



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Russia and China Accused of Cyber-Spying Campaign to Steal U.S. Secrets](#)

1. ['Stuxnet, an Israeli Cyber War Tactic'](#)
2. [Ahmadinejad Says Nuclear Weapons a Thing of the Past](#)
3. [Iran Says Russian Plan could Revive Nuclear Talks](#)
4. [N. Korea Must Halt All Nuclear Activities Ahead of 6-Party Talks: FM](#)
5. [North Korea Poised for Nuclear Weapon Test Next Year](#)
6. [Kim Jong Il Snatch Scenario Included in Military Exercise](#)
7. [Nuclear Program in Safe Hands](#)
8. [Pakistan Lets China See US Helicopter](#)
9. [New Stealth Fighter Jet for Russia, India](#)
10. [New 'Missile Shield' to Be Built Around Moscow After 2015](#)
11. [Russia and China Accused of Cyber-Spying Campaign to Steal U.S. Secrets](#)
12. [US Ports Spend Big on Post-9/11 Security](#)
13. [Factbox: For Cuts, Pentagon Must Choose Among Weapons, Personnel](#)
14. [Yemen: Barack Obama Warned that al-Qaeda Planning Ricin Attack](#)
15. [Al-Qaida Chief Urges Attacks on 'Criminal' America](#)
16. [A Nuclear Iran would Pose Huge Threat to the World](#)
17. [A Cold War Missile Treaty That's Doing Us Harm](#)
18. [China's Nuclear Sub Needs](#)
19. [Get Ready for the Democratization of Destruction](#)
20. [Global Insights: Harmonizing U.S. Military Tools](#)
21. [Deficit Reduction and National Defense: Everything Shouldn't be on the Table](#)
22. [Between Disarmament Plans](#)

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. 932, 16 August 2011

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
Saturday, August 13, 2011

'Stuxnet, an Israeli Cyber War Tactic'

Israel's use of the highly sophisticated computer virus Stuxnet to cripple Iran's nuclear program signifies the beginning of Tel Aviv's cyber war on Tehran.

A report published recently in the German weekly *Der Spiegel* refers to the Israeli spy agency Mossad's 'attack on Iran's nuclear program with Stuxnet being the first digital weapon of geopolitical importance as it could change the way wars are fought -- and it will not be the last attack of its kind.'

Stuxnet, first identified by Iranian officials in June 2010, is a malware designed to infect computers using Siemens supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) -- a control system favored by industries that manage water supplies, oil rigs, and power plants.

In July last year, media reports claimed that Stuxnet had targeted industrial computers around the globe, with Iran being the main target of the attack. They said the country's Bushehr nuclear power plant was at the center of the cyber attack.

However, Iranian experts detected the worm in time, averting any damage to the country's industrial sites and resources.

According to the recent *Der Spiegel* article, a site on a hill near an interchange on the highway from Tel Aviv to Haifa is known in Israel simply as 'The Hill,' which is as big as several soccer fields and is sealed off from the outside world with high walls and barbed wire -- a modern fortress that symbolizes Israel's fight for survival in the Middle East.

As the headquarters of Israel's spy agency, the fortress is strictly off-limits to politicians and journalists alike. Ordinarily, it is the Mossad that makes house calls, and not the other way around.

The report says that Meir Dagan, the former head of Mossad, had told journalists in January how Mossad has been seeking to cripple Iran's nuclear program.

He spoke about the risks of a possible military strike against Iran, saying that he believed that such an attack would lead to a conflagration in the region that would include a war with Lebanon's Hezbollah and Hamas, and possibly with Syria.

The then Mossad chief was reportedly against a war, but in favor of anything that could derail Iran's nuclear program.

The ex-Mossad head hinted at a weapon, which he did not mention by name: Stuxnet.

The virus represents a fundamentally new addition to the arsenal of modern warfare. It enables a military attack using a computer program tailored to a specific target, the report adds.

