemical and Biological Defense Program, which includes several defense offices and agencies, to determine what capabilities DOD possesses and how much needs to be kept alive inside the Pentagon or could be better found in the civilian world. One problem: all of those offices and agencies.

The panel found that almost all of DOD's core "science and technology needs" for the defense of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons already exist outside of the military, but argues that a culture change is needed to bridge that gap.

The military, the group argues, needs to seek out breakthroughs and promote "blue sky thinking" to partner better with private research and development. "The committee found that almost all of the capabilities can be found outside of the service laboratories."

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The NRC found it difficult to fully evaluate secretive military capabilities. But while some commercial capabilities often exceed military ones, the panel argued they also can be prohibitively expensive to move them into DOD.

For example, DOD is well-suited for using "Animal Models" (as PETA is well-aware, the military uses live animals for testing) and discovering methods of decontamination.

But the Pentagon is poor where defense or pharmaceutical industries or other government agencies excel, such as in developing the instruments to detect chemical or biological agents, or analyze how they are transported.

Additionally the missions of the many offices working under the program are "far from seamless." NRC called on Parker's office to align "all of the program elements and offices."

"Bold moves are needed to break the current stagnation that permeates the chemical and biological [science and technology] and acquisition environment. Tweaking the management or refocusing a few projects will not be sufficient."

Kevin Baron reports on the people and policies driving the Pentagon and the national security establishment in The E-Ring.

http://e-ring.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/10/report_us_unable_to_keep_up_with_cbrn_threats

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

People's Daily – China

OPINION

Media: China Must Enhance Strategic Nuclear Forces

(People's Daily Online)

September 11, 2012

Translated by People's Daily Online

According to U.S. media reports, the U.S. military has detected at least three strategic missile tests from the Second Artillery Force of the PLA within the last month. It is speculated that they are JL-2 submarine-launched ballistic missiles, Dongfeng-41 surface-to-surface multiple-warhead missiles and Dongfeng-5 multiple-warhead long-range missiles.

The U.S. side has paid special attention to the Dongfeng-41. It is said that the Dongfeng-41 can carry 10 nuclear warheads, which means it will be difficult for the U.S. missile defense system to intercept. In addition, the Chinese military had publicly announced last month that most strategic missiles of the Second Artillery Force of the PLA can be launched by vehicle-mounted launchers. It means that China's land-based nuclear weapons have a valid viability when suffering a nuclear attack and can launch a second nuclear strike.

The combination of all these pieces of information shows that China has a believable and powerful nuclear deterrent. It is the footstone for China to guarantee its national security in the complex international environment and the foundation for the United States or the West to have to show a certain-level strategic respect to China.

The society of China is busy doing the arduous, specific and complex construction of people's livelihood, and the nuclear topic has almost been forgotten by the public. Currently, it even seems to be unsuitable to talk about the nuclear power's significance to the Chinese people. However, the urgent international situation will not change because of the domestic pace of China and China must make preparations in all aspects.

China must accelerate upgrading and strengthening its nuclear deterrent and make it real and believable. China should change its past nuclear image, explore the possibility of using the nuclear deterrent to change China's strategic environment peacefully but firmly and make China a large country that no country dare provoke easily.

One year ago, the presidential candidate of the U.S. Republican Party John McCain was not aware China is a nuclear country, indicating that China's nuclear power is relatively weak and China's nuclear deterrent is not strong enough in

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

the outside world's opinion. In other words, China's nuclear power did not play an important role in the course of the U.S. society forming its attitude towards China. It is a dangerous thing and may mislead the U.S. media to pursue an unpractical tough stance against China.

As the strategic mutual suspicion between China and the United States is strengthening, the United States' anxiety on the rise of China is also rising. Therefore, it is necessary for China to upgrade its nuclear power to narrow the nuclear gap between China and the United States. In the long run, although China should not pursue a balance of nuclear powers between China and the United States, China should try hard to realize a balance of nuclear deterrents between China and the United States. It means that although the number of China's nuclear weapons is smaller than that of the United States, the United States' reverence towards China's nuclear power should be equal to China's reverence towards the United States' nuclear power.

