



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Nuke Mod Funding Faces Hurdles: U.S. State Dept. Official](#)

1. [IAEA Chief Not Protecting Confidential Information: Iranian IAEA Ambassador](#)
2. [Iran Pushes Ahead in Building Nuclear Reactor](#)
3. [Clear 'Red Lines' Vital in Thwarting Iran's 'Apocalyptic' Nuclear Program, Netanyahu Tells UN](#)
4. [A Tour of Syria's Chemical Weapons](#)
5. [China Navy Takes Delivery of First Aircraft Carrier: Report](#)
6. [S.Korea 'Wins Permission to Extend Missile Range'](#)
7. [Images Show N. Korea Launch Pad Halt](#)
8. [Tunnel at N. Korea's Nuclear Test Site Damaged by Typhoon: Source](#)
9. [Lee Calls for Building Stronger Armed Forces Citing NK, Regional Tensions](#)
10. [Officials from All Parties in N. Korea Nuclear Talks Meet in China](#)
11. [Pakistan Developing Tactical Nukes Aimed at India: Experts](#)
12. [Russian Military Dumps Unified Nuclear Command Plan - Media](#)
13. [Russia to Base MiG-31 Interceptors in Arctic](#)
14. [Russian Air Force to Get New Cruise Missile in 2013](#)
15. [Trident Submarine Missiles Review to Suggest 'Stepping Down Nuclear Ladder'](#)
16. [Benefits Seen in Canceling Planned U.S. ICBM Interceptors in Europe](#)
17. [Obama Vows before UN to Halt Iran Bomb](#)
18. ['Milestone Experiment' Measures Safety of Aging Nuclear Stockpile](#)
19. [Nuke Mod Funding Faces Hurdles: U.S. State Dept. Official](#)
20. [Cyberwarfare Emerges From Shadows for Public Discussion by U.S. Officials](#)
21. [US Cyberwarrior Accuses China of Targeting Pentagon](#)
22. [Reforms and Nukes](#)
23. [Pentagon Behind on Predicting Chemical, Biological Threats](#)
24. [U.S. Curbs on S.Korean Missiles Are Absurd and Risky](#)
25. [Keeping Nukes Safe from Cyber Attack](#)
26. [Plan for Dismantling Britain's Nuclear Arsenal](#)
27. [ADNEY: Nuclear Arsenal Deteriorating](#)
28. [After Trident: A Well-Made Argument in a Necessary Debate](#)

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.1026, 28 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.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Tehran Times – Iran

IAEA Chief Not Protecting Confidential Information: Iranian IAEA Ambassador

By Political Desk

Wednesday, September 26, 2012

TEHRAN – The Iranian ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency has said that IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano is not protecting confidential information about Iran’s nuclear activities.

Ambassador Ali Asghar Soltanieh made the remarks during an interview with the Inter Press Service News Agency published on Monday in reference to the remarks that Atomic Energy Organization of Iran Director Fereydoun Abbasi made in Vienna on September 17.

Abbasi had said that the sabotage of power to the Fordo facility the night before an IAEA request for a snap inspection of the facility showed that the agency could be infiltrated by “terrorists and saboteurs”.

Soltanieh said, “The objection we have is that the DG (director general) isn’t protecting confidential information.”

He added, “When they have information on how many centrifuges are working and how many are not working, this is a very serious concern.”

Iran has complained for years about information gathered by IAEA inspectors, including data on personnel in the Iranian nuclear program, being made available to U.S., Israeli, and European intelligence agencies.

Iran offered deal to halt 20 percent enrichment in return for lifting of sanctions

Elsewhere in his remarks, Soltanieh commented on the meeting that the secretary of Iran’s Supreme National Security Council, Saeed Jalili, held with European Union foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton over Tehran’s nuclear program in Istanbul on September 18.

Ashton represents the 5+1 group (the five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany) in nuclear negotiations with Iran, and Jalili is Iran’s chief nuclear negotiator.

Soltanieh stated that during the meeting, Iran again offered to stop producing uranium enriched to a purity level of 20 percent in return for the lifting of sanctions.

The six major powers have demanded that Iran halt 20 percent enrichment, shut down the Fordo uranium enrichment facility, and ship all of its stocks of 20 percent enriched uranium out of the country.

And Iran’s main demand is that its right to uranium enrichment, as enumerated in the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, be recognized.

The Iranian ambassador to the IAEA added, “We are prepared to suspend enrichment to 20 percent, provided we find a reciprocal step compatible with it.”

“We said this in Istanbul,” he added.

“If we do that,” Soltanieh said, “there shouldn’t be sanctions.”

He also repeated the past Iranian rejection of any deal involving the closure of Fordo.

“It’s impossible if they expect us to close Fordo,” Soltanieh said.

The U.S. justification for the demand for the closure of Fordo has been that it has been used for enriching uranium to the 20-percent level, claiming that it makes it much easier for Iran to continue enrichment to weapons grade levels.

But Soltanieh pointed to the conversion of half the stockpile to fuel plates for the Tehran Research Reactor, which was documented in the IAEA report released on August 30.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



“The most important thing in the report,” Soltanieh said, was “a great percentage of 20-percent enriched uranium already converted to powder for the Tehran Research Reactor.”

That conversion to powder for fuel plates makes the uranium unavailable for reconversion to a form that could be enriched to weapons grade level.

Soltanieh suggested that the Iranian demonstration of the technical capability for such conversion, which apparently took the United States and other 5+1 group countries by surprise, has rendered irrelevant the group’s demand to ship the entire stockpile of 20-percent enriched uranium out of the country.

“This capacity shows that we don’t need fuel from other countries,” he stated.

Elsewhere in his remarks, Soltanieh said that two senior IAEA officials had accepted a key Iranian demand in the most recent negotiating session in Vienna on August 24 on a “structured agreement” on Iranian cooperation on allegations of “possible military dimensions” of its nuclear program – only to withdraw the concession at the end of the meeting.

The issue was Iran’s insistence on being given all the documents on which the IAEA bases the allegations of Iranian research related to nuclear weapons which Iran is expected to explain to the IAEA’s satisfaction.

The February 20 negotiating text shows that the IAEA sought to evade any requirement for sharing any such documents by qualifying the commitment with the phrase “where appropriate.”

At the most recent meeting, however, the IAEA negotiators, IAEA Deputy Director General and Head of the Department of Safeguards Herman Nackaerts and Assistant Director General Rafael Grossi agreed for the first time to a commitment to “deliver the documents related to activities claimed to have been conducted by Iran”, according to Soltanieh.

At the end of the meeting, however, Nackaerts and Grossi “put this language in brackets”, thus leaving it unresolved, Soltanieh said.

Former IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei recalls in his 2011 memoirs that he had “constantly pressed the source of the information” on alleged Iranian nuclear weapons research – meaning the United States – “to allow us to share copies with Iran”. He writes that he asked how he could “accuse a person without revealing the accusations against him?”

Soltanieh confirmed that the other unresolved issue is whether the IAEA investigation will be open-ended or not.

The February 20 negotiating text showed that Iran demanded a discrete list of topics to which the IAEA inquiry would be limited and a requirement that each topic would be considered “concluded” once Iran had answered the questions and delivered the information requested.

But the IAEA insisted on being able to “return” to topics that had been “discussed earlier”, according to the February negotiating text.

That position remains unchanged, according to Soltanieh.

The Iranian ambassador quoted an IAEA negotiator as asking, “What if next month we receive something else — some additional information?”

“If the IAEA had its way,” Soltanieh said, “it would be another 10 or 20 years.”

Amano reneged on promise about mid-October meeting

In addition, Soltanieh stated that a meeting between Iran and the IAEA set for mid-October had been agreed before the IAEA Board of Governors earlier this month with Nackaerts and Grossi.

The Iranian ambassador said the IAEA officials had promised him that Director General Yukia Amano would announce the meeting during the Board meeting, but Amano made no such announcement.



Instead, after a meeting with the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran chief, Amano only referred to the “readiness of agency negotiators to meet with Iran in the near future.”

“He didn’t keep the promise,” said Soltanieh, adding that Iran would have to “study in the capital” how to respond.

<http://www.tehrantimes.com/politics/101783-iaea-chief-not-protecting-confidential-information-iranian-iaea-ambassador>

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

The Star – Malaysia

Wednesday, September 26, 2012

Iran Pushes Ahead in Building Nuclear Reactor

By Fredrik Dahl

VIENNA (Reuters) - Iran appears to be making headway in building a research reactor that could yield potential nuclear weapon material, adding to Western concerns about Tehran's atomic aims, experts and diplomats say.

The West's worries about Iran are focused largely on underground uranium enrichment plants at Natanz and Fordow, but it is also pressing ahead with construction of a heavy-water reactor near the town of Arak, which analysts say could produce plutonium for nuclear arms if the spent fuel is reprocessed.

Iran now plans to bring Arak on line in the third quarter of 2013, moving up its timetable from 2014, according to the latest U.N. information, although there is uncertainty whether it will be able to meet that target date.

Iran, rejecting Western allegations it seeks to develop a capability to assemble atomic arms, says its nuclear programme is entirely peaceful and that the reactor will produce isotopes for medical and agricultural use.

"There is no reason to seriously doubt Iran's resolve to complete this project on time and begin operating the reactor," said Mark Hibbs of the Carnegie Endowment think-tank.

Most of what is needed is "dual-use, off-the-shelf equipment that Iran can buy all over the world using the procurement network it has set up" for its nuclear programme, he said.

A U.N. report last month on Iran's nuclear programme, which made headlines because it showed a doubling of the uranium enrichment capability at Fordow, suggested Tehran was also carrying out new work at Arak.

The report by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) said cooling and moderator circuit piping was being installed when inspectors visited the Arak facility in early August.

"They are certainly continuing to make progress on the reactor," one Vienna-based diplomat said. "As long as we still don't trust Iran's nuclear intentions, even the elimination of its enrichment capability will not eliminate all the danger."

THREATS

Israel, believed to be the Middle East's only nuclear-armed state, sees Iran's nuclear programme as a serious threat and has ramped up threats of attacking its arch enemy. If it does, the nuclear sites at Natanz, Fordow and Arak in central Iran are likely to be among the targets.

U.S. President Barack Obama this week warned Iran he would do what it takes to prevent it from getting nuclear weapons.

The European Union this month said it was "deeply worried" Iran had not suspended activity at the Arak facility, which like other nuclear sites is monitored by U.N. inspectors to ensure there is no diversion of nuclear materials.

In August, German prosecutors said police had arrested four men suspected of delivering valves for the heavy-water reactor, breaking an embargo on such exports to Iran.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

If operated optimally, the heavy-water plant would produce about 9 kilograms of plutonium annually, or enough for about two nuclear bombs each year, said the Institute for Science and International Security, a U.S.-based think-tank.

"Before it could use any of the plutonium in a nuclear weapon, however, it would first have to separate the plutonium from the irradiated fuel," it added on its web site.

Iran has announced it has no plans to reprocess the spent fuel, the International Institute for Strategic Studies think-tank said in report last year.

But Mark Fitzpatrick, director of its non-proliferation and disarmament programme, said "similarly sized reactors ostensibly built for research" have been used by India, Israel, North Korea and Pakistan to make plutonium for weapons.

Given Iran's "record of delays with other major nuclear facilities and the sanctions and export controls that have impeded access to foreign parts, it is very doubtful that the 2013 deadline will be met", he said.

Editing by Jane Baird.

http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2012/9/26/worldupdates/2012-09-26T113124Z_2_BRE88POPD_RTROPTT_0_UK-NUCLEAR-IRAN-REACTOR&sec=Worldupdates

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

Times of Israel – Israel

Clear ‘Red Lines’ Vital in Thwarting Iran’s ‘Apocalyptic’ Nuclear Program, Netanyahu Tells UN

PM brandishes a cartoon bomb, equates the danger to the world from Tehran with the threat posed by Nazis during WWII

By Times of Israel Staff
September 27, 2012

Iran will back down" from its nuclear weapons drive if the world sets out clear "red lines" to thwart it, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said Thursday in a speech to the United National General Assembly. But, he warned, failure to address the Iranian nuclear program forcefully was tantamount to placing an atomic weapon in the hands of the al-Qaeda terror organization.