"Stuxnet is the most sophisticated attack we have ever seen. This sort of an attack, on a mature, isolated industrial system is completely unusual." He projects a map onto the wall, showing the countries where such an attack has taken place: Iran, Indonesia, Malaysia and Belarus," says Sam Angel, the head of Symantec Israel in the report.

When engineers got to work, they came across two computers that had directed the attacks. One of the servers was in Malaysia and the other was in Denmark, and they were reachable through the addresses *todayfutbol.com* and *mypremierfutbol*. They had been registered, under a false name and with a forged credit card, through one of the world's largest Internet registration companies, a firm based in the US state of Arizona, the report goes on to say.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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

Computer engineers found out that Stuxnet had infected about 100,000 computers worldwide, including computers in Iran, Indonesia and India.

According to *Der Spiegel*, it is widely believed that Americans may have helped the Mossad as there is a US government research institution in Idaho where scientists study the Siemens control technology used in Iran. The basic research for Stuxnet could have taken place there and the virus could have been tested at Israel's nuclear research center near Dimona in the Negev Desert later.

Stuxnet is programmed to delete itself from the USB flash drive after the third infection, presumably to prevent it from spreading explosively, which would have been noticed immediately. The goal of the cyber-weapon is to sabotage its targets in a sustainable, rather than spectacular, manner.

The multi-million dollar malware has fundamentally changed the digital attacks. The US government recently issued a new cyber war doctrine that defines a cyber-attack as a conventional act of war, *Der Spiegel* says.

According to the report, last year the British government adopted a new security strategy, for which it approved funding of 650 million pounds (£565 million or \$1,070 million). The cyber world will become "more important in the conflict between nations," Israeli Deputy Prime Minister Dan Meridor said in a speech in al-Quds (Jerusalem) in February. "It is a new battleground, if you like, not with guns but with something else."

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/193779.html>

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

Tehran Times – Iran
Monday, August 15, 2011

Ahmadinejad Says Nuclear Weapons a Thing of the Past

TEHRAN - Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has said that the 21st century is about knowledge, while nukes are the means of the past and are not going to be a determining force in the world in future.

Ahmadinejad made the remarks during an interview with Russia Today (RT) on August 13. His comments were later translated into English by this television network.

Commenting on the dispute over Iran's nuclear program, Ahmadinejad said, "We do not want nuclear weapons for a few reasons... This weapon is inhumane. Because of our faith, we are against it. Our religion says it is prohibited, and we are religious people."

"Nuclear weapons have no capabilities today. If any country tries to build a nuclear bomb, in fact, they waste their money on resources and, secondly, they create a big danger to themselves," he stated.

No country possessing nuclear weapons has benefited from it, Ahmadinejad said, adding, "The Americans have nuclear bombs and nuclear weapons. Could they win in Iraq or in Afghanistan? Could nuclear weapons help the Zionist regime win in Lebanon and Gaza? Could nuclear weapons help the former Soviet Union avoid collapse?"

He added, "Nuclear weapons are the means of the previous century. This century is the century of knowledge and thinking. It is the century of human beings. It is the century of culture and knowledge."

Ahmadinejad pointed out that nuclear weapons are not going to be the determining force in the world in future, saying, "It is about the power of people, not nuclear weapons. Meanwhile, I should say that, our goal in the country and the goal of our people, our slogan is 'Peace for all!' Nuclear energy for all, nuclear weapons for none! This is our goal."

He also stated that Iran's activities in the sphere of nuclear energy are closely monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



"There hasn't been any document against Iran in the agency. They just claim. It is a claim by the United States, but they have no evidence that Iran is diverting [to acquiring nuclear weapons]," Ahmadinejad said.

Israel, U.S. dare not attack Iran

Asked to comment on the possibility of the U.S. and Israel's military campaign against Iran, Ahmadinejad said, "They wish to do it, they want to do it, but they know about our power. They know that we are going to give them a decisive response," he said. "We have a saying in our language: 'If someone throws a smaller stone, you should respond with a bigger stone.' We will defend ourselves within our capabilities."