The Second Artillery Corps of China develops very rapidly in recent years. It already has the independent innovation capacity, has realized the change from the single-warhead missile to multi-warhead missile and the change from the fixed missile silo to mobile missile silo, and has also realized a qualitative change in the penetration capability. China should expand this trend in the future and guarantee the situation of the Asia-Pacific Region to get used to it gradually so that other strategic factors of the region will co-exist with it in a mutual-respect way.

China should allow its public to approach the Second Artillery Corps properly, make China's nuclear power enter the visual field of the Chinese public, and make it a part of the public's concept and recognition of the nation. China is a large country shouldering a strategic mission, and the situation that the public is not familiar with the nuclear power is not good for the whole society to form a healthy ideology.

China is a late starter in developing the nuclear weapon and lacks experience in "using it." China needs to develop the hardware of the nuclear weapon and also needs to keep studying and exploring it and combine it with China's complicated national mission. It is also an important innovative course of the country of China.

<http://english.people.com.cn/90786/7943863.html>

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

Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS)

OPINION/Project On Nuclear Issues

September 11, 2012

The Future of Conventional Prompt Global Strike

By Matthew Fargo

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has increasingly moved nuclear weapons to the periphery of its defense posture and has amplified the importance of its conventional forces in their stead. This shift has been facilitated by the continuous evolution of precision guided munitions (PGMs), which have been used extensively in recent conflicts.

In response to perceived conventional capability gaps, the United States began a program in 2002 designed to develop a conventionally-armed weapon which could strike targets anywhere in the world in about one hour – a degree of responsiveness currently only achievable with nuclear weapons. The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review Report detailed the requirements for prompt global strike (PGS) capabilities: “[to strike] fixed, hard and deeply buried, mobile and re-locatable targets with improved accuracy.” In addition, it is hoped that prompt global strike technology could serve as a more credible deterrent than existing nuclear weapons against non-nuclear powers or non-state actors. This mission has gained more prominence as the United States must increasingly balance the competing trends of restructuring its global military presence in the face of fiscal austerity and the escalating mission requirements placed on conventional American military assets.

Proposed Systems

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



Some of the first concepts designed to satisfy the newly-defined PGS mission involved retrofitting existing Trident II D5 submarine-launched ballistic missiles or Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missiles with conventional warheads – systems which could be made operational by the mid-2010s. Congress balked at funding the former proposal, however, citing concerns about inadvertent Russian retaliation in the event that a PGS launch was mistaken for a nuclear first-strike.

In the intervening years, support has gathered behind the concept of highly maneuverable hypersonic glide vehicles. Hypersonic vehicles could satisfy the promptness criterion and would be capable of penetrating sophisticated air and missile defense systems without putting American military personnel at risk. The politically delicate question of whether or not they would pass the “discrimination test” – whether they would threaten to provoke a nuclear response from Russia, which the Conventional Trident Modification program was deemed to have failed – will depend on the eventual method of deployment. The most prompt option would still require rocket boosters which would still conspicuously resemble ballistic missiles upon take-off. Although test failures have delayed the Air Force’s projected deployment date, hypersonic reentry vehicles remain a funding priority in Congress and may someday serve an important role in the PGS mission.

Strategic Implications and Future Trends

The advancements made by the United States in its conventional war-fighting capabilities have already impacted how Russia, China, and other nations pursue their strategic aims. By trying to further limit the role of nuclear weapons through the development and deployment of unmatched conventional military capabilities, the U.S. risks severely degrading the global security environment of other nations which cannot hope to match American defense spending. This may inadvertently lead other nations to view unconventional weapons proliferation as a potential defense against American conventional military superiority. The deployment of global strike weapon systems will undoubtedly impact this calculus in the minds of putative adversaries.

Weighing the costs and benefits of developing new prompt global strike capabilities in these contexts will be necessary as the Pentagon and Congress continue to push American strategic conventional capabilities forward.

