



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** [Fusion Energy Progress by Livermore Scientists](#)

1. [Iran to Offer 'New Initiatives' at Talks with P5+1: SNSC](#)
2. [Iran Has Tripled Centrifuge Separation](#)
3. [US Warns Iran to Give 'Concrete' Evidence It Is Halting Nuclear Ambitions](#)
4. [Iran Sees Nuke Talks Leaning Their Way](#)
5. [North Korea Launch Casts Doubt on Improving Relations](#)
6. [North Korea's Impending Missile Launch Puts Focus on China](#)
7. [Kim Jong-il's Will Demands WMDs](#)
8. [North Korea Insists Rocket Launch Does Not Flout Deal with U.S.](#)
9. [N. Korea's Long-Range Rocket Crashes Shortly after Takeoff](#)
10. [North Korea May Hold Nuclear Test in Days, Rand's Bennett Says](#)
11. [Pyongyang More Likely to Conduct Nuclear Test](#)
12. [Countdown to India's big Agni leap begins](#)
13. [Pakistan Rapidly Developing its Nuclear Arsenal: Report](#)
14. [Crucial Tests of Three Agni Missiles Soon](#)
15. [Fusion Energy Progress by Livermore Scientists](#)
16. [The U.S. Still Has More Nukes than Russia](#)
17. [N.K.'s Reckless Gamble](#)
18. [The Rocket in Kim Jong Un's Pocket](#)
19. [Terrorists in Court](#)
20. [The Unveiling of North Korea's ICBM](#)
21. [A Real Opportunity to Remold Nuclear Policies for this Century](#)
22. [Iran: We Do Not Want Nuclear Weapons](#)
23. [If at First Iran Says No, Try, Try Again](#)
24. [The Nuclear Test for Iran](#)
25. [North Korea's Failure: The Good and the Bad](#)
26. [Pyongyang Tries – and Fails – to Intimidate the World](#)

*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. 997, 13 April 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

Press TV – Iran

## Iran to Offer ‘New Initiatives’ at Talks with P5+1: SNSC

Wednesday, April 11, 2012

Secretary of Iran's Supreme National Security Council (SNSC) Saeed Jalili says Tehran will offer “new initiatives” during the upcoming talks with the six major world powers(P5+1).

“Iran's representatives will participate in the negotiations with new initiatives and we hope that the P5+1 countries will also enter talks with constructive approaches,” Jalili told reporters in Tehran on Wednesday, IRNA reported.

“The language of threat and pressure against the Iranian nation has never yielded results but will lead to more seriousness in the attitude of the Iranian nation,” he added.

He emphasized, “We are ready to hold progressive and successful talks on cooperation.”

Jalili said a dialogue-oriented cooperation approach to ties with Iran will be successful.

The SNSC secretary noted that the P5+1 countries-the US, Russia, China, Britain, France plus Germany- need time to be ready for the talks.

He lauded the Islamic Republic's progress and accomplishments over the past year, particularly the production of fuel rods for the Tehran Research Reactor, and stated that the country should strongly defend its rights.

Iran and the P5+1 have held two rounds of talks, one in Geneva in December 2010 and another in the Turkish city of Istanbul in January 2011.

Tehran says it is ready to resume the talks based on common grounds; however, it has repeatedly made it clear that it will not negotiate over any of its nuclear rights.

Iran maintains that as a signatory to the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency, it has the right to acquire and develop nuclear technology for peaceful objectives.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/235676.html>

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

United Press International (UPI)

## Iran Has Tripled Centrifuge Separation

April 11, 2012

TEHRAN, April 11 (UPI) -- Fereidoun Abbasi, the head of Iran's Atomic Energy Organization, said the country has succeeded in tripling the separation capacity of its nuclear centrifuges.

The announcement came as Saeed Jalili, head of Iran's Supreme National Security Council, said Tehran plans to offer "new initiatives" at the upcoming talks with P5+1 countries -- the United States, Russia, China, Germany, France and the United Kingdom -- scheduled for Friday in Istanbul, Turkey.

The P5+1 countries hope to secure guarantees from Iran that its enrichment of uranium will not be used for military purposes

"Iran's representatives will participate in the negotiations with new initiatives and we hope that the P5+1 countries will also enter the talks with constructive approaches," Jalili told the official Islamic Republic News Agency. Iran, he said, is ready "to hold progressive and successful talks on cooperation."

Speaking at a ceremony in Qom, Abbasi said Iran is enriching uranium to the purity level of 3.5 percent at all its nuclear facilities, the semi-official Fars news agency said Wednesday.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"At present [nuclear] fuel rods and plates are being produced inside the country. At the same time high-power[ed] centrifuges have been used in Natanz [nuclear enrichment facilities] and a 164-set cascade has been set up in the center and therefore the separation capacity of the Iranian [centrifuge] machines has tripled," Abbasi said.

The Fars news agency noted by improving the separation capacity, the speed of fuel production is accelerated, allowing the country to produce larger volumes of fuel.

[http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/World-News/2012/04/11/Iran-has-tripled-centrifuge-separation/UPI-50561334145302/](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/World-News/2012/04/11/Iran-has-tripled-centrifuge-separation/UPI-50561334145302/)

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

London Guardian – U.K.

## **US Warns Iran to Give 'Concrete' Evidence It Is Halting Nuclear Ambitions**

*Hillary Clinton says Iran must show at Turkish summit it is serious about negotiating – but Ahmadinejad vows not to retreat*

Chris McGreal in Washington

Friday, 13 April 2012

The US has warned Iran that it will be expected to "demonstrate verifiably" at talks in Istanbul this weekend that it is prepared to roll back its nuclear programme.

The White House has said that "the window was closing" for Tehran to reassure the six countries present at the talks – the US, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany – that it is not using the negotiations to buy time.

The US secretary of state, Hillary Clinton, reinforced that message on Thursday when she said that in order for the talks to continue Washington is "looking for concrete results" from Iran to show that it is not in pursuit of nuclear weapons.

"We want them to demonstrate, clearly, in the actions they propose that they have truly abandoned any nuclear weapons ambition," she said. "Of course, in a negotiation, we understand that the Iranians will be asking for assurances or actions from us and we will certainly take those under consideration."

Western officials say Washington is committed to its ultimate goal of seeing Iran dismantle its fortified underground nuclear facility at Fordo and hand over higher grade enriched uranium – moves also demanded by Israel, which is threatening a military assault if Tehran's nuclear programme continues to advance, although there is no firm evidence it is developing a nuclear weapon.

But first, the US, backed by the Europeans, is looking to Iran to demonstrate that it is serious after the last round of negotiations in January 2011 collapsed when Tehran demanded that sanctions be dropped and the major powers recognise its right to enrich uranium before negotiations could proceed.

"We're not setting in advance of this meeting any condition except for what our bottom line is, and that's a bottom line shared internationally," said the White House spokesman, Jay Carney. "The Iranians need to demonstrate that they are serious, that they will engage in these talks seriously and focus on the issues that need to be resolved. Beyond that, we'll have to see how they go."

Officials in Washington acknowledge they have little idea as to how Iran will respond.

Tehran says it will present "new initiatives" in Istanbul but it has given no details.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said on Thursday that his country will not retreat on its nuclear programme.

"The Iranian nation is standing firm on its fundamental rights and under the harshest pressure will not retreat an iota from its undeniable right," he said. But the ultimate decision lies with Iran's supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has said the pursuit of nuclear weapons is un-Islamic.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



"The Iranians are under no illusions," said one western official. "The emphasis is on them to demonstrate they are serious about the talks. We need to come out of it convinced that a second meeting is worthwhile."

Barack Obama needs to demonstrate that sanctions and diplomacy are having the desired effect on Tehran in order to stave off pressure from Israel and Republicans in Congress who have already declared them a failure and are pressing for a more robust – which to many means military – response.

But the major powers at the table cannot themselves agree what constitutes progress. The Europeans have pushed even harder than the US for pressure to be brought to bear on Tehran. The Russians and the Chinese have supported four UN security council resolutions demanding that Iran stop enriching uranium, but they have opposed the biting oil and banking sanctions against Tehran and argued for incentives to encourage Iran.

Moscow has held direct talks with Iran that were intended to agree a plan in which US and European sanctions were gradually eased as Tehran opened up to international oversight of its nuclear programme. But the negotiations were inconclusive.

Sergey Ryabkov, the Russian deputy foreign minister, said in Washington this week that there is no common position in confronting the Iranians at the talks. "I do not think that we'll come to any unified position before the negotiations, but rather have a menu of options," said Ryabkov.

The Americans and Europeans say that the clearest demonstration that Tehran is serious would be for it to immediately stop enriching uranium to a higher grade than is required for power stations.

Iran is enriching uranium at its fortified underground facility at Fordo to 20%.

Electricity plants run on uranium refined up to 5%. A bomb requires 90% but the leap from 20% is relatively easy. Iran says it needs 20% refined uranium to fuel a medical isotope reactor.

"We would look to a freezing of the 20% enrichment right at the beginning," said one official in Washington. "But we're not being prescriptive. That could be something for a second round if we walk out the door knowing that Iran is serious. There's not many people around here who are holding their breath on that one."

The stated aim of the pressure is to get Iran to cease all enrichment. But the US and Russia have hinted at agreeing to Tehran enriching its own uranium for use in power plants – a retreat on their original demands that nuclear rods had to be imported by Iran. However, Ryabkov said the "right to enrich (is) not an opening negotiating proposal, let me be clear".

Dennis Ross, Obama's former national security council adviser on Iran, this week proposed that Iran be permitted to conduct limited enrichment. But Ross said that it would be necessary to reach an interim agreement first that "stops the clock" on Iranian nuclear advances in order to reassure Israel and hold off the threat of military action.

"The advantage of the interim approach is that it could buy time and space to reach more fundamental understandings. The disadvantage is that it does not solve the problem and may take the pressure off Iran in a way that would not be so easy to resume later. In short, an interim step that stops the momentum toward the use of force would be desirable but also risky, since that momentum may be the very thing spurring Iran's interest in finding a way out," wrote Ross.

The latest talks were prompted by a letter from the Iranian leadership to the EU's foreign affairs chief, Catherine Ashton, in February that was initially met with scepticism. But Tehran's promise to bring new initiatives to the table and the Obama administration's need to see diplomatic pressure in order to stave off pressure from Israel and the US Congress saw the talks agreed.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2012/apr/13/us-iran-nuclear-ambitions>

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



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Al Arabiya – U.A.E.

## Iran Sees Nuke Talks Leaning Their Way

Friday, 13 April 2012

By The Associated Press

Dubai -- Iran's envoys are heading for nuclear talks with confidence that the chips are falling their way.

It could be dismissed as just political theatrics for the world powers that Iran will face in Istanbul on Saturday. After all, Iran has some serious matters on its plate: Tightening economic sanctions, near blacklist status from international banking networks and the threat that Israel or the U.S. could eventually opt for a military strike against Tehran's nuclear program.

But think like the Iranian leadership. The baseline objective is to keep the centrifuges spinning in its uranium enrichment sites. That now seems within reach – and the Islamic Republic could even try to leverage a few concessions from the West along the way.

That's because Iran has been very busy since the last attempts at negotiations nosedived more than a year ago with the same group: The five permanent U.N. Security Council members – the United States, France, China, Russia and Britain – plus Germany.

Iran is now churning out uranium at 20 percent enrichment at a regular pace. That level – compared to the 3.5 percent needed for Iran's lone Russian-built energy reactor – is necessary to make isotopes for cancer treatment and other medical and research applications. But the U.S. and allies fear that higher-level enrichment puts Iran significantly closer toward possibly making weapons-grade material – a goal that Iran repeatedly claims is not on its agenda.