"Imagine the world with a nuclear-armed al-Qaeda," Netanyahu said, noting that it made no difference if such weapons were in the hands of "the world's most radical terrorist regime or terrorist organization." It was the "same hatred, same violence."

As he has done in the past, the prime minister also equated the threat from "Iran's apocalyptic leaders" with the threat posed by the Nazis during World War II.

"It's not whether this fanaticism will be defeated — it's how many lives will be lost before it's defeated," he said. "Seventy years ago the world saw similar fanaticism... At stake is the future of the world."

"The hour is getting late," he said, "very late."

As expected, the heart of Netanyahu's speech was a reiteration of the need to draw "red lines" for Iran's nuclear program, which, if crossed, would precipitate a Western military campaign. The question of "red lines" has been a bone of contention between Israel and the US.

Pulling out a cartoon image of a bomb, Netanyahu averred that "red lines" might have prevented some of the horrors of World War II, and said such lines could work with Iran.

Issue No. 1026, 28 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 first, vital red line must be drawn “on Iran’s efforts to enrich uranium,” Netanyahu said, before launching into a description of the mechanics of building such a bomb.

“For Iran,” he said, “amassing enough enriched uranium is far more difficult than producing the nuclear fuse.” Iran can produce “the detonator” in a year or less, in a tiny workshop that — like the underground enrichment facility in Fordo, which for a time Western intelligence was oblivious to — may be hard to find. “The same is true for the small facility in which they could assemble a warhead,” Netanyahu warned.

“Do we want to risk world security on finding a workshop in a country the size of half of Europe?” he said.

The red line must be set “before Iran gets to the point where it is a few months away or a few weeks away” from amassing enough enriched uranium to make a nuclear weapon, he said, driving his message home by drawing a thick — and very literal — line with a red marker across the cartoon image of the bomb in his hand.

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/a-nuclear-armed-iran-as-dangerous-as-a-nuclear-armed-al-qaeda-netanyahu-warns/>

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

Washington Free Beacon

A Tour of Syria’s Chemical Weapons

Syrian chemical weapons sites revealed as defector adds new details on regime’s plans to use nerve gas

By Bill Gertz

September 28, 2012

Rebels in Syria have disclosed new details on the Damascus regime’s chemical weapons storage sites, as a military defector last week outlined plans by Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad to use the deadly arms.

U.S. intelligence agencies recently reported on several chemical arms sites in Syria that were revealed in five YouTube videos uploaded to the Internet in July, according to officials familiar with the recordings.

The posting of the videos coincided with the defection in July of Maj. Gen. Adnan Sillu, head of Syria’s chemical arms forces, who told Britain’s *Times of London* newspaper that Assad will use the arms to stay in power and that his regime has discussed handing over some of the weapons to the Lebanese terrorist group Hezbollah.

The five rebel videos use Google Earth maps software to show chemical arms storage and production plants—some hidden in underground bunkers—and Scud missiles armed with chemical warheads, according to U.S. officials who have analyzed the videos.

They are likely to be used by U.S. or Israeli military planners in any future attacks designed to eliminate Syria’s chemical arms stockpiles.

Israel’s military said in June that it would be forced to act against Syria to prevent advanced rockets and chemical arms from falling into the hands of terrorists like Hezbollah.

The 10-minute-long videos were judged to be accurate by U.S. officials in describing suspected hidden Syrian chemical facilities.

One video reveals a major chemical weapons facility in the downtown area of the Syrian capital of Damascus located a short distance by underground tunnel from al-Mazzeah military airfield in southwestern Damascus.

The tunnel can accommodate tractor trailer-sized trucks and exits several buildings on the base. An Arabic-speaking narrator on the video shows the path of the tunnel leading to an underground storage area north and east of the airfield.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



The narrator said the roof of the bunker includes 45 feet of reinforced concrete designed to withstand a strike from U.S. Tomahawk missiles. The facility is said to contain a variety of chemical weapons, from hand grenades filled with the blistering agent mustard to chemical weapons rockets of differing sizes.

The video shows an aircraft runway near the facility, which is called Zone 86, and housing used by senior Syrian military officers and members of the paramilitary Shabiha.

The video also states that a building near Saraya traffic circle is a residence for foreign technicians from Iran and North Korea.

The Sanid News Network, a pro-rebel news outlet, posted the videos online.

A second video reveals what is believed to be the largest storage facility for Syria's biological and chemical weapons, located in a residential area north of Damascus between Al-Tal and Aysh Wurur.

Roads are identified in the video that lead to tunnels built into mountains that stretch 1,500 feet inside the mountain and are hardened against attack.

The narrator of this video, identified as Abu Saqr, stated that he has been inside one of the tunnels that had separate storage rooms sealed with heavy metal doors.

Among the chemical agents stored in the bunker are mustard agent and cyanide and nerve agents Sarin, Tabun, and the ultra-lethal VX nerve agent.

The reported biological weapons at the facility include weaponized "bacteria and viruses" that can be transmitted to populations through food, water, and soil.

The video narrator also asserted that Iran is storing enriched uranium in the underground facility.

A third video around eight minutes long purports to show a Syrian chemical weapons factory located near al-Dumayr.

The factory is located east of al-Dumayr on the north side of a highway underneath an earthen berm 30 to 45 feet high. Roads are shown exiting the berms, and camouflaged tanks are nearby.

The plant has a high wall around its perimeter and, according to the video narrator, is operated by Iranians and North Koreans.

An underground storage facility is located nearby the plant.

Another of the rebel videos includes images of Syrian short-range Scud missiles at a base southwest of al-Qutayfah that the narrator asserts are armed with chemical weapons warheads. The missiles are shown loaded on trailers with a nearby underground storage facility for the chemical arms.

The last video uses Google Earth to identify what it claims to be an underground chemical weapons factory near the military airbase at al-Nasiriyah. It was described as an underground chemical weapons production facility and research center.

The Syrian defector, Maj. Gen. Sillu, stated in the interview published Sept. 19 that he took part in leadership discussions about using chemical weapons against civilians.

"We were in a serious discussion about the use of chemical weapons, including how we would use them and in what areas," Sillu said. "We discussed this as a last resort—such as if the regime lost control of an important area such as Aleppo."

Sillu said the meeting held at a Syrian chemical arms center five miles south of Damascus prompted him to defect because he opposed the use of the deadly arms against the population.

Sillu, now residing in Turkey, also said the Syrian regime considered handing over chemical weapons to Hezbollah.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“They wanted to place warheads with the chemical weapons on missiles—to transfer them this way to Hezbollah. It was for use against Israel, of course,” he said.

The Damascus government in the past had opposed supplying chemical arms to Hezbollah over concerns about the fallout from arming the terrorist group, he said.

“Now, if they have nothing to lose why not share these weapons? If a war starts between Hezbollah and Israel it will be only good for Syria,” Sillu said.

Sillu said members of Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps took part in meetings on chemical weapons.

“They were always coming to visit and to advise. They were always sending us scientists and bringing our scientists to them,” he said. “They were also involved on the political side of how to use the chemical weapons.”

The CIA in the past has said that reports of Syrian development of chemical and biological arms were exaggerated.

In 2003 the agency blocked congressional testimony by then-Undersecretary of State John Bolton that was to express new concerns about Syrian chemical and biological weapons.

Since that time, the Syrian program has continued to grow.

Israel also attacked a nuclear plant in Syria at al-Kibar that was being built with North Korean assistance.

<http://freebeacon.com/a-tour-of-syrias-chemical-weapons/>

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

Manila Times – Philippines

China Navy Takes Delivery of First Aircraft Carrier: Report

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

23 September 2012

BEIJING: China's first aircraft carrier was handed over on Sunday to the navy of the People's Liberation Army, state press said, amid rising tensions over disputed waters in the East and the West Philippine Sea (South China Sea).

The handover ceremony of the 300-meter (990-foot) ship, a former Soviet carrier called the Varyag, took place in northeast China's port of Dalian after a lengthy refitting by a Chinese shipbuilder, the Global Times reported.

During the handover ceremony the aircraft carrier raised the Chinese national flag on its mast, the PLA flag on its bow and the navy's colors on its stern, the short online report said.

A ceremony to place the ship into active service would be held sometime in the future, the paper said without elaboration.

China's defense ministry was unavailable to comment on the ceremony.

The announcement comes at a time of heightened tensions over maritime disputes in the Asia-Pacific region, where China's growing assertiveness has put it on a collision course with Japan, Vietnam and the Philippines.

China also on Sunday postponed a ceremony marking the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic ties with Japan, due to a noisy territorial dispute with Tokyo over the Diaoyu Islands, known in Japanese as Senkaku.

Tensions have also risen this year with Vietnam and the Philippines over disputed islands in the West Philippine Sea.

Beijing confirmed last year it was revamping the old Soviet ship, and has repeatedly insisted the carrier poses no threat to its neighbors and will be used mainly for training and research purposes.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



But numerous sea trials of the aircraft carrier—currently only known as "Number 16"—since August 2011 were met with concern from regional powers including Japan and the United States, which called on Beijing to explain why it needed an aircraft carrier.

Construction of the Varyag originally ended with the 1991 collapse of the Soviet Union.

China reportedly bought the carrier's immense armored hull—with no engine, electrics or propeller—from Ukraine in 1998 and began to refit the vessel in Dalian in 2002.

The PLA—the world's largest active military—is extremely secretive about its defense programs, which benefit from a huge and expanding military budget boosted by the nation's runaway economic growth.

China's military budget officially reached \$106 billion in 2012, an 11.2 percent increase.

According to a report issued by the Pentagon in May, Beijing is pouring money into advanced air defenses, submarines, anti-satellite weapons and anti-ship missiles that could all be used to deny an adversary access to strategic areas, such as the West Philippine Sea.

China's real defense spending amounts to between \$120 to \$180 billion, the report said.

<http://www.manilatimes.net/index.php/news/breaking-news/31756-china-navy-takes-delivery-of-first-aircraft-carrier-report>

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

The Chosun Ilbo – South Korea

September 24, 2012

S.Korea 'Wins Permission to Extend Missile Range'

The U.S. has reportedly agreed to let South Korea extend its ballistic missile range from 300 km to 800 km while maintaining the weight of the warhead at the current 500 kg.

In protracted talks, the two sides also agreed to scrap a trade-off clause in a bilateral agreement that says if the maximum range is extended, the payload weight must be reduced.

They remain at loggerheads over Washington's dogged opposition to Seoul's development of combat drones and civilian solid-fuel rockets. As a result, South Korea may have to abandon plans to develop state-of-the-art combat drones for which it has already budgeted W500 billion (US\$1=W1,119) and will also have trouble pursuing its civilian space project.

The missile guidelines were last revised in 2001.

A government source on Sunday said the two countries have "virtually finished" the missile talks that started early last year and hope to issue a statement by mid-October. "There's been progress in issues like missile range, missile payload weight, and unmanned aerial vehicles but not over development of civilian solid-fuel rockets," the source added.

Seoul had hoped to extend the missile range to 1,000 km, which would cover all of North Korea from Jeju, and increase the payload weight to 1 ton. But Washington is worried that this would also bring the Chinese and Japanese capitals within reach.

For drones, Seoul wanted to increase the current payload of less than 500 kg to 2.5 tons and develop not only reconnaissance UAVs but also combat drones. The U.S. agreed to increase the payload of reconnaissance drones up to a point but is against letting Seoul develop combat drones, the source said.

The talks are expected to wind up by mid-October so South Korea can declare its new missile policy before the two defense ministers meet at the annual Security Consultative Meeting in Washington late next month.



http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/09/24/2012092400698.html

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

Images Show N. Korea Launch Pad Halt

September 25, 2012

Associated Press (AP)

SEOUL--North Korea has stopped construction on a launch pad where intercontinental-range rockets could be tested, an interruption possibly due to heavy rains and that could stall completion up to two years, according to an analysis of new satellite imagery.

Despite the setback, however, Pyongyang is also refurbishing for possible future use another existing pad at the same complex that has been used for past rocket launches, according to the analysis of Aug. 29 images provided to The Associated Press by 38 North, the website of the U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies.

While the renovations don't mean a launch is imminent, they indicate North Korea is preparing the site for possible future rocket tests, according to the 38 North special report written by Nick Hansen.