The overall trend toward the increased use of precision guided munitions will likely continue in the near-term as the relative importance of nuclear weapons to the national security strategy of the U.S. continues to decline and as existing PGMs are enhanced and improved to become more accurate, more powerful, and more adaptable.

Obstacles and Alternatives

Although the PGS mission may have merit in concept, in practice global strike weapons will require extraordinary intelligence in order to prove viable. Stationary targets, such as missile silos, could certainly be held at risk by such systems – according to Russian Major General Vladimir Dvorkin, “The growing counterforce capability of U.S. PGMs may present a considerable threat to the survivability of Russia’s strategic forces.” But the idea of pursuing fleeting targets, otherwise out of the reach of American military assets, is one which has failed spectacularly in the past.

Perhaps the most critical dilemma which will face the development of prompt global strike capabilities will be its future role in a new American security strategy. With the growing strategic focus on the Asia Pacific and increasing concerns over sophisticated anti-access area-denial technologies being developed by China and other potential rivals, PGS may serve a role in destroying heavily defended targets or neutralizing defensive systems so that other assets can be safely deployed in-theater. Although it is infrequently discussed, it is in this context that the argument in favor of developing PGS capabilities is most compelling, and it is in this limited role that PGS offers the greatest potential against future threats. However, unproven and potentially destabilizing prompt global strike systems are not the only weapons which could accomplish this mission.

With the conversion of four Ohio-class submarines to cruise missile submarines – each submarine can carry up to 154 Tomahawk cruise missiles – the American military has at least developed an interim global strike capability which could be deployed in the event of a crisis, though a gap still remains in the theoretical cases of immediate need.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Unlike the currently planned prompt global strike systems, however, existing precision guided munitions have the ability to loiter in a target area for hours and can provide intelligence via on-board cameras and can be reprogrammed to engage more important targets as they arise. Given the importance of accurate intelligence to accomplish any global strike mission, this capability could prove decisive in helping to identify and eliminate potential targets.

Even as the United States continues to spend billions of dollars on ballistic missile defense systems, the development of cruise missile defenses has been slower to materialize. The absence of effective cruise missile defenses against even unsophisticated and antiquated Chinese-built Seersuckers cruise missiles during the early stages of the Iraq War (let alone more advanced terrain-hugging and stealthy) proved problematic for the United States. Although some progress has been made since then, cruise missiles will continue to pose significant challenges to potential defenders for the foreseeable future.

Conclusion

These trends may indicate that the usefulness of more advanced (and less destabilizing and less costly) cruise missiles and other precision guided conventional munitions may obviate the need for prompt global strike weapons in all but the most extreme circumstances in the future.

Determining the relative value of different capabilities of future PGMs will be a complex undertaking – attributes ranging from responsiveness, radar cross section, payload variability, range, and launch platform will all be important factors – but these developments will not occur in a vacuum. Russia and China already feel threatened by American conventional superiority – convincing them that the deployment of future conventional weapons will not threaten their strategic positions will prove challenging. Any guarantees to the contrary will ring hollow – especially as the U.S. continues to move forward with missile defense deployments in both Europe and Asia. Proponents of prompt global strike – both in and out of Congress – must keep this in mind.

Matthew Fargo is an intern for the Project on Nuclear Issues. The views expressed above are his own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Center for Strategic and International Studies or the Project on Nuclear Issues.

<https://csis.org/blog/future-conventional-prompt-global-strike>

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

The Hill

OPINION/Congress Blog

Nonproliferation Requires Enforcement

By Robert Monroe, vice admiral, U.S. Navy (Ret.)

September 12, 2012

Should America use military force to prevent Iran from producing nuclear weapons? Our leaders are urgently addressing this question, spurred on by concerns that Israel, any day, may feel forced to launch such strikes independently. It's a life-and-death question, because Iran's response has the potential to trigger major armed conflicts. Yet in addressing it we are ignoring what may be the most important strategic issue of all – global nonproliferation! Let's take a broader look.