Yet the 20 percent material offers other opportunities for Iran.

It could agree – without any direct pain to its nuclear program – to Western demands to suspend the 20 percent production as an act of good faith that Iran would want reciprocated. Tehran could then ask 'how about easing some of the sanctions?'

Iran also has started operations at a second enrichment site, buried deep into a mountainside south of Tehran to protect against air attacks.

U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton says the new facility, known as Fordo, must be closed and on Thursday she called on Iran use the Istanbul talks to credibly address concern about its nuclear program.

Again, Iran could entertain the idea of closing Fordo without any real setbacks to its overall uranium enrichment. The far bigger labs at Natanz, in central Iran, provide almost all of Iran's nuclear fuel.

Other demands and counterproposals are likely to be raised in Istanbul. They include what to do about Iran's stockpile of 20 percent enriched uranium and access for future inspections by the U.N.'s nuclear watchdog agency.

But what's not there is perhaps the most significant. The West – at least at this stage - no longer calls for an all-out halt to uranium enrichment as it did last year.

If this path stays, Iran can boast about outmaneuvering the Western demands and keeping the heart of the nuclear program intact. The U.S. and others will then have to sell this outcome to the Israelis. The pitch is that trying to whittle down Iran's enrichment capabilities and stockpiles – coupled perhaps with stricter inspections – is a more prudent route than launching attacks and possibly opening up another Middle East war.

"We're not going to prejudge these talks before they start, but the context going in is important," White House spokesman Tommy Vietor said.

Vietor said the rest of the world is more united than ever in opposition to an Iranian nuclear bomb, and noted that Iran is facing the toughest sanctions yet as a consequence of its nuclear program.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



Some advance lobbying may already be under way. In an interview aired Sunday by CNN, Israeli Defense Minister Ehud Barak appeared to focus on gaining outside control of the uranium stockpiles rather than trying to push Iran to give up its ability to make nuclear fuel – something that Iranian officials have said is nonnegotiable.

Uranium enrichment, in fact, has been wrapped tightly around the powerful themes of patriotism, scientific achievements and international justice by Iran's leadership.

President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad called it the "locomotive" for all other high-profile programs, such as Iran's aerospace and biotech efforts. Enrichment is permitted under the U.N.'s treaty overseeing the spread of nuclear technology and the West's attempts to shut it down brought a predictable outcry over perceived bullying.

It's never said directly in Iran, but two scenarios are always background noise in Iran's nuclear considerations.

Libya is the cautionary tale. Muammar Qaddafi's decision to abandon his nuclear program is seen as weakening his bargaining power and opening his regime to NATO attacks and its eventual downfall last year. Pakistan tells another story to the Iranian leaders. Its development of nuclear arms is seen as sharply boosting Islamabad's international standing and respect.

During a ceremony in February to put the first domestically made fuel rod's in Tehran's research reactor, Ahmadinejad spoke on national television next to photos of five nuclear scientists and researchers killed since 2010 as part of a suspected shadow war with Israel. Iranians also are linked to recent attacks and plots against Israeli officials and others in Bangkok, New Delhi and elsewhere.

Although Ahmadinejad does much of the political grandstanding for Iran's nuclear program, he has little to say about any potential deals with world powers. Those big decisions rest with Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

Khamenei has two main talking points recently: Repeating that Iran will never consider giving up uranium enrichment, but claiming there is no intention to seek nuclear arms – even calling them against Islamic principles.

Khamenei has ever been much for bold policy gestures or initiatives toward the West, preferring to stick closely to Iran's narrative that Western culture is morally bankrupt and on the decline. But he's also not seen as inflexible.

The signals from the top in Iran in recent days appear to acknowledge that some movement is needed on the nuclear impasse. But if Iran has its way, the talks will be drawn out and incremental. This week in Istanbul is likely just the opening bid.

Iran is already proposing the venue for round two: Baghdad.

<http://english.alarabiya.net/articles/2012/04/13/207387.html>

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

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) – U.K.

11 April 2012

## **North Korea Launch Casts Doubt on Improving Relations**

By Jonathan Marcus, BBC Diplomatic Correspondent

North Korea's planned rocket launch over the next few days casts doubt on hopes for an agreement on its nuclear programme, but there is little chance it will back down.

In Japan surface-to-air missile batteries are on alert.

Japanese, South Korean and Philippine Airlines flights are being diverted away from the danger area and both the Philippines and South Korean authorities have warned fishing boats to avoid waters where debris from the North Korean rocket launch might fall.

This represents the first international crisis since the new North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, took office.



It risks dashing all hopes that his new leadership might offer the chance for better relations between Pyongyang and the outside world.

China, Russia, the United States and a host of other countries have urged the North Koreans to abandon their rocket launch which Pyongyang says is intended to lift a satellite into orbit.

Experts believe that there is little chance of the mission being cancelled.

"According to North Korean spokesmen the missile launch was ordered by the late Kim Jong-il last year, before he died," says Mark Fitzpatrick, director of the Non-Proliferation and Disarmament Programme at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London.

"Given the public connection to the late leader and the significance of the launch on the centenary of Founding Father Kim Il-sung's birth, there is no way for North Korea to back down without huge loss of face."

He adds: "The launch is important to North Korea militarily because past test launches have all been failures. The military wants to make sure that it has a longer-range missile that works."

But the launch, argues Mr Fitzpatrick, "is even more important politically".

"For years," he says, "North Korea has proclaimed that this month's centenary would usher in an era of 'prosperity and power' for the nation.

"With the economy unable to escape the chronic impoverishment induced by central planning and misallocation of resources, the missile launch is the only thing the regime can use to demonstrate the 'power' part of the pledge."

By launching a rocket into space, North Korea will be breaking two UN Security Council resolutions demanding that it halt all missile tests.

#### **Atop the missile**

This is indeed all about rocket science. For the technology for this space launch is mostly identical to that employed in North Korea's ballistic missile programme. This includes the engine, the missile frame, and the three-stage separation technology.

"The main difference," says Mr Fitzpatrick, "is what sits atop the missile: in this case presumably a satellite rather than a warhead."

He says: "This launch won't help North Korea ensure that it can protect a nuclear warhead from the heat and buffeting of atmospheric re-entry.

"But the launch will help North Korea significantly in its programme to develop a long-range ballistic missile for military purposes."

What is even more worrying for many observers are the indications that North Korea may be planning to follow-up the satellite launch with another nuclear test.

Mr Fitzpatrick has no doubt that North Korea is also preparing another nuclear test, although, he says, it may come later in the year.

"Its previous two nuclear tests were only partially successful, so the military leaders will want another test to ensure reliability.

"As in 2009, the missile launch will result in global condemnation, which Pyongyang will then cite as an excuse for another provocation, this time in the form of a nuclear test."

#### **Limited outside influence**

So where does this leave international efforts to contain North Korea and to try to roll-back its nuclear programme?



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In disarray is probably the only reasonable answer. The US had been hoping to build on a North Korean offer to suspend some of its nuclear activities in return for food aid, to encourage Pyongyang back to the negotiating table. But if the launch goes ahead food aid will be out of the question.

Conservative voices in the US have criticised the Obama administration's whole approach towards North Korea - there is of course a US presidential campaign under way.

But the ability of outsiders to influence Pyongyang remain limited. This crisis underscores that even China's capacities in this respect are often much over-stated.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-17677212>

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

USA TODAY

## **North Korea's Impending Missile Launch Puts Focus on China**

By Calum MacLeod, USA TODAY

April 11, 2012

BEIJING—North Korea's impending launch of what appears to be a ballistic missile capable of hitting the United States puts a spotlight on China, the North's closest ally and benefactor.

China has insisted publicly to the U.S. that it has little influence over the weapons programs of its reclusive neighbor, even though it is the North's largest provider of food, fuel, and industrial machinery, according to the Congressional Research Service.

While the U.S. State Department presses China to use its influence to stop the launch, foreign policy experts say China is urging restraint because its aims differ from the U.S.

"China has less influence than we think, but more than it uses," said Stephanie Kleine-Ahlbrandt, Northeast Asia director for the International Crisis Group.

The West's priority is for North Korea to stop threatening its neighbors and end an illegal nuclear program that is suspected of transferring nuclear technology to other states, such as Syria. But China's communist leadership's priority is to ensure the impoverished dictatorship does not erupt in revolution or uprisings, experts say.

China fears a flood of refugees more than North Korea's uranium-enrichment program or missile technology, and sees the North as a useful buffer between it and U.S.-backed democratic South Korea, Kleine-Ahlbrandt said.

Even for Chinese researchers, the nation's dealings with North Korea are "like a black hole," said Shen Dingli, a foreign policy specialist at Shanghai's Fudan University.

"We don't know how the government and parties of the two countries actually interact, but the reality is that North Korea is not persuaded (to abandon the launch), so we do not have effective influence," said Shen Dingli, a foreign policy specialist at Shanghai's Fudan University.

Shen said he believes the West will eventually be forced to accept North Korea's nuclear-missile capability, given China's stance. That does not mean China is in favor of North Korea's actions, some experts said.

"China wants most a calm Asia to improve its own economy," and North Korea's actions threaten that priority, said Bruce Klingner, a former chief of the CIA's Korea branch and now an analyst at the Heritage Foundation.

Klingner said a rift has appeared among China's leadership over how to handle the North. He says "old school" leaders see North Korea as an ally going back to the 1950s-era Korean War that must be defended. They feel China must prop up North Korea's communist regime to maintain a buffer from South Korea, which many younger Chinese admire for its pop culture, he said.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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





Klingner said "new school" leaders see China's future on the Korean Peninsula more aligned with South Korea, whose strong economy can help China maintain the economic growth it needs to absorb new workers in the job market and avoid unrest that would result from a stalled economy.

"The new school sees North Korea as an anachronism, an irksome ally that could drag China into a crisis it doesn't want," he said.

As a result, Chinese policy is "on both sides of the fence at once, openly condemning North Korea's actions as it has in the past, but not going too far, at least publicly, in punishing North Korea," Klingner said.

Zhang Li, 32, was looking at captured U.S. military vehicles from the Korean War inside Beijing's Military Museum when asked about China's relationship with the North. "The war doesn't seem worthwhile today, but at the time it was necessary as China feared U.S. designs," Zhang said. "North Korea's satellite and nuclear tests are not good for China's security. I doubt China has as much influence now as it once had."

*Contributing: Oren Dorell in McLean, Va.*

<http://www.usatoday.com/news/world/story/2012-04-11/north-korea-missile-launch-china/54187674/1>

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

Herald Sun – Australia

## **Kim Jong-Il's Will Demands WMDs**

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

April 12, 2012

KIM Jong-Il's will urges North Korea to develop weapons of mass destruction, a top defector has said.

A top North Korean defector yesterday said he had obtained the last will and testament of Kim Jong-Il.

"Keep in mind that constantly developing and keeping nuclear (weapons), long-range missiles and biochemical weapons is the way to keep peace on the Korean peninsula, and never drop your guard," the will said, according to Japanese weekly tabloid magazine Shukan Bunshun.

The report comes as poor but nuclear-armed North Korea is planning to launch a rocket that it says will put a satellite in orbit to mark the centenary of the birth of late founding president Kim Il-Sung, the father of Kim Jong-Il.

Lee Yun-Keol, the head of respected South Korean think-tank NK Strategic Information Service Centre (NKSIS), obtained the will from "a person very close to a top North Korean official", the Japanese magazine said.

Mr Lee is a 44-year-old defector who was educated in North Korea's elite science school before fleeing in 2001 and arriving in South Korea in 2005.