North Korea conducted nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009, but experts don't believe Pyongyang has yet mastered the technology needed to shrink a nuclear weapon so it can be mounted onto the tip of a long-range missile.

There are worries, however, about North Korea's rocket and missile programs. The United States, South Korea and others have said North Korea uses rocket launches, including a failed effort in mid-April, as covers to test banned missile systems that could target parts of the United States. North Korea says recent rocket launches were meant to put peaceful satellites into orbit.

North Korea has repeatedly vowed to push ahead with its nuclear program in the face of what it calls U.S. hostility that makes a "nuclear deterrence" necessary.

Both the new launch pad where work has been suspended and the existing launch pad being refurbished is at the Tonghae launch complex, which houses nine facilities around the villages of Musudan-ri, No-dong and Taepo-dong on the northeast coast, according to the report.

"Despite the temporary halt in construction at the new Tonghae launch pad and the failed test last April, the North Koreans appear determined to eventually build bigger and better rockets," Joel Wit, a former U.S. State Department official and editor of 38 North, told AP.

The failed April launch of Pyongyang's new Unha-3 rocket occurred at the Sohae Satellite Launching Station in Tongchang-ri, a sophisticated, newer site on the country's northwestern coast.

The new commercial satellite photos of Tonghae, taken by DigitalGlobe, also show halted construction at fuel and oxidizer buildings near the new pad, the analysis said. Those buildings are described as crucial to any future tests.

The exact reason for the halt isn't clear, but the analysis says the rains this summer that killed dozens of people and submerged large amounts of farmland are one explanation. North Korea is particularly vulnerable to natural disasters because of its poor drainage, widespread deforestation and poor infrastructure.

There are no workers or heavy construction equipment at the new pad site. No flooding can be seen in the new photos, but the analysis speculates that the construction equipment may have been moved to help with rebuilding efforts elsewhere. It says that heavy equipment can only get to the site by a rutted dirt trail that crosses a stream.



"Whatever the reason, the slowdown, barring concerted North Korean efforts to make up for lost time, could result in a 1-2 year slip in the planned completion date of the new complex, which was probably the middle of this decade," the report said.

It said Pyongyang can still launch longer-range rockets from its Sohae facility.

The analysis also notes as an "important new development" the start of what could be a new launch control center meant for the entire complex. It's the only site "where work is proceeding at a rapid pace," the report said.

The images are also said to show "further, although very slow, progress" at a structure meant to build future long-range rocket stages. North Korea has also apparently improved its ability to destroy launched missiles, "an important development since rockets from Tonghae can come close to or overfly Japan."

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/korean_peninsula/AJ201209250012

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

The Korea Herald – South Korea

Tunnel at N. Korea's Nuclear Test Site Damaged by Typhoon: Source

September 26, 2012

One of two new tunnels at North Korea's nuclear test site was damaged by a recent typhoon and heavy rains, but appears to have only minor damage, a Seoul government source said Wednesday.

North Korea has built two new tunnels at Punggye-ri in the northeastern province of North Hamgyong, where the North conducted atomic tests in 2006 and 2009, in a possible preparation for its third underground nuclear test.

"It appears that one of two newly-dug tunnels at Punggye-ri was damaged by a typhoon and heavy rains," the source said on condition of anonymity.

However, the source said, the damage was not severe but only soil erosion at the tunnel entrance.

Concerns persist that North Korea might carry out a third underground nuclear test after its much-hyped launch of a long-range missile fizzled in April. Media outlets have reported the North appears to have completed preparations for such a test.

"It is not the situation that North Korea could not conduct a nuclear test because there is another new tunnel, if the North puts its mind to it," the source said.

North Korea's previous launches of long-range missiles in 2006 and 2009 were followed by nuclear tests. The international community has warned the North, already under U.N. sanctions for the nuclear tests, that it will face tougher sanctions if it goes ahead with another test.

North Korea was hit by two typhoons and severe floods in recent months, which left hundreds of people killed or missing. (Yonhap News)

<http://view.koreaherald.com/kh/view.php?ud=20120926000261&cpv=0>

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

The Korea Times – South Korea

September 26, 2012

Lee Calls for Building Stronger Armed Forces Citing NK, Regional Tensions

President Lee Myung-bak called for building stronger armed forces Wednesday, saying North Korea keeps posing missile and nuclear threats, and regional tensions are escalating over history and sovereignty issues.



Lee stressed the security environment around the Korean Peninsula is growing more fluid and unstable as he addressed top military commanders during an Armed Forces Day ceremony at the Gyeryongdae military headquarters in central South Korea.

"North Korea is still pursuing the development of nuclear weapons and missiles ... Political conflicts and military tensions are building up (in Northeast Asia) due to different perceptions of history and issues surrounding territories and claims to sovereignty," Lee said.

"As a result, the security environment is in a state of flux and becoming increasingly unstable. ... To surmount these challenges and safeguard peace and prosperity on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia, our military has to serve as an unwavering foundation of security," he said.

Tensions in Northeast Asia have spiked in recent months, with relations between South Korea and Japan turning sharply sour over Tokyo's territorial claims to the South's easternmost islets of Dokdo, and Japan experiencing a similar row with China and Taiwan over a group of East China Sea islets.

Lee said the country should steadily push for defense reform to make the military lighter, more agile and efficient. He also said the combined defense capabilities with the United States should be bolstered under the South's initiative ahead of Seoul's retaking of wartime operation control over its troops in 2014.

"We have to keep abreast of the changes likely to take place in future wars. They may well be described as a 'hybrid war' in that they will be a combination of conventional war, non-military confrontation and high-tech war based on science and technology," he said.

Lee also called for the military to arm itself with resilient spiritual power and determination to safeguard the country, stressing that high-tech weaponry alone does not guarantee strong leading armed forces.

Armed Forces Day is Oct. 1, but the ceremony was moved up because of the Chuseok holiday. (Yonhap)

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/09/116_120897.html

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

Yonhap News Service – South Korea

September 27, 2012

Officials from All Parties in N. Korea Nuclear Talks Meet in China

DALIAN, China/SEOUL, Sept. 27 (Yonhap) -- Senior officials from the six nations involved in stalled talks on North Korea's nuclear program gathered Thursday at an annual security conference here, where long-standing tensions over the North's nuclear ambition are likely to top the agenda, a diplomatic source said.

The Northeast Asia Cooperation Dialogue (NEACD) drew government officials and civilian experts from South Korea, North Korea, the United States, China, Japan and Russia to this eastern Chinese port city of Dalian for the two-day, closed-door forum.

Organized by the University of California Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation, the NEACD has served as an opportunity for informal dialogue between North Korea and its nuclear negotiation partners. Last year's meeting was held in Hawaii, but North Korean officials did not attend.

North Korea sent its deputy chief envoy to the six-party talks, Choe Son-hui, to the conference and other nations also dispatched their deputy chief nuclear envoys to the Dalian forum.

It is the first time since 2009 that representatives from all nations participating in the six-party talks joined the NEACD conference.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In Seoul, however, foreign ministry spokesman Cho Tai-young told reporters that South Korea's deputy chief nuclear envoy, Lee Do-hoon, has "no plan" to hold a one-on-one meeting with the North's Choe on the sidelines of the forum.

The U.S. State Department has also ruled out the possibility of a bilateral meeting with the North Korean representative during the forum.

The six-party talks were last held in late 2008 and diplomatic efforts to resume negotiations have been frozen since April, when North Korea defiantly launched a long-range rocket that failed moments after lift-off.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2012/09/27/75/0401000000AEN20120927007500315F.HTML>

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

Times of India – India

Pakistan Developing Tactical Nukes Aimed at India: Experts

By Sachin Parashar, Tamil News Network (TNN)

September 27, 2012

NEW DELHI: Pakistan is developing non-strategic or tactical nuclear weapons to check the asymmetry with India in conventional capabilities, noted nuclear expert Hans M Kristensen of Federation of American Scientists said.

Kristensen and his partner Robert Norris have just published a report identifying Pakistan and China as among the five nuclear powers which either have, or are developing non-strategic nuclear weapons.

The other three countries identified are Russia, US and France. "On Pakistan, the picture is clearer in the sense that it is developing the Nasr that it claims has nuclear capability," Kristensen told TOI.

"As for the role of a nuclear Nasr, it appears intended for use against invading Indian troop formations that Pakistan doesn't have the conventional capabilities to defeat," he added. About the short-range ballistic Nasr though, Kristensen said despite Pakistan's claims that it was already nuclear-capable, he was yet to witness any assessment by the US intelligence community to prove this.

With Pakistan already building its fourth reactor at Khushab military facility, a plutonium producing unit, there have been speculations for over a year now that Pakistan is manufacturing low-yield, tactical nuclear weapons. These weapons, according to Indian experts, are meant to be used along the border in case of any skirmish with the Indian Army.

Kristensen and Norris described Pakistan's "new weapon" in the report as a 60-km ballistic missile launched from a mobile twin-canister launcher. "Following its first test launch in April 2011, the Pakistani military news organization, Inter Services Public Relations, described the Nasr as carrying a nuclear warhead 'of appropriate yield with high accuracy', with 'shoot and scoot attributes' that was developed as a quick response system to 'add deterrence value' to Pakistan's strategic weapons development programme 'at shorter ranges' in order 'to deter evolving threats'," they said in the report.

The Indian security establishment was shocked last year after news broke out, as confirmed by satellite images, that Pakistan had already completed much work on the fourth reactor at Khushab. "It will add to their stockpile of low-yield weapons which, they believe, will help them dominate any low-intensity conflict with India," said SD Pradhan, former chief of joint intelligence committee, adding that Pakistan was following the Chinese in acquiring such weapons.

On China though, Kristensen clarified that there was a great deal of uncertainty about its non-strategic nuclear weapons and that China may not be developing these "now". "If China has developed non-strategic nuclear weapons, then I don't think this has anything to do with India. Instead, it would have been motivated by its concern over the longer border with the Soviet Union (in the past)," Kristensen told TOI.

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

"If the DF-10 (or other cruise missiles) have nuclear capability — and we don't conclude that it does but mention language in US intelligence documents that might attribute some nuclear capability to that weapon -- then it would be a more generic weapon that could potentially be used for regional targeting," he added.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Pakistan-developing-tactical-nukes-aimed-at-India-Experts/articleshow/16562770.cms>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russian Military Dumps Unified Nuclear Command Plan - Media

24 September 2012

Russia's Defense Ministry has abandoned plans to set up a unified command structure for the country's nuclear triad, the newspaper Izvestia reported on Monday.

As a result, each major branch of the Armed Forces – the Strategic Missile Forces (SMF), the Air Force and the Navy - will retain control over its own triad component, Izvestia said, citing an unidentified source in the ministry.

In the absence of any official statement from the ministry, the paper suggested that the decision might result from an unresolved internal struggle for leadership within the new structure.

The creation of a unified strategic nuclear command has been one option under consideration by the Russian military since late 1990's. The idea's proponents, including former SMF commander Col. Gen. Viktor Yesin, argue it would streamline both the development and the deployment of Russia's nuclear triad.

The plan envisioned the direct subordination of the command to the General Staff of the Russian Armed Forces.

According to the latest official figures, Russia has 494 deployed launchers for land, sea and air-based missiles armed with 1,492 warheads.

Russia's Defense Ministry plans to acquire at least eight Borey class strategic nuclear submarines, thoroughly upgrade its fleet of Tu-160 Blackjack and Tu-95 Bear strategic bombers, and equip its Strategic Missile Forces with formidable Yars ballistic missile systems.

MOSCOW, September 24 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20120924/176201126.html

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia to Base MiG-31 Interceptors in Arctic

25 September 2012

The Russian Defense Ministry is to base MiG-31 long-range interceptors at the Rogachyovo Arctic base on the island of Novaya Zemlya by the end of the year to defend against attack from the north, Izvestia reported on Tuesday quoting military sources.

"The MiG-31 squadron will be the main element of Russia's developing anti-missile defense system - the MiG-31 is capable of intercepting not only strike aircraft, but also cruise missiles with nuclear warheads from the Barents Sea to the shores of the Laptev Sea," the source said.