Bushehr power plant to be launched on schedule

Elsewhere in his remarks, Ahmadinejad spoke about the launch of the Bushehr nuclear power plant, saying, "I have already talked to President Dmitri Medvedev, who told me there is no obstacle to the plant launching its operations at the scheduled time."

The plant is expected to be fully operational by the end of this year, he added.

He went on to say that Russia's taking part in constructing the nuclear plant in Bushehr not only marks the good relations between the two countries, but also signals to the world community Iran's intentions to build nothing but a nuclear power plant.

"Iran and Russia are neighbors at least in terms of geography. This is something that cannot be changed," the Iranian president said. "Earlier I had very productive talks with Prime Minister Vladimir Putin besides negotiations with President Medvedev. I hope we can extend our relations, especially taking into account current changes in the global economy and politics. Iran and Russia could offer joint solutions to current international problems."

UNSC authorization of military action in Libya was a mistake

Speaking of Iran's stance on the "Arab Spring", Ahmadinejad said that these events reflect problems that go far beyond the needs of the people of the region.

"The entire world is not satisfied," he said. "There are class distinctions, there are pressures, armed conflicts, and a large number of nations are being humiliated all the time. Today, justice and dignity are among the requirements of all human beings. Nations in our region and in North Africa have the same aspirations."

Nations in the Middle East and North Africa have the ability to run their own countries and that NATO and the United Nations have made a mistake in "having meddled in Libya," Ahmadinejad said.

"NATO has interfered in Libya's affairs. The (UN) Security Council has made a mistake," he said. "Instead of sending bombs and planes to Libya they should have sent mediation groups, in order to (help them) prepare for free elections, under the auspices of the United Nations."

Instead, Ahmadinejad said, the UNSC "hastily issued the resolution," which has complicated the situation and led to numerous deaths among the civilian population.

Iran among the best in terms of freedom

In reply to a question about the human rights situation in Iran, Ahmadinejad said, "There are 35 kinds of democracy in the world. English democracy and German democracy are different," he said. "Human rights are being violated in Europe. The same situation is in the United States, in Asia and Africa."

"We have an independent judiciary and we have transparent legal proceedings," he stated. "We have mass media, we have free press. They criticize the government."

He also said that Iran is "among the best in the world in this respect."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Asked about his plans after the end of his term in office in 2013, Ahmadinejad said, "I am a university professor and I have retained this post and qualification. I will continue to serve the nation anywhere, and in the university there will be no problem about that," he said.

In conclusion, the Iranian president said, "We love and respect all human beings, disregarding the language, religion and the color of skin. We are very sad to see discrimination and poverty in the world. Hopefully, a day will come when the world is void of that. We are also sad to see the world suffer from conflicts and we hope peace will prevail. This is not going to happen unless we all join hands. We should come together to make a better tomorrow for our children."

<http://www.tehrantimes.com/index.php/politics/1584-nuclear-weapons-not-a-determining-force-in-21st-century-ahmadinejad-to-rt>

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

Los Angeles Times

Iran Says Russian Plan could Revive Nuclear Talks

By Reuters

August 16, 2011

- * Moscow's new push to restart talks welcomed by Tehran
- * Details of proposal not yet been made public
- * U.S. has given cautious welcome to Russian initiative

TEHRAN, Aug 16 (Reuters) - Iran welcomed on Tuesday a Russian attempt to revive talks with six world powers that are concerned about the its uranium enrichment programme, a potential pathway to nuclear weapons, but was vague about what the agenda should be.

After meeting Russian Security Council secretary Nikolai Patrushev, his Iranian counterpart said a proposal by Moscow -- details of which have not been made public -- could be used to re-launch the talks that stalled in January.

"Our Russian friends' suggestion could be a basis for starting talks for regional and international cooperation especially in the field of peaceful nuclear activities," Saeed Jalili, secretary general of Iran's National Security Council, told state broadcaster IRIB.

