



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Obama Seeks More Money For Nuclear Arms, Nonproliferation](#)

1. [Turkish Diplomat: Iran Is Ready to Cut a Deal](#)
2. [Iran to Unveil Major Nuclear Achievements Soon](#)
3. [Iran Will Not Surrender to West's Threats: Foreign Minister](#)
4. [U.S. Would Block Iran from Mining Hormuz Strait, Commander Says](#)
5. [China Urges Iran to Work with IAEA](#)
6. [Iran to Insert First Domestic Nuclear Fuel Rods into Reactor: Official](#)
7. [Iran Set to Unveil Nuclear 'Achievements' on Wednesday](#)
8. [Nuclear Facilities Immune to Cyber Attacks: Iran](#)
9. [N. Korea Began Enriching Uranium in 1998, Exported to Libya Via Pakistan](#)
10. [China Gauging NK Leader's Level of 'Respect'](#)
11. [Japan Atomic Power Defenders: Keep Ability to Build Nuclear Weapons](#)
12. [N. Korea, US to Hold High-Level Talks Next Week](#)
13. [Antony Calls for Joint Combat against WMDs](#)
14. [India to Test Launch Agni-5 ICBM in March](#)
15. [Russia Digs Heels on Security](#)
16. [Russian Superlaser to be As Good As H-Bomb](#)
17. [Report: Russian Sub Carrying Nuclear Missiles during Fire; Govt Had Said None Aboard](#)
18. [Su-34s to Replace Su-24 Bombers by 2020 -- Russian Air Force Com](#)
19. [Moscow Warns Against US Warships](#)
20. [Russia to Deploy S-400 Air Defense Systems Near Borders](#)
21. [Armageddon Averted? Nukes 'on Board' Blazing Sub \(VIDEO\)](#)
22. [Air Force Eyes Mobile Options for Future ICBMs](#)
23. [Next U.S.-Russia Arms Talks to Move in Challenging Direction](#)
24. [Obama Seeks More Money For Nuclear Arms, Nonproliferation](#)
25. [Worst Ever Treaty Provisions](#)
26. [Nuclear Weapons No Guarantee](#)
27. [The Nuclear Impasse](#)
28. [Wired Opinion: Cyberwar Is the New Yellowcake](#)

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. 980, 14 February 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

Washington Post

Turkish Diplomat: Iran Is Ready to Cut a Deal

By Joby Warrick and Karen DeYoung

February 10, 2012

Turkey's top diplomat said Friday that Iran is ready to negotiate an end to the standoff with Western powers over its nuclear program, suggesting that the controversy could be resolved quickly if the deep distrust between the two sides could be overcome.

Turkish Foreign Minister Ahmet Davutoglu also criticized economic sanctions against Iran as ineffective and warned that any military strike against the country's nuclear facilities would inflame the region while doing little to curb Iran's ambitions. Israeli and U.S. officials have not ruled out military options to impede Iran's progress.

"I am telling you, a military strike is a disaster," Davutoglu told a gathering at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, a Washington think tank. "It should not be an option."

Davutoglu, in Washington to consult with the Obama administration on the Syrian and Iranian crises, said he perceived a new willingness among Iran's leaders to cut a deal on limits to its nuclear program. Talks between Iran and the "P5-plus-1" powers — the United States, Russia, China, France, Britain and Germany — have been frozen for more than a year.

Turkey has sought to play a mediating role in the dispute, and two years ago it sought to help broker a deal in which Iran would give up nearly all of its stockpile of enriched uranium in return for fuel rods for its medical research reactor. Iran initially accepted the deal but then reneged.

"The deal is clear. It could be resolved in a few days," Davutoglu said Friday. The problem, he said, was "mutual distrust," including deep suspicions on the Western side that Iran may make a pretense of negotiating merely to buy more time for its nuclear scientists.

Both sides are responsible for the toxic atmosphere, said the Turkish diplomat. He said economic sanctions imposed by Western countries in the past two years have caused economic pain without slowing Iran's production of enriched uranium.

"What happened? Iran produced more," he said.

Several Iranian officials, including President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, have said publicly that Iran is ready to resume negotiations on its nuclear program. Yet, there has been no formal request for talks from Iran. Catherine Ashton, foreign affairs chief for the European Union, sent a letter to Iranian leaders in October expressing a willingness to re-engage if Iran would agree to negotiate without preconditions. As of late Friday, Iranian officials had not replied to the letter.

During a separate briefing with journalists earlier Friday, Davutoglu said Turkey stood to suffer from new U.S. sanctions that would penalize foreign countries and companies that conduct business with the Central Bank of Iran, the financial institution that handles most of the country's foreign transactions. Turkey is requesting a waiver from the U.S. sanctions, which are due to take effect in early summer.

He said Turkey's energy needs are almost totally dependent on imported natural gas, which comes primarily from Iran and Russia. It's why Turkey's capital of Ankara is eager to see an end to the standoff with Iran, Davutoglu said.

"If there's a deal tomorrow, Turkey will be relieved," he said.

http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/turkish-diplomat-iran-is-ready-to-cut-a-deal/2012/02/10/gIQANA164Q_story.html

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

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Press TV – Iran

Iran to Unveil Major Nuclear Achievements Soon

Saturday, February 11, 2012

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has announced the unveiling of “major nuclear accomplishments” in the next few days despite increasing Western pressure over the country’s nuclear program.

“In the nuclear field, major achievements have been made by the Iranian nation in recent years,” Ahmadinejad said in a Saturday speech, marking the 33rd anniversary of the 1979 Islamic Revolution.

The Iranian president said the world has witnessed hegemonic powers use every means to prevent the Islamic Republic from attaining nuclear progress.

“Today, not only has this (Iranian) nation become[a] nuclear [capable nation], but it has also succeeded in meeting a large portion of its needs in this field,” Ahmadinejad added.

The US and the EU have recently increased pressure on the Islamic Republic by imposing unprecedented sanctions against the country’s oil industry and Central Bank.

The Western sanctions and frequent threats of a military strike against Iran are intended to force Iran to halt its nuclear program, which the US and its allies claim has a covert military aspect.

Iran, however, has repeatedly refuted the allegations and said as a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and a signatory to the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) it is entitled to use nuclear technology for civilian purposes.

In line with its confidence-building policy, the Islamic Republic has repeatedly opened up its nuclear facilities to IAEA inspectors, who have found no evidence of a deviation in the country’s nuclear program.

<http://presstv.com/detail/226141.html>

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

Press TV – Iran

Iran Will Not Surrender to West's Threats: Foreign Minister

Saturday, February 11, 2012

Iranian Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Salehi says Iran will not give in to any threat over its nuclear program since it has taken the proper precautions to counter every possible scenario.

“Our nation should know that the Islamic Republic of Iran takes these threats seriously and we are prepared in every respect and have plans for the worst case scenarios. But we know that nothing will happen,” Salehi said in a television interview with Iran’s Channel 3 late on Friday.

Referring to the talks between Iran and the 5+1 group--Russia, China, Britain, France and the United States, plus Germany--, Salehi said the group has a number of questions over some “ambiguities” which Iran is trying to answer.

The minister said Iran will announce new nuclear achievements in the coming weeks, stressing the importance of confidence building between the West and Iran over Tehran’s atomic case.

“They [the 5+1 group] should trust us and we [Iran] will take the required measures within the framework of our nuclear safeguards,” Salehi noted.

The West has heightened sanctions against Iran as the US and Israel’s war rhetoric against the country is intensified.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Recently, US Defense Secretary Leon Panetta has reportedly said there is a strong possibility that Israel will launch an attack on Iran in April, May, or June 2012.

The US, Israel, and their Western allies accuse Iran of pursuing a military nuclear program and have used this allegation as a pretext to convince the United Nations Security Council to impose four rounds of sanctions on Iran.

Rejecting the allegations, Iran says it has every right to peaceful nuclear activities as an International Atomic Energy Agency member state and a signatory to the Non Proliferation Treaty.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/226084.html>

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

Bloomberg News

U.S. Would Block Iran from Mining Hormuz Strait, Commander Says

By Tony Capaccio

February 12, 2012

The U.S. Navy would move to stop any Iranian attempt to lay mines in the Strait of Hormuz or Persian Gulf as an “act of war” the international community wouldn’t tolerate, the U.S. Navy’s top Gulf commander said.

Iran’s inventory of thousands of mines “represents an indiscriminate and very difficult maritime problem,” comparable to the improvised roadside bombs used in Iraq and Afghanistan to kill U.S. troops, Vice Admiral Mark Fox, commander of the U.S. 5th Fleet, told reporters at his Bahrain headquarters and on a conference call today.

Iran’s Vice President Mohammad Reza Rahimi said on Dec. 27 that his nation may close the Strait, the passageway for about one-fifth of globally traded oil, if the U.S. and its allies impose stricter economic sanctions in an effort to halt his country’s nuclear research. U.S. officials, including Pentagon spokesman George Little, have said since that threat that they haven’t seen any Iranian moves to close the waterway.

“The laying of mines in international waters is an act of war,” Fox said today. “We would, under the direction of the national leadership, prevent that from happening. We always have the right and obligation of self-defense and this falls in ‘self-defense.’

“If we did nothing and allowed some” mining, “it would be a long and difficult process to clear them,” Fox said.

While Iran says its nuclear program is for civilian use, the U.S. and allies say the country may move to develop nuclear weapons.

Iranian’s Vow

Iran’s Foreign Minister Ali Akbar Salehi told reporters in Tehran yesterday that his country won’t ever cede to international pressure. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said he will disclose “major nuclear accomplishments” in coming days, according to the state-run Press TV news channel.

“The Iranians have every bit as much right to operate in international waters as we do,” Fox said, and “we are very keen on not trying to over-pressurize the situation.”

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps that controls Persian Gulf operations is “capable of striking a blow, I don’t deny that,” Fox said. “The guidance I give the commanding officers of my ships is that ‘you have a right and obligation of self- defense.’ ”

Still, “the oil always flowed,” even in periods of instability such as the “Tanker War” in the 1980s, when ships were attacked and damaged, he said.