According to the NKSIS, he worked as a scientist in the state organisation charged with promoting the health and longevity of Kim Il-Sung and Kim Jong-Il, who died last December.

Mr Lee, who says he remains in touch with his former colleagues in the North, said that the contents of the magazine's report were accurate.

The best-selling Shukan Bunshun did not print an image of the will, but reproduced a number of quotes it said were taken from the document.

"We have to win the psychological war with the United States. By standing up imposingly as a legitimate nuclear power, we have to weaken American influence in the Korean peninsula and work toward lifting international sanctions to prepare external conditions for economic development," it said.



Kim Jong-Il apparently had a cautious view of North Korea's main ally China, saying it was "the country that currently has the closest relations with us, but it could become the country we need to watch most in the future".

"Historically, China is the country that forced difficulties on our country. Keep this in mind and be careful... Avoid being exploited by China," Kim Jong-Il said in his will, according to the report.

Earlier this year the Shukan Bunshun's publisher, Bungeishunju, published a book by Tokyo Shimbun reporter Yoji Gomi called "My father Kim Jong-Il and Me", based on emails and interviews with Kim Jong Il's eldest son, Kim Jong-Nam.

Jong-Nam's younger brother Kim Jong-Un is now in charge of North Korea, and is cementing his power with an array of events this week including the planned rocket flight. Western critics see the launch as a thinly veiled missile test.

"There have been rumours in Seoul that Kim Jong-Il left his will in writing and Seoul authorities got hold of a copy of it and are now analyzing it," said professor Yang Moo-Jin at the University of North Korean Studies.

<http://www.heraldsun.com.au/ipad/kims-will-pushes-nuclear-weapons/story-fn6s850w-1226325339950>

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

Washington Post

## **North Korea Insists Rocket Launch Does Not Flout Deal with U.S.**

By Chico Harlan

Thursday, April 12, 2012

SEOUL — North Korea's five-day window to launch a long-range rocket opened Thursday without a blast off, but the country reiterated that it should not be punished if it does go ahead with its plan.

Pyongyang's state-run news agency posted an editorial, originally published in the Asia Times, saying that new leader Kim Jong Eun does not believe that the planned satellite launch violates an earlier agreement with the United States in which Pyongyang agreed to a moratorium on weapons and nuclear tests. Western nations, including the United States, have said they view the satellite launch as the cover for a ballistic missile test, because the two operations both depend on comparable technology, including a three-stage rocket.

"The North Koreans are of the firm view that a Cold Warrior mindset has misled the Americans to mistake the launch of an observation satellite for that of a ballistic missile test," the editorial said.

The North only posts on its Web site content that parrots the official viewpoint of the authoritarian nation.

On Feb. 29, Pyongyang and Washington agreed to a deal in which the U.S. would provide 240,000 tons of food aid as the North pledged to hold off on weapons tests while also freezing parts of its nuclear program. But the deal has fallen apart on a key point: The North believes that satellite launches and missile tests are different — one peaceful, the other provocative. The United States, officials say, believes both are substantively the same.

Obama administration officials have indicated that a satellite launch will violate the so-called Leap Day deal. The North announced its plans for the satellite launch 16 days after reaching the agreement, and has since drawn calls from Western leaders to cancel the operation.

The North has said that it would launch its satellite on any given day from April 12 until April 16, between 7 a.m. and noon. The blast-off time could be swayed by wind and weather at the launch station, located in the northwestern corner of the country.

Through Sunday, South Korea's Yonhap news agency said, skies will be cloudy near the launch site, but with minimal wind.

The launch is the centerpiece of a weeklong celebration for the 100th birthday of North Korea's late founder Kim Il Sung.



*Special correspondent Yoonjung Seo contributed to this report.*

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia\\_pacific/north-korea-signals-rocket-launch-does-not-flout-deal-with-us/2012/04/12/gIQAXSgNCT\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/north-korea-signals-rocket-launch-does-not-flout-deal-with-us/2012/04/12/gIQAXSgNCT_story.html)

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

Yonhap News – South Korea  
April 13, 2012

## **N. Korea's Long-Range Rocket Crashes Shortly after Takeoff**

SEOUL, April 13 (Yonhap) -- North Korea defiantly fired off a long-range rocket Friday, but the three-stage craft exploded in mid-air and crashed into the sea shortly after takeoff, South Korean officials said.

The communist nation also acknowledged that the launch went wrong, saying a satellite aboard the rocket failed to enter orbit. It was the first time Pyongyang has admitted failure in a long-range rocket launch.

Still, the launch drew strong condemnation from South Korea, the United States and others as it violated a U.N. resolution that bans the communist nation from any ballistic missile activity that can be used to develop missiles carrying nuclear weapons.

The Unha-3 rocket took off from the Dongchang-ri launch site at 7:39 a.m., but burst into pieces after flying about one or two minutes, Shin Won-shik, a senior Defense Ministry official, said during a briefing.

"The ballistic missile test-firing failed," he said.

After reaching a final altitude of 151 kilometers, the rocket exploded and began falling in about 20 pieces, Shin said. Debris landed over a broad area in waters about 100-150 kilometers off South Korea's west coast, but no damage was reported, he said.

The military is scouring the area, which is within South Korea's exclusive economic zone, to recover debris, Shin said. The South Korean and U.S. militaries are keeping a close watch over the North for any signs of additional provocations, he said.

The North had said it would launch the rocket between April 12 and 16 to put what it claimed to be a satellite into orbit to mark the 100th birthday celebrations for Kim Il-sung, the country's late founder and grandfather of current leader Kim Jong-un.

South Korea, the United States and other regional powers urged Pyongyang to call off the launch, denouncing it as a pretext to disguise a long-range missile test, banned under a U.N. Security Council resolution.

The Council plans to meet Friday (New York time) to discuss the launch, officials said.

Calling the rocket no different from a long-range missile, South Korea condemned the launch as a "provocative act that threatens peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia" and constitutes a clear violation of the U.N. Security Council resolution.

"North Korea launched a de facto long-range missile, which the North calls an 'application satellite,'" Foreign Minister Kim Sung-hwan said, reading a government statement after President Lee Myung-bak held an emergency meeting with security ministers.

"The government of the Republic of Korea strongly condemns that the new North Korean leadership pushed forward with the launch, disregarding the international community's unified call for withdrawal of the launch. North Korea must be held duly accountable for its actions," he said.

South Korea wants the U.N. Security Council to punish the North, officials said.



"Regardless of its success or failure, we urge the U.N. Security Council to take action against North Korea's rocket launch," a senior official at Seoul's foreign ministry said, on condition of anonymity.

The United States also condemned the launch as a provocative act undermining regional security.

"Despite the failure of its attempted missile launch, North Korea's provocative action threatens regional security, violates international law and contravenes its own recent commitments," White House press secretary Jay Carney said in a statement.

The U.S. remains vigilant in the face of North Korean provocations and is fully committed to the security of its allies in the region, he added. "North Korea is only further isolating itself by engaging in provocative acts, and is wasting its money on weapons and propaganda displays while the North Korean people go hungry."

Such provocative behavior is not an answer to the impoverished communist nation's future, Carney said, stressing the Obama administration is still ready to help Pyongyang should it abide by international law, live up to its obligations and work for the well-being of its 24 million people.

Foreign Minister Kim and U.S. Secretary of State Hillary Clinton spoke by phone and pledged to take "resolute" action against the North's rocket launch. They also agreed to refer the issue to the U.N. Security Council, an official said.

During a 10-minute conversation, Kim and Clinton "shared the view that the international community should send a clear and strong message to North Korea," the official said on the condition of anonymity.

North Korea announced the rocket launch plan just weeks after it reached a deal with the United States in February under which it agreed to put a moratorium on missile and nuclear tests and halt uranium enrichment in exchange for American food aid.

Washington officials have warned Pyongyang that a rocket launch would be a deal-breaker. The launch is expected to cast further clouds over the prospects of resuming the long-stalled six-party talks aimed at ending Pyongyang's nuclear programs.

Experts in Washington said the launch has effectively suspended negotiations, perhaps for good.

"It is unfortunate that North Korea has decided to go ahead with this launch," Gordon Flake, executive director of the Maureen and Mike Mansfield Foundation told Yonhap News Agency. "With this action, the pathway back to negotiations has been effectively closed down, and the prospects for increased tension and crisis have increased dramatically."

Marcus Noland, a senior researcher at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, said it was unfortunate the North "decided to defy the U.N. Security Council and world opinion in engaging in this provocative act."

"The good news is that the launch may have been unsuccessful if it did indeed malfunction before completing its intended mission," he said, adding that the failure proved North Korean missiles may be unreliable and hence may not pose an immediate threat.

"North Korea's ability to gain useful data and experience from this test may not be so great if the missile malfunctioned," he said.

The North's nuclear and missile programs have long been a regional security concern. The country is believed to have advanced ballistic missile technology, though it is still not clear whether it has mastered the technology to put a nuclear warhead on a missile.

South Korean officials have said the North has also apparently been making preparations to conduct a third nuclear test by digging a new underground tunnel at its Punggye-ri nuclear test site. Two previous tests were conducted in 2006 and 2009.

A nuclear test following a long-range missile test fits the pattern of North Korean behavior.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In 2006, the provocative regime carried out its first nuclear test, three months after the test-firing of its long-range Taepodong-2 rocket. The second nuclear test in 2009 came just one month after a long-range rocket launch.

South Korean officials said they cannot rule out the possibility of North Korea setting off a nuclear device built with highly enriched uranium this time, unlike two previous tests where plutonium was used.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2012/04/13/56/030100000AEN20120413001257315F.HTML>

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

Bloomberg News

## **North Korea May Hold Nuclear Test in Days, Rand's Bennett Says**

By Chris Cooper

April 13, 2012

Bruce W. Bennett, a senior defense analyst at Rand Corp. who is visiting Seoul, comments on North Korea's missile and nuclear tests after South Korea's defense ministry said the North's rocket launch may have failed:

On rocket launch:

"This launch was decided on, probably a year ago by Kim Jong Il before he died. He was probably very demanding of his scientists. For this kind of failure to occur I assume some people will pay with their lives."

On nuclear test and Kim Jong Un:

"I would have to think the North Korea leadership is very anxious to have something that eases this failure. Last time they launched in April and had a nuclear test in May. I would suspect they would try to do it more quickly. They may do it within the next couple of weeks, perhaps within the next few days.

"If he really wants to make an impact, he's going to detonate something closer to the Hiroshima bomb, in the 10- to 20-megaton range."

On the missile failure:

"I don't think it will be particularly good for Kim Jong Un. In the elite a fairly large number do have access to outside information. They're going to look at this as the failure of a young guy who hasn't shown his mettle yet.

"It's going to be destructive in North Korea. We really don't know the strength of his grip yet. We don't really know who is making the day-to-day decisions."

On the international reaction:

"Most of the people recognize it is a violation of a previous United Nations security resolution.

"The key question is going to be China. China was prepared to support them in 2009. In 2010 they hardly said a word. China's No. 1 imperative is to maintain stability in North Korea. I suspect they won't be outwardly supportive. I suppose they will refuse to criticize.

"The real question is do we step back and limit our response to military and economic action? Do we take political action? Do we broadcast into North Korea to undercut the regime?"

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-04-13/north-korea-may-hold-nuclear-test-in-days-rand-s-bennett-says.html>

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

Korea Times – South Korea

## **Pyongyang More Likely to Conduct Nuclear Test**

Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012

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



April 13, 2012

The chance of North Korea conducting a nuclear test has increased as the result of its failed rocket launch, experts said Friday.

Kim Jong-un, the young and untested leader of the impoverished country, apparently tried to use the launch, which Pyongyang claimed was aimed at deploying a satellite, as a show of strength both to the world and its population.