Proliferation of nuclear weapons among nations is the gravest threat facing the US and the world. For twenty years two irresponsible and belligerent rogue states have been working intensely to develop nuclear weapons production capabilities. The world has protested and wrung its hands. North Korea has now tested primitive weapons, and Iran is close to producing them. When North Korea succeeds in weaponizing its designs, it will sell them to anyone desiring to buy – including terrorists. Neighboring states such as South Korea and Japan will be forced to go nuclear in self-protection. Iran's acquisition of nuclear weapons – and its likely willingness to give them to proxies such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and Al Qaeda for use – will stimulate another regional surge of proliferation as Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Turkey, and others follow suit.

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 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 no time the cascade will be global, as states like Venezuela, Germany, Brazil, and Argentina, rush to protect themselves. With nuclear weapons widespread, and nuclear material even more readily available, terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons will not be difficult. We're moving toward a world of nuclear horror and chaos, a return from which appears impossible.

President Obama's response to this threat, however, has been disastrous. He has evoked the "world without nuclear weapons" vision and started dismantling the US nuclear weapons capability as a model for others to follow. His vision is totally at odds with reality. No nation with nuclear weapons has any intention of getting rid of them. All other such nations are improving or increasing their arsenals, and non-nuclear weapons states are racing to acquire them. No one can describe how a world without nuclear weapons can be reached, or – if reached – could be continued. Verification would be impossible. There's even great doubt that such a world is desirable. And we don't have the decades Obama says would be required to reach his goal. A proliferation cascade is upon us!

Is there an alternative that would avert disaster? Absolutely! The way to prevent proliferation is simply to stop the proliferators. Nonproliferation requires enforcement! If deterrence is used, early-on and powerfully, most potential proliferators will be stopped without violence. If a proliferator continues, military force should be used. This undoubtedly will result in casualties and disruptions, but nothing to compare with those suffered if the proliferator gains nuclear weapons. Importantly, the first time deterrence or military force stops a proliferator, the world will be renewed. Proliferation will cease. Nonproliferation will become the norm. Fear will be replaced by confidence in a safer world.

But who is to enforce nonproliferation? There's a near-term and a far-term answer. Far-term first. This answer is in the Nonproliferation Treaty itself, which created two tiers of states. The NPT approved five nuclear-weapons states, the permanent members of the UN Security Council (U.S., UK, France, Russia, and China). All other states are to remain non-nuclear-weapons-states. Currently, 185 nations have voluntarily signed the NPT in non-nuclear status, recognizing that, so long as the NPT regime holds, this frees them from worries over attack by a nuclear-armed neighbor or aggressor. The enforcers of the regime must be the five nuclear-weapons states, acting collegially. This is not possible today because of past animosities and conflicts; but we would surely evolve to this within decades as lack of alternatives becomes clear to both tiers of states.

In the near-term, the US, the world's true leader, must have the courage and sense of responsibility to accept this burden and save the world from destruction. Target the most immediate threat – Iran – and try deterrence first (although we're years late). Inform Iran that if it does not dismantle its nuclear weapons facilities, we will be forced to do so. Then, if necessary, use conventional military force to accomplish it.

In 1938, Britain and France had a chance to stop Nazi Germany before WWII began. They shrank from it, because of the casualties and destruction. The result was seven years of world war and 60 million dead. It's 1938 again, and if we fail this time the results will be far worse. Nonproliferation requires enforcement!

Monroe is a retired vice admiral (U.S. Navy) and a former director of the Defense Nuclear Agency.

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/249049-nonproliferation-requires-enforcement>

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

The Moscow Times – Russia

OPINION

A Strong Military Doesn't Mean a Strong Nation

12 September 2012

By Sergei Karaganov

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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



Russia is moving toward a major military buildup even though the external military threat is at an all-time low. The Moscow leadership is committed to pursuing this military course in one form or another, convinced that a strong army is needed in the unfolding world order and that the buildup will stimulate the country's development.

Meanwhile, many adhere to the conventional theory that maintaining a large military force is less important than it was in the past. Indeed, most of the major problems of the modern world, such as climate change, the large gap between the wealthy and the poor or the growing relative shortage of raw materials and food, can be solved by military means.