Mine-Sweeping Ships

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The U.S. has four Avenger-class mine-sweeping ships in the Gulf -- the USS Ardent, USS Dextrous, USS Gladiator and USS Scout. The U.K.'s Royal Navy has another four vessels -- the HMS Pembroke, HMS Middleton, HMS Quorn and HMS Ramsey, according to the U.S. 5th Fleet in Bahrain.

Mines in the Strait could prompt insurance companies to raise rates on tankers utilizing the waterway, which in turn could lead at least temporarily to higher oil prices.

U.S. officials who follow Iran for the U.S. Central Command estimated in 2008 that Iran possessed as many as 5,000 mines. That compares with 1,000 mines in the 1980s during its conflict with Iraq and the Tanker War.

These include moored mines such as a variant that damaged a frigate, the USS Samuel Roberts, in April 1988 during the Operation Earnest Will escort of Kuwaiti and Saudi tankers.

The inventory also includes as many as 600 advanced mines bought from Russia, such as the MDM-3, which can be dropped from an aircraft. These "influence mines" can be programmed to detonate based on a ship's acoustic signature.

Caught 'Red-Handed'

The Navy would detect signs of Iranian mine-laying through surveillance aircraft and sensors, Fox said.

During the Tanker War "we caught some guys red-handed and we stopped them," he said.

Iran was assessed by U.S. officials in 2008 as having a substantial inventory of mines that could be laid by three Russian-built Kilo-class diesel submarines it bought in the 1990s. In the past 18 months, Iran also increased its inventory of smaller, domestically made Yono-class submarines to more than 10 from 5 previously, Fox said.

The subs are similar to the vessel the U.S. assessed as having sunk the South Korean corvette Cheonan in March 2010, Fox said.

The Yono class is a "lethal but not very capable submarine, he said. "It doesn't go very far. It can't stay submerged very long, but the geography of the Strait of Hormuz is certainly in their favor," Fox said of the narrow waterway.

The Office of Naval Intelligence also says the Yono-class subs may be used to deploy scuba divers.

Iran has increased the number of small, fast patrol aircraft, some of which have been outfitted with a large warhead for a suicide run at U.S. vessels, Fox said.

It also has boosted the number of coastal-defense cruise missiles along the Strait and invested to make them mobile.

"They have a capability, and we take that capability very seriously and are prepared for it," Fox said.

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-12/u-s-would-block-iran-from-mining-hormuz-strait-commander-says.html>

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

China Daily – China

China Urges Iran to Work with IAEA

February 13, 2012
(Xinhua)

TEHRAN - Visiting Chinese Assistant Foreign Minister Ma Zhaoxu has urged Iran to enhance cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Ma made the remarks Sunday during talks with Ali Baqeri, deputy secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Ma, who started a two-day visit to Iran on Sunday, said his visit was aimed at exchanging views with Iran on its nuclear issue in a candid and in-depth way.

Under current circumstances, Ma said, China is willing to maintain close communication with related parties to promote the early resumption of talks between the six nations - Britain, China, France, Russia, the United States and Germany - and Iran.

China encourages Iran to enhance cooperation with the IAEA in a bid to put the Iranian nuclear issue on the course of dialogue, he said.

Teheran said it is willing to resume the talks with the six nations at an early date and continue to strengthen cooperation with the IAEA.

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/china/2012-02/13/content_14595803.htm

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Iran to Insert First Domestic Nuclear Fuel Rods into Reactor: Official

14 February 2012

Iran will insert the first nuclear fuel rods produced in the country into a research reactor in Tehran on Wednesday, a top Iranian official told RIA Novosti on Tuesday.

"Because Western countries were unwilling to help us, we began enriching uranium to 20 percent to make nuclear fuel rods," Ali Bagheri, deputy chief of Iran's national security council, said in an interview here.

"These nuclear rods, the first created by Iranian specialists, will be inserted tomorrow into the Tehran Research Reactor in the presence of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad," Bagheri said.

TEHRAN, February 14 (RIA Novosti)

<http://en.rian.ru/world/20120214/171314666.html>

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

London Telegraph – U.K.

Iran Set to Unveil Nuclear 'Achievements' on Wednesday

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad is to unveil several unspecified nuclear "achievements" on Wednesday, his government's website said.

14 February 2012

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

"Several completed nuclear projects will be unveiled tomorrow in the presence of the president," the official website said on Tuesday.

"Experts believe these achievements will show the world the extraordinary capability and knowledge of Iranians."

It added that the progress will underline Iran's scientific adherence to "nuclear power for all and nuclear weapons for none," the website said.

The announcement confirmed a vow made by Ahmadinejad on Saturday to inaugurate "important nuclear projects" within "days," in a speech marking the anniversary of Iran's 1979 Islamic revolution.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Iran's progress in its nuclear programme has deeply unsettled the West and Israel, which see it masking a drive for atomic weapons. A report by the UN nuclear watchdog in November also expressed strong suspicions in that sense.

Tehran, though, has repeatedly said its nuclear activities are exclusively peaceful in nature.

The international showdown over Iran's nuclear programme has deepened in recent months, with the United States and the European Union slapping unprecedentedly tough economic sanctions on the Islamic republic to pressure it to halt its activities.

Israel has threatened to possibly unleash air strikes against Iranian nuclear facilities, while the United States has intimidated it, too, could take military action if it thought it necessary.

Iran has reacted defiantly, beginning uranium enrichment in a fortified bunker under a mountain in Fordo, near the holy city of Qom, and promising soon to insert its first domestically made nuclear fuel plates into its Tehran research reactor.

It has also claimed to be ready to resume stalled talks with world powers over its nuclear programme but has yet to formally reply to a letter sent by EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton nearly four months ago offering negotiations.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/9081851/Iran-set-to-unveil-nuclear-achievements-on-Wednesday.html>

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

Times of India – India

Nuclear Facilities Immune to Cyber Attacks: Iran

Associated Press (AP)

February 14, 2012

TEHRAN: A senior Iranian military official today said that Tehran's nuclear and other industrial facilities suffer periodic cyber attacks, but that the country has the technology to protect itself from the threat, an official news agency reported.

Iran considers itself to have been waging a complicated cyber war since 2010, when a virus known as Stuxnet disrupted controls of some nuclear centrifuges.

"Most enemy threats target nuclear energy sites as well as electronic trade and banking operations," said Gholam Reza Jalali, who heads an Iranian military unit in charge of combatting sabotage.

Jalali said that in addition to Stuxnet, Iran has discovered two espionage viruses, Stars and Doku, but that the malware did no harm to Iran's nuclear or industrial sites.

Iran says Stuxnet and other computer virus attacks are part of a concerted campaign by Israel, the US and their allies to undermine its nuclear programme.

The US and its allies suspect Iran's nuclear programme aims to develop atomic weapons. Iran says its programme is meant to produce fuel for future nuclear power reactors and medical radioisotopes needed for cancer patients.

Jalali was quoted by the state news agency IRNA as saying that Iran's nuclear facilities possess the technology and skills to deal with malicious software.

"Iranian experts possess adequate knowledge to confront cyber threats. All nuclear facilities in the country are immune from cyber attacks," he said.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Iran has acknowledged that Stuxnet affected a limited number of its centrifuges -- a key component in the production of nuclear fuel -- at its main uranium enrichment facility in the central city of Natanz. But Tehran has said its scientists discovered and neutralised the malware before it could cause serious damage.

Iranian officials in April 2011 announced the discovery of Stars, which they said embedded itself in the file systems of government institutions and had the capability to cause minor damage.

Jalili described a third virus, Doku, which he said "only spies and gathers information".

"Doku has not created any troubles for Iranian industrial organizations," he said.

He said all three attacks had been stopped and the viruses cleaned up from Iranian systems. "Many viruses are produced in the world every day, and (Iran's) cyberdefense headquarters monitors them. So far there has been no destructive impact inside the country," he said.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/tech/enterprise-it/security/Nuclear-facilities-immune-to-cyber-attacks-Iran/articleshow/11884484.cms>

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

Mainichi Daily News – Japan
February 11, 2012

N. Korea Began Enriching Uranium in 1998, Exported to Libya Via Pakistan

LONDON -- North Korea began to enrich uranium in 1998, the year after the construction of light-water nuclear reactors began in the country under a 1994 agreement with the United States, the Mainichi has learned.

The U.S. government had believed that North Korea began to enrich uranium for nuclear weapons in 2000. It is also known that North Korea has been producing uranium hexafluoride (UF6) through cooperation with Pakistan in violation of its framework agreement with the U.S.

The latest revelations highlight Pyongyang's intense focus on its nuclear weapons program.

North Korea began building nuclear reactors and related devices at its Nyeongbyeon Nuclear Scientific Research Center in the 1980s. It then started reprocessing spent nuclear fuel to extract plutonium for nuclear bombs.

However, under the October 1994 framework agreement, North Korea promised to give up nuclear weapons development in exchange for two U.S. light-water reactors. After North Korea discontinued all its nuclear arms-related projects including plutonium extraction, the construction of the reactors began in Kumho, South Hamgyong, in August 1997. The following year, however, Pyongyang began to secretly enrich uranium for nuclear weapons.

According to diplomatic sources familiar with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections, in the mid-1990s Pyongyang obtained centrifuges and other devices needed for uranium enrichment through Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan -- the "father" of Pakistan's atomic arsenal who North Korea had established relations with through missile exports.

In April 1998, North Korea asked Khan to analyze the composition of UF6 it had produced during experiments. However, as the UF6 sample quality was quite low, Khan provided North Korea with Pakistani UF6, depleted uranium gas and other substances.

What is believed to be some 1.7 metric tons of North Korean-made UF6 was first discovered in two cylinders by IAEA inspectors in Libya in December 2003, around the time the regime of Moammar Gadhafi gave up its nuclear weapons program.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

One large cylinder contained 1.6 tons and one smaller cylinder held 25 kilograms. A third small cylinder contained 25 kilograms of depleted uranium gas that cannot be used for enrichment.

It also came to light that Khan's illicit nuclear technology business had agreed in 1997 to sell 20 tons of UF6 to Libya. All the three cylinders found in Libya bore serial numbers indicating the containers were produced in Pakistan.