Military analyst Anatoly Tsyganok says the MiG-31BM has a range of 900 miles (1,450 km) on internal fuel, which can be extended to 3,355 miles (5,400 km) with air-to-air refuelling.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



Although Russia does not have complete ground-based radar coverage across its northern areas, he explained, the two-seat MiG-31 can intercept targets up to 124 miles (200 km) away thanks to its advanced radar and long-range missiles.

The MiG-31, the fastest fighter-interceptor in service anywhere in the world, has recently been the subject of a comprehensive upgrade to MiG-31BM standard.

The modernized version boasts upgraded avionics and digital data-links, a new multimode radar, color multifunction cockpit displays, and a more powerful fire-control system. It can simultaneously track up to 10 targets.

Earlier this year, the Air Force said it was testing a new advanced air-to-air missile, which aviation analysts told RIA Novosti was likely to be the K-37M (also known as RVV-BD or AA-X-13 to NATO). This could be deployed on the MiG-31BM, significantly enhancing its long-range interception performance against cruise missiles.

An Air Force representative said there will be no problem basing the advanced supersonic MiGs on the frozen island, as the airfield has a good runway and a full range of facilities for those based and living there, including their families.

Russia has based the 63 Fighter Squadron equipped with Sukhoi Su-27 fighters at Rogachyovo since 1993.

MOSCOW, September 25 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20120925/176212312.html

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

The Journal of Turkish Weekly – Turkey

Russian Air Force to Get New Cruise Missile in 2013

Wednesday, 26 September 2012

The Russian Air Force will accept into service in 2013 the new Raduga Kh-101 cruise missile, capable of delivering precision strikes with a conventional warhead at long-distance, an Air Force source told Izvestia on Wednesday.

The new missile, currently being flight-tested, will be able to hit targets with an accuracy of just 30 feet (10 meters) at ranges of up to 6,000 miles (10,000 km), giving Long-Range Aviation its first precision-strike long-range weapon, the paper says.

The Russian Air Force's bombers currently deploy the Kh-555 conventionally-armed cruise missile, which only has an accuracy of 75-90 feet (25-30 meters) accuracy.

The subsonic Kh-101 navigates primarily by using Russia's GLONASS satellite navigation system, but also has a backup inertial guidance mechanism which can take over if its SATNAV is jammed. It will also be capable of hitting small moving targets like vehicles, the paper said.

The new missile delivers a bigger payload - 880 pounds (400 kg) than its Kh-555 predecessor (440 pounds), and over a much longer range. A nuclear-armed variant, Kh-102, will also enter service.

The long-range capability is essential as Russia no longer has bases abroad and therefore cannot provide distant fighter escort for its bomber fleet, Alexander Konovalov of the Strategic Evaluation Institute told the paper.

The large size of the weapon means it can only be carried by Russia's biggest bombers, the Tupolev Tu-95MS and Tu-160, and not the Tu-22M3, which will continue in service with the Kh-555, the source told Izvestia.

RIA Novosti

<http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/142643/russian-air-force-to-get-new-cruise-missile-in-2013.html>

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

London Guardian – U.K.

Trident Submarine Missiles Review to Suggest 'Stepping Down Nuclear Ladder'

Ousted defence minister Nick Harvey claims military and Whitehall backing for cheaper alternatives

By Juliette Jowit and Patrick Wintour

Wednesday, 26 September 2012

The government's review of the future of the Trident submarine nuclear missile system is likely to suggest a significant downgrading of the UK's nuclear deterrent, including the possibility of locking the warheads "in a cupboard" for delayed launch only after several weeks of mounting international tension.

The revelation was made by Sir Nick Harvey, the Liberal Democrat who was the defence minister leading the review until the government reshuffle this month. The MP for North Devon said he believed the policy could get support in Whitehall and from senior military figures and Labour.

Harvey said past policy on Trident had been dictated by the 1980s view that the only deterrent to a nuclear attack from the then Soviet Union was the belief that the UK could "flatten Moscow" in retaliation. This led to the UK building Trident and having at least one armed submarine at sea every hour of every day since.

Speaking in detail about the Trident review for the first time since he was sacked as minister, Harvey said: "If you can just break yourself out of that frankly almost lunatic mindset for a second, all sorts of alternatives start to look possible, indeed credible."

He continued: "The Russia of the 21st century – economically diverse, vaguely democratic, but definitely a very different sort of place from where it was in 1980 – might find all sorts of damage to be unacceptable short of flattening Moscow.

"Therefore to convince ourselves that the only point of having any deterrent at all is the capability of flattening Moscow is the wrong and distorting lens through which to view the debate."

Instead of replacing Trident with a like-for-like 24-hour nuclear armed submarine presence at sea after the current system is due to be taken out of service in 2028, cheaper alternatives are being considered. These range from stepping down the patrols, to designing missiles to be launched from aircraft, surface navy ships or land, to a delayed launch system on the model employed by other countries, including Japan.

The delayed-launch model would involve developing a nuclear warhead for a cruise missile that could be launched from existing Astute submarines, Harvey said, "but having perfected that technology simply put it away in a cupboard and keep it as a contingency in case there ever were to be a deterioration in the global security picture that might need the UK government to take it out of the cupboard".

In this situation, the UK would store the warheads in a secure military location, from where they could be removed, put on the tip of a missile and put to sea within weeks or months.

Challenged as to why the review did not consider nuclear disarmament, Harvey said: "I think you might struggle to persuade the British public to do that, but I think you might persuade them to go down to the penultimate step: you keep something for a rainy day, but putting it away and not having it as part of your everyday activity."

Harvey told a fringe debate at the Liberal Democrat conference in Brighton that the idea of moving "down the nuclear ladder" had support across all three armed services: the army, the Royal Navy and the RAF.

He said one reason for growing support for the review's alternatives was a "perfect storm" of defence capital costs around 2020, including building the new joint strike fighter aircraft and Type 26 frigates, a new generation of unmanned aircraft, and amphibious craft for the navy.

The army, he said, was "driving around in vehicles which are literally about to fall to pieces".

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

If defence ministers in 2020 were not to be put in an impossible position, the defence ministers of the next couple of years would have to take the necessary decisions to avert a crisis.

He said: "Believe you me there are very senior figures of all three services who are highly aware of that perfect storm of these costs, who don't believe the Treasury is going suddenly ride to their rescue with a cheque and who are asking, 'Is the opportunity cost of having another generation of nuclear weapons too high, in terms of what it would prevent us doing on other fronts?'"

He added: "I can't say with certainty how they [military chiefs] will respond, but a number of them made the point to me to not portray it [the report] in such a political and party way that you don't create the space for some of us to support you and try and help."

It was not impossible that the review could get support from the Whitehall security sector, said Harvey, who was also hopeful that Labour, or parts of the party, would support the review's conclusion.

He added: "The UK national security strategy no longer even identifies the nuclear menace as a tier one threat."

In a sign of the potential political row brewing over Trident, John Woodcock, the Labour MP for Barrow in Furness, where new Trident subs would be built, this week accused the Lib Dems of being in a "hopeless muddle" over the issue.

"The Lib Dems are either cosmically ill-informed or seeking to pull the wool over the eyes of many thousands whose jobs depend on a thriving shipyard," he said.

Harvey's response was that creating jobs in Barrow should be the last consideration. "The idea that you should produce weapons of mass destruction in order to keep 1,500 jobs going in the Barrow shipyard is palpably ludicrous. We could give them all a couple of million quid and send them to the Bahamas for the rest of their lives, and the world would be a much better place, and we would have saved a lot of money," he said.

"I had wanted my legacy to be bringing the UK down the nuclear ladder," added Harvey, who was knighted after his dismissal in the reshuffle.

However, Professor Malcolm Chalmers, research director at the defence think-tank Royal United Services Institute (RUSI), raised concerns about possible savings by scrapping a Trident replacement, saying he was not yet convinced by the figures.

"If you end up going for an option which steps down the ladder but you don't save any money it's a political non-starter," he said.

The review was made part of the coalition agreement between the Lib Dems and the Conservatives after the 2010 election because the two parties disagreed strongly on the issue. After Labour decided in 2007 to replace Trident with a like-for-like system, the Lib Dems went into the 2010 general election opposing that policy while the Tories supported it.

The review is now being headed by Danny Alexander, the chief secretary to the Treasury, who is a Lib Dem.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2012/sep/26/trident-nuclear-missiles-review-downgrading?newsfeed=true>

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

Global Security Newswire

Benefits Seen in Canceling Planned U.S. ICBM Interceptors in Europe

September 25, 2012

By Rachel Oswald, *Global Security Newswire*

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



WASHINGTON -- Improved relations with Russia could be one benefit that derives from a potential move by the Obama administration to implement the findings of recent expert report and cancel plans to deploy ICBM interceptors in Poland, according to missile defense experts.

In a congressionally ordered report released last week, the National Research Council concluded it was not necessary for the United States to field next-generation Standard Missile 3 Block 2B interceptors to defend European allies from ballistic missiles fired from the Middle East. The system would also not be optimal for protecting the mainland United States, according to the findings.

"It's not that Phase 4 is a stupid idea or that it won't work," Walter Slocombe, who co-chaired the NRC expert committee that wrote the report, said in an interview with *Global Security Newswire*. "It is that it is only necessary for the defense of the United States and there is a better way to do the defense."

Phase 4 refers to the final stage of the White House's European "phased adaptive approach" that would field increasingly sophisticated sea- and land-based missile interceptors around Europe for the stated purpose of fending off potential Iranian ballistic missile strikes.

Russia views the Obama plan, particularly Phase 4, as a threat to its own long-range nuclear deterrent. It has threatened a host of military responses, including deploying short-range ballistic missiles in territory bordering NATO states, and has also linked beginning new bilateral nuclear arms control talks with resolving the missile defense dispute.

"It is a fact that the Russians seem to be less concerned about a U.S. missile defense that is intended to defend the United States from [within] the United States than a defense that is intended to defend from Europe," Slocombe noted in discussing possible gains that could be realized if Phase 4 is canceled.

Throwing out plans to deploy the Block 2B interceptors "should significantly reduce the Russian complaints although it won't get rid of them. It shouldn't be the primary reason (for doing it) but it does have that benefit," said Michael Elleman, a senior fellow on missile defense with the London-based International Institute for Strategic Studies, in a telephone interview.

The NRC panel concluded that improving the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system was the best option for shielding the United States from long-range ballistic missile strikes. That conclusion was based on an analysis of the physics involved in intercepting missiles fired from the Middle East, according to Slocombe.

The GMD system, comprised of 30 silo-based interceptors fielded in California and Alaska, is the country's principal line of defense against long-range missile attacks. In its current design, it is best suited to countering a limited strategic missile assault launched from North Korea. The NRC committee concluded the system was insufficient for fending off a large-scale missile attack launched by other countries. Its recommendations included establishing a third GMD interceptor site, possibly in Maine or upstate New York, to provide a better angle for responding to missiles launched from Iran.

If all the recommended changes are made, the Ground-based Midcourse Defense program would be more likely than the planned SM-3 Block 2B to succeed in destroying an ICBM heading toward the United States, Slocombe explained.

While a Poland-based interceptor could be outflown by a faster strategic missile, a U.S.-based defense would have a longer window to eliminate the threat, according to the former Clinton administration Defense undersecretary for policy. An enhanced GMD system could fire off several rounds of interceptors at the enemy missile while taking the time in between to recalibrate flight trajectories based on data gathered by radars and sensors.

"Each [GMD] engagement provides additional information so that your second engagement has a higher probability of being successful than the first," Slocombe said.

Responding to questions on the Defense Department's reaction to the NRC finding on Phase 4, Pentagon spokeswoman Lt. Col. Monica Matoush said by e-mail that "while DOD does not agree with every conclusion in the



National Academy report, it is evaluating the report's recommendations as well as the recommendations of a number of other studies.”

Matoush said results of that internal analysis would be reflected when the department sends Congress its fiscal 2014 budget proposal early next year.

Rick Lehner, spokesman for the Pentagon’s Missile Defense Agency, used somewhat stronger language in rejecting the finding on Phase 4.