In the past, to paraphrase Prussian military theorist Karl von Clausewitz, war was simply a continuation of politics. But after two world wars and the emergence of nuclear weapons, the ethical paradigm has shifted such that the use of force is now regarded as a failure of politics.

At the same time, however, another set of factors contradicts the argument that military force plays a decreasing role in world affairs and is no longer the leading instrument of state policy.

For example, Western powers won in Yugoslavia and Libya, although with mixed results. Russia won in Chechnya — albeit at a terribly high price — and achieved a clear victory in Georgia in 2008.

In addition, nuclear deterrence, as a demonstration of military strength, has worked over the past 60 years to prevent a major world war. But while the United States and Russia have signed modest nuclear arms reduction treaties, they, along with other countries that have nuclear weapons, are committed to modernizing their nuclear arsenals or, in many cases, augmenting them.

The use of military force has undermined many of the ethical norms of international relations. The West claimed that its attacks against Yugoslavia, Iraq and Libya were justified on humanitarian grounds. But the results are what matter most: The world witnessed that weaker states get attacked, while stronger ones do not. The regime in non-nuclear Iraq was swept aside in a matter of months, while the nuclear regime in North Korea, which has a worse human rights record, remains untouched.

In the medium term, the global economic slowdown puts limits on the insatiable appetite of the military lobby, but it also strengthens fringe groups at home who seek to start wars as a means of diverting attention from domestic problems. In this regard, the West's military campaign in Libya was a boost to the political tactic of initiating an easily winnable, short military campaign against a weak opponent.

Now Russia has set out to rebuild its military might, despite finding itself in a historically unprecedented situation with regard to its military security. A country that for millennia has been focused on the national idea of protecting itself against external threats to ensure its territorial sovereignty now faces no threats at all, and there is nobody that could pose a serious threat anytime soon.

Moscow propagandists often point to NATO's superior strength in conventional forces as an external threat to Russia. But they conveniently fail to mention that Europe has been reducing those forces and military expenditures.

Although China is becoming a greater military and political rival of the United States, it is doing everything possible not to threaten Russia.

The real threat of conflict is growing rapidly on Russia's southern periphery. Military force might have to be used to prevent, or worse, put an end to such conflicts. But these are not threats to Russia's existence.

Even in the long term, Russia faces no discernible threat of a traditional, large-scale military attack. That is, of course, unless Moscow chooses to worry about the U.S. delivering a massive strike using high-precision conventional missiles. But even if Washington succeeded in developing these weapons, it is absurd to imagine this strike against Russian territory because Moscow would be able to respond with a nuclear counterstrike.



The Kremlin has suggested on several occasions that a U.S. missile defense system could spark an arms race between the two countries. Most likely, though, Moscow's opposition to missile defense is being used as a political bargaining chip in an attempt to gain concessions from Washington in other areas.

But despite the absence of a real threat, Russia's planned military buildup is unavoidable. I think the Kremlin has chosen to strengthen the military as a means of showing the world that Russia is capable of developing something tangible. The years of empty talk about modernization, with no concrete steps other than the Skolkovo technology park, have shown that Russian society and the elite have not yet matured enough for a modernization breakthrough.

A weakening of the economy could lead to a weakening of national sovereignty as well. The 1990s gave President Vladimir Putin and many of his supporters confirmation that weaker countries are not respected and are beaten up one way or another. To make matters worse, Russian society has become "genetically programmed" to defend its territorial sovereignty at all costs, and it has done so with amazing courage and self-sacrifice throughout its history.

In the end, it seems that the military buildup is intended to compensate for Russia's relative weakness in other traditional areas of strength — economic, technological, ideological or psychological.

It is easy to condemn Russia's approach to power projection as being inappropriate in the modern world, and on the whole this condemnation is justified. But the modern world is changing so rapidly and unpredictably that the present course might actually prove prescient.