However, the UF6 in the large cylinder did not match any available data on nuclear substances throughout the world, prompting the IAEA to launch an investigation to confirm its origins. The IAEA discovered that North Korea had asked Khan to analyze its UF6, and that all the three cylinders had been exported from Pakistan to North Korea, with the large one empty.

Moreover, the organization confirmed that all the cylinders had been shipped from North Korea to Libya via Pakistan and Dubai, and that Libya had remitted massive sums to North Korea's bank accounts in Macau and other areas the year after receiving the UF6.

Based on the finding, the IAEA pointed out in a September 2011 report on North Korea that UF6 contained in the large cylinder is highly likely to have been made in North Korea. It then pointed to the possibility that North Korea supplied UF6 to Libya on behalf of Pakistan's illegal nuclear technology business.

<http://mdn.mainichi.jp/mdnnews/international/news/20120211p2a00m0na015000c.html>

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

Korea Times – South Korea
February 13, 2012

China Gauging NK Leader's Level of 'Respect'

By Kim Young-jin

China is gauging the new North Korean regime to see whether it will show “respect” to Beijing, an article in its state-run media said, adding that Pyongyang is apparently seeking better relations with the West.

The remark, carried in an editorial on the official website china.org.cn, came after the North installed Kim Jong-un as its new leader following the death of his father, the late ruler Kim Jong-il.

“North Korea is the country that China assists the most, however, it no longer treats Beijing as a close friend. Instead, it wants to build direct relations with the U.S.

“As Kim Jong-un becomes the country's new leader, how much the DPRK will respect China has yet to be seen,” it said, using the acronym for the North's official name.

The comment was surprising given that analysts say the bond between the traditional Cold War allies has become tighter in recent years amid the North's growing isolation over its nuclear weapons program and provocative behavior. Beijing reportedly delivered massive amounts of food aid across the border following the senior Kim's death in an apparent bid to help maintain stability.

Observers said the editorial appeared to be a warning to the new regime not to neglect its benefactor for the sake of better ties with Washington, in a move that would come as Chinese Vice President Xi Jinping, Beijing's leader-in-waiting, travels to the United States for a highly-anticipated visit this week.

North Korea is expected to be discussed when Xi meets with U.S. President Barack Obama today.

The talks come as regional players consult over how to resume six-party negotiations on denuclearizing the North, a forum that Beijing hosts.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Before Kim Jong-il's death, Pyongyang reportedly struck a deal with Washington to suspend its uranium enrichment program in return for food aid, a deal which would have paved the way for resumption. While the leader's passing threw this into doubt, both sides have left the door open for further discussions.

U.S.-North Korea ties have been icy since Obama took office in 2009, with the North walking out of the six-way talks, conducting a nuclear test and twice attacking the South during that time.

The editorial struck an impatient tone apparently over the stalled negotiations.

"China has mediated and promoted talks between the North Korea and the U.S., but neither of the two nations has embraced these efforts," it said.

China and the U.S. have locked horns over the North in recent years, with Beijing protecting Pyongyang at the U.N. Security Council for censure over its 2010 sinking of the warship Cheonan and shelling of Yeonpyeong Island. Amid growing concern over China's clout, the Obama administration has signaled a strategic shift to Asia including strengthening its military presence here, a move the editorial acknowledged.

"The U.S. is never going to leave Asia. China and the U.S. must learn to live with each other at peace in the region," it said.

Analysts do not expect Kim Jong-un to veer from his father's policies as he focuses on consolidating power, and relations with major powers such as China.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/02/116_104735.html

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

Arab News – Saudi Arabia

Japan Atomic Power Defenders: Keep Ability to Build Nuclear Weapons

By REUTERS

February 13, 2012

TOKYO: Japan's nuclear power advocates have pulled out all the stops since the Fukushima crisis, even arguing that the only nation to suffer an atomic attack needs to keep its ability to build its own nuclear weapons.

Once, merely the public suggestion that Japan should debate ending its ban on such weaponry was enough to get a politician fired. But worries about North Korea's nuclear ambitions and an expanding Chinese military are eroding that taboo.

Last March's disaster at the Fukushima atomic plant, which spewed radiation and forced mass evacuations, has already prompted Japan to scrap a plan to boost nuclear power to over 50 percent of electricity demand by 2030 from 30 percent before the accident.

But politicians, experts and officials are still arguing over what role — if any — nuclear power should play in a new energy mix program to be unveiled in the summer.

Even the rationales for keeping atomic energy are proving contentious.

"There are people who say that one reason we need nuclear power is in order to have the latent capability for nuclear weapons, from the perspective of national defense," Tatsuo Hatta, an economist who is on an expert panel discussing Japan's future energy mix, told Reuters in a recent interview.

"I think that is one idea but if that is the case, we don't need so many reactors. And the objective should be made clear," he said. "This is not something that should be debated by the trade ministry."

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



Japan has 54 nuclear reactors, all but three now off-line mainly for safety checks. The rest are due to shut down soon while the government tries to persuade a wary public that it is safe to restart those that pass newly-imposed stress tests.

Shigeru Ishiba, a former defense minister from the now- opposition Liberal Democratic Party, laid out the argument for a latent nuclear deterrent in a magazine article late last year.

“If we had to start from basic research, it would take 5-10 years to create nuclear weapons, but since we have nuclear power technology, it would be possible to create nuclear weapons in the relatively short time of several months to a year,” he said.

“And our country has globally leading-edge rocket technology, so if we put these two together, we can achieve effective nuclear weapons in a relatively short time.”

Japan’s post-World War Two constitution prohibits going to war and, if taken literally, bans the maintenance of a standing army. But successive governments have interpreted the pacifist Article Nine as allowing a military for self-defense.

Since 1957, the official interpretation has also held that Article Nine is not an obstacle to developing nuclear arms even though the concept has long been a political taboo.

“People used to be more reserved about saying it,” said Koichi Nakano, a Sophia University political science professor.

“Ishiba isn’t saying that Japan should have nuclear weapons but that having the potential is very important to stay in the big leagues and if you don’t want to be pushed around by China.”

Suggestions Japan might someday use its civilian nuclear technology and stockpile of plutonium — now totalling about 45 tons at home and overseas — to arm itself with atomic bombs risk fanning concerns by an already suspicious Beijing.

Critics have questioned why Japan stays committed to developing costly nuclear waste reprocessing facilities unless it wants to be able to make atomic bombs should it so decide.

The idea that Japan should have its own nuclear arms, however, is unlikely to gain traction with the majority of the public, whose collective psyche remains scarred by memories of the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in the final days of World War Two, experts say.

“Japan is the only country that suffered from nuclear weapons. It is a sort of shared understanding that we should use nuclear power only for peaceful uses,” said Masakazu Toyoda, head of the Institute of Energy Economics, Japan and a member of the expert panel, who believes Japan needs atomic energy.

As Toyoda’s remark suggests, not all supporters of nuclear power — whose reasons range from the need for energy security in a resource-poor land to a desire to lead in atomic power safety technology, find the latent deterrent argument appealing.

“If Japan considers arming itself with nuclear weapons, then it will find itself in the same situation as Iran and North Korea,” Jitsuro Terashima, chairman of the Japan Research Institute and another member of the expert panel, told Reuters.

“Japan’s isolation would quickly deepen.”

<http://arabnews.com/world/article575006.ece?>

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

Korea Times – South Korea



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

February 14, 2012

N. Korea, US to Hold High-Level Talks Next Week

WASHINGTON (Yonhap) -- The United States said Monday that it will hold another round of high-level talks with North Korea next week, an announcement that came hours before a closely watched trip by Chinese Vice Premier Xi Jinping here.

"Special Representative for North Korea Policy Glyn Davies will lead an inter-agency team to Beijing on Feb. 23 to meet with a DPRK delegation led by First Vice Minister Kim Kye-gwan," State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland told reporters. DPRK stands for North Korea's official name, Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

It would be the first direct dialogue between the two sides since a leadership change in the secretive communist nation.

The North's leader, Kim Jong-il, died of a heart attack in December following a 17-year rule. His son, Kim Jong-un, reportedly in his late 20s, took power after his father's death.

"This is a continuation of the meetings that we have been having with North Korea ... to see if it is prepared to fulfill its commitments under the 2005 joint statement of the six-party talks (and) its international obligations as well as to take concrete steps towards denuclearization," Nuland said.

She continued, "This is the third such meeting that they have had. The question is whether they are prepared to respond to what we are looking for in order to get back to talks, so that's what we're looking to find out in Beijing. We thought that it was a good time to see where they are."

The Beijing-based six-way talks were launched in 2003. But the on-again and off-again negotiations have been stalled for three years amid Pyongyang's repeated provocative acts.

Mike Hammer, acting assistant secretary of state for public affairs, later said his government views talks with North Korea on the basis of "realism, not optimism."

He said it's worth "exploring" whether North Korea is prepared to fulfill its commitments under the 2005 six-party deal with the U.S., South Korea, China, Russia and Japan. Pyongyang agreed to abandon all of its nuclear program in return for political and economic incentives.

"It's not a question of really trying to gauge this with some level of optimism but rather realism," he told a meeting at the Foreign Press Center.

Hammer did not give a clear answer to a question about whether the U.S. took into account Xi's visit in deciding the timing of the announcement on the talks.

He said the U.S. has consulted with the other partners, including China, on the next steps.

Xi is apparently on track to become China's next leader. He flew in Washington on Monday for a five-day stay.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/02/113_104771.html

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

Firstpost – India

Antony Calls for Joint Combat against WMDs

February 13, 2012

Press Trust of India (PTI)

New Delhi: Warning against the danger of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) falling into wrong hands, Defence Minister AK Antony today said nations will need to work together to defeat such challenges.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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 defence minister also said that the international community will have to jointly fight the menace of terrorism, which is of “grave concern to global peace and stability”.

“WMDs go beyond nuclear weapons. These weapons may be biological, chemical and radiological, in nature and do not require sophisticated delivery systems. There is always a danger that these weapons may fall into wrong hands.

“Thus, nations need to cooperate with each other and draw up a comprehensive approach to evolve institutional frameworks to defeat such challenges,” he said while addressing the 14th Asian Security Conference in New Delhi.

Antony said problems such as “terrorism, drug trafficking, money laundering and transnational crimes are common concerns the world over”.