Jalili's general remarks gave no indication Iran was now prepared, unlike previously, to address what the powers see as the crucial concern -- its uranium enrichment drive, which U.N. inspectors say Iran has not proven is for peaceful energy only.

Talks between Iran and the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council -- the United States, Russia, China, Britain and France, plus Germany (known as the EU3+3 or P5+1) -- in Istanbul in January foundered with Iran insisting on having what it says is its right to produce nuclear fuel recognised.

Since then, Iran has vowed to increase its enrichment activities and shift its production of higher grade fuel to an underground bunker that would be less vulnerable to a military strike.

With Israel and Washington keeping open the possibility of pre-emptive strikes on Iran to stop it getting nuclear weapons, negotiations are a possible way of avoiding what analysts say would be military action that could inflame the Middle East.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov told U.S. President Barack Obama in July of Moscow's "step-by-step" approach under which Iran could address questions about its nuclear programme and be rewarded with a gradual easing of sanctions.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"We and the six countries as seven countries can create the grounds for cooperation through this strategy," Jalili said.

While Iran plays down the "nuclear" aspect of talks, saying the negotiations are meant to cover a wide range of issues, the Western focus has always been Iran's atomic activities.

Iran says they are intended only to run a future network of civilian nuclear power plants as another source of energy for its burgeoning population so it can export more oil, and for medical and agricultural applications.

Many countries fear Iran is secretly bent on developing nuclear weapons capability, pointing to its past concealment of sensitive nuclear work and continued curbs on access for International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors.

Any new talks are likely to focus on concerns about Iran's nuclear enrichment which a U.N. Security Council resolution requires it to stop but which Tehran says it is entitled to do as a member of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

But its decision last year to raise the level of enrichment from the 3.5 percent fissile purity needed for normal power plant fuel to 20 percent worried countries that saw it as a notable step towards the 90 percent threshold needed for bombs.

The United States has cautiously welcomed Russia's overture to Iran, but says it will continue a "dual approach" of sanctions pressure and the possibility of talks. "We welcome any Russian effort to persuade Iran that it's time to change course and meet its international obligations," State Department spokeswoman Victoria Nuland told reporters on Monday.

Reporting by Mitra Amiri; Writing by Robin Pomeroy; Editing by Mark Heinrich

<http://www.latimes.com/sns-rt-iran-nucleartalks-pix-tvl5e7jg20110816,0,1440808,full.story>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

August 12, 2011

N. Korea Must Halt All Nuclear Activities Ahead of 6-Party Talks: FM

SEOUL, Aug. 12 (Yonhap) -- North Korea must halt all of its nuclear activities, including a uranium enrichment program, before the resumption of the stalled six-party talks can take place, South Korea's foreign minister said Friday.

"Suspension of all nuclear activities by North Korea, including its uranium enrichment program, is one of the prerequisites for the resumption of the six-party talks," Foreign Minister Kim Sung-hwan told reporters.

"And then, North Korea needs to allow international inspectors to verify" the suspension, Kim said.

Kim also pressed North Korea to show its genuine willingness to denuclearize through its actions in order to reopen the multinational talks on ending the North's nuclear programs.

The North's uranium enrichment program is among the key obstacles to the resumption of the six-party talks involving the two Koreas, the U.S., China, Russia and Japan. The talks have been stalled since late 2008 after the North stormed out.

Last November, Pyongyang stunned the world by revealing a modern uranium enrichment facility that could provide the communist regime with new material to make atomic weapons, in addition to its known plutonium-based weapons program.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2011/08/12/10/0401000000AEN20110812007000315F.HTML>

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

The Australian – Australia

North Korea Poised for Nuclear Weapon Test Next Year

EXCLUSIVE: Greg Sheridan, Foreign editor, The Australian
August 16, 2011

NORTH Korea will conduct another nuclear weapons test within 12 months, according to senior US sources with access to Washington's intelligence assessments.

This will bring much closer the day when North Korean nuclear weapons could threaten Australia. And it could trigger explosive reactions in northeast Asia.