Thus, its Unha-3 rocket failure could push the North to proceed with a third nuclear test to make up for a major loss of face, they said.

"It's the natural next step in the sequence," Bahng Tae-seop, an analyst with the Samsung Economic Research Institute, said. "They have been working on this program for decades and now need to show their strength, especially after the failure of the launch."

The North has promised to emerge this year as a "strong and prosperous" state in time for the 100th anniversary of the birth of its founder Kim Il-sung. Efforts to build a nuclear deterrent are seen as part of this campaign.

Bahng said past precedent and the North's past actions make a third nuclear test inevitable.

The nuclear program began sounding alarms the early 1980s when a U.S. surveillance satellite captured the construction of a nuclear reactor at Yongbyon.

In 2006, the North test-fired several missiles, including a long-range Taepodong-2, before detonating an alleged nuclear device. Three years later it claimed it sent a satellite into orbit before carrying out a second test.

Recent signals point to a similar progression this time.

Intelligence officials this week said recent satellite imagery showed new tunnels being dug at the North's test site in Punggye-ri, North Hamgyeong Province.

The Choson Sinbo, a Pro-Pyongyang newspaper based in Japan, said earlier this month that the North could abandon a moratorium on nuclear tests if the February agreement with the United States was not carried out. Washington says the North's rocket launch would kill the deal, which would have included U.S. food aid for the impoverished state.

The launch raised questions over the international community's ability to quell the North's weapons program, as reports said the U.N. Security Council would convene an emergency meeting over the matter.

In question is how effective measures taken by the UNSC \_ sanctions or a statement \_ can be in handling an increasingly bold Pyongyang.

"They have done basically all they can do in terms of resolutions," Peter Beck, the head of the Asia Foundation's branch in Korea said.

The UNSC has been the stage for recent diplomatic showdowns over how to handle the regime's provocations.

While it remains to be seen how divided the council will be, scrutiny is likely to land on China, a permanent member of the council with a history of shielding its communist ally from censure.

Analysts say Beijing is between a rock and a hard place as it signed UNSC resolution 1874, which was implemented in response to the North's 2009 nuclear test and rocket launch and demands that Pyongyang not conduct "any launch using missile technology."

While the resolution expanded sanctions and encouraged U.N. member states to search North Korean cargo, China has been criticized for reducing its effect by increasing bilateral economic cooperation.

"Since it agreed with the resolution, Beijing will face some trouble in deciding what they are going to do," Yun Duk-min, a professor at the Korea National Diplomatic Academy (KNDA) said.



In 2010, China and Russia, both permanent members of the council, prevented any direct blame of Pyongyang in a presidential statement released by the UNSC after the sinking of the South Korean warship Cheonan.

Later that year, Beijing was alone in opposing a statement against Pyongyang's deadly shelling of Yeonpyeong Island.

Consternation is growing over the program.

The North in 2010 revealed a uranium enrichment facility to a visiting U.S. scientist. Analysts say others likely to exist given the speed at which the facility was built and its high level of sophistication. Satellite imagery also shows progress on a light-water reactor at Yongbyon.

Beck said the only option, though perhaps not attractive to some, appears to be to seek talks again.

"Sooner or later we are going to have to find strategies to reengage North Korea," Beck said. "But the North's provocations are making it more difficult."

[http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/04/116\\_108935.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2012/04/116_108935.html)

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

Hindustan Times – India

## Countdown to India's big Agni leap begins

By Shishir Gupta, Hindustan Times  
New Delhi, April 10, 2012

The countdown to test-firing Agni-5, India's first inter-continental ballistic missile (ICBM), between April 18 and 24 has begun. India is scheduled to issue air and shipping advisories on Tuesday afternoon for the launch of the missile in the Bay of Bengal and Indian Ocean.

Successful test-firing of the Agni-5 will catapult India to a hyper-exclusive club that now counts only the United States, Russia and China as members. It will be a huge strategic leap and give India capability to target all of Asia, including the northernmost parts of China and large parts of Europe as well.

Government sources said that the Indian Navy is expected to issue a world-wide notam (acronym for 'notice to airmen') on Tuesday, asking ships and aircraft to steer clear of the area on account of missile firing during the scheduled period.

The three stage solid-fuelled 50-tonne missile will be launched off Wheeler Island in Odisha and is expected to reach its target area in southern Indian Ocean

Defence minister AK Antony is expected to be present for the launch.

Official sources said that the missile will be test-fired over the full-range of 5,000 km and will be monitored by DRDO scientists from launch to the point of impact in order to study its accuracy.

Once the missile is inducted into India's strategic forces in the next three years, New Delhi will acquire deterrent capacity against China.

India's strategic establishment has been eagerly waiting for the Agni-5 ICBM since Beijing started deploying strategic missiles in Tibet and Xinjiang autonomous regions against India and building capacities of its land forces in the region.

Last year, India discovered multiple missile silos at Xiadulla across the Karakoram Pass in China's Xinjiang region. Following this, the Indian Air Force has strengthened its air bases along the line of actual control that is the de-facto border with China.

### THE N FACTOR

#### Agni-5: More firepower

- 5,000-km range missile can reach large parts of China, which is already calling it a 'killer missile'
- Carries 1-tonne nuclear warhead
- Capable of hitting multiple targets with several warheads on one missile
- Strategic leap will give India capability to target all of Asia
- Once inducted into India's strategic forces in the next three years, New Delhi will acquire deterrent capacity against China.

#### Playing with big boys

With Agni-5 (2014-15 induction) and INS Chakra, India joins US, France, Russia, UK and China in elite N-club



<http://www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/NewDelhi/Countdown-to-India-s-big-Agni-leap-begins/Article1-838111.aspx>

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

The Hindu – India  
April 11, 2012

## **Pakistan Rapidly Developing its Nuclear Arsenal: Report**

By Press Trust of India (PTI)

Washington - Estimated to have more nuclear weapons than India, Pakistan is rapidly developing and expanding its atomic arsenal, spending about \$ 2.5 billion a year to develop such weapons, a report has said.

“Pakistan has been rapidly developing and expanding its nuclear arsenal, increasing its capacity to produce plutonium, and testing and deploying a diverse array of nuclear-capable ballistic and cruise missiles,” said the report ‘Assuring Destruction Forever: Nuclear Modernisation Around the World’

“Pakistan is moving from an arsenal based wholly on HEU to greater reliance on lighter and more compact plutonium-based weapons, which is made possible by a rapid expansion in plutonium production capacity,” said the 150-page report by Reaching Critical Will of the Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom.

“Pakistan is also moving from aircraft-delivered nuclear bombs to nuclear-armed ballistic and cruise missiles and from liquid-fuelled to solid-fuelled medium-range missile. Pakistan also has a growing nuclear weapons research, development, and production infrastructure,” it said.

According to the report Pakistan is estimated to have 90-110 nuclear weapons.

“A long-term concern now driving Pakistan’s nuclear programme is the US policy of countering the rise of China by cultivating a stronger strategic relationship with India. This may tie the future of Pakistan and India’s nuclear weapons to the emerging contest between the United States and China,” said the report.

Pakistan has a number of short—range, medium, and longer—range road—mobile ballistic surface—to—surface missiles in various stages of development.

“It has developed a second generation of ballistic missile systems over the past five years. It is estimated that Pakistan could have a stockpile of 2750 kg of weapon—grade HEU and may be producing about 150 kg of HEU per year,” it said.

Estimates suggest Pakistan has produced a total of about 140 kg of plutonium, the report said.

While not much information is available on the funding of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons project, the report said estimates indicate that Pakistan spends about \$ 2.5 billion a year on nuclear weapons.

Despite extensive foreign military assistance, Pakistan’s effort to sustain its conventional and nuclear military programmes has come at increasingly great cost to the effort to meet basic human needs and improve living standards, the report said.

India, the report says, is estimated to have 80-100 nuclear warheads.

“It is also developing a range of delivery vehicles, including land— and sea—based missiles, bombers, and submarines,” it said.

“While nuclear weapons used to be seen as a ‘necessary evil’, there is no more enthusiasm for India to become a bonafide nuclear weapon power that can exercise its military might in the region,” it said.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/article3302640.ece>

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





IBNLive – India

April 12, 2012

## Crucial Tests of Three Agni Missiles Soon

By Hemant Kumar Rout

BALASORE: Preparations are on at the Wheelers Island off the Odisha coast for a series of tests of three Agni missiles, including the maiden test of India's longest-range ballistic missile Agni-5. They will be held shortly. Prior to the first development trial of 5,000-km range Agni-5, the DRDO has planned to conduct two user trials of 700-km range Agni-1 and 2,000-km range Agni-2 missile.

As India is attempting its first intercontinental missile test, scientists are leaving no stone unturned for a successful mission. A defence official said the three missiles would require three separate range configurations.

Hence, they would be test-fired on three occasions between April 18 and April 25.

“Earlier we have tested missiles with the longest 3,500-km range (Agni-3).

For the first time we would conduct trial for 5,000-km range.

We would first test Agni-1 and then Agni-2 before going for Agni-5,” he said.

The DRDO is excited for the three-stage A-5 missile as its successful launch would propel India to join the elite league of nations like the US, the UK, China, France and Russia, which have inter-continental ballistic missiles (ICBM).

The 17-metre tall missile with a diameter of two metres, weighs around 50 tonnes.

It can carry a nuclear warhead weighing nearly 1,000 kg and also carries multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MITRV) capable of delivering multiple warheads at different targets at long distances.

The canister-launched solid-fuelled Agni-5 is crucial for India's nuclear deterrence position in the world as whole of China comes under its strike range, though the latter's arsenal armed with missiles like 11,200-km range Dong Feng-31A is capable of hitting any Indian city.

On the other hand, the Pakistan specific Agni-1 missile, which weighs around 12 tonnes can carry both conventional and nuclear payload of about 1,000 kg.

It can blast off from both road and rail mobile launchers.

It is a useful missile for the Army.

The missile was first tested on January 25, 2002 and inducted into Indian Army in 2004.

Similarly, the 2000-km range two-stage Agni-II missile is designed to carry 'special weapons' nuclear payload of over 1,000 kg.

It is always in a ready-to-fire mode and can be launched within 15 minutes.

Programme Director of Agni missiles and Chief Controller (Missiles and Strategic Systems) Avinash Chander said the exact dates of the tests have not been finalised yet. “The tests would be conducted one after another once the integration process is complete and range is ready,” he added.

<http://ibnlive.in.com/news/crucial-tests-of-three-agni-missiles-soon/248091-60-117.html>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

## Fusion Energy Progress by Livermore Scientists

Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012

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



By David Perlman  
Wednesday, April 11, 2012  
Page A-1

Livermore scientists report that after years of experiments, they have moved closer to reproducing the blazing energy of the sun's interior in the laboratory.

A team of physicists and engineers at the \$3.5 billion National Ignition Facility said they fired an array of 192 laser beams, focused "in perfect unison," and created a single pulse of energy that for 23 billionths of a second generated a thousand times more power than the entire United States consumes in a single second.

The experiment March 15 delivered to the center of the facility's target chamber 1.87 megajoules of ultraviolet light, amounting to 100 times more energy than any other laser system in the world, the scientists said in a report.

A megajoule is a million joules of energy, the equivalent of a million watts of electric power. In this one experiment, the virtually instantaneous shot generated 411 trillion watts of power, the scientists said.

The ultimate goal of the multibillion-dollar laboratory experiments is to safely mimic in miniature the immensely powerful thermonuclear explosions of hydrogen bombs so that experts can validate their bomb-making computer codes and verify the safety and reliability of America's arsenal of nuclear weapons.