“Terrorism continues to remain a grave concern to world peace and stability. Nations must draw up collective and innovative measures to counter and defeat such asymmetric threats,” he said.

The defence minister said impact of issues such as food, water, economic instability, terrorism, proliferation of WMD and drug trafficking is having an impact on the dynamics of various societies and nations.

Antony said that as a fast-developing economy and democracy, India has been and will continue to be committed towards building a peaceful, secure and economically stable Asia.

“However, to address such non-traditional challenges, we also need to move beyond conventional ways of dealing with them,” he added.

Observing that cyber security was a critical area of concern, Antony said nations must take serious and prompt note and cooperate with each other to strengthen seamless cyber security.

“Security of networks has become an urgent concern, as enormous vital and critical data passes through them every day. Any breach of cyber networks can cause untold damage to the security of any society or country,” he said.

Pointing out that climate change too has an impact on security as it is causing floods and the per capita availability of water is decreasing sharply worldwide, the minister said, “Water is actually fast emerging as a major source of insecurity and a potential issue for conflict among nations.”

“Thus, nations need to cooperate on sharing water and efficient water usage and harvesting and initiate collective action for preserving our common environment,” he added.

Antony said that energy was a source of competition among nations for energy demands and as fossil fuels are depleting at a rapid pace, nations and societies need to focus on alternative sources to meet our needs.

<http://www.firstpost.com/fwire/antony-calls-for-joint-combat-against-wmds-211437.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

India to Test Launch Agni-5 ICBM in March

14 February 2012

India plans to test launch its new Agni-5 intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM), capable of carrying nuclear warheads, in the second half of March, The Times of India reported on Tuesday.

The Agni-5 has a striking range of up to 5,000 kilometers (around 3,100 miles), which means it could bring targets as far away as northern China within reach. Only Russia, the United States, China, Britain and France have such missiles in their arsenals.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

"Integration of Agni-5 is on, one at Hyderabad and the other at Wheeler Island. Later part of March we will be launching this ICBM," Vijay Kumar Saraswat, Scientific Advisor to the Defense Minister, was quoted as saying by The Times of India.

Earlier versions of the Agni series, Agni 1-3 with a range between 700 and 3,500 kilometers are already in service with the Indian Army, while Agni-4 remains in testing mode. It was successfully tested last year.

Compared to previous Agni variants, the Agni 4 and 5 have a better striking precision and are based on mobile launchers, while the older missiles needed rail mobile launchers with an exhaustive infrastructure.

NEW DELHI, February 14 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20120214/171307089.html

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

Voice of Russia – Russia

Russia Digs Heels on Security

By Garibov Konstantin

February 11, 2012

Russia will not discuss with Washington the issue of non-strategic nuclear weapons on the principle of a proposed "swap".

This is how the head of the Foreign Ministry's security and disarmament desk, Mikhail Ulyanov, responded to a pertinent hint by Rose Gottemoeller, US Assistant Secretary of State for arms control, verification and compliance.

The problem is, Russia's non-strategic nuclear armory is on Russian territory, while America's – far away from the US coast and, at the very same time, very close to this country's border. Instead of any swaps Russia insists on a complete scrapping by Washington of its entire overseas infrastructure for the rapid deployment of such weapons.

Mentioning the issue of the US-proposed European missile defense, Mikhail Ulyanov warned the West that Moscow would respond adequately to any such moves and, if necessary, would deploy on its western and southern borders advanced missile systems, including state-of-the-art Iskanders. We have a commentary by defense expert Igor Korotchenko.

"We still have no progress in our missile defense talks with the West, as all our proposals are simply being brushed aside... No one is giving us any security guarantees, so we warned that as soon as they start setting up anti-missiles in Poland and we see American warships with Aegis missile on board appearing close to our borders, Russia would respond with deployments of attack missiles on its border, which I believe is an absolutely normal and adequate reaction to the American threats..."

Russia also wants Pakistan, India and Israel to sign up to the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and is urging North Korea to do the same and enjoy pertinent guarantees by the IAEA.

Pyongyang pulled out of the nonproliferation accord and sent out IAEA inspectors after the UN Security Council condemned a test of a North Korean nuclear device.

Says Vladimir Yevseyev, the head of a political and public research center in Moscow:

"We need to do this because the threat of the global spread by these countries of nuclear weapons and materials is very real... If the international community, Russia included, is able to exert influence on these countries, then the risk of such nuclear proliferation from India, Pakistan and Israel will diminish and we'll manage to avert the nightmarish scenario of nuclear terrorism..."

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Tightening the security of nuclear installations, materials and technology is a major goal, says Pyotr Topychkanov, a Moscow-based expert on international security.

"It's imperative for us to get rid of the natural barrier that exists between the signatories to the nonproliferation treaty and those who are not.... Security criteria for nuclear materials must be equally high for all and here we need a greater degree of cooperation..."

In 2004 Russia and the US proposed a UN Security Council resolution which, among other things, aimed to prevent weapons of mass destruction from falling into the hands of terrorists. In 2006 Moscow and Washington collectively put forth the so-called Global Initiative against acts of nuclear terrorism, almost 100 countries have since signed up to. Russia and the US also work hand in hand in countering risks and threats of nuclear proliferation...

<http://english.ruvr.ru/2012/02/11/65847426.html>

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

RT – Russia

Russian Superlaser to be As Good As H-Bomb

12 February 2012

Russia has launched a \$1.5 billion project to create a high-energy superlaser site which designers pledge will be the best in the world. Capable of igniting nuclear fusion, the facility will be used both for thermonuclear weapon and civil purposes.

The new laser device will be used for inertial confinement fusion (ICF) studies. The field aims to recreate in the lab the processes which happen inside a star or in a hydrogen bomb explosion. ICF is similar to what scientists are trying to do with the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) project, but takes an alternative approach to how nuclear fusion is started.

The laser facility will be developed by the Research Institute of Experimental Physics (RFNC-VNIIEF), a leading Russian nuclear laboratory. In its six decades of history, it was involved in the development of both the military and civilian nuclear programs in Russia.

The site will have the size of a 360-meter long 10-story building and be built near the Sarov technology park in Nizhny Novgorod region in central Russia, said the institute's head of research, Radiy Ilkaev, who said it will be a dual-purpose device.

"On the one hand, there is the defense component, because high energy density plasma physics can be productively studied on such devices. It's necessary for developing thermonuclear weapons. On the other hand, there is the power industry component. The world's leading physicists believe that laser nuclear fusion can be useful for future energetics," the scientist said.

The Russian device will be compatible with the American National Ignition Facility (NIF) and the French Laser Mégajoule (LMJ) in terms of their capabilities. The US laboratory is currently online. The French counterpart is due to be launched in 2012. The Russian facility may be ready in a decade, Ilkaev estimates.

Ilkaev says the future Russian facility will be able to deliver 2.8 megajoules of energy to its target, as compared to energy levels of about 2 megajoules for the American and French lasers.

"We are making our device later than they did, because such projects are costly, but ours will be the best in the world," the scientist promised.

An ICF laser device takes a powerful laser beam, splits it into a dozen separate "beamlets", amplifies each one individually and shoots all of them at a pellet of fusion fuel. If carefully timed, the pinhead-sized target implodes

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



on itself, which makes the mix of deuterium and tritium in it 100 times denser than lead and heats it up to 100 million degrees. This is enough to start a chain nuclear fusion reaction.

The process is somewhat similar to what happens in a thermonuclear bomb. In such a weapon an ordinary fission bomb is used to produce energy to trigger reaction in fusion fuel. An ICF attempts re-release the same nuclear energy in a more controlled manner.

It may sound simple, but in practice it took scientists and engineers decades to create powerful lasers, special optic systems, techniques for precise target fabrication and other technologies to even come close to success. So far no laboratory has managed to produce more energy in this fashion than the amount used to power the laser.

But when this ignition milestone is reached, the result could be a source of clean power with fuel reserves lasting for centuries to come. Unlike uranium, which is used in present-day nuclear power plants, deuterium and tritium, which are rare variations of hydrogen, are abundant in the oceans.

And for the generals an ICF facility gives an opportunity to find out more about how thermonuclear weapons work. Currently the US, France and Russia are signatories to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, which forbids any kind of tests involving nuclear explosions.

It means the military cannot just take an old bomb and detonate it to see if it's still operational after decades of storage. A superlaser capable of performing a mini-H-bomb blast can provide the data to alleviate those professional fears.

<http://rt.com/news/russia-superlaser-thermonuclear-weapon-123/>

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

Minneapolis Star Tribune

Report: Russian Sub Carrying Nuclear Missiles during Fire; Govt Had Said None Aboard

By VLADIMIR ISACHENKOV , Associated Press

February 13, 2012

MOSCOW - A fire at a drydocked Russian nuclear submarine in December could have sparked a radiation disaster because it was carrying nuclear-tipped ballistic missiles and other weapons, despite official statements to the contrary, a Russian news magazine reported Monday.

The respected Kommersant Vlast said the fire aboard the Yekaterinburg could have triggered powerful explosions that would have destroyed the submarine and scattered radioactive material around a large area.

When the fire erupted on Dec. 29, Russia's Defense Ministry said all weapons had been unloaded before the submarine was moved to a drydock for repairs at the Roslyakovo shipyard in the Murmansk region.

The ministry declined immediate comment on the magazine's claim.

It took hundreds of emergency workers more than 20 hours to extinguish the massive blaze that shot orange flames up to 66 feet (20 meters) into the air. The Defense Ministry said an unspecified number of crew members remained inside the sub during the fire and that seven crewmen were hospitalized after inhaling carbon monoxide fumes from the blaze.

The fire, which authorities later blamed on a breach in safety regulations, erupted at wooden scaffolding around the sub and quickly engulfed the vessel's rubber-coated outer hull.

With the sub's hydraulic systems incapacitated, the crew had to manually remove heavy torpedoes from tubes in the bow to prevent them from exploding as temperatures were rising quickly.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The magazine said that an explosion of torpedoes, each carrying 660 pounds (300 kilograms) of TNT would likely have destroyed the bow and could have triggered a blast of nuclear-tipped missiles in the midsection and the vessel's two nuclear reactors.