Sergei Karaganov is the chairman of the Council on Foreign and Defense Policy. This comment appeared in Vedomosti.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/a-strong-military-doesnt-mean-a-strong-nation/468054.html>

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

London Guardian – U.K.
OPINION/Comment is Free

Chris Stevens Died At the Hands of Militants, Not an Offended Mob

The brutal death of Chris Stevens shows Libya is home to many unregulated, well-equipped radicals who are hostile to the US

By Nabila Ramdani

Thursday, 13 September 2012

Those caught up in the excitement and jubilation of last year's Arab spring will be at a loss to reconcile it with the murder of an American ambassador. The brutal killing of Chris Stevens alongside three colleagues in a grenade attack is an unmitigated disaster for those striving to establish democracy in the Middle East and north Africa.

Not only did Stevens die in Benghazi – the cradle of the Libyan revolution – but the diplomat was pivotal in getting the US to support the Nato air attacks that ultimately toppled Colonel Muammar Gaddafi after 42 years. A "clean" intervention was his mantra – facilitating the death of a dictator through superior firepower while not risking a single American life. Now, in a country stripped of a functioning security apparatus and awash with weapons and ammunition, Stevens has met a similarly violent end to Gaddafi.

The perpetrators are not the only ones trying to set their extreme violence in the context of an insult against their Muslim religion. An Egyptian crowd who attacked the US embassy in Cairo on Tuesday was protesting against the same film clips that triggered a storming of the US consulate in Benghazi, and then Stevens' death. All were apparently incensed that the crass images, posted on YouTube, insulted the prophet Mohammed.

The film has nothing to commend it in terms of artistic merit or entertainment value, and it is certainly blasphemous. It portrays the prophet as a sexually incontinent fool, thus evoking the same kind of malevolent caricature which appeared in a Danish newspaper in 2005 and triggered riots across the world, that left at least 50 people dead.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

But claiming that Stevens died at the hands of newly democratised Arabs furious at an attack on their faith is disingenuous in the extreme. In fact, it seems certain that Stevens died at the hands of radicals inspired by al-Qaida. Sources in Benghazi – including a factional commander celebrating the death of the ambassador – are already suggesting they were linked to Ansar al-Sharia, a violent Sunni Islamist group that has become notorious for carrying out executions in Libya's second city since the toppling of Gaddafi, as well as attacks on other western interests.

Stevens had worked as a Peace Corps volunteer in north Africa, teaching English in Morocco, and was devoting his professional life to establishing a secure Libya. He was imbued with the spirit of the Arab spring at a time when new Libyan MPs had just taken their seats in parliament, and plans were under way to establish a properly trained police force.

Like the majority of ordinary Libyans, Stevens was powerless to resist a clearly co-ordinated rocket-propelled grenade attack carried out by bandits – ones who are taking advantage of the fledgling nature of their new state to settle scores with the US. Hatred of America did not end when the Arab spring began, any more than the establishment of supposedly tolerant western liberal democracies ended the baiting of Muslims with provocative films and cartoons.

It is no coincidence that Stevens's murder came on the anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, and after militants were called to avenge the death of Abu Yahya al-Libi, al-Qaida's second-in-command, in north-west Pakistan in June. With the CIA and US military determinedly assassinating figures like Libi and Osama Bin Laden since the start of the "war on terror", so the terrorists' surviving supporters have fought back in kind.

An unstable country such as Libya is an obvious place for such men of violence to rally and prosper. The fact that the Red Cross, as well as aid convoys from the UK, has been attacked numerous times in Benghazi over the past few months gives an indication of the nature of the hateful gangs operating in the area.

There are millions of peaceful, decent Libyans living in the country, but at present it is jihadists who are in the ascendancy. Angry reactions to blasphemous insults are one thing, but the truth is that Libya is currently a hotbed of unregulated, well-equipped and fiercely determined radicals who think nothing of murdering Americans. This is the ultimate message behind the appalling death of Chris Stevens.

Nabila Ramdani is a Paris-born freelance journalist and academic of Algerian descent. She specialises in Anglo-French issues, Islamic affairs, and the Arab World.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/sep/13/chris-stevens-libya-brutal-death>

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

Issue No. 1024, 14 September 2012

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