To achieve that kind of explosion, the facility's 192 laser beams would have to be focused so precisely and be delivered at such immensely high energy that the combined single beam would crush a tiny capsule of frozen hydrogen gas no bigger than a peppercorn and ignite a thermonuclear reaction inside the capsule.

In nature those reactions are known only in the interior of the sun and the stars, and the physics involved is so difficult that it demands far more megajoules of energy than has so far been reached. At the start of the experiments two years ago, the scientists' goal was an energy beam of only a single megajoule, but in shot after shot energy has increased slowly.

### **Classified work**

The huge lab known as the NIF, 10 stories high and bigger than a football field, was completed three years ago. Its massive building, heavily guarded and highly classified, stands on isolated ground inside the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

Scientists associated with the ignition effort predicted at first they would achieve ignition in 2010, and again last year. Ed Moses, leader of the NIF program, and his colleagues next set the goal of ignition for this October, and now the aim is to achieve it by the end of the year.

Moses is not making any firm predictions now.

"We are encouraged with our progress and look forward to the knowledge we will gain this year," he said. "Hopefully this will include demonstrating fusion burn," another term for ignition.

### **Doubts about experiments**

Many scientists have long voiced doubts that the experiments could ever yield enough energy to achieve ignition, and it's still an open question whether thermonuclear reactions can ever be achieved in the laboratory. Last month a committee of experts preparing a report on the future of fusion research for the National Academy of Sciences expressed continued doubts.

"The scientific and technological progress in inertial confinement fusion has been substantial during the past decade. However, many of the technologies needed for an integrated inertial fusion energy system are still at an early stage of technological maturity," the committee said in a statement. "For all approaches to inertial fusion energy there remain critical scientific and engineering challenges."



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Stephen Bodner, retired director of the laser-fusion program at the Naval Research Laboratory in Washington and a longtime public critic of the ignition project, said he was highly skeptical of the significance of the latest development. Bodner has advocated a completely different approach to creating the unimaginably high temperatures and pressures required for achieving fusion.

"Was it just a gimmick shot, achieved without any real progress ... and done only to demonstrate some sort of program progress?" he asked in an e-mail. "It appears that they are just floundering about as they try to solve the many basic problems with their ignition target design."

The facility's campaign has been running at a budget of more than \$450 million a year. This year its budget is \$474 million, and the president's budget request would cut that total to about \$460 million.

<http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/c/a/2012/04/11/MN2N10OUJP.DTL>

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

U.S. News & World Report  
OPINION/DOTMIL Blog

## **The U.S. Still Has More Nukes than Russia**

April 10, 2012

The United States has hundreds more nuclear weapons deployed and aircraft capable of dropping atomic bombs than Russia, according to State Department data released Tuesday.

Under a nuclear-arms reduction pact the Cold War-era rivals struck last year, both nations are in the midst of reducing their nuclear arsenals.

Congressional Republicans continue to hammer President Obama for those reductions, and experts say the proper size of the U.S. nuclear arsenal could be an election issue for some independent voters who favor a strong national defense.

The State Department data shows the U.S. has 812 intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles and heavy bombers deployed. Russia possesses 494.

The report also says the military has nearly 1,740 nuclear-tipped ICBMs and sub-based ballistic missiles, and warheads "counted for deployed heavy bombers." Russia has around 1,490.

Washington also has the edge in the number of total—meaning those that are and aren't currently deployed—nuclear ballistic missile launchers, submarines and bomber aircraft: 1040 to Moscow's 881.

Obama has talked of a "nuclear-free world," and has pushed hard for nuclear weapons reductions between the Cold War foes. More pragmatic Obama administration officials simply want nuclear arsenal cuts because they feel the nation has more than enough and it would perhaps free up billions annually.

But hawkish Republicans on Capitol Hill vow to block big reductions.

One such GOP member is Ohio Rep. Mike Turner, who chairs a House subcommittee that oversees nuclear weapons.

"It has not yet been explained to me how fewer nuclear weapons in the U.S. deterrent is necessarily better for the country's security," Turner said in a recent speech.

Turner hit Obama hard on the issue, saying he is moving away from a line of thinking that has been common with past presidents' nuclear policies.

"Every other president has asked one simple question," Turner said. "What level of nuclear forces do I need to ensure that a potential enemy or adversary knows that if he attacks the United State or our allies, we will have the ability to respond with nuclear forces that could result in nothing less than total devastation?"

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 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

*DOTMIL* is brought to you by veteran national security correspondent John Bennett and the U.S. News & World Report staff.

<http://www.usnews.com/news/blogs/dotmil/2012/04/10/the-us-still-has-more-nukes-than-russia>

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

Korea Herald – South Korea

OPINION/Editorial

April 11, 2012

## **N.K.'s Reckless Gamble**

This week is a crucial week for North Korea and its young leader, Kim Jong-un. Amid global outcry, the impoverished country is ready to launch a long-range rocket to mark the April 15 centennial of the birth of Kim Il-sung, its founder and the grandfather of the 20-something leader.

Underlying the planned rocket launch is the paranoid regime's desire to demonstrate to the outside world as well as its disgruntled people that it has attained its long-cherished dream of becoming a "strong and prosperous" country.

A successful rocket blastoff could be vaunted as a symbol of military strength as it implies that the belligerent regime can now hit its arch enemy — the United States — with its missiles.

The pariah state would be able to blackmail the world's most powerful country if it acquires the ability to build a small nuclear warhead that can be put on a long-range missile. To hone its technology to miniaturize an atomic bomb, the North is reportedly planning to conduct another nuclear weapons test.

Pyongyang's rocket launch, slated to take place by Monday, is rightly met with international condemnation, as it is basically a ballistic missile test, which is banned under United Nations Security Council Resolution 1874. Yet it brazenly asserts that the launch is intended to put a satellite into orbit.

The rogue regime is pushing for the launch for another reason — to declare the beginning of a new era following the death in December of Kim Jong-il. A series of high-profile political events are under way in Pyongyang to complete the transfer of power to the new leader and proclaim the start of his era.

Kim Jong-un became vice chairman of the Central Military Commission of the Workers' Party in 2010. This week, he is expected to assume the top posts held by his father — the commission's chairman, general secretary of the Workers' Party, and chairman of the National Defense Commission.

If the young leader ascends to these posts as expected, a comparison with his father is inevitable. Following the death of Kim Il-sung in 1994, Kim Jong-il had a three-year mourning period before inheriting the leadership titles held by his father.

For Kim Jong-un, the mourning period was a mere 100 days. The hurried completion of the succession process is obviously intended to stabilize his leadership as early as possible. Yet this is also a telltale sign that the inexperienced leader's power base is still shaky.

In this regard, it is noteworthy that, following the North's announcement in March of the rocket launch plan, some Pyongyang watchers cautiously broached the possibility of a power struggle among key players around the new leader.

The theory surfaced as the North breached its Feb. 29 agreement with the United States even before the ink was dry. To reach a deal with Washington, Pyongyang promised to put a moratorium on long-range missile launches, nuclear tests and uranium enrichment. In return, it was supposed to receive 240,000 tons of food aid.

The North's bizarre behavior is difficult to explain without imagining a power struggle between two groups, with one prioritizing dialog with Washington and feeding the country's starving people and the other putting military strength before anything else.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

At the moment, it is difficult to tell whether this explanation is valid or not. But if the leap day deal had been scuttled by hard-liners, it carries deep implications. For one thing, we will have to brace for a third nuclear weapons test. At the same time, we need to prepare ourselves for contingencies resulting from a free-for-all scramble for power.

The benighted leaders in Pyongyang who insisted on launching a rocket might have thought that the already isolated regime had not much to lose even if the U.N. Security Council would resolve to punish it for violating its resolution, which was adopted in 2009.

The council is unlikely to come up with any punitive measures with teeth, given China's lukewarm attitude toward punishing its traditional ally.

Yet the rocket launch will mean another blown opportunity for the destitute regime to be brought in from the cold. Defining the launch as a provocation, the U.S. and its allies have made it clear they would take "appropriate action" against the North. Washington said it would cancel the promised supply of nutritional aid.

Thus, it remains to be seen whether the launch will signal the onset of a new era for the bankrupt regime or the beginning of its collapse.

<http://www.koreaherald.com/opinion/Detail.jsp?newsMLId=20120411000088>

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

Foreign Policy  
OPINION/Argument

## The Rocket in Kim Jong Un's Pocket

*The missile we should be worried about isn't the one North Korea is about to launch, it's the much bigger one that's hiding in plain sight.*

BY NICK HANSEN

APRIL 11, 2012

North Korea announced on Tuesday, April 10, that it had completed preparations for this week's satellite launch and a day later started fueling for a test that the United States says raises questions about Pyongyang's desire to improve relations with the rest of the world. But more worryingly, Pyongyang also announced that it had begun a five-year program to develop even larger rockets, which could function as intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) potentially able to reach the continental United States.

Earlier this month, a South Korean newspaper reported an unconfirmed claim that a U.S. reconnaissance satellite had spotted a new North Korean rocket, probably at the Sanum Dong research and development facility in Pyongyang, where other long-range systems have been observed in the past. According to this report and others that seem to substantiate the North's claims, this new 40 meter missile is 25 percent longer and has a larger booster than the Unha-3 rocket scheduled for launch this week. Whether this system is functional or a life-size mock-up remains unclear. While impossible to confirm, analyzing satellite images and photographs of the new launch facility, as well as displays at a museum in Pyongyang, seem to suggest that North Korea is developing an intercontinental ballistic missile with longer range and greater capabilities than the one scheduled for testing this week. And there's a chance that this new, more threatening missile might even be on display in Pyongyang soon, for either the April 15 centenary parade for the late Kim Il Sung or the April 25 military founding day parade.

Is there cause to worry? In a word, yes. Before leaving office last year, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates spoke numerous times about the threat a North Korean ICBM posed to the United States. While a previous North Korean missile tested in 2009 -- the Unha-2 -- could potentially reach the United States, the even larger rocket in development will likely be able to carry heavier warhead payloads longer distances, an important attribute given the likelihood that Pyongyang's nuclear technology may not be that advanced.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



Some clues to this mysterious new missile can be found at North Korea's new Sohae test center, on which construction started early this decade and where it plans to launch the Unha-3 rocket this week. Pyongyang has historically designed its gantries (launch towers) with a view towards accommodating future generations of rockets. For example, the Tonghae gantry at its old launch facility, was initially used for the 1998 launch of the smaller Taepodong -1 (TD-1) rocket, but also built to hold the later, larger Unha missile.

To launch the larger Unha rocket in 2009, the North Koreans added a fifth set of movable work platforms at the top of the gantry shown in figure 2.

Recent photos of the new Sohae gantry taken by visiting journalists on April 8 show that it is designed the same way. In figure 3, the Unha-3 rocket is set on a seven-meter high mobile launch platform. The 30 meter-long rocket comes up to the second level of the fourth set of work platforms, leaving about 10 meters of the tower, enough to accommodate the reported new 40-meter rocket.

Sohaе's mobile launch pad provides another clue about the physical dimensions of the new North Korean rocket. The commercial satellite photograph in figure 4 shows this platform in 2008, while it was being assembled, with a four-meter hole in its center. Next to the mobile launch pad, however, there is a plug that reduces the hole to just 2.5 meters, enabling the stand to hold the Unha-3 rocket. But the plug can be removed to accommodate a larger rocket, like the one presumably planned.