"Russia was a step away from the largest catastrophe since Chernobyl," Komersant Vlast said, referring to the 1986 explosion at a nuclear power plant in then-Soviet Ukraine.

The magazine said that weapons are normally removed from submarines before repairs, but the navy wanted to save time on a lengthy procedure to unload the missiles and torpedoes. It said the repairs were supposed to be relatively minor and the Northern Fleet wanted the Yekaterinburg to be quickly back to service.

<http://www.startribune.com/world/139206694.html>

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

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Russia
14 February 2012

Su-34s to Replace Su-24 Bombers by 2020 -- Russian Air Force Com

SINGAPORE, February 14 (Itar-Tass) — Su-24 front-line bombers will be replaced with Su-34s according to schedule by 2020, Russian Air Force Commander in Chief Col.-Gen. Alexander Zelin told ARMS-TASS at the Singapore Air Show 2012 on Tuesday.

Commenting, at the ARMS-TASS request, on last Monday's Su-24 accident in the Kurgan Region, in which the crew survived as they were safely ejected, and on the aircraft replacement, the commander noted that the planes would be replaced according to schedule as Su-34s were placed in service.

According to the commander, the Russian Air Force has 124 Su-24s at present.

The Air Force will receive ten Su-34s in 2012, and in 2011, six such front-line bombers were taken.

Su-34 mass production is organized at the Novosibirsk-based Chkalov aircraft building centre, which belongs to the Sukhoi holding. The Air Force has twelve such planes for the present. The aircraft are supplied in accordance with the state contract concluded in 2008 to provide 32 such planes for the Defence Ministry. By 2020, Su-34s will replace all the Su-24 bombers.

<http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c32/342098.html>

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

China Daily – China

Moscow Warns Against US Warships

February 14, 2012
(Xinhua)

MOSCOW - Russia would respond if the United States deploys warships in the Black Sea or Arctic, Russian Chief of the General Staff Nikolai Makarov said Tuesday.

"In a case where such (Aegis anti-missile system-equipped) ships appear in the Barents Sea, or in the Black Sea for instance, we will likely take special measures in the frame of the state re-armament program," Makarov told reporters.

"But we would not like to use these measures as they increase the financial burden for us," he added.

Referring to the US-led NATO missile defense shield in Europe, which, according to the United States, is aimed at countering potential missile threats from Iran, Makarov said it would also pose a threat for Russia.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

By 2018, an entirely different generation of those missiles would be "capable of shooting down strategic missiles over our territory," Makarov said.

Moscow has long opposed the deployment of NATO missile defense facilities near its borders and wants legally binding guarantees from the United States and NATO that the shield does not target Russia.

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2012-02/14/content_14608113.htm

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

Journal of Turkish Weekly – Turkey

Russia to Deploy S-400 Air Defense Systems Near Borders

Tuesday, 14 February 2012

RIA Novosti

Russia will place several new S-400 Triumf air defense systems near its borders in 2012, Air Force Commander Alexander Zelin said.

"The Russian Armed Forces will receive several S-400 Triumf air defense systems this year," Zelin told RIA Novosti on Monday. "This time they will be deployed in air defense units guarding [Russia's] border regions."

Russia currently has two S-400 regiments protecting the airspace around Moscow.

Zelin did not specify the deployment locations for new S-400 units, but some of them will most likely be placed in the Russian exclave of Kaliningrad as part of the response to the planned European missile shield initiative, which Moscow considers as a threat to its national security.

The S-400 (SA-21 Growler) air defense system is expected to form the cornerstone of Russia's theater air and missile defenses by 2020.

The S-400 can engage targets at a range of up to 400 km and an altitude of 40,000-50,000 meters. The system uses an array of assets optimized for engaging ballistic and cruise missiles.

An S-400 air defense regiment consists of two or three battalions equipped with four systems each. Russia is planning to arm 56 battalions with S-400 systems by 2020.

<http://www.turkishweekly.net/news/131344/russia-to-deploy-s-400-air-defense-systems-near-borders.html>

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

RT – Russia

Armageddon Averted? Nukes 'on Board' Blazing Sub (VIDEO)

14 February 2012

There are claims in the Russian media; the country was within a hair's breadth of a disaster comparable to Chernobyl a few weeks ago. It is alleged a strategic missile-carrying sub was on fire for more than a day with its entire arsenal aboard.

According to Kommersant-Vlast magazine the submarine K-84 'Ekaterinburg' was undergoing minor repairs when it caught fire on December 29 during routine maintenance at a dry dock in Murmansk in Northern Russia. The missiles had not been offloaded as the repairs were regarded as minor, and the sub was due to return to service early in 2012.

The magazine claims the scale of emergency has been downplayed.

Equipment on the K-84

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



The standard arsenal of the K-84 is 16 intercontinental ballistic Sineva missiles with four thermonuclear warheads on each one of them. Every missile is also a tank filled up with highly toxic and combustible fuel. A missile weighs about 80 tons and most of that is fuel.

The submarine is also armed with up to 12 torpedoes and anti-submarine missiles, with about 300 kilograms of high-power military explosive or a nuclear warhead on every one.

On top of that the sub is powered by two 90 megawatt water-cooled nuclear reactors each containing about 70 kilograms of uranium-235. The reactors were stopped for the time of the repair but the fission materials remained on board at the time of the alleged accident.

The “Ekaterinburg” had a busy year in 2011, performing three missile tests, including the launch of a new deeply modernized missile Liner. In late August or early September the sub damaged its nose section, (the reason has never been made public) and was brought to Murmansk for a repair.

The fire on board a nuclear sub

It’s alleged the fire started in the bow of the boat at 15:45 on December 29 during welding. The reports suggest timber scaffolding which is prohibited from use for such work caught fire along with the special rubber hydro-acoustic coating inside and outside of the sub.

The fire spread rapidly into the hard to reach space between the thin outer hull and the hardened pressure vessel. It took the efforts of over 400 fire fighters with 72 vehicles, including specialist units for fighting heavy industrial fires, to bring the blaze under control by 18.20 on December 30.

Kommersant-Vlast insists the fire was raging just meters from torpedoes and nuclear missiles which – if detonated – could have destroyed the submarine and the reactors on board. If such nightmare had happened, the magazine speculates, the nuclear fall out would have covered three nearby towns with a population of 350,000.

The Russian Navy stated immediately after the incident that no weapons were on board of K-84 at the time of the incident and that the background radiation in the dock after the fire remained unchanged.

Nine people were treated in hospital following the incident, seven crew members and two fire fighters. Most of them were treated for smoke inhalation and some for minor burns.

The magazine alleges the consequences of the fire could have been disastrous. It argues, if the missiles blew up, it would have killed everyone close by and required the evacuation from the area of hundreds of thousands of people in conditions of a polar night. The environmental damage could also be considerable, says Kommersant-Vlast.

Russia’s nukes and international obligations

The allegation in the magazine has raised concerns among Russian military experts.

Viktor Litovkin, editor-in-chief of the Independent Military Review, seriously doubts a nuclear sub could undergo maintenance with missiles and torpedoes on board. He called the allegations by Kommersant-Vlast “wild”, because an ‘off-duty’ submarine cannot have any weapons on board due to the Russian-American Prague agreement on nuclear arms.

“When such a submarine is in dock, all missile pits are opened so that the Americans could check from surveillance satellites that there are no missiles in them,” Litovkin explained.

He said Moscow and Washington notify each other when nuclear missile carriers are going off duty for maintenance and Russia does the same surveillance of American subs.

Litovkin said that if such a thing as missiles on off-duty submarine really took place, Russia’s North Fleet commander, his chief of staff and deputy would have been already fired.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

He says the Russian authorities should consider a strong reaction to the publication in Kommersant-Vlast because it casts shadow on the Russian Navy.

This is a scandal of universal scale, believes Litovkin, because *“it puts under question the ability of Russia to maintain its nuclear arsenal”*.

“Russia should not leave such imputation unanswered,” Viktor Litovkin concluded.

The expert says torpedoes are too heavy to move by hand, so the claim that sailors on the ‘Ekaterinburg’ were manually retracting torpedoes from launchers is a complete nonsense.

In the hypothetical situation of a fire on board a nuclear sub in dry dock with missiles on board, the nuclear warheads could never go off because they all have multilevel protection mechanisms, Litovkin says. He explains, every missile silo is completely rigid and isolated from external influences. Only a serious explosion could do real harm to an intercontinental missile and explode its fuel.

The aftermath of a blaze

Several days after the incident, the K-84 “Ekaterinburg” left the dock without assistance and made its way to home base not far from Murmansk.

The submarine has reportedly completely lost its integrated sonar system as a result of the fire.

Russian newly appointed Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin, the man now responsible for country’s military-industrial complex, has promised the K-84 “Ekaterinburg” will be back in service by the summer of 2014 with the most advanced sonar system available.

<http://rt.com/news/nuclear-sub-fire-missile-165/>

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

National Journal

Air Force Eyes Mobile Options for Future ICBMs

By Elaine M. Grossman

February 10, 2012

The Air Force is studying a wide range of options for how to base future nuclear ICBMs, including the possibility of making them mobile rather than installing them in fixed underground silos, a service official said in an interview (see *GSN*, Jan. 30).

Initial analyses have weighed the prospects for simply remanufacturing today’s Minuteman 3 ICBMs, according to Col. John Johnson, who heads ICBM requirements at the Air Force Global Strike Command. The Pentagon also has looked at a variety of new options for a future ground-based leg of the nuclear triad, he said last week.

The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review, a major report on the nation’s nuclear strategy, forces, and readiness, said the Pentagon would explore “new modes of ICBM basing that enhance survivability and further reduce any incentives for prompt launch.”

This might include fielding missiles that could be dispersed on trucks or trains in a crisis, according to experts. The Air Force has 450 Minuteman 3 missiles based in underground launch structures in three states.

Under the terms of last year’s New START arms-control agreement with Russia, the United States has said it would retain no more than 420 Minuteman 3 ICBMs. The replacement ballistic missiles are to be fielded by 2030 as today’s Minuteman missiles are retired.