“Certainly the Defense Department doesn’t agree with the assessment of the NRC in this case,” he said. “We believe Phase 4 will provide a forward-based defense of the U.S. homeland from a future long-range missile threat from Iran and it will also complement the existing Ground-based Midcourse Defense System now in Alaska and California for a more effective homeland defense.”

Elleman, however, agreed with the NRC report’s finding and said Phases 1-3 should provide a more than adequate defense of Europe from short-, medium-, and intermediate-range ballistic missiles fired from the Middle East.

“In an ideal world you would do both” Phase 4 and an enhanced GMD system, said a senior Senate staffer whose portfolio includes missile defense. The source spoke on demand of anonymity as he is not authorized to speak on the record.

“The 2B missile will not be available until 2021, 2022” at the earliest, he said in offering a rationale for moving forward with building a third East Coast GMD installation. Republicans in the House of Representatives have passed legislation demanding such a site be established no later than 2015.

The Defense Department in its public 2012 assessment of Iran’s military capabilities said there is intelligence suggesting the nation by 2015 could be ready to flight-test an ICBM if it receives technical outside help.

Iran is understood to not presently have any operational ballistic missiles with ranges exceeding 800 miles, though its developmental Sajjil 2 ballistic missile is designed with a range of up to 1,250 miles. Tehran has not conducted a flight test of the weapon since February 2011.

Brookings Institution Arms Control Initiative Director Steven Pifer has floated an idea for resolving the dispute with Russia on missile defense that would essentially see Washington promise to delay or cancel development of the Block 2B interceptor if it determines within a certain amount of time that Iran is not close to wielding a continent-spanning ballistic missile. The interceptor is officially projected for deployment around 2020.

Pifer told *GSN* that such a move would push Russia to use “whatever levers” are available to prevent Iran from acquiring an ICBM. Still, the former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine said he has “heard no suggestion from anybody in the administration that they are prepared to do away with Phase 4.”

The Obama administration does not want to give Republican opponents, particularly presidential contender Mitt Romney, any opening to paint it as weak on national security. That likely means no decision on the future of Phase 4 will be made before November elections, issue experts told *GSN*.

“We are in a very charged political season and I am sure there would be people who would love to play that and say the administration is not committed to missile defense,” Pifer said.

The Obama administration has its hands somewhat tied on the issue of European missile defense. In securing the Senate’s late 2010 ratification of the New START nuclear arms control accord with Russia, the president affirmed in writing that it was his intention to move forward with all four stages of the phased adaptive approach, according to Pifer.

A Romney White House would probably be in a better position politically than a re-elected Obama to replace Phase 4 with an improved GMD system, according to the Senate staffer. Romney could make the argument to Republicans in



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Congress that he is doing away with an aspect of his predecessor's missile defense agenda that is not technologically ready or strategically necessary, he said.

In the event President Obama is elected to a second term, the administration is not without options in supporting cancellation of the costly Phase 4 and securing new monies for the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, according to Elleman.

"I think if the Obama administration casts it in terms of budget constraints and actual efficacy they could easily push forward the argument" of substituting a new East Coast interceptor site with Phase 4 of the EPAA plan, he said.

Whether it happens under an Obama or Romney White House, replacing Phase 4 with a stronger GMD approach is "a very good deal for Republicans," the Senate aide said. "They can forgo the 2B and in return for that they get what they really want, which is strengthened protection for the United States."

"It's a very viable compromise but when politics intrude that makes it much more complicated," he said.

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/benefits-tradeoffs-seen-canceling-planned-us-icbm-interceptors-europe/>

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

Jordan Times – Jordan

Obama Vows before UN to Halt Iran Bomb

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

September 25, 2012

UNITED NATIONS — President Barack Obama vowed Tuesday the United States would not permit Iran to arm itself with nuclear weapons, as the UN General Assembly heard a call for an Arab military intervention in Syria.

Crises across the Middle East dominated the first day of the annual UN summit, with Western leaders trying to increase pressure on Damascus and Iran to abandon confrontation and seek negotiated settlements.

UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon condemned the violence, speaking a day after his peace envoy had accused Syrian leader Bashar Assad's regime of resorting to "medieval forms of torture" against his own citizens.

And Obama went further, declaring: "The regime of Bashar Assad must come to an end so the suffering of the Syrian people can stop, and a new dawn can begin."

But the emir of Qatar, Sheikh Hamad Bin Khalifa Al Thani, a key supporter of the Syrian opposition, called for an Arab military intervention.

"It is better for Arab countries themselves to intervene out of their humanitarian, political and military duties and do what is necessary to stop the bloodshed," he told the General Assembly.

Obama was unequivocal on Iran, which is locked in a standoff with the West over a nuclear programme that Washington alleges is designed to produce a weapon that could tip the balance of power in an already volatile region.

"Make no mistake. A nuclear-armed Iran is not a challenge that can be contained. It would threaten the elimination of Israel, the security of Gulf nations and the stability of the global economy," Obama warned.

"That is why a coalition of countries is holding the Iranian government accountable. And that is why the United States will do what we must to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon," he declared.

Six weeks before he is due to seek re-election, Obama is under pressure on the foreign policy front, with criticism of his handling of the killing of US diplomats and claims he is not standing closely enough behind Israel.

His speech was designed to counter claims from White House rival Mitt Romney and also to renew his outreach to the Muslim world after two weeks of anti-American violence triggered by a movie trailer that insulted Islam.

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

Obama said the Arab Spring would lead to improved democracy and living standards in a Middle East region more in line with US values but, while he condemned the film, he insisted no insults could justify violence.

He vowed that the militants who stormed the US consulate in Benghazi on September 11, killing the American ambassador to Libya and three colleagues, would face justice, and said the United States would always defend free speech.

“There are no words that excuse the killing of innocents. There is no video that justifies an attack on an embassy,” he said.

“There is no slander that provides an excuse for people to burn a restaurant in Lebanon, or destroy a school in Tunis, or cause death and destruction in Pakistan,” he said.

Debate in New York in the run-up to the assembly focused on the violence in Syria and the risk that the Iranian stand-off could lead to broader conflict if Israel or the United States launched a preemptive strike.

Ban spoke for many delegates when he called on world powers to put aside their differences and unite behind a plan to pressure the parties to ensure the conflicts be settled through negotiation.

The UN chief dubbed the Syria conflict “a regional calamity with global ramifications” and said: “The international community should not look the other way as violence spirals out of control.”

“We must stop the violence and flow of arms to both sides and set in motion a Syrian-led transition as soon as possible,” Ban added.

The 15-nation Security Council has become paralysed by deadlock over the 18-month-old war, which Syrian activists say has left more than 29,000 dead.

Ban also expressed concerns for the mounting tensions surrounding Iran, denouncing what he called: “The shrill war talk of recent weeks.”

While Obama took no option off the table in dealing with Iran’s nuclear ambitions, Ban called on the United Nations to reject threats of military action, warning: “Any such attacks would be devastating.”

Iran’s President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, who is in New York, has shrugged off talk of an attack on his country’s nuclear facilities, and insisted that his country will not end he insists is peaceful civilian research.

<http://jordantimes.com/obama-vows-before-un-to-halt-iran-bomb>

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

Las Vegas Review-Journal

'Milestone Experiment' Measures Safety of Aging Nuclear Stockpile

By Keith Rogers, Las Vegas Review-Journal

September 26, 2012

Scientists at the Nevada National Security Site this week fired the 100th shot on their JASPER gas gun to help them assess the safety and reliability of the nation's aging nuclear weapons stockpile.

National Nuclear Security Administration spokesman Darwin Morgan said a team from Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California conducted the milestone experiment Tuesday at the JASPER facility, in the south central part of the former Nevada Test Site, 80 miles northwest of Las Vegas.

The 90-foot-long, two-stage gas gun shoots projectiles at tiny discs of plutonium to show how they blow apart under certain pressures, temperatures and strain rates.

Issue No. 1026, 28 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 facility known by its acronym, JASPER, for Joint Actinide Shock Physics Experimental Research, opened for plutonium experiments in 2003, but it has been operational since 2001 for targets made of surrogate materials. Of the 100 shots, 41 have involved the nuclear weapons ingredient, plutonium.

In a statement Wednesday, Nevada National Security Site Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs Don Cook applauded the "remarkable milestone" achievement.

"Data gathered from experiments conducted on JASPER and the other tools and facilities throughout the national nuclear security enterprise helps the Nevada National Security Site meet its mission in ensuring the safety, security and effectiveness of the nuclear deterrent without underground nuclear explosive testing," Cook said.

He noted that the experiments "also help achieve President Obama's nuclear security objectives."

The experiments are conducted by Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for the Nevada National Security Site, with Joint Laboratory Operations-Nevada, a collaboration of Lawrence Livermore and the Los Alamos, N.M., national laboratories and National Security Technologies, the management and operating contractor for the site.

The JASPER gun fires projectiles into targets within confinement chambers at about the same velocity as a bullet fired from a hunting rifle.

JASPER uses gunpowder and compressed nitrogen gas to fire a small projectile of metal tantalum at nearly 16 times the speed of sound: 11,677 mph. The round projectile, the diameter of a 50-cent piece, impacts a gram-size amount of plutonium bomb material.

The JASPER facility was shut down for two years after scientists discovered that plutonium fragments had escaped a primary containment vessel during an experiment in February 2009.

The agency that runs the site is a semiautonomous agency within the Department of Energy. The agency spent \$18.9 million to replace some equipment and the two containment chambers and returned the gun to full operation for plutonium experiments in September 2011.

From 1951 through 1992, the site's role focused on full-scale tests of nuclear weapons. During that time, 100 were conducted in the atmosphere until the Limited Test Ban Treaty took effect in 1963.

That was followed by 828 that rumbled through the desert after they were set off below ground in shafts and tunnels.

Sixty-two of those full-scale tests involved simultaneous detonations, bringing the total number of devices set off to 1,021.

The last full-scale test, Divider, was conducted on Sept. 23, 1992. What followed was a moratorium that has been extended indefinitely.

The stockpile stewardship mission now relies in part on studying how plutonium ages in the decades after weapons were produced.

<http://www.lvrj.com/news/-milestone-experiment-measures-safety-of-aging-nuclear-stockpile-171442431.html>

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

Defense News

Nuke Mod Funding Faces Hurdles: U.S. State Dept. Official

September 26, 2012

By JOHN T. BENNETT

Securing billions of dollars to modernize the U.S. nuclear arms fleet will be challenging as Washington wrestles with its shabby finances, a senior State Department official said Sept. 26.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



Additionally, the Obama administration plans a “persistent” push to convince the Senate to ratify a key nuclear arms treaty, said Rose Gottemoeller, acting undersecretary of state for arms control and international security.

The U.S. possesses 1,737 deployed strategic nuclear warheads that are fitted on land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and bombs dropped from Air Force aircraft. The Obama administration, in its fiscal 2013 budget request, is seeking a 5 percent hike for all nuclear arms activities.

What’s more, over the next four years, the administration intends to spend \$9.6 billion to maintain and modernize the atomic arsenal, according to the Arms Control Association.

“We’re going to have to work with Congress on the ... request for the infrastructure modernization and stockpile stewardship part to make sure that funding is forthcoming,” Gottemoeller told a forum in Washington.

She noted officials and lawmakers face a “very complicated situation on Capitol Hill” to find the billions necessary for the pricey work “with the fiscal cliff [and] with sequestration looming out there.”

The fiscal cliff Gottemoeller was referring to is a term used inside the Beltway to describe the perceived effect of a number of budgetary and fiscal laws slated to expire Dec. 31: George W. Bush-era tax cuts, temporary payroll tax cuts and tax reductions for business. That also is when the health care law President Barack Obama pushed through Congress kicks in.

Additionally, twin \$500 billion, decade-long cuts to planned federal defense and domestic spending will take effect under a process called sequestration unless Congress produces a \$1.2 trillion deficit-reduction plan that either President Obama or GOP nominee Mitt Romney would sign into law.

To keep the nuclear modification work funded, Gottemoeller said Obama administration officials must form “deep partnerships” with key lawmakers and aides. Despite the 2013 modernization plans, some hawkish congressional Republicans charge that the White House is blocking efforts to modernize the U.S. nuclear arms fleet.

“The president has really emphasized the funding for infrastructure modernization and the stockpile stewardship program,” Gottemoeller said. “He has been clear. We will continue to drive forward to get the funding we need for those.”