The senior US sources believe the test could come sooner rather than later, although next year is regarded as the most likely.

"2012 is an auspicious year from the North Korean point of view," said one senior American.

"It's an election year in the US and an election year in South Korea. And the North Koreans have publicly declared their desire to be a fully functional nuclear weapons state by 2012."

For most of the past decade, sources say, North Korea has been systematically involved in nuclear proliferation.

At a meeting in 2003, senior North Koreans told representatives of the Bush administration that if the Americans did not agree to their demands for aid and diplomatic recognition, Pyongyang would share its nuclear technology with foreign nations.

Shortly after that, US sources believe, the North Koreans began selling nuclear technology to Syria and Burma.

In 2007, Israel destroyed a nuclear reactor in Syria that was being built by the North Koreans.

In 2009 and last year, US Secretary of State Hillary Clinton made a series of statements in which she expressed concerns about North Korea transferring nuclear material to Burma.

Senior US sources believe the illegal nuclear trade between North Korea and Burma continues to this day.

Senior sources believe Burma's primitive technological base means it is unlikely to be able to produce nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future.

However, the US administration is still extremely concerned about the nuclear trade between North Korea and Burma.

There is also believed to be an extensive trade, especially in missile technology, between North Korea and Iran.

North Korea is known to have two nuclear weapons programs, one involving plutonium and one highly enriched uranium.

A weapons test involving either would be extremely dangerous.

Once a nation can produce highly enriched uranium, it is relatively easy for it to keep increasing its weapons-grade stock annually.

North Korea is believed to have made progress on miniaturising nuclear weapons so they can be carried on long-range missiles. The Taepodong-2 missile, which the North Koreans tested unsuccessfully in 2006 but much more successfully in 2009, has the range to hit northern Australia, as well as US states such as Alaska and Hawaii.

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/n-korea-poised-for-nuke-weapon-test-next-year/story-fn59niix-1226115518606>

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

Kim Jong Il Snatch Scenario Included in Military Exercise

By YOSHIHIRO MAKINO Correspondent

August 14, 2011

A joint military exercise conducted last year by the United States and South Korea included the capture of North Korean leader Kim Jong Il as one of its hypothetical goals, military sources said.

The exercise is held annually, and this year's exercise, scheduled to start on Aug. 16, may also include the capturing of Kim as a scenario.

According to military sources, the capture of Kim is part of the joint tactical plan 5027, which prepares for the possibility of war with North Korea.

The plan envisages first stopping the North Korean military from invading South Korea. U.S. and South Korean forces move toward Pyongyang, and special forces locate Kim and seek to capture him. Capturing the North Korean leader appears to be seen as a way of minimizing casualties and shortening hostilities.

Because of the dictatorial structure of North Korea, Kim holds many key posts, including the chairmanship of the National Defense Commission, the most important institution in the government structure. He is also supreme commander of the military and chairman of the Central Military Commission of the Workers' Party of Korea.

The obvious risk of any attempt to capture Kim during real fighting would be of provoking the North Koreans into an all-out counterattack.

The annual U.S.-South Korean exercise, known by the codename Ulchi Freedom Guardian, is mainly conducted on computers as a command and control simulation.

The tactics are based on the U.S. military concept of effects-based operations. With the use of advanced precision weapons and reconnaissance satellites, the emphasis is on achieving an early victory by attacking the enemy's key assets from the start of fighting.

Sources said U.S. and South Korean joint military planners are continuing to identify important targets that would make it difficult for North Korea to fight.

<http://www.asahi.com/english/TKY201108130210.html>

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

Arab News – Saudi Arabia

Nuclear Program in Safe Hands

By KHURSHEED ANWAR

August 13, 2011

Pakistan became the world's eighth nuclear weapon state in May 1998 and the motive behind this move was regional and originated from the Indian threat.

Pakistan views nuclear weapons as a guarantee of its independence and physical integrity; they have made it possible for a weaker state to defend itself against a larger and more powerful adversary.