In initial studies, the Air Force’s strike headquarters “reviewed the spectrum of options from upgrading the current system that we have in the field today, and all the way up to replacing with a new system with alternate

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

basing, as directed in the NPR,” Johnson told *Global Security Newswire* in a Jan. 31 interview. “Those are the scope [of options] that we’re looking at.”

The service official declined to provide further detail about the possible technology solutions under consideration, citing the “sensitive nature of the assessment.”

Air Force Global Strike Command last year completed a preliminary programmatic phase for the future ICBM, in which officials drafted a secret “initial-capabilities document” outlining the main features needed for the future missile to perform its military missions.

Air Force officials plan to vet the requirements document through the Louisiana-based command and submit it to service headquarters for approval by March, Johnson said on Monday in a written response to additional questions. By June, the Air Force hopes to receive multiservice support for its future ICBM requirements in the form of a nod from the Pentagon’s top-level Joint Requirements Oversight Council, he said.

Johnson and his colleagues are also now preparing for the next preparatory phase of the future ICBM program, in which they will draft a formal “Analysis of Alternatives” for actually filling the requirements laid out in the initial-capabilities document.

In addition to discussing basing options, missile-requirements documents typically set performance parameters such as speed, range, and payload.

Beginning late last summer, Johnson and his command began establishing work groups and formulating a study plan for the Analysis of Alternatives.

The study plan is “starting to put boundaries on to the left side, to the right side, of what we need to look at,” he said. “And then that will inform or prepare us better for the Analysis of Alternatives.”

Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Norton Schwartz last February said his service would request funds to begin the so-called “AOA” in fiscal 2013 (see *GSN*, March 23, 2011). The Obama administration on Monday is expected to release its budget plan for the coming fiscal year, which begins on Oct. 1.

The Air Force has budgeted more than \$10 million in fiscal 2013 and a similar amount in 2014 to conduct the major analysis, according to other defense sources who declined to be named in discussing as-yet unannounced spending plans.

The Analysis of Alternatives was earlier planned to have begun in fiscal 2012 and completed in 2014, when “DOD will recommend a specific way-ahead for an ICBM follow-on to the president,” according to a 2010 administration report to Congress dubbed the “1251 Update.” Although it is now clear the analysis will begin late, Johnson declined to address current expectations for when the AOA process would conclude.

The Air Force colonel did indicate, though, that the Analysis of Alternatives would speak to whether a future ICBM should be able to carry only a single warhead or alternatively, perhaps, include a capacity for additional warheads to be “uploaded.”

The Nuclear Posture Review said that all Minuteman 3s on alert today would be “de-MIRVed” and carry just one warhead, even though they were originally built to deliver up to three warheads.

The review said that loading all Minuteman 3s with a single warhead would increase stability at times of crisis by “reducing the incentives for either side to strike first.” A missile with fewer warheads makes a less attractive target for Washington’s nuclear adversaries and diminishes the risk of a “use-or-lose” phenomenon, according to conventional wisdom in nuclear-policy circles.

The Pentagon’s posture review did not specifically say, however, whether a future ground-based missile might be able to carry more than a single weapon.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Some analysts argue that such a feature could help Washington hedge against a potentially resurgent Russia or the unexpected rise of another significant nuclear-weapons state. On the other hand, it also might compel similar -- and unwelcome -- hedging actions abroad.

“Some ability to ‘upload’ nondeployed nuclear weapons on existing delivery vehicles should be retained as a hedge against technical or geopolitical surprise,” the 2010 nuclear review stated.

It added a caveat, though, against a multiwarhead capability on ICBMs: “Preference will be given to upload capacity for bombers and strategic submarines.”

With budget pressures mounting in Congress and at the Pentagon, there have been increasing calls to eliminate plans for a next-generation ICBM, and perhaps move to a two-legged nuclear “dyad” (see *GSN*, Feb. 8).

However, Johnson emphasized the importance of retaining ICBMs into the future, alongside ballistic missile-armed submarines and nuclear-capable bomber aircraft.

“The stability of an on-alert, homeland-based ICBM force is increasingly vital to offset the potential for instability as arsenal sizes decline,” Johnson said in written responses. “Such a force raises the threshold for adversary attack on the homeland and negates any perception that an adversary could achieve a ‘fait accompli’ through a small-scale first strike.”

Today’s expenditure-cutting mandates -- which have already triggered a \$487 billion defense-budget reduction over the next decade -- could compel the Air Force and Navy to team up on the development of selected technologies for future ballistic missiles, according to military sources.

Johnson was reluctant to discuss details, but did acknowledge behind-the-scenes discussion about the potential for the two services to jointly build technologies for missile guidance, propulsion, and fuses.

If this type of approach proves feasible, future Air Force and Navy ballistic missiles might share the same design for these key components, even if the weapons differ in other ways, according to other defense sources.

Navy leaders plan to initially field today’s nuclear-armed Trident D-5 ballistic missiles aboard their future Ohio-class replacement submarines, but also hope to develop a next-generation missile to replace the D-5 after the new vessels begin deploying (see *GSN*, Feb. 4, 2011). The Navy also wants to design a new, conventionally armed ballistic missile for its Virginia-class submarines (see *GSN*, Jan. 27).

“Because Navy and Air Force strategic-missile systems have different operating environments, having a completely common missile system is not achievable,” Johnson noted. “However, the Air Force is already working with the Navy in several technical areas.”

Those include a fuse-modernization effort, the development of updated guidance-system components, and the study of common rocket-booster technologies, he said.

“As DOD programs continue to compete for limited fiscal resources, it becomes more important for the Air Force and the Navy to leverage to the greatest extent possible our expertise” and identify technologies that could be used in both services’ missile systems, Johnson said.

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/nationalsecurity/air-force-eyes-mobile-options-for-future-icbms-20120210>

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

Chicago Tribune

Next U.S.-Russia Arms Talks to Move in Challenging Direction

By David Alexander Reuters

February 10, 2012

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - The next round of U.S.-Russian nuclear arms talks is likely to focus on the delicate task of reducing a much broader range of atomic weapons, U.S. negotiators said on Friday as they discussed the first anniversary of the New START treaty.

Ted Warner, senior adviser to the undersecretary of defense for arms control, said the United States and Russia had reached a point where negotiations needed to include strategic and tactical weapons, regardless of whether they are in storage or mounted on delivery vehicles.

New START, which went into force in February last year, commits the two sides to reducing their strategic, or longer-range, deployed nuclear weapons to 1,550 per side, down from the previous ceiling of 2,200.

The treaty did not address tactical, or shorter-range, nuclear weapons, or even stockpiles of strategic warheads held at storage facilities apart from their delivery vehicles.

The United States said in 2010 that its total nuclear stockpile, including deployed and non-deployed, tactical and strategic nuclear weapons was 5,113.

Russia has not made public its total arsenal, but is believed to have a stockpile "in shouting distance of that," Warner told a forum at the Brookings Institution think tank in Washington.

Warner said President Barack Obama made it clear when he signed New START that he hoped to move ahead with another round of nuclear arms talks that would look at the full range of atomic weapons.

"What the president said is ... the next time we look at this, we really ought to look at the total operational inventory, the nuclear stockpile of operational weapons," he said. "And that would be strategic and nonstrategic, and both deployed and non-deployed."

Rose Gottemoeller, assistant secretary of State for arms control, said work on New START over the past year had helped lay the groundwork for a new round of arms control talks but "the next treaty will be one that I think takes us in some more challenging directions."

A treaty dealing with non-deployed weapons would require opening sensitive storage facilities to inspection and verification, she said.

A treaty incorporating tactical nuclear arms would require greater openness and transparency about conventional systems like missile defense or U.S. plans for "Prompt Global Strike," a conventional weapon that could hit any target on Earth in about an hour.

"HOMEWORK"

With Russia and the United States in the process of holding presidential elections, neither side is in a position to move ahead with a new round of nuclear arms talks right away.

For now, the sides are carrying out what Warner described as "homework" as they attempt to set the stage for a renewal of arms control discussions once elections are over.

The United States is conducting a Nuclear Posture Review implementation study, which will allow Obama to issue guidance to the Pentagon about the future size and scope of the country's nuclear arsenal.

The implementation study informed the Pentagon's strategic review issued in early January, which said the administration believes it can maintain an effective nuclear deterrent with fewer warheads.

NATO is conducting a similar review looking at the nuclear, conventional and missile defense forces it believes will be needed to protect the Western alliance over the next decade.

The aim is to have NATO leaders formally approve the Deterrence and Defense Posture Review at their summit in Chicago in May.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 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

Meanwhile, U.S. and Russian negotiators are holding regular Strategic Stability Talks this year on a range of issues in an effort to lay the groundwork for new arms control talks.

"The Russians have made clear if we're going to move on to further nuclear reductions, there are a set of issues that need to be addressed at least in parallel as this goes along," Warner said.

Those issues include the Prompt Global Strike weapon and the European missile defense system being assembled by the United States and its NATO allies. Russia views both as a threat to its nuclear deterrent.

Reporting By David Alexander; Editing by Xavier Briand

<http://www.chicagotribune.com/news/politics/sns-rt-us-usa-defense-nucleartre81a01h-20120210,0,1449686.story>

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

Global Security Newswire

Obama Seeks More Money for Nuclear Arms, Nonproliferation

February 13, 2012

By Chris Schneidmiller, Global Security Newswire

WASHINGTON -- The Obama administration is seeking a bump in funding for programs to maintain the U.S. nuclear arsenal and to prevent the spread of atomic arms around the world, according to budget figures released on Monday (see *GSN*, Feb. 8).

The White House spending plan calls for the Energy Department's semiautonomous National Nuclear Security Administration to receive \$11.5 billion in fiscal 2013, which begins on Oct. 1.

The requested funding for the nuclear agency, just shy of 5 percent above the amount allocated in the current budget, demonstrates President Obama's "commitment to a 21st century nuclear security enterprise by giving us the resources we need to take innovative approaches to some of our greatest nuclear security challenges, make key investments in our infrastructure and revitalize our existing facilities," NNSA chief Thomas D'Agostino said in a press release.

The budget would provide \$7.6 billion for NNSA efforts to "maintain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent," according to the spending request issued by the Management and Budget Office. That would represent a \$363 million boost from the amount appropriated by Congress for this year and aligns closely to the spending level the administration first sought for fiscal 2012.