Meantime, she also announced the administration is preparing to make a new push to convince the Senate to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).

That international pact would “institute a worldwide ban on nuclear tests and the use of networks to apply pressure against states like Iran and North Korea,” according to the American Security Project, a nonpartisan Washington think tank.

“Ratification would be significant affirmation to the importance the U.S. gives the international nonproliferation regime,” Gottemoeller said. “U.S. ratification would increase” global efforts to reduce the number of nuclear weapons around the world, she said.

If the Senate ratified the treaty, “states interested in nuclear weapons would ... face international condemnation,” Gottemoeller said.

Treaty proponents believe if the U.S. ratifies it, many other nations will follow suit. A wave of such approvals would make it easier to pressure North Korea to give up its nuclear arms and convince Iran to cease its pursuit of them, proponents argue.

But some in Washington don’t buy the alleged virtues of the CTBT.

“Opponents maintain that there can be no confidence in existing warheads because many minor modifications will change them from tested versions, so testing is needed to restore and maintain confidence,” states the Congressional Research Service.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

But Gottemoeller says verification technologies and tactics have improved greatly over the last decade, making evasion tougher.

The Obama administration has “no timetable” for a Senate vote on the measure, but made clear officials plan to meet with key senators and staffers in an attempt to gain their vote.

“We will be patient,” she said. “But we will also be persistent.”

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20120926/DEFREG02/309260004/Nuke-Mod-Funding-Faces-Hurdles-U-S-State-Dept-Official?odyssey=nav%7Chead>

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

New York Times

Cyberwarfare Emerges From Shadows for Public Discussion by U.S. Officials

By SCOTT SHANE

September 27, 2012

Page – A10

WASHINGTON — For years, even as the United States carried out sophisticated cyberattacks on Iran’s nuclear program and the Pentagon created a Cyber Command, officials have been hesitant to discuss American offensive cyberwarfare programs openly. Since June, in fact, F.B.I. agents have been investigating leaks to The New York Times about the computer attacks on Tehran.

But the reticence is giving way. The chorus of official voices speaking publicly about American cyberattack strategy and capabilities is steadily growing, and some experts say greater openness will allow the United States to stake out legal and ethical rules in the uncharted territory of computer combat. Others fear that talking too boldly about American plans could fuel a global computer arms race.

Next month the Pentagon’s research arm will host contractors who want to propose “revolutionary technologies for understanding, planning and managing cyberwarfare.” It is an ambitious program that the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, or Darpa, calls Plan X, and the public description talks about “understanding the cyber battlespace,” quantifying “battle damage” and working in Darpa’s “cyberwar laboratory.”

James A. Lewis, who studies cybersecurity at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, says he sees the Plan X public announcement as “a turning point” in a long debate over secrecy about cyberwarfare. He said it was timely, given that public documents suggest that at least 12 of the world’s 15 largest militaries are building cyberwarfare programs.

“I see Plan X as operationalizing and routinizing cyberattack capabilities,” Mr. Lewis said. “If we talk openly about offensive nuclear capabilities and every other kind, why not cyber?”

Yet like drone aircraft, which similarly can be used for both spying and combat, American cyberattack tools now are passing through a zone of semisecrecy, no longer denied but not fully discussed. President Obama has spoken publicly twice about drones; he has yet to speak publicly on American cyberattacks.

Last week, at a public Cyber Command legal conference, the State Department’s top lawyer, Harold H. Koh — who gave the Obama administration’s first public speech on targeted killing of terrorists in 2010 — stated the administration’s position that the law of war, including such principles as minimizing harm to civilians, applies to cyberattacks.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



In August, the Air Force raised eyebrows with a bluntly worded solicitation for papers advising it on “cyberspace warfare attack capabilities,” including weapons “to destroy, deny, degrade, disrupt, deceive, corrupt or usurp” an enemy’s computer networks and other high-tech targets.

And a few weeks earlier, a top Marine commander recounted at a public conference how he had used “cyber operations against my adversary” in Afghanistan in 2010. “I was able to get inside his nets, infect his command-and-control, and in fact defend myself against his almost constant incursions to get inside my wire,” said Lt. Gen. Richard P. Mills, now deputy commandant of the Marine Corps.

Cyberwarfare was discussed quite openly in the 1990s, though technological capabilities and targets were far more limited than they are today, said Jason Healey, who heads the Cyber Statecraft Initiative at the Atlantic Council in Washington.

“Our current silence dates back 8 or 10 years, and N.S.A. is a big reason,” said Mr. Healey, who is working on a history of cyberwarfare.

The National Security Agency, which plays a central role in Cyber Command, traditionally breaks foreign codes and eavesdrops on foreign communications; it is among the most secretive agencies in government. Years ago it pioneered the field of cyberespionage: breaking into foreign computer systems in order to collect intelligence. The same skills and reflexive secrecy of spies carried over to cyberwarfare, Mr. Healey said. American officials have long preferred to talk cyberdefense, leaving the attack side in the shadows.

The increased candor recently about cyberoffense results not from a policy change, officials say, but from an inevitable acceptance of attacks on computer networks as a standard part of military and intelligence capabilities. The fact that dozens of Beltway contractors see cyberwarfare as one of the few parts of the defense budget that are likely to grow is also a factor.

When Darpa announced a “proposers’ day workshop” for its Plan X program, the “overwhelming response from industry and academia” led the defense research agency to expand the event to an extra day, the agency said in a statement. (A Darpa spokesman declined to comment further on Plan X.)

Just as drone-fired missiles have never been a secret to those on the ground, so cyberattacks have consequences that cannot be hidden, even if their origin may be initially uncertain. The computer worm called Stuxnet, devised by the United States and Israel to destroy Iran’s nuclear centrifuges, was quickly detected by computer security experts when it infected networks around the world in 2010 — but remains highly classified.

Hence the Cyber Command legal conference, which avoided specific cases while dwelling on principles. Mr. Koh, of the State Department, told the conference that the United States carries out “at least two stages of legal review” on cyberwarfare operations — considering whether the law of war prohibits the use of “new weapons” altogether and, if not, how the law governs their use in “each particular operation.”

Matthew Waxman, a law professor at Columbia and former Defense Department official, said speaking openly about cyberwarfare policy was important because it allowed the United States to make clear its intentions on a novel and fast-emerging form of conflict.

Because both the Bush and Obama administrations were slow to speak publicly about their use of armed drones, Mr. Waxman said, “they ceded a lot of ground to critics to shape the narrative and portray U.S. practices as lawless.” As a result, he said, “the U.S. is trying to play catch-up, giving speech after speech, saying ‘We abide by the law.’ ”

Now, Mr. Waxman said, because the United States “occupies a position of advantage on offensive cyber capabilities, it should seize the opportunity to lay out a set of rules for itself and others.”

That is a worthy goal, said Daryl G. Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association. But he said that came with a hazard: more talk about the United States’ cyberwarfare capabilities might prompt other countries to step up their own programs at a time when the world is “on the cusp of a cyber arms race,” he said.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Mr. Kimball said Darpa's sweeping public statement about the goals of its Plan X for cyberwarfare might be a case in point.

"It makes it sound like the U.S. is preparing to be able to wage a full-out cyberwar," Mr. Kimball said. "Those kinds of statements could come back to haunt the U.S. down the road."

http://www.nytimes.com/2012/09/27/us/us-officials-opening-up-on-cyberwarfare.html?hp&_r=0&pagewanted=all

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

Aviation Week

US Cyberwarrior Accuses China of Targeting Pentagon

By Jim Wolf, Reuters

September 28, 2012

The U.S. Cyber Command's top intelligence officer accused China on Thursday of persistent efforts to pierce Pentagon computer networks and said a proposal was moving forward to boost the cyber command in the U.S. military hierarchy.

"Their level of effort against the Department of Defense is constant" while alleged Chinese attempts to steal corporate trade secrets has been growing, Rear Admiral Samuel Cox, the command's director of intelligence, told Reuters after remarks to a forum on the history of cyber threats.

The Office of the National Counterintelligence Executive, a U.S. intelligence arm, said in a landmark report a year ago that "Chinese actors are the world's most persistent perpetrators of economic espionage."

"It's continuing apace," Cox said. "In fact, I'd say it's still accelerating." He accused China of trying to "exfiltrate" Pentagon secrets, jargon for sneaking them out.

Asked whether any classified U.S. networks had been successfully penetrated -- something not publicly known to have occurred -- Cox replied: "I can't really get into that."

A spokesman for the Chinese embassy did not immediately respond to a request for comment. In the past Chinese officials have denied such accusations.

Cyber Command is responsible for defending Defense Department networks as well as mounting any U.S. offensive operations in cyberspace. It was created about two years ago as a unit of the U.S. Strategic Command, the outfit responsible for U.S. nuclear and space operations.

Cox said a proposal was moving forward to elevate the cyberwarfare unit to the status of a full unified combatant command. This would put it on the same footing as its parent Strategic Command and the Defense Department's eight other top-level military units.

The matter was headed to the secretary of defense and the president for a decision that possibly would come by the end of the year, he said.

Cox spoke after telling a conference hosted by the Atlantic Council think tank that the overall sophistication and danger of cyber threats is increasing at "an accelerating rate, not a linear rate."

"So the potential for these things to do destructive damage is very high," he said.

The United States is among the few countries reliably reported to have mounted a destructive keyboard-launched attack - against Iran's disputed nuclear centrifuges using malicious code known as Stuxnet that surfaced in 2010.

Army General Keith Alexander, who simultaneously heads Cyber Command and the National Security Agency, told a forum in July that unspecified foreign countries, hackers and criminal gangs contributed to a 17-fold jump in cyber attacks on U.S. infrastructure from 2009 to 2011.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



Promoting Cyber Command in the military hierarchy would simplify its operations in cyberspace and boost its ability to work directly with U.S. government agencies, allies and coalition partners.

http://www.aviationweek.com/Article.aspx?id=/article-xml/awx_09_28_2012_p0-501031.xml

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

Korea Times – South Korea

OPINION/Commentary

September 23, 2012

Reforms and Nukes

By Andrei Lankov

In recent months, it appears increasingly likely that the North Korean government is gradually switching to a reformist path, largely in emulation of China.

This is welcome development, to be sure. A reforming North Korea, if it manages to survive and remain stable (two big ifs indeed) in some regards will remain a rather unpleasant place. But this transformation will mean significant improvements for the average person there (and outsiders too).

We should not assume that a reformist North Korean government will try, or will be able to, solve all major problems overnight. Among other things, it seems likely that a reforming North Korea will keep nuclear weapons, even though, under a reformist regime, such weapons will constitute a significantly smaller threat for the outside world.

While developing their nuclear weapons program, the North's decision makers largely had two goals in mind. First, they needed nuclear weapons for security (correctly perceiving them as the ultimate deterrent). Second, they saw nuclear weapons as indeed an important diplomatic tool, making them powerful enough to extract aid from the international community, above all, from the United States.

Under Kim Jong-il, the North Korean economy remained woefully inefficient. To stay afloat, the country needed outside aid, and its diplomats have become very skillful at trading halting their program for large scale shipments of food and fuel. If North Korea starts to reform, its economy is likely to start growing as well. So its government will have much less reason to keep nuclear weapons as a tool for diplomatic blackmail.

However, the second function of North Korean nuclear weapons — that of a deterrent — is here to stay. If anything a reforming government will feel even more need for a working deterrent than Kim Jong-il.

The reformist regime, which is seemingly emerging in North Korea, will face two major threats. In the short run it has to be afraid of a conservative backlash. But in the long run its major problem will become its own people's growing expectations, which are likely to be unleashed by the first reforms and further encouraged by the existence of the rich and attractive South Korea just across the border. In other words, the North Korean regime will face an ever present threat of popular revolution and it is unlikely that this threat will be taken lightly.

In this regard, the experience of Libya is highly instructive, and is indeed frequently cited in official announcements of the North's media. Moammar Gadhafi's rule in Libya agreed to trade in their nuclear weapons in exchange for better relations with the West. But when a massive uprising erupted in the North African country, Western powers cited the notorious "responsibility to protect" principle and provided the rebels with air cover and military support.