After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Western nations, particularly their think tanks and the media, started to propagate their fears about the safety and security of Pakistan's nuclear assets. On Sept. 18, 2001, the Institute for Science

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



and International Security (ISIS) raised concerns that “increased instability in Pakistan could make Pakistan’s nuclear weapons and stocks of nuclear explosive material dangerously vulnerable to theft by militant groups.”

To question the safety of Pakistan nuclear arsenal amounts to doubting the very guarantee that assures the existence and survival of the country. It is equally unlikely that terrorists could steal Pakistan nuclear weapons or fissile material. It is true that the authority of Pakistan is being challenged throughout Pakistan, especially in the tribal regions bordering Afghanistan. In the most troubled regions, police and military forces are stretched to maintain order. However, the installations that house Pakistan’s nuclear weapons and fissile material are heavily guarded and among the most secure facilities in all of Pakistan.

Pakistan has made its nuclear weapons as secure as other nuclear-weapon states have done. Since the 1998 nuclear tests, Pakistani authorities have taken different measures to safeguard the country’s nuclear assets. The first step in this regard was the creation of the 10-member National Command Authority (NCA) in 1990 to “ensure security and safety of the nuclear establishments, nuclear materials” and to safeguard all “information and technology related to the security and safety of the Strategic Organization.” With the establishment of NCA and Strategic Plan Division (SPD), the permanent secretariat of the NCA, the management of nuclear weapons acquired “institutionalized capability.” On May 28, 2009, the director of arms control and disarmament affairs at the SPD, Air Commodore Khalid Banuri, claimed that Pakistan has a large force of nearly 10,000 people deployed to keep vigil on the country’s nuclear arsenal. As far as physical security of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons and infrastructure is concerned, the nuclear establishments are distributed geographically.

There is a multilayered system of security over these nuclear installations. This includes highly trained special forces at the inner perimeter, air defense system, no-fly zones, fencing of structures, monitoring by state-of-the-art equipment. Close-circuit cameras, sensors, and checkpoints at second and third level, and counterintelligence teams to identify any threat to nuclear installations. Pakistan has a lot of sophisticated equipment for the security of its nuclear material, warheads and laboratories.

In 2001, in an effort to secure Pakistan’s nuclear weapons, former President Pervez Musharraf ordered the redeployment of nuclear weapons to at least six secret new locations, and organized the military oversight of nuclear forces. In order to avoid the unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, the nuclear warheads are separated or “de-mated” from the missiles or bombs casing that would carry them in an attack and only put into operation with the consent of NC. In addition to their disassembled status, Pakistan’s nuclear warheads are now equipped with Permissive Action Link (PAL), a sophisticated type of lock used to prevent unauthorized launching. Pakistan has developed its own PAL systems which obviously ensure that even if an unauthorized person get holds of a weapon, he cannot activate it unless he also has access to the electronic codes.

Pakistan follows a two-man rule to authenticate the codes that call for the release of the weapons. As far as transportation of nuclear weapons and material is concerned, Pakistan is relying on secrecy in transporting its nuclear weapons rather than a highly visible security profile.

Pakistan’s nuclear export control framework is governed by a single legislation, the “Export Control on Goods, Technologies, Material and Equipment related to Nuclear and Biological Weapons and their Delivery Means Act, 2004.” This act strengthens control on the export, re-export, transshipment and transit of goods and technologies, material and equipment related to nuclear and biological weapons and missiles capable of delivering such weapons. The act extends to whole of Pakistan and maintains a control list that is consistent with the Nuclear Supplier Group, the Missile Technology Control Regime, and the Australia Group. Exporters are required to maintain detailed inventories and records and to notify the relevant authority if they are aware or suspect that goods or technology are intended to be used in connection with weapons. Offenders face tough penalties, which include imprisonment of up to 14 years, a fine of up to five million rupees, and the seizure of all assets and property. A particular worry about Pakistan is that scientists and engineers within its nuclear program may share weapons information with other countries or Islamist groups. To avoid such happenings, Pakistan has also set up a personal reliability system of the type used by the United States to continually monitor the financial status,