"This budget meets the goals of the Nuclear Posture Review by continuing nuclear-weapon life extension programs -- such as upgrades to the W-76 and B-61 nuclear weapons -- by improving and replacing aging facilities -- such as increasing investments in funding for the Uranium Processing Facility -- and by sustaining the existing stockpile through underlying science, surveillance, and other support programs," according to the budget document.

The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review was a key assessment of the nation's nuclear strategy, forces and readiness.

The administration aims to freeze development of the Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement complex at the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico, which would conduct work on materials such as plutonium employed in the U.S. nuclear arsenal, the Associated Press reported (see *GSN*, Dec. 19, 2011). Recent reporting had indicated that given existing federal budget troubles, funding for the project estimated to cost up to \$6 billion might be reduced or zeroed in favor of the Uranium Processing Facility at the Y-12 National Complex in Tennessee.

Under the proposal, funding for the Los Alamos site would be cut by \$165 million and building would be pushed back by no less than five years, the watchdog Project on Government Oversight said.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



"To meet the NPR goals, but still stay within the discretionary spending caps, the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) and the Department of Defense are reducing and stretching out the schedule of several weapons life extension programs and are restructuring plans for maintaining plutonium capabilities," the budget plan states.

That means the administration is seeking \$372 million less for weapons programs than it had anticipated requesting as of 2011. Republicans -- who are already speaking out against the overall White House budget offering -- might find the development difficult to swallow given the administration's pledge to spend \$85 billion on nuclear arms complex modernization over a decade (see *GSN*, Feb. 9).

President Obama offered the pledge in 2010 as he sought GOP support for the New START nuclear arms control deal with Russia. Thirteen Republican members of the Senate voted in favor of the treaty, which entered into force in February 2011.

Meanwhile another \$2.5 billion is proposed for NNSA initiatives to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and related materials. That amount, if approved, would constitute a \$163 million boost from the amount allocated for this year and "reflects completion of accelerated efforts to secure vulnerable nuclear materials within four years," according to the budget.

"This proposal fully funds administration priorities to secure and dispose of nuclear material, to develop technologies to prevent, deter, or detect nuclear proliferation, and to implement international nonproliferation treaties, regulatory controls and safeguards," the document states.

The Energy Department expects by the close of next year to have extracted in excess of 4,300 kilograms of vulnerable nuclear material across the globe -- enough to fuel more than 170 nuclear warheads.

"The savings that make it possible to fund these priorities come from restructuring the Pit Disassembly and Conversion project and transitioning the Second Line of Defense (SLD) program to a sustainment phase," the budget says. "By the end of 2012, SLD will have exceeded its original goals, having installed radiation detection equipment at almost 500 foreign ports or crossing sites, including all 383 customs sites in Russia. SLD will continue its efforts to improve deployed capabilities and continue to provide foreign partners with mobile detection equipment."

The agency's work to disassemble retired nuclear warheads would receive \$51.3 million in fiscal 2013. The full complement of weapons retired by fiscal 2009 are to be taken apart within the next 10 years, according to the NNSA press release.

The National Nuclear Security Administration would receive some funding each year through the Defense Department.

The budget says the "administration also continues its commitment to sustaining and modernizing U.S. strategic delivery systems, thus ensuring an effective deterrent in the face of evolving challenges and technological developments."

The first replacement for today's Navy fleet of Ohio-class ballistic missile submarines is to be acquired in 2021. The Pentagon said recently it would delay the program by two years (see *GSN*, Jan. 27).

The budget also commits Washington to "sustain the Air Force's Minuteman 3 missile through 2030; and modernize the heavy bomber force so it can serve for the indefinite future."

In addition, the Defense Department's ballistic missile defense activities would receive \$9.7 billion under the Obama budget plan.

The administration requested \$328 million for the Homeland Security Department's Domestic Nuclear Detection Office, a \$39 million increase over its estimated total funding for this budget cycle.



<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/obama-seeks-more-money-nuke-nonproliferation-efforts/>

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

Arms Control Wonk
OPINION/Blog

Worst Ever Treaty Provisions

By Michael Krepon
12 February 2012

I belong to the tribe that favors treaties that reduce the risk of war, add transparency and predictability to relations between well-armed competitors, and that depress impulses toward arms races. Not all treaties and treaty provisions succeed. Some have not only failed to accomplish these objectives, but have undercut them. What are the worst offenders?

In contemporary Republican circles, the 1972 Antiballistic Missile Treaty tops this list, but I strongly disagree. For three decades, the ABM Treaty braked one source of nuclear weapon requirements. Unfortunately, other accelerators were unchecked. If you are looking to apportion blame for MIRVs and other strategic modernization programs, the fault lies with the SALT I Interim Agreement, not with the ABM Treaty.

If we were to compile a list of the top mistakes in terms of provisions missing from arms control agreements, failure to stop MIRVs in the SALT I would certainly qualify. My list would also include the absence of a ban on underground testing in the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty. But this post focuses on what was agreed to, not what was out of reach.

What, then, are the three worst treaties or treaty provisions? Here's my list:

1. The 1919 Pact of Paris that followed World War I. The mercurial William C. Bullitt, who staffed President Wilson and Colonel House during the Paris Peace Conference, quit the US delegation and subsequently testified against the Treaty, famously declaring that, "This isn't a treaty of peace... I can see at least eleven wars in it." It didn't take long for Bullitt to be proven right.
2. The provision in the 1922 Washington Naval Treaty prohibiting new or enlarged fortifications in the area east of Singapore and west of Hawaii. This constraint was a corollary to establishing a 5-5-3 ratio of naval power projection among the United States, Great Britain and Japan. Tokyo accepted the short straw if western powers did not build up their infrastructure in the Pacific. This system of constraints did not turn out very well. I'll return to the inter-war naval treaties in a subsequent post.
3. The 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact not to use war as an instrument of national policy. Calvin Coolidge's Secretary of State, Frank Kellogg, won the Nobel Peace prize for this agreement in 1929. Perhaps we should compile another list of regrettable Nobel Peace Prize recipients.

What I find notable about this short list is that all of these picks were negotiated during the inter-war period when high diplomacy sought to paper over hard reality. These agreements sought to constrain conflicts and eminently usable weapons without addressing the underlying reasons for war. They failed for understandable reasons.

Critics of nuclear arms control point to these failures all the time when lambasting treaties like New START or the CTBT. They cannot acknowledge two crucial differences between nuclear treaties and the inter-war accords. First, nuclear arms reduction and testing treaties haven't papered over political differences; instead, they contributed to positive shifts in relations between well-armed, major powers that sought to avoid war. Second, nuclear weapons, unlike naval surface combatants, are not useful instruments of war.

<http://krepon.armscontrolwonk.com/archive/3352/worst-ever-treaty-provisions>

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The News International – Pakistan

OPINION/Analysis

Nuclear Weapons No Guarantee

Our correspondent

Monday, February 13, 2012

Karachi: Nuclear weapons may be a source of deterrence against external aggression but they are absolutely no guarantee against internal threats which may be as destructive to the country's existence as foreign aggression.

These views were expressed by Dr Zafar Iqbal Cheema, at a panel discussion, titled, "Nuclear Pakistan: an overview of strategic dimensions" on the second day of the Karachi Literature Festival.

He said distorted governance, corruption, glaring socio-economic disparity, political feuding, civil war conditions, decimation of vital institutions, and bloody political squabbling were equally destructive to a country's being and a nuclear bomb could not counter the effects of these evils.

In support of his contention, he cited the case of the former Soviet Union, which, he said broke apart on account of internal dissension and political distortions despite having a mammoth nuclear arsenal.

Coming to South Asia, he said that there was a N-arms race on in the subcontinent for which he blamed India which, he said had blocked the signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the CTBT (Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty).

"We are not the instigators of the arms race. We are just reacting to the Indian moves, in self-defence. He pointed out the duplicity of the US, saying that while the US had all along been arm-twisting Pakistan into giving up nuclear weapons, it had signed a civil nuclear accord with India, an accord that had overt military overtones.

Dr Pervez Hoodbhoy, internationally renowned physicist and social activist, however, had a very radical view of Pakistan's nuclear weapons strategy. He said he'd really like to know in what way nuclear weapons had really benefited Pakistan. The country, he said, today looked far less confident of its security. Pakistan, he said, had a large arsenal of 100 warheads and quit the fissile materials treaty in Geneva. He wanted to know wanted benefits such a large arsenal would serve all at the cost of the population's civic rights to an optimum, viable quality of life.

He asked whether it was possible that the Difa-e-Pakistan rally held in the morning and the "Establishment" had decided that there were going to be further attacks outside the by the LeT.

"I was a proponent of nuclear testing but that was based on the premise that spending on conventional weapons would be considerably reduced so that the economic interests and the optimum quality of the people's lives, which was their constitutional right did not suffer", said former Foreign Secretary Najmuddin Sheikh.

"When we talk of security, it doesn't just mean military security. Internal problems, he said, were a veritable threat to a country's security against which nuclear weapons were of no consequence", he said.

"Nuclear capability is good for us if we can divert resources to other far more urgent heads of social spending", he said. Sheikh said that we had to guard against the temptation to continue building nuclear weapons. "We should develop the minimum imaginatively and constructively", he said, in a tone reflective of pragmatism.

<http://www.thenews.com.pk/TodaysPrintDetail.aspx?ID=92397&Cat=4&dt=2/13/2012>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

OPINION/Commentary

The Nuclear Impasse

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



Dr Maleeha Lodhi (Issues)
13 February 2012

The UN Conference on Disarmament opened last month amid conflicting expectations among its 65 member states about what the focus should be in the world's sole multilateral negotiating forum on disarmament issues. The US-led group of western and other countries will continue to push for starting negotiations on a treaty banning bomb-making nuclear material (Fissile Material Cut off Treaty or FMCT).

They will insist that the CD accord priority to the 2009 work plan, calling for negotiations on an FMCT and discussions on the three other core issues: a nuclear disarmament treaty, negative security assurances for non-nuclear states and prevention of an arms race in outer space.