Other clues can be found at the new launch site. Commercial satellite photography from 2006, when Sohae was still under construction, show that the number and size of storage tanks inside the large buildings near the launch pad that are used to store Unha-3's first-stage propellants greatly exceeded what would be needed to fuel the rocket for this week's launch. In other words, the tanks appear to have been built for a larger rocket. The same is true for the rocket engine test stand at Sohae, which is designed to fire larger, higher energy engines than the facility at the old Tonghae site, where the smaller Unha engines were tested.

Pictures recently seen on display at the Three Revolutions Museum's space exhibit in Pyongyang may provide another clue to the mysterious rocket's existence and characteristics. Figure 5 shows a photograph of an artist's concept of a large satellite launch vehicle and gantry tower. The rocket and gantry portrayed in this picture differ from the Taepodong 1 launched in 1998 and the Unha rocket tested in 2009 and soon to be launched this week. But is this just another piece of propaganda or a representation of a future large DPRK space launch vehicle?

It's impossible to say for sure. The space exhibit is full of false or misleading claims, including that the two satellites launched during previous tests achieved orbit, which they did not. Another photo shows a Chinese satellite that the North Koreans claim as one of their own. On the other hand, both launch videos and models of earlier rocket tests are accurate.

Assume for a moment, then, that the photo -- propaganda though it may be -- bares some resemblance to a future large North Korean rocket. The depiction of the confirmed gantry at Sohae doesn't look quite the same, but let's also assume that the dimensions are close. Given our detailed knowledge of the Sohae gantry from commercial satellite imagery, and now ground photos, the rocket in the picture can be roughly scaled to obtain its dimensions: about 38 to 40 meters long and 3.5 to 4 meters in diameter. The dimensions are similar to the large rocket reported by the press, the height of the Sohae gantry, and the diameter of the hole in the mobile test pad.

To carry this analysis one step further, a rocket of this size would be able to comfortably mount inside its first stage nine engines used by the Nodong medium-range missile -- more than twice as many as the Unha-3 first stage. The second stage looks to be 2.5 meters in diameter, similar to the Unha first stage, and could thus mount four engines. The two stages alone would give the next-generation North Korean rocket nearly 450 tons of thrust, much more than the current generation of North Korean rockets and more than enough to power a highly capable ICBM or space-launch vehicle.

Of course, none of the information regarding the image in figure 5 is definitive. And information about North Korea's WMD programs is scarce, even for governments watching Pyongyang closely. But the pieces of this unclassified puzzle -



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

- press reports, commercial satellite pictures of the new test facility, and exhibits from a Pyongyang museum -- allow us to put together a more complete picture of North Korea's new rocket than has been previously available. It also gives us a rare glimpse into Pyongyang's future plans as it moves down the road to becoming a small nuclear power, a development that has major implications for international peace and security.

*Nick Hansen is a veteran of the U.S. aerospace industry and is affiliated with the Center for International Security and Cooperation at Stanford University.*

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/11/the\\_rocket\\_in\\_kim\\_jong\\_uns\\_pocket?page=full](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/04/11/the_rocket_in_kim_jong_uns_pocket?page=full)

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

Wall Street Journal  
OPINION/Review & Outlook  
April 11, 2011

## Terrorists in Court

*Abu Hamza and friends may get the U.S. justice they deserve.*

Page – A19

When it comes to what George W. Bush used to call "the war on terror," Europeans often seem divided on what they think is worse: terrorism itself, or the means the U.S. government has used to prosecute it. On Tuesday the Strasbourg-based European Court of Human Rights (ECHR) took a stand on the subject by ruling in America's favor.

The case concerned the U.S. attempt to extradite several alleged terrorists from Great Britain. One of the them, Egyptian-born cleric Abu Hamza al-Masri, was better known in London as the Finsbury Park mosque imam. In 2006, a British court found him guilty on six counts of soliciting to murder. The U.S. wants to try him for seeking to establish a terrorist training camp in Oregon, and for taking hostages in Yemen in 1998.

Another is Khaled Fawwaz, a key aide to Osama bin Laden who has been charged in the U.S. with 269 counts of murder in the 1998 embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania. Babar Ahmad and Syed Ahsan are thought to have set up pro-jihadist websites. Then there is Adel Abdul Bary, who is also implicated in the embassy bombings.

In short, charming characters all. But thanks to the protections of English law, all were given a chance to contest their extradition to the U.S. in British courts and through the usual appeals process. When they lost, they took their case to the ECHR, claiming they might be sent to Guantanamo or rendered to a third country.

Happily, the European court decided that their rights would not be in jeopardy in American courts (where they would be accorded the presumption of innocence) or even in places like the "Supermax" prison in Colorado, where the worst terrorist offenders often go. That ruling is a triumph over a mountain of anti-American prejudice.

Still, it's worth asking what the ECHR has contributed to this process, other than to allow five noxious men to delay their reckoning with justice and put the U.K. and U.S. legal systems on trial. Terrorism is always an assault on democracy. In presuming to adjudicate this case, the ECHR has made itself an accessory to that assault.

<http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702303772904577335690495206970.html>

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

38North.org  
OPINION/Analysis

## The Unveiling of North Korea's ICBM

By Joshua Pollack

Wednesday, April 11, 2012

Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012

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



North Korea's planned satellite launch has been widely condemned on the grounds that there is little difference between a space launcher and a missile. US government spokesmen have declared that firing off a long-range rocket, regardless of payload, will violate the terms of the missile-test moratorium included in the February 29 understanding between Washington and Pyongyang (the so-called Leap Day Agreement). This claim has obscured what ought to be the more significant development: the gradual unveiling of an actual North Korean inter-continental ballistic (ICBM) missile force. A space launcher could be considered dual-purpose; an ICBM cannot.

Over the past year's time, little-noticed public statements by American officials and a series of oblique references in the North Korean state media have telegraphed the appearance of the new weapon system. Regardless, in the absence of a flight test, a televised display, or a statement by American officials judging the missile to have been deployed, the emerging ICBM force has yet to enter the public consciousness.

Certainly, North Korea's progress comes as a surprise, even to those who track these matters closely. The decisions of about a decade ago to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and to deploy the Ground-based Midcourse Defense System were premised on the eventual emergence of North Korean (and Iranian) ICBMs. But even as late as March 2009, just prior to North Korea's last space-launch attempt, then-Secretary of Defense Robert Gates was still downplaying Pyongyang's ability to build weapons that can hurdle the Pacific.

Calling the upcoming rocket launch "a mask for the development of an intercontinental ballistic missile," Gates told Chris Wallace of Fox News that fielding nuclear-armed missiles was North Korea's "long-term intent," not a near-term prospect.

The February 2010 report of the US Department of Defense's Ballistic Missile Defense Review took a similar view, treating North Korean ICBM development as somewhat uncertain in its progress. "Although the test launches of the TD-2 [Taepodong-2] in 2006 and 2009 were deemed unsuccessful," the report concluded, "we must assume that sooner or later North Korea will have a successful test of its TD-2 and, if there are no major changes in its national security strategy in the next decade, it will be able to mate a nuclear warhead to a proven delivery system."

Before the end of the year, something changed minds at the Pentagon. During an overseas trip that November, Gates told the press that North Korea was "clearly developing longer range missiles, including potentially a mobile ICBM," a claim not heard before. In Beijing the following January, Gates explained that he had just warned the Chinese leadership that North Korea was "becoming a direct threat to the United States" on account of its development of nuclear weapons and ICBMs. While not "immediate," he said, the threat would emerge in less than five years.

Gates restated his concern about "potentially a road-mobile" ICBM in North Korea during a June 2011 policy conference in Singapore. He added that President Barack Obama had raised the issue with Chinese President Hu Jintao in the fall of 2010—perhaps just prior to a meeting of the G-20 in Seoul in November.

A few weeks later, Gates made his last observations on the subject, telling John Barry of *Newsweek*, "North Korea now constitutes a direct threat to the United States. The president told [China's] President Hu that last year. They are developing a road-mobile ICBM. I never would have dreamed they would go to a road-mobile before testing a static ICBM. It's a huge problem. As we've found out in a lot of places, finding mobile missiles is very tough."

This March, Gates's comments were echoed in the testimony of Admiral Robert Willard of US Pacific Command before the House Armed Services Committee. Willard described the emerging missile's mobility as making it "less predictable than Taepodong-2 or some of the other ballistic missile capabilities that are a little more easy to observe."

In its own unique way, the North Korean government has also started publicizing the new weapon system. Starting in February 2011, the Korean Central News Agency (KCNA)—North Korea's official, externally-oriented news service—started issuing frequent reports on the modernization activities of Russia's ICBM force, the Strategic Rocket Force (SRF), and its Chinese counterpart, the Second Artillery. Ten such reports appeared in 2011, and another six in just the first three months of 2012. All but three of these stories have concerned the SRF. For example:

- "Russia Strives to Strengthen Strategic Rocket Forces"





- “Russia Plans to Equip Its Strategic Rocket Force with New-type Missiles”
- “Russia Will Take Resolute Measures against US Missile Defence.”
- “Russia Launches ICBM”
- “Russian Strategic Rocket Forces Start Combat Patrol”

Without saying a word about North Korea, these reports portray the development and deployment of new ICBMs as legitimate and necessary in the face of the American threat. They do not appear accidentally: KCNA’s online archive, which extends back to January 1997, contains just one previous reference to the SRF, in December 2003. The archive contains no earlier mentions of the Second Artillery.

The first hint at North Korea’s own achievements in the ICBM field came just days before the announcement of the Leap Day Agreement. A February 25 statement attributed to the National Defense Commission—North Korea’s most authoritative public voice—condemned upcoming joint US-South Korean exercises. By itself, there was nothing unusual in such a declaration, except for one detail. It contained, for the first time, an explicit warning of North Korea’s ability to attack the United States:

*The US is sadly mistaken if it thinks it is safe as its mainland is far away across the ocean...There is no limit to the striking intensity and range of our army and people to wipe out the aggressors.*

By this time, too, a South Korean newspaper, *Chosun Ilbo*, had already reported that North Korea’s new leader, Kim Jong Un, had visited the North Korean military organization responsible for nuclear weapons and missiles. Another article profiled its chain of command.

The North Korean media issued a similar message itself on March 2 by announcing that Kim Jong Un—accompanied as usual by senior military and party officials—had inspected “the Strategic Rocket Force Command” of the Korean People’s Army. Still photos from the tour were broadcast on national television.

No such organization seems to have appeared in the North Korean media before, despite the claim that the facility had been visited by Kim Jong Un’s two predecessors. It may be synonymous with the Artillery Guidance Bureau—the name by which the organization commanding North Korea’s missile force has been called in the South Korean media. Publicizing the body for the first time under the name “Strategic Rocket Force Command” signals that Russia’s mobile missile force has become the implicit role model for North Korea’s.

Less apparent is exactly what developments have given both Washington and Pyongyang confidence that North Korea is making progress toward deploying an ICBM. In November 2011, a South Korean newspaper, the *Dong-a Ilbo*, reported the static (i.e., stationary) test of a long-range rocket stage at North Korea’s Musudan-ri (Tonghae) facility. Just days ago, the *Chosun Ilbo* reported the sighting of a missile longer than the TD-2 space launcher. Otherwise, the public record is silent.

Nor is it entirely apparent what technology the missile uses. According to David Wright of the Union of Concerned Scientists, the most likely configuration is either a weaponized, transportable version of the three-stage TD-2, or a multi-stage missile based on Soviet R-27 (SS-N-6) missile technology. North Korea has already adapted R-27 technology for its Musudan intermediate-range ballistic missile, but as Wright observes, the Musudan, like the new ICBM, is not known to have been flight-tested.

The reasons for this unusual act of restraint are not fully clear. One possibility might be inferred from a recent statement attributed to the North Korean foreign ministry, which hints that missile tests, by spurring new missile-defense efforts in the United States, would harm Chinese interests. North Korea can scarcely afford to give casual offense to Beijing, which helps to prop up the regime in Pyongyang.