It is not clear whether Western assistance was pivotal in the defeat of Gadhafi loyalists — it is quite possible that the eccentric colonel would have been thrown out anyway. But it is hard to deny that without Western intervention, his survival chances would have been significantly higher. It is also equally difficult to deny that the West would have been significantly less willing to intervene if Gadhafi still had nuclear weapons at his disposal.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In 2004-05, Western diplomats frequently cited the Libyan example approvingly when talking to their North Korean counterparts whilst urging the North to denuclearize (the U.S. ambassador to the U.N. at the time, John Bolton, even penned an op-ed on the subject). It seems that the North Koreans have indeed learnt the Libyan lesson only too well.

All this does not mean that a reforming North Korea will be as dangerous to the outside world as during the Kim Jong-il era. Pyongyang is highly likely to keep nuclear weapons for security purposes but will also be far less likely to proliferate or engage in diplomatic nuclear blackmail.

Proliferation simply does not make much sense for a country which will become increasingly dependent on international trade: selling cheap running shoes and stuffed toys to the world market will be significantly more profitable and less risky than selling plutonium and nuclear technology to rogue states.

This will mean that the outside world and especially the countries that care most about the North Korean nuclear program should welcome and encourage reform. They might even try to use it as an opportunity to achieve the holy grail of denuclearization – after all, Kim Jong-un is young and seemingly somewhat naive, so there is a slim chance that he will ignore the above mentioned hard-nose pragmatic considerations and sign away his nuclear program.

But one should not be excessively optimistic. A reforming North Korea will become a much less dangerous place but it is likely to remain nuclear so long as the Kim family remains in power.

Professor Andrei Lankov was born in St. Petersburg, Russia, and now teaches at Kookmin University in Seoul.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/opinion/2012/09/137_120661.html

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

Foreign Policy

OPINION/The E-Ring

Pentagon Behind on Predicting Chemical, Biological Threats

Posted By Kevin Baron

Monday, September 24, 2012

The Pentagon does not have a clear idea of how adversaries could misuse modern biotechnology and chemical advances, according to the Defense Department's chief chemical and biological defense official.

It turns out the Pentagon can move people faster than the speed of sound but not necessarily faster than the speed of biotechnology developments.

Gerald Parker, deputy assistant to the secretary of defense for chemical and biological defense, told the E-Ring in an interview in his fifth-floor Pentagon office that he is reexamining the department's sizable network of laboratories, Army commands, and DOD offices tasked with the work of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) protection.

"The pace of the scientific development is so rapid, and trying to understand where adversaries may try to use that advancement in, say, biotechnology, synthetic biology, genetic engineering, how it may be misused, is what we have to try to anticipate," he said. That includes, states, terrorists -- anyone. "And that's where we don't have a good crystal ball."

Parker manages the back-end of these defenses, the science, the labs, the development, and recently commissioned the National Research Council to help recommend where to start. The NRC provided him a tall list, including building a basic framework to evaluate their work and better collaboration across DOD agencies.

"Bold moves are needed," the report concluded, "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."

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



But it's not a new concern. Congress created Parker's office, long before he arrived, in the early 1990s to oversee an unwieldy network. The current assessment, Parker insisted, is a "natural evolution" to meet changing threats.

"It is evolving and it is changing, and that is a challenge that we face. What a decade ago may have impossible is now within the realm of feasibility for bad actors, to use, say, enhanced agents or new agents from a chemical and biological domain, to cause us harm."

Ten years ago, he said, after the Cold War there was a popular belief that "advances in sciences all are going to be used for good and to help mankind." Not anymore.

"A decade ago we still had a fairly prescribed threat list, and what are some of the pathogens or the chemicals that we need to worry about," he said, and some are still the threats of today. "But as we evolve to the future - how will technology be misused? And that's what we have to turn some attention to."

"The intelligence community has a hard, hard, hard challenge," he said. The Pentagon knows today's threats, he said, but not enough about what could come in the future. "Our job is to try to anticipate that better."

Now Parker wants "much more flexibility" for the Pentagon to develop countermeasures, especially in preparedness for bio-terrorism and infectious diseases. "There really is no hard and fast line between those," he said.

For example, Parker wants DOD to move away from vaccines that use, he argued, "the one drug, one bug approach." The fix is to have a "technology platform"-- remember we're talking about living things here -- able to carry the immunization components of many diseases or pathogens, not just one, such as with the current anthrax vaccine.

Beyond that, DOD needs better ability to scale-up drug and vaccine production to national security levels, and Parker is pushing for a specific network of contracts, acquisitions and close partnerships between defense laboratory and private scientists and biotechnology companies. Parker also is pushing to fast-track past some FDA guidelines that slow vaccine production, a problem he said has caused a "gap" in biodefense.

"We have a plague vaccine in development, we have **botulinum** vaccine in development - they're not licensed yet. Those are gaps that we want to close by having a fully-licensed vaccine against those two threats that have been in development."

But, he said, "It takes a long time to develop a vaccine.... We want to close those gaps that are already in phase 2 clinical trials and make sure they get across the goal line."

Additionally, he is promoting "bio-security" practices domestic with non-defense U.S. agencies and international partners.

"We have to worry about state actors and non-state actors," he said, of his Pentagon office. Especially, he said, "Making sure bad actors don't have access to dangerous pathogens." So DOD is getting more involved in beefing up detection of accidental or intentional outbreaks to security breaches and safe bio-containment at laboratories around the globe.

To get started, Parker said he's going to incorporate some of National Research Council recommendations into his own internal review.

Kevin Baron is a national security reporter for Foreign Policy, covering defense and military issues in Washington. He is also vice president of the Pentagon Press Association. He reports on the people and policies driving the Pentagon and the national security establishment in The E-Ring.

http://e-ring.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/24/pentagon_behind_on_predicting_chemical_biological_threats

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

The Chosun Ilbo – South Korea
OPINION/Editorial



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

September 25, 2012

U.S. Curbs on S.Korean Missiles Are Absurd and Risky

South Korea is apparently close to persuading the U.S. to let it boost the maximum range of missiles from the present 300 km to 800 km. South Korea originally wanted to extend the range to 1,000 km and the maximum weight of the warhead from the present 500 kg to 1,000 kg, but the U.S. agreed only to extending the range to some degree.

The U.S. also vehemently opposes South Korean development of a solid-fuel rocket for the country's space civilian program, and is against the South Korean military transferring its home-grown, short-range missile technology to the civilian sector.

Washington's claim that South Korean missile development would increase concerns among its neighbors is ludicrous. North Korea has nuclear weapons, and already 16 years ago fielded a missile with a range of 1,300 km. Recently it put into operation a new mid-range missile which can hit targets 3,000 km to 4,000 km away carrying a 650 kg warhead. And the North is developing a long-range missile with a range of 6,000 km and capable of delivering a 1,000 kg warhead to targets in Alaska.

China and Russia, meanwhile, both have intercontinental ballistic missiles that can travel more than 11,000 km, and Japan has the technology to develop a three-stage, solid-fueled rocket that can be transformed into an ICBM with a maximum reach of 10,000 carrying a 2,000 kg warhead.

It is absurd for the U.S. to tie South Korea's hands behind its back on the pretext of promoting peace in the region when its neighbors are armed to the teeth. Washington is blocking South Korea's right to peaceful space development by prohibiting it from developing a solid-fueled rocket, citing concerns that the technology may be used for military purposes, yet even Japan, with its history of aggression, was allowed to do that long ago.

Leaving South Korea unable to defend itself while tensions are mounting between nuclear-armed China and Japan over the Senkaku islands, is tantamount to threatening the South's right to survival. The U.S. must realize that prohibiting Seoul from developing its capacity to defend itself will destroy the balance of power among the three Northeast Asian countries and can hardly benefit the Seoul-Washington alliance.

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2012/09/25/2012092501439.html

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

Foreign Policy

OPINION/Killer Apps

Keeping Nukes Safe from Cyber Attack

By John Reed

Tuesday, September 25, 2012

In the wake of a 2010 incident in which the Air Force lost contact with 50 intercontinental ballistic missiles, the service is figuring out how to protect its command-and-control systems from cyber attack -- a nonexistent threat when the missiles were designed decades ago.

"Our ability to keep our networks assured and protected and not vulnerable is really important, it's something we have looked at hard," Maj. Gen. William Chambers, head of Air Force Global Strike Command's nuclear deterrence shop, told Killer Apps during a Sept. 18 interview. "It's something that we build into all of our new nuclear weapons systems so that they remain cyber-secure."

Global Strike Command manages U.S. land-based nuclear ICBMs and air-launched nuclear cruise missiles and bombs.

Protecting what are arguably the nation's most important military assets from cyber attack, and avoiding the terrifying scenario of an enemy feeding incorrect information into the nuclear command-and-control networks "seized" Air Force

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



officials after they lost contact with a field of 50 Minuteman III ICBMs at FE Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming for an hour in late 2010, according to Chambers.

"It's really important. It's a problem that about a year ago we were seized with. We have done some pretty comprehensive studies of the cyber-state of our ICBM force. We are confident in it," said Chambers. "There was an issue: we had a temporary interruption in our ability to monitor one of our missile squadrons back in the fall of 2010. That produced a need to take a comprehensive look at the entire system. It took a year to do that study, and we're confident that the system is good, but as we upgrade it, modernize it, integrate it, we've got to really pay attention to" protecting nuclear command-and-control information.

While Chambers didn't go into specifics of how Global Strike Command will protect its nuclear command-and-control networks from cyber attack, he did say that it is working to harden its networks against intrusion and the manipulation of nuclear command-and-control information and to increase backup communications abilities.

Chambers added that the Minuteman III ICBM command systems, designed in the 1960s and 1970s, are incredibly robust. "ICBM-wise we have a very secure system."

A Boeing official later told Killer Apps that while it is looking at upgrading the ancient technology used in parts of the Minuteman command networks, that technology is safe from hacking. Boeing is on contract with the Air Force to maintain the 1970s-vintage Minuteman III fleet and is helping the service keep the missiles in service through the 2030s.

"Our C2 [command-and-control] system for Minuteman is a very old system. There's a network called the HICS [hardened intersite cable system] network, and it's [made of] copper wire, and it's limited in bandwidth," said Peggy Morse, director of Boeing's strategic missiles systems programs, told Killer Apps on Sept. 18. While it's old, "it's very secure," she added.

Still, "as we look at different C2 systems and ways to move data about in the field, information assurance is a big deal there, and the security requirements are going to drive the solutions that we look at," said Morse. The company is also working to modernize the actual cryptographic devices used to encrypt and decipher launch codes for nuclear missiles.

Bruce Blair, a former Minuteman III launch-control officer and co-founder of the Global Zero movement to eliminate nuclear weapons, describes several ways the ICBMs' aging command-and-control technology are vulnerable to hacking.

Both the missile silos' radio receivers, which are designed to read messages from the flying command posts that would be used to launch the missiles in the event that land-based command centers have been destroyed, and the HICS cables are vulnerable, according to Blair.

"In the case of Minuteman, there are...potential entry points into the supposed fire-walled command and control system," Blair told Killer Apps in a Sept 25 email. "One of them is the radio antenna at the unmanned missile silos designed to allow airborne launch control centers to inject the three short signal bursts [telling the missiles to identify their targets, arm, and launch] in the event of a breakdown in the local underground command post system (for instance, their destruction by enemy nuclear missiles)."

If hackers were able to take over this antenna, "this entry point could provide access under a range of circumstances such as the loss of control experienced at FE Warren in a squadron of 50 missiles . . . or such as illicit actions taken by an 'insider' agent," added Blair.

"Another [vulnerability] are the thousands of cables that run 6-feet underground interconnecting all of the missile silos with all of the launch control centers in a given squadron. It's possible to imagine outside parties surreptitiously tapping into one cable at one location or another, and thereby gaining access to the actual conduits that control and target, enable, and fire the missiles."

Still, doing so would require knowing exactly where the cables are and avoiding security details.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Chambers did not comment on the command systems for the service's air-launched nuclear cruise missiles and B-61 tactical nuclear bombs.

A key part of protecting nuclear weapons from cyber attack as they are modernized and upgraded is making sure that the supply chain for nuclear weapons electronics is secure -- a problem that has plagued the Defense Department for years.