This group of countries has been contending that the consensus rule (under which all countries must agree) has made the CD dysfunctional and enabled some states to hold up FMCT negotiations. Countries belonging to the Group of 21 developing nations will want the CD to focus on all four core issues, not just the FMCT to strike a fair and necessary balance between nonproliferation and disarmament. Along with Russia and China they reject the notion that the present deadlock is due to the rules of procedure. They argue that it is not the consensus rule that is barring progress but the security interests of states. What is therefore required is a political resolution of these issues to end the stalemate.

Pakistan has long identified the problem at the CD and how to solve it. Its misgivings about the treaty are rooted in a vital security interest. As currently envisaged the FMCT fails to address existing and unequal fissile stockpiles. By not taking into account the prevailing asymmetry in stocks the proposed treaty will upset the strategic equilibrium in South Asia by freezing the imbalance between Pakistan and India. While Pakistan's deterrent capability would be curbed India has been provided the means to escape a similar cap on its nuclear arsenal – by the nuclear exceptionalism conferred on it by the US and the waiver by the Nuclear Suppliers Group. India's subsequent fuel agreements with many countries will assure supply and enable it to process reactor-grade material because there are no safeguards to prevent this. This is only a small step to its conversion to weapons-grade material.

Pakistan's stance for the CD's 2012 session was finalised in meetings held in Islamabad last December. The imperative to preserve the credibility of its deterrent capability was further reinforced. Several developments in 2011 have clouded the country's longer-term security picture and affected its strategic calculus. This included reports of Washington's willingness to consider supplying India with ballistic missile defences. These indicated that the US is keen to sell India the Patriot Advanced Capability (PAC)-3 missile defence system, regarded as the most advanced air defence missile in the world.

Whether or not this is part of Washington's strategy to build India as a counterweight to China – also signalled by America's new defence strategy and its strategic pivot to Asia – the move will have serious security implications for Pakistan. The target may be China but its consequence will be to oblige Pakistan to multiply its missile capabilities to penetrate the missile shield in order to maintain deterrent credibility. Pakistan has long advocated the non-induction of anti-ballistic missile systems into the region and reiterated this in talks on nuclear CBMs with India in December. But this has elicited no support either from Delhi or any western country.

Another development that has been noted by Islamabad is how Australia was prodded by the Americans to join the queue of countries eager to supply India with nuclear fuel. While these developments speak to the future security environment, also weighing on Islamabad's mind is the marked deterioration in the country's military capabilities in the decade following 9/11. Protracted engagement in military operations in the tribal areas and the accompanying wear and tear has occurred just when Indian military capabilities have been increasing. These factors are likely to urge Pakistan to hold the line on the FMCT. The continuing deadlock in the CD may revive the demand by some states to take FMCT negotiations to another forum. But efforts to pursue this option last year came to naught. The US now opposes transferring negotiations to an alternate venue. This means any renewed attempt to pursue this course is unlikely to succeed.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The only way then to revive the CD's momentum and ensure its centrality in upholding the rule of law in the disarmament process is to address the issues that lie at the heart of the present deadlock. That means evolving an acceptable treaty on the basis of the principle of undiminished and equal security for all.

Dr Maleeha Lodhi served as Pakistan's Ambassador to the US and United Kingdom

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle.asp?xfile=data/opinion/2012/February/opinion_February50.xml§ion=opinion&col=

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

Los Angeles Times

Wired News

OPINION/Threat Level Guest Column

Wired Opinion: Cyberwar Is the New Yellowcake

By Jerry Brito and Tate Watkins

February 14, 2012

In last month's State of the Union address, President Obama called on Congress to pass "legislation that will secure our country from the growing dangers of cyber threats." The Hill was way ahead of him, with over 50 cybersecurity bills introduced this Congress. This week, both the House and Senate are moving on their versions of consolidated, comprehensive legislation.

The reason cybersecurity legislation is so pressing, proponents say, is that we face an immediate risk of national disaster.

"Today's cyber criminals have the ability to interrupt life-sustaining services, cause catastrophic economic damage, or severely degrade the networks our defense and intelligence agencies rely on," Senate Commerce Committee Chairman Jay Rockefeller (D-W.Va.) said at a hearing last week. "Congress needs to act on comprehensive cybersecurity legislation immediately."

Yet evidence to sustain such dire warnings is conspicuously absent. In many respects, rhetoric about cyber catastrophe resembles threat inflation we saw in the run-up to the Iraq War. And while Congress' passing of comprehensive cybersecurity legislation wouldn't lead to war, it could saddle us with an expensive and overreaching cyber-industrial complex.

In 2002 the Bush administration sought to make the case that Iraq threatened its neighbors and the United States with weapons of mass destruction (WMD). By framing the issue in terms of WMD, the administration conflated the threats of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons. The destructive power of biological and chemical weapons—while no doubt horrific—is minor compared to that of nuclear detonation. Conflating these threats, however, allowed the administration to link the unlikely but serious threat of a nuclear attack to the more likely but less serious threat posed by biological and chemical weapons.

Similarly, proponents of regulation often conflate cyber threats.

In his 2010 bestseller *Cyber War*, Richard Clarke warns that a cyberattack today could result in the collapse of the government's classified and unclassified networks, the release of "lethal clouds of chlorine gas" from chemical plants, refinery fires and explosions across the country, midair collisions of 737s, train derailments, the destruction of major financial computer networks, suburban gas pipeline explosions, a nationwide power blackout, and satellites in space spinning out of control. He assures us that "these are not hypotheticals." But the only verifiable evidence he presents relates to several well-known distributed denial of service (DDOS) attacks, and he admits that DDOS is a "primitive" form of attack that would not pose a major threat to national security.

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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



When Clarke ventures beyond DDOS attacks, his examples are easily debunked. To show that the electrical grid is vulnerable, for example, he suggests that the Northeast power blackout of 2003 was caused in part by the “Slammer” worm. But the 2004 final report of the joint U.S.-Canadian task force that investigated the blackout found that no virus, worm, or other malicious software contributed to the power failure. Clarke also points to a 2007 blackout in Brazil, which he says was the result of criminal hacking of the power system. Yet investigations have concluded that the power failure was the result of soot deposits on high-voltage insulators on transmission lines.

Clarke’s readers would no doubt be as frightened at the prospect of a cyber attack as they might have been at the prospect of Iraq passing nuclear weapons to al Qaeda. Yet evidence that cyberattacks and cyberespionage are real and serious concerns is not evidence that we face a grave risk of national catastrophe, just as evidence of chemical or biological weapons is not evidence of the ability to launch a nuclear strike.

The Bush administration claimed that Iraq was close to acquiring nuclear weapons but provided no verifiable evidence. The evidence they did provide—Iraq’s alleged pursuit of uranium “yellowcake” from Niger and its purchase of aluminum tubes allegedly meant for uranium enrichment centrifuges—was ultimately determined to be unfounded.

Despite the lack of verifiable evidence to support the administration’s claims, the media tended to report them unquestioned. Initial reporting on the aluminum tubes claim, for example, came in the form of a front page *New York Times* article by Judith Miller and Michael Gordon that relied entirely on anonymous administration sources.

Appearing on *Meet the Press* the same day the story was published, Vice President Dick Cheney answered a question about evidence of a reconstituted Iraqi nuclear program by stating that, while he couldn’t talk about classified information, *The New York Times* was reporting that Iraq was seeking to acquire aluminum tubes to build a centrifuge. In essence, the Bush administration was able to cite its own leak—with the added imprimatur of the *Times*—as a rationale for war.

The media may be contributing to threat inflation today by uncritically reporting alarmist views of potential cyber threats. For example, a 2009 front page *Wall Street Journal* story reported that the U.S. power grid had been penetrated by Chinese and Russian hackers and laced with logic bombs. The article is often cited as evidence that the power grid is rigged to blow.

Yet similar to Judith Miller’s Iraq WMD reporting, the only sources for the article’s claim that infrastructure has been compromised are anonymous U.S. intelligence officials. With little specificity about the alleged infiltrations, readers are left with no way to verify the claims. More alarmingly, when Sen. Susan Collins (R-Maine) took to the Senate floor to introduce the comprehensive cybersecurity bill that she co-authored with Sen. Joe Lieberman (I-Conn.), the evidence she cited to support a pressing need for regulation included this very *Wall Street Journal* story.

Washington teems with people who have a vested interest in conflating and inflating threats to our digital security. The watchword, therefore, should be “trust but verify.” In his famous farewell address to the nation in 1961, President Dwight Eisenhower warned against the dangers of what he called the “military-industrial complex”: an excessively close nexus between the Pentagon, defense contractors, and elected officials that could lead to unnecessary expansion of the armed forces, superfluous military spending, and a breakdown of checks and balances within the policy making process. Eisenhower’s speech proved prescient.

Cybersecurity is a big and booming industry. The U.S. government is expected to spend \$10.5 billion a year on information security by 2015, and analysts have estimated the worldwide market to be as much as \$140 billion a year. The Defense Department has said it is seeking more than \$3.2 billion in cybersecurity funding for 2012. Lockheed Martin, Boeing, L-3 Communications, SAIC, and BAE Systems have all launched cybersecurity divisions in recent years. Other traditional defense contractors, such as Northrop Grumman, Raytheon, and ManTech



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

International, have invested in information security products and services. We should be wary of proving Eisenhower right again in the cyber sphere.

Before enacting sweeping changes to counter cyber threats, policy makers should clear the air with some simple steps.

Stop the apocalyptic rhetoric. The alarmist scenarios dominating policy discourse may be good for the cybersecurity-industrial complex, but they aren't doing real security any favors.

Declassify evidence relating to cyber threats. Overclassification is a widely acknowledged problem, and declassification would allow the public to verify the threats rather than blindly trusting self-interested officials.

Disentangle the disparate dangers that have been lumped together under the "cybersecurity" label. This must be done to determine who is best suited to address which threats. In cases of cybercrime and cyberespionage, for instance, private network owners may be best suited and have the best incentives to protect their own valuable data, information, and reputations.

Jerry Brito is a senior research fellow at the Mercatus Center at George Mason University and director of its Technology Policy Program. Tate Watkins is a research associate at the Mercatus Center.

<http://www.wired.com/threatlevel/2012/02/yellowcake-and-cyberwar/>

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

Issue No. 980, 14 February 2012

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