It is possible, nevertheless, for the North Koreans to have at least some confidence in their ICBM technology, both from static engine testing and from the 2009 flight of the TD-2. Even if the new missile is based on the R-27 and not the TD-2, there appears to be some overlap. In 2009, Wright and Theodore Postol of MIT concluded that the second stage of the TD-2 was “identical” to the R-27.



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In the meantime, too, there are other ways to highlight a missile capability, if desired. After years of media reports, mock-ups of the Musudan finally appeared on large transporter-erector-launcher vehicles in an October 2010 parade in Pyongyang. With the acrimonious collapse of the Leap Day Agreement, North Korea's ICBM force may soon come more fully into view.

*Joshua Pollack is a consultant specializing in nuclear nonproliferation and arms control. He is a columnist for the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists" and a regular contributor at the Arms Control Wonk blog. The views expressed here are his own and should not be attributed to his employer or clients.*

<http://38north.org/2012/04/jpollack041012/>

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

The Hill  
OPINION/Congress Blog

## **A Real Opportunity to Remold Nuclear Policies for this Century**

By Lt. Gen. Dirk Jameson, USAF (Ret.)  
April 11, 2012

The Obama Administration is currently preparing to review the size of America's nuclear force -- and develop a plan for its future.

The Department of Defense will present the president with three options for the size of our arsenal: high, medium, and low. The current stock of 1,550 deployed weapons mandated by the recently ratified New START Treaty will represent the highest option.

It's time for the United States to scale down its stock of nuclear weapons. A new and effective strategy for deterring a nuclear attack can be achieved with a substantial reduction in our nuclear force.

Our present nuclear war-fighting strategy is outdated and geared against an enemy that hasn't existed for 20 years -- the Soviet Union.

Today, the greatest threats to our nation's security are weapons of mass destruction -- whether nuclear, biological, or chemical -- in the hands of terrorist organizations or rogue states in unstable regions.

These threats are not deterred by America's massive arsenal of 1,550 deployed nuclear weapons, or the thousands more we have in reserve. Indeed, these weapon systems are of limited practical use and pose tremendous costs that we can ill afford.

Some in Washington continue to hold on to the idea that America needs a massive nuclear force. But such thinking is outdated and no longer addresses today's strategic reality. Times have moved on, and so should we. The United States can still maintain a strong, effective nuclear deterrent with a dramatic reduction in deployed and non-deployed weapons.

Combined, the United States and Russia control ninety percent of the world's nuclear weapons. But Russia is not our enemy today. We must work together to reduce the nuclear threat to both our nations and to the world.

So how do we arrive at an appropriate level for our nuclear deterrent?

First, U.S. nuclear policy must remain nonpartisan. Our strategic security must not be influenced by politics. Only by looking practically at our nuclear policy will we achieve one that is in line with our interests and the threats we face.

Second, we need to remember that having more weapons doesn't mean we are "winning" -- or will even succeed in deterring others from pursuing nuclear weapons. It merely reflects that our nuclear strategy is ill-suited to our times.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 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

Third, the Cold War is over -- we won. We no longer need thousands of nuclear weapons ready to deter an enemy that no longer exists. Remember, at the end of World War II, we began rapidly dismantling and recycling our massive and expensive arsenal of weaponry to a size sustainable in peacetime.

Finally, we must work with other nations to mutually reduce unnecessary weapons. That is in everybody's interest.

The New START Treaty with Russia provides an instructive example. It established modest reductions in each side's strategic nuclear forces in conjunction with boots on the ground in Russia to verify the treaty. The result was improved intelligence on Russian strategic nuclear weapons through mutual reporting and data exchange.

Such information relieved our intelligence agencies of the expensive burden of keeping an eye on Russia's arsenal by other means. The treaty created both stability and predictability between our two nations. Consequently, we've been able to free up assets and money to spend elsewhere.

American policymakers should recognize the success of New START and take things further with Russia -- not just by seeking additional reductions in nuclear arms, but also working to scale down our reserves of strategic and tactical weapons.

The bottom line is that with modern nuclear strategy and geopolitical reality, we no longer require a massive and complex Cold-War-era nuclear force. We can reduce the numbers of these weapons while still providing our nation with a strong and appropriate deterrent.

Let's get on with this task -- so we can focus on truly strengthening our national security.

*Jameson served as Deputy Commander in Chief and Chief of Staff of U.S. Strategic Command before retiring from the U.S. Air Force in 1996 after more than three decades of active service. He is a member of the Consensus for American Security.*

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/221025-a-real-opportunity-to-remold-nuclear-policies-for-this-century>

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

Washington Post  
OPINION/Commentary

## **Iran: We Do Not Want Nuclear Weapons**

By Ali Akbar Salehi  
April 12, 2012

Forty-five years ago, the United States sold my country a research reactor as well as weapons-grade uranium as its fuel. Not long afterward, America agreed to help Iran set up the full nuclear fuel cycle along with atomic power plants. The U.S. argument was that nuclear power would provide for the growing needs of our economy and free our remaining oil reserves for export or conversion to petrochemicals.

That rationale has not changed.

Still, after the Islamic Revolution in our country in 1979, all understandings with the United States in the nuclear field unraveled. Washington even cut off fuel deliveries to the very facility it supplied. To secure fuel from other sources, Iran was forced to modify the reactor to run on uranium enriched to around 20 percent. The Tehran Research Reactor still operates, supplying isotopes used in the medical treatment of 800,000 of my fellow Iranians every year.

But getting to this point was not easy. In 2009, we put forward a request to the International Atomic Energy Agency for fuel for the reactor as its supply was running out, threatening the lives of many Iranians. When we agreed to exchange a major portion of our stock of low-enriched uranium for reactor fuel in 2010 — a proposal by the Obama administration — the response we got from the White House was a push for more U.N. Security Council sanctions.

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 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

Again, we did what every government is obliged to do: protect and ensure the well-being of our citizens. Thanks to the grace of God and the hard work of our committed and growing cadre of scientists, we managed to do something we had never done before: enrich uranium to the needed 20 percent and mold it into fuel plates for the reactor. We have never failed when faced with no option but to provide for our own needs.

All relationships — whether between parents and children, spouses or even nation-states — are based on trust. The example of the Tehran Research Reactor vividly illustrates the key issue between Iran and the United States: lack of trust.

We have strongly marked our opposition to weapons of mass destruction on many occasions. Almost seven years ago, Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei made a binding commitment. He issued a religious edict — a fatwa — forbidding the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons. Our stance against weapons of mass destruction, which is far from new, has been put to the test. When Saddam Hussein attacked us with chemical arms in the 1980s, we did not retaliate with the same means. And when it comes to our nuclear energy program, the IAEA has failed to find any military dimension, despite an unprecedented number of man-hours in intrusive inspections.

Being sovereign and independent does not mean that there is no room for dialogue or diplomacy. It means that one enters any debate as an equal, based on mutual respect and justice. To reestablish trust, all sides must assume an honest approach with a view toward moving past the barriers to sincere dialogue.

A key aspect of entering a conversation based on mutual respect is recognizing the other side's concerns as equal to one's own. To solve the nuclear issue, the scope of the upcoming talks among Iran and the "P5+1" (the United States, Britain, China, France, Russia and Germany) must be comprehensive. The concerns of all sides must be addressed. Complex matters that have been left unaddressed for decades cannot be solved overnight. Another sign of mutual respect is a willingness and readiness to both give and take, without preconditions. This form of reciprocity is distinct from approaches that involve only taking. Most important, and this cannot be stressed enough, is that dialogue must be seen as a process rather than an event. A house can burn to the ground in minutes but takes a long time to build. Similarly, trust can easily and rapidly be broken, but it takes a long time to build.

If the intention of dialogue is merely to prevent cold conflict from turning hot, rather than to resolve differences, suspicion will linger. Trust will not be established. Despite sanctions, threats of war, assassinations of several of our scientists and other forms of terrorism, we have chosen to remain committed to dialogue.

In the upcoming talks, we hope that all sides will return to the negotiating table as equals with mutual respect; that all sides will be committed to comprehensive, long-term dialogue aimed at resolving all parties' outstanding concerns; and, most important, that all sides make genuine efforts to reestablish confidence and trust.

*Ali Akbar Salehi is foreign minister of the Islamic Republic of Iran.*

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/iran-we-do-not-want-nuclear-weapons/2012/04/12/gIQAjMNnDT\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/iran-we-do-not-want-nuclear-weapons/2012/04/12/gIQAjMNnDT_story.html)

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

New York Times  
OPINION/Op-Ed Contributor  
*International Herald Tribune*  
April 12, 2012

## **If at First Iran Says No, Try, Try Again**

By VOLKER PERTHES

BERLIN — It is not certain that the talks scheduled to begin in Istanbul on Friday between the "P5-plus-1" group (the five permanent U.N. Security Council members — the United States, China, Britain, France and Russia — plus Germany)

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



and Iran are really the last chance to avoid war over Iran's nuclear program. But there is no question that the risk of military conflict increases should this round prove as fruitless as the last one in early 2011.

The conditions appear a little better this time. The European Union and the United States continue to see a — dwindling — chance to prevent Iran from achieving a military nuclear capability through negotiations and also decrease the risk of a military confrontation between Israel and Iran.

The Iranian leadership seems more interested than a year ago, for a number of reasons, to start discussions with clear goals.

The harsh sanctions imposed by the United States and the European Union as well as the U.N. Security Council on Iran have started to bite, affecting most of the country's business with the world. The Iranian leadership wants to rid itself of these sanctions at least in part. Iran has also been made to realize that threats, such as the closing of the Strait of Hormuz, have failed to deter the Americans and Europeans from imposing these sanctions.

There is also the fact that regional politics have not been going Iran's way, even though Tehran continues to publicly celebrate the "Islamic awakening" in the Arab world. Iran faces the loss of its only strategic ally in the region, the Assad regime in Damascus, and the Arab Gulf States are actively engaged in an attempt to roll back Iran's influence. What's more, Islamic movements such as the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt or Hamas in Gaza by no means follow a pro-Iranian agenda.

Inside Iran, President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has been badly weakened. The Iranian negotiator, Saeed Jalili, has made clear that he acts on behalf of the religious leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

In his letter to the E.U.'s foreign affairs chief, Catherine Ashton, who heads the "P5-plus-1" group, Jalili declared that Iran was ready for the "step-by-step" approach and the "reciprocity" she proposed for the discussions.

In fact, such a gradual approach — tying the lifting or suspension of various sanctions to steps Iran must undertake — is the only chance for success. The mutual distrust is too great for any quick, comprehensive solution that would lead Iran to abandon its uranium enrichment program. But a few agreed steps could restore the minimum of trust needed for a constructive diplomatic process.

The most important breakthrough would be for Iran to agree to suspend its 20 percent uranium enrichment, ship stockpiles of such uranium to agreed locations abroad, and allow the International Atomic Energy Agency to inspect facilities that could serve to produce nuclear weapons.

The idea that Iran could swap its enriched uranium for a research reactor would likely be put on the table again. Further steps could include the ratification of the Additional Protocol to the Non-Proliferation Treaty that gives the I.A.E.A. full inspection rights.

All these steps cannot be achieved in one round of negotiations. They would require talks over several months. But that is only feasible if both sides act constructively in the first round.

Iran will want to know what it will gain if it agrees to such an approach. The P5-plus-1 group should have a convincing answer, such as identifying which specific American or European sanctions would be suspended should Iran stop its 20 percent enrichment.