"We are continuing to study the cyber assurance aspect of the supply chain that supports our nuclear weapons systems," said Chambers. "That work is underway and we're taking steps to mitigate and close off any vulnerabilities."

This effort is focused on making sure that Defense Department officials know exactly where the electronic chips and other components used in nuclear command and control come from and how they are produced.

"That's not just our problem, that's a national problem," added Chambers, referring to the fact that the entire DoD is concerned about counterfeit electronic parts making their way into its supply chains. Such parts are at best, potentially unreliable and at worst could be infected with malware aimed at U.S. military gear.

John Reed reports on the frontiers of cyber war and the latest in military technology for Killer Apps.

http://killerapps.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/09/25/keeping_nukes_safe_from_cyber_attack

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

London Guardian – U.K.

OPINION/Defence and Security Blog

Plan for Dismantling Britain's Nuclear Arsenal

CND offers step-by-step guide

Doubts about government's 'Alternatives to Trident' study

Posted by Richard Norton-Taylor

Wednesday, 26 September 2012

All 120 armed warheads on Britain's fleet of Trident submarines could be removed within a month in a staged dismantling of the country's nuclear weapons system.

It would take just two years to remove Britain's entire stockpile of nuclear weapon from the Clyde, and four years to dismantle the entire stockpile of less than 225 warheads.

This is the timetable set out in what the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) calls "a practical guide to de-activating and dismantling the Trident nuclear weapon system".

It says: "Recent years have seen the consensus in Westminster crumble, with defence analysts recognising both the crippling on conventional defence spending of retaining and replacing Trident, and the strategic redundancy of nuclear weapons".

The defence budget remains under intense pressure despite belt-tightening measures imposed by defence secretary Philip Hammond (measures which should be welcomed, apart, that is, from his plan to hive off more tasks to the private sector, about which he seems to have second thoughts after the G4S Olympics debacle).

The sacking of LibDem Nick Harvey from his post as armed forces minister has been widely interpreted as meaning that Nick Clegg has given up all hope of influencing defence policy or decided that the LibDems would be even more unpopular by opposing Trident.

Certainly Harvey was angry about being sacked (despite being awarded a knighthood by Cameron). The job of monitoring the "alternatives to Trident" study that was part of the 2010 coalition deal and is due to be completed by the end of the year, is now in the hands of Danny Alexander.

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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



As Chief Secretary to the Treasury, he should take a robust approach. We will see.

The Tories and most Ministry of Defence officials say that Trident will be replaced. Their strongest argument seems to be that any alternatives, notably placing nuke warheads on smaller cruise missiles, would be just as expensive but less effective.

It all depends on what an "effective" deterrent means now. One alternative being suggested is a "virtual" deterrent whereby Britain would keep its nuclear weapons capability but not the weapons themselves - the art, but not the article, as Churchill put it after the second world war.

The CND report spells out eight phases, from ending the operational deployment of submarines to dismantling all of the UK's nuclear warheads.

The government's 2012 strategic defence and security review said the UK's overall warhead stockpile would be reduced from 225 to 180, while the operational stockpile would be reduced from 160 to 120. The number of missiles on each submarine would be reduced from 12 to 8.

One Trident submarine remains on patrol at all times - "continuous at sea deterrence", as it is called - and each submarine carries eight missiles, each of which can have up to five warheads – 40 in total.

The political and Whitehall establishment - the "permanent government" - has woken up to what Scottish independence might mean for the future of Trident since Britain's only nuclear missile submarine base is on the Clyde. Thinktanks and parliamentary committees have been drawing up reports about the prospect.

Instead of worrying about something unlikely to happen soon, they could do better to investigate the more immediate and tangible problem of what to do about Britain's nuclear weapons.

Richard Norton-Taylor regularly contributes to BBC news and current affairs programmes. Since 1998, he has been the Guardian's security editor. He won the Freedom of Information Campaign Award for journalism in 1986.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/defence-and-security-blog/2012/sep/26/nuclear-trident-liberal-democrats>

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

Washington Times
OPINION/Commentary

ADNEY: Nuclear Arsenal Deteriorating

Outdated weapons a national security threat

By Kenneth J. Adney

Thursday, September 27, 2012

Last Sunday passed with little notice. It marked 20 years since the last nuclear test conducted by the United States. The test, appropriately named "Divider," was a divider between an era of responsible U.S. nuclear weapon policy and management and the subsequent years of negligence and decline.

This test was the last gasp of a program barely started to bring our nuclear stockpile into the post-Cold War world. The time to restore and update U.S. nuclear weapon capabilities is long overdue.

In 1992, President George H.W. Bush reluctantly signed into law a nuclear test moratorium in hopes of saving the Superconducting Super Collider — a never-to-be-realized particle accelerator planned in Texas. Though the law eventually expired, nuclear tests were prohibited by presidential order throughout the eight Clinton years. Complaints that the stockpile and the quality of the U.S. nuclear weapon complex would decline were muted by promises of generous funding for "non-nuclear" nuclear weapon research.

Legislation was also passed making it illegal for our scientists to work on new nuclear weapons. For years, nuclear weapon scientists shouldered the unpopular but vital mission of "thinking about the unthinkable" — developing

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

nuclear weapons to assure the credibility and reliability of our deterrent. With the passage of this law, a noble responsibility was declared illegal.

Consumed by the terrorism threat, the eight years of President George W. Bush's administration were marked by continued, even if unintended, neglect of U.S. nuclear weapons. Expectations of friendship with Russia led to further reductions in the numbers of U.S. weapons, while those remaining grew older and increasingly obsolete, both technically and tactically.

The Obama administration makes little pretense of responsible husbandry, even of a geriatric nuclear stockpile. It fully embraces the goal of nuclear disarmament and measures progress by how fast we dismantle and disarm. As a long-worshipped leftist goal, no justification is needed for this policy within the administration. It is reinforced by the need to reduce spending in a stagnant economy, to support profligate spending on more popular priorities and a compliant, stressed-out military.

Twenty years have passed, and where are we? The number and variety of weapons in the stockpile have been reduced to levels not seen since the mid-1950s. If the Obama administration gets its way, the stockpile will soon look like it did in the 1940s.

The few nuclear weapon types remaining were appropriate for a Cold War nuclear exchange with the Soviet Union but, frozen in time, it is hard to imagine they are a good fit in today's more complex world. Our remaining nuclear systems were designed when eight-track tapes were an innovation.

Many of the experienced scientists and engineers at the nuclear weapons laboratories have died, retired or been dismissed from the team. Serious thinking about modernizing our arsenal is taboo. Any suggestion that nuclear testing should be resumed is stifled by the layers of managers, bureaucrats and politicians who control the budgets. Survival is the name of the game, not science in the interest of national security.

Some of our newer scientists have convinced themselves they know so much that more nuclear testing is superfluous. True, labs have computer simulations that rival most video games, but they are not the real world. The B-52 bomber is an old weapon system, but it is flown quite often. If it sat in a hangar for 20 years and only "flown" by simulator, would you trust it? Would an enemy fear it?

Don't forget that our nuclear weapon enterprise is "managed" by the Department of Energy, a bureaucracy that may be the most ineffective and mismanaged agency in American history. If you could peek behind the curtain, you shouldn't be surprised to see a nuclear version of Solyndra.

Also telling, the department's Nevada Test Site has been given a new name: the "Nevada National Security Site." Despite the test site's history, political correctness demands avoidance of the "N-word" (nuclear) and the "T-word" (test).

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad and the North Korean leader-du-jour threaten others with nuclear annihilation, implied or otherwise. Who knows what level of self-destruction they would risk for their cause? Our weakness and neglect of the U.S. nuclear weapon enterprise only entices them. Are they likely to take seriously the threat of retaliation by a president who won't test his most powerful weapons for fear of offending the Sierra Club?

If, after the election, adult supervision returns to the White House and Senate, a Romney administration will be faced with a long list of neglected and mismanaged federal responsibilities. On that list should be a realistic review of U.S. nuclear weapon policy.

Restoration of U.S. nuclear weapon capabilities is long overdue. It isn't clear that large numbers of nuclear weapons are necessary, but new designs and new ways of deployment should be examined — without artificial, childish constraints. Nuclear test resumption must be on the table. Let's never forget, these are nuclear weapons — they demand nuclear testing.

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

If realism and responsibility are restored to U.S. nuclear weapon policy, the prefix “super” will be unquestioned when the United States is called a superpower.

Kenneth J. Adney, a physicist who worked on nuclear weapons programs for the federal government for 35 years, was involved in more than 100 nuclear tests.

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2012/sep/27/nuclear-arsenal-deteriorating/?page=all#pagebreak>

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

The London Guardian – U.K.

OPINION/Comment is Free

After Trident: A Well-Made Argument in a Necessary Debate

Hats off to Sir Nick Harvey for again getting Trident out of the political freezer and exploring a way in which the issue can be publicly discussed without being trapped in the strong-versus-weak quicksand

Editorial

Thursday, 27 September 2012

For more than 20 years, public debate about Britain's nuclear weapons has been plunged firmly in the deep freeze. It has been frozen because, at the time when the debate was hot and loud, there was only ever one political winner. The argument was won, repeatedly, by those who regarded nuclear weapons as patriotic, brave and in keeping with Britain's status. Those who opposed them were treated as naive or treacherous, and their folly was portrayed as a danger to the country.

And there the issue has languished for a generation, never seriously debated again or publicly rethought because the political price was always deemed too high. One of the few politicians of the last generation who briefly took the issue out of the deep freeze – before returning it there – was Tony Blair. In his memoirs, Mr Blair admits he hesitated over the 2007 renewal of the Trident submarine nuclear missile system. There was a case either way, he writes. The missiles were hugely costly, a declining deterrence and would never be used. To give them up, however, would mark a downgrading of the UK and would be a defence risk. In the end, he renewed. As Mr Blair puts it: "Imagine standing up in the House of Commons and saying I've decided to scrap it ... Caution, costly as it was, won the day."

Hats off, therefore, to the Liberal Democrat former defence minister Sir Nick Harvey for again getting Trident out of the political freezer and, unlike Mr Blair, exploring a way in which the issue can be publicly discussed without being trapped in the strong-versus-weak quicksand. Sir Nick who, until this month's government reshuffle, was leading the coalition's value-for-money review of the Trident successor programme – a review which exists because of Lib Dem persistence – believes there is a strong financial and defence case for a viable downgrading of the Trident replacement which will save significant money while still keeping Britain safe. Though – or possibly because – he has been dropped from the government, Sir Nick clearly intends to go public with his views, and hopes to ensure that the review, now in the hands of the treasury secretary Danny Alexander, does not falter.

There are two main reasons why it is so important that the review proceeds and the debate deepens. The first is that the taboo on talking about Britain's nuclear weapons ought to be ended. It is crazy that almost every item of UK public spending is on the table for debate, either in this parliament or, like overseas aid and retirement benefits, the next, while one of the single biggest items of public expenditure of all is quietly waved through as untouchable. But it is also crazy that Britain's national security debate is allowed to cover any subject except the nuclear option. For financial and defence reasons alike, Trident should be on the table. It is too important not to be.

Sir Nick Harvey's smartness, however, is that he has managed to reopen the issue without – so far – it becoming trapped in the polarisation between nuclear weapons and nuclear disarmament. Sir Nick's argument offers a different option (one of several) in which Britain retains a nuclear option while also downgrading it – and saves big money while continuing to face real security threats with a nuclear programme. At the heart of it is the argument that like-for-like

Issue No. 1026, 28 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

Trident replacement, costing at least £25bn, is not the only way to maintain an effective nuclear deterrent calibrated to post-cold war realities.

Crucially, Sir Nick's argument has wide support within the armed forces. It ought also to connect across political boundaries, even to parties that are more committed to Trident replacement than the Lib Dems. Sir Nick's intervention elevates the seriousness of the often sterile defence debates that take place in conference season. Labour and the Conservatives should rise to the challenge – not in the old way of dismissing his argument as weak on defence, but in a new, hopefully more honest way which respects well argued views about a subject that is now, and should stay, back in the arena of serious politics.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/sep/27/trident-necessary-debate-liberal-democrats?newsfeed=true>

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

Issue No. 1026, 28 September 2012

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