Simply promising not to impose additional sanctions does not constitute a major incentive. And a total lifting of sanctions is as unlikely today as a full halt of Iranian enrichment activities.

The P5-plus-1 negotiators should, however, be prepared to suggest what a final settlement might look like — what assurances and guarantees the international community would need in order to accept an Iranian nuclear program with limited enrichment activities.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Given the lack of elementary trust, the new talks will be fragile. There is always the risk that Iranian domestic politics will halt the process, as it did in 2009. The talks can also crash if the P5-plus-1 group fails to make clear that they are really about limiting the spread of nuclear weapons, and not about regime change in Tehran.

If the Iranian leadership is firmly convinced that the goal of the sanctions is only to weaken or overthrow its regime, why would it abandon a program that so troubles Israel and the West?

*Volker Perthes is the director of Stiftung Wissenschaft und Politik (SWP), the German Institute for International and Security Affairs, Berlin.*

[http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/12/opinion/if-at-first-iran-says-no-try-try-again.html?\\_r=2](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/12/opinion/if-at-first-iran-says-no-try-try-again.html?_r=2)

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

London Guardian – U.K.

OPINION/Comment is Free

## **The Nuclear Test for Iran**

*Ahead of its P5+1 meeting in Istanbul, the embattled Iranian regime is running out of options. It will do what it must to survive*

By Mehrdad Khonsari

Friday, 13 April 2012

The ruling establishment in Iran is facing the most testing period of its existence. A fraction of its former size, it has been beset by one crisis after another in the last 33 years. So far the leadership has displayed an uncanny instinct for survival despite serious foreign and domestic challenges.

Always aggressive and uncompromising in its diplomacy, only once has the regime ever backed down: in 1988 when faced with serious reverses in the Iran-Iraq war, the late Ayatollah Khomeini agreed to a ceasefire – an act he likened to "consuming a jug of poison". But now the late Ayatollah's heirs could be in for a repeat of his humiliating experience.

Having prevaricated for more than a decade over the nuclear issue, there is little room left for diplomatic tactics. International isolation and biting sanctions have brought the Iranian economy to the verge of a meltdown and, alongside the potential fallout of a military confrontation with Israel, mean the regime must in its encounter with the "P5+1" (the UN security council and Germany) this week decide if it wants a diplomatic settlement or to pursue the path of a conflict it knows it cannot risk. Because Tehran's decisions are always guided by a cost-benefit approach – especially when it comes to its own ultimate survival – many still expect a possible diplomatic solution to this potentially explosive crisis.

Nonetheless, the acquisition of nuclear weapons will remain an integral part of the Islamic regime's strategy. Why else would it have put itself and the Iranian nation through so much hardship and isolation in the past 10 years. Its foreign policy also hinges on its ability to stand up to the west and provide an umbrella for its surrogates – a goal that requires becoming a member of the nuclear club.

No choice made by the regime will be "cost-free". Faced with having to submit to intrusive inspections by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the humiliation of having its nuclear facilities attacked, a "rational actor" would opt for the less costly short-term option of a diplomatic settlement. The Iranian leadership is eager not to follow Saddam Hussein's example, knowing that if the Iraqi dictator had left Kuwait 24 hours prior to the start of hostilities in 1991, he might never have lost his stranglehold on the Iraqi people.

But dictatorships always display a tendency for overplaying their hand, and the Khomeini-Ahmadinejad tandem is no exception. There is always a possibility that rationality will not prevail and that diplomatic talks will not achieve their aim. A freak accident in the delicate situation between Iranian forces and the US and other naval forces in the Persian

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 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

Gulf could also trigger an unexpected encounter that could get out of hand. This is exacerbated by the fact that Iran's Arab neighbours are as concerned about a nuclear Iran as Israel.

A tactical compromise therefore will only be putting off the inevitable as the regime cannot afford to simply jettison its nuclear ambitions. Time is not on its side and, despite a resurgence of Islamic movements as a result of the Arab spring, it knows that political Islam in Iran has been dead for a long time. Thus to avoid the risk of public unrest in the event of a military strike, its aim for now would be to try and stabilise a volatile situation with a view to resurrecting its nuclear ambitions as soon as the coast is clear.

*Mehrdad Khonsari, a former Iranian diplomat, is secretary-general of Green Wave – Supporters of Freedom in Iran.*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/apr/13/nuclear-test-iran>

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

Council on Foreign Relations  
OPINION/First Take

## **North Korea's Failure: The Good and the Bad**

By Richard N. Haass, President, Council on Foreign Relations  
April 13, 2012

North Korea's failed attempt to launch the unha-3, a new three-stage long-range ballistic missile, is for obvious reasons welcome. More than anything else it demonstrates limits to the DPRK's technical prowess. And it means that the United States and the world have more time before they must contend with the possibility that the world's most closed and militarized country has the capacity to launch missiles, conceivably with nuclear warheads, across great distances.

But any sigh of relief must be tempered. First, the fact that the test took place at all in the face of widespread international opposition demonstrates North Korea's ability to defy external pressure and isolation. It also means that China, the country with the most influence over North Korea, is still unwilling to use that influence in a decisive manner.

Second, North Korea remains a serious military threat. It still possesses as many as a dozen nuclear warheads, proven short-range missiles, and a formidable conventional fighting force. It is as much an army with a country as vice-versa.

Third and perhaps most immediate, the test's failure constitutes a humiliating setback for the country's new leader, Kim Jong-un. It is likely that a principal reason for the launch was to signal his emergence and consolidate his authority. There is thus a real risk that he will turn to a tried and true path to accomplish the same ends.

If history is any guide, this suggests that a test of a nuclear warhead or some sort of aggressive military action -- for example, an artillery strike -- against South Korea could be in the offing. And if this latter scenario occurs, South Korea, unlike on previous occasions, is almost certain to retaliate. And if this happens, escalation and a serious armed clash on the Korean Peninsula, territory where the United States, China, Japan, and others all have vital interests, could well materialize. This last outpost of the Cold War, ignored or forgotten by many, retains the potential to constitute a major threat to post-Cold War international order.

<http://www.cfr.org/north-korea/north-koreas-failure-good-bad/p27946>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency  
OPINION/Analysis

## **Pyongyang Tries – and Fails – to Intimidate the World**

13 April 2012

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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



By Konstantin Bogdanov, Dmitry Kosyrev, RIA Novosti political commentators

North Korea has failed to do in 2012 what the USSR successfully did way back in 1957, when it launched the world's first artificial satellite. The country's much-hyped ballistic missile fell apart just minutes after launch, and its debris fell into the sea. So what conclusions can we draw about the international diplomatic standoff sparked by the launch?

### **A peaceful achievement with military implications**

The rift was clear from the very start: one group of countries (or their experts) saw the event as a thinly-veiled ballistic missile test, while another group claimed it was a satellite launch. The debate was actually about war and peace, but the problem is that both are involved in this case.

Pyongyang's launch of an orbiter was meant as a bit of flag waving by way of military-technological achievement. In many respects, the USSR was engaged in the same thing when it launched its R-7 carrier rocket – the world's first intercontinental ballistic missile – with satellite on board. The clearly audible signal the satellite transmitted from orbit sent a message clearer than any military parade or combat exercise: the U.S. was no longer safe behind its ocean borders.

A successful launch would have at least enabled Pyongyang to pose as a power with the potential to strike America. We say "pose" because there is a difference between putting a satellite in orbit and delivering a nuclear weapon to North America.

For example, you have to deal with the issue of accuracy. Of course, if your bomb is powerful enough, you can more or less disregard precision and drop it within a kilometer or two of any densely populated urban area. But the DPRK is a far cry from Russia, whose strategic missile forces must be able to deliver pinpoint counterstrikes against U.S. silos and command centers in case of a hypothetical war.

There are numerous other problems as well. The simplest satellites are compact and rather lightweight, comparable to the mid-yield nuclear warheads available only to the nuclear superpowers. Pyongyang does not possess these technologies, and won't for the foreseeable future.

Strictly speaking, it is still unclear whether the DPRK has moved from producing nuclear explosive devices (only officially confirmed by two tests) to producing nuclear warheads for existing carriers. There are numerous doubts that it possesses this capability.

Potentially a trial device capable of exploding at a test site can be of any size or weight. A good illustration is the difference between the world's first thermonuclear device (Ivy Mike, 1952, U.S.A.), a 62-ton multi-level affair, and the world's first thermonuclear munition (RDS-6s, 1953, USSR), a bomb that could fit into the bomb bay of a Tupolev Tu-95 bomber. But in a missile warhead, everything hinges on a matter of kilograms and centimeters: the ideal device must be pared down to only the absolutely essential, and for that you need the most advanced technologies.

Even supposing the DPRK will soon manage to make a nuclear warhead, it is likely to be a munition for "regional" systems that threaten Seoul and Tokyo more than they do Washington. It will be a long time before the existing North Korean systems are capable of carrying nuclear warheads – and that would be true even if the recent satellite launch had been successful.

### **A diplomatic game**

All this explains the reaction of the world community to the North Korean launch. Everyone made sure to issue the requisite condemnation, but this attitude is a far cry from the parallel process involving Iran. A few days ago it was believed that the North Korean launch and the talks with Iran in Istanbul would take place simultaneously. Pyongyang got out ahead, but this is of no importance. What is important is that all major world media have kept Iran squarely on the front page, while relegating North Korea to the background.

Why? Don't we have identical stories here? Two countries have been punished by the UN for pursuing nuclear arsenals of their own. Two groups of states with almost the same composition have been engaged for years in a diplomatic





**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

game with both countries in a bid to prevent them from gaining nuclear status. But their diplomatic efforts have been largely unsuccessful, to say the least.

And yet, there is a difference in approaches. Take North Korea. Its announced launch was condemned by the United States, Russia, and China, not to mention Japan, above whose territory the most recent DPRK missiles have flown. Everyone reminded North Korea of UN Security Council Resolutions 1718 and 1874 banning ballistic launches. Everyone warned that consequences would follow.

Nevertheless, a meeting of foreign ministers of China, South Korea and Japan took place over the weekend, and while they issued another stern warning to Pyongyang they failed to go any further. Asked whether Beijing was ready for new resolute steps at the UN Security Council, the Japanese diplomats shook their heads despondently.

Somewhat earlier Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov said that Russia must “calibrate” its response to the launch, meaning to balance what it wants to achieve with the steps it can afford to take.

Pyongyang has been playing a diplomatic game. Instead of pursuing the six-party talks (the two Koreas, the U.S.A., Russia, China, and Japan), the North Koreans are engaged in a dialogue with the United States (last time it was held in Berlin). Pyongyang was following the well-worn routine of attempting to raise the stakes: after all, previous missiles barely reached Alaska, while the impending launch, if successful, would have been a much more threatening. Japan? To be sure, it was scared stiff, but while the previous three missiles overflew the Japanese islands, the present one was directed at a southern area and the Philippines. North Korea’s gesture was subtle and diplomatically elegant.

No matter how hard Pyongyang tries to scare its negotiating partners with its nuclear might, the result is nil. Iran, on the contrary, has achieved all it wanted. Though Pyongyang seems to have made several primitive nuclear devices while Iran has none, this changes nothing in the present line-up.

The world powers are taking different approaches to the two trespassers. We can expect North Korea will be punished across the board (there was a launch after all, even if it failed), but the North Korean nuclear crisis will continue to be addressed through protracted talks. Even if the talks drag on after the U.S. presidential elections in November, a relatively successful outcome is still a possibility. Iran is another matter.

*The views expressed in this article are the authors’ and may not necessarily represent those of RIA Novosti.*

<http://en.rian.ru/analysis/20120413/172807592.html>

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

**Issue No. 997, 13 April 2012**

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