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

material condition, mental health and other aspects of officials in the nuclear system to ensure they are not disloyal or vulnerable to bribery or blackmail. Similarly, a Human Reliability Program (HRP) has been instituted for all military personnel involved with the nuclear forces in Pakistan. Furthermore, National Command Authority Ordinance, 2007, gives the SPD authority to investigate suspicious conduct, and can send for up to 25 years of imprisonment any serving and retired personnel, including military personnel, notwithstanding any other laws. Pakistan is so much conscious about its nuclear program and it is using its own technology to safeguard it.

http://arabnews.com/saudiArabia/pakistan_independence-day/article488067.ece

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

Financial Times – U.K.

August 14, 2011

Pakistan Lets China See US Helicopter

By Anna Fifield in Washington

Pakistan allowed Chinese military engineers to photograph and take samples from the top-secret stealth helicopter that US special forces left behind when they killed Osama bin Laden, the Financial Times has learnt.

The action is the latest incident to underscore the increasingly complicated relationship and lack of trust between Islamabad and Washington following the raid.

"The US now has information that Pakistan, particularly the ISI, gave access to the Chinese military to the downed helicopter in Abbottabad," said one person in intelligence circles, referring to the Pakistani spy agency. The Chinese engineers were allowed to survey the wreckage and take photographs of it, as well as take samples of the special "stealth" skin that allowed the American team to enter Pakistan undetected by radar, he said.

President Barack Obama's national security council had been discussing this incident and trying to decide how to respond. A senior official said the situation "doesn't make us happy", but that the administration had little recourse.

As Navy Seals raided Bin Laden's compound in the military city of Abbottabad, just outside Islamabad, in May, one of their modified Black Hawk helicopters crashed into the wall of the compound, rendering it inoperable.

The Seals used a hammer to smash the instruments then rigged up explosives to detonate it in an effort to keep classified military technology secret, but the tail section landed outside the compound wall and remained intact. John Kerry, chairman of the Senate foreign relations committee, went to Pakistan two weeks after the raid to secure the tail's return.

At the time, Pakistani officials, who were livid that the US carried out the raid without informing Islamabad first, hinted that the Chinese were interested in looking at the wreckage, and photographs of the tail circulated on the internet. But people close to the White House and the Central Intelligence Agency have told the FT that the Chinese were in fact given access to the helicopter.

"We had explicitly asked the Pakistanis in the immediate aftermath of the raid not to let anyone have access to the damaged remains of the helicopter," said the person close to the CIA.

Senior US officials confronted General Ashfaq Kayani, head of the Pakistan military, about this but he flatly denied it, according to a person with knowledge of the meeting. A senior Pakistani official also denied it to the FT. China declined to comment, as did the White House and CIA.

Beijing has a strong military relationship with Islamabad and is a major supplier of weapons to the Pakistani military.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"The Chinese would have enormous interest in this newfangled technology," said the person involved in confronting the Pakistanis. "They [Seals] did not blow the thing up for no reason," he said.

However, the senior government official said it was "hard to say" how useful the information would have been.

"Most of the helicopter was virtually destroyed during the operation," he said.

Additional reporting by Matthew Green and Kathrin Hille

<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/09700746-c681-11e0-bb50-00144feabdc0.html#axzz1V397c4IY>

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

Daily Pioneer – Pakistan

New Stealth Fighter Jet for Russia, India

August 16, 2011

Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)/RIA Novosti, Zhukovsky (Russia)

Russia's new stealth fighter jet, which is expected to make its first public appearance at the MAKS exhibition near Moscow Tuesday, will be the principal plane for both the Russian and Indian military, a top official says.

"The T-50 will be the newest main plane both for the Russian and Indian Air Force," Mikhail Pogosyan, the head of Russia's state-run United Aircraft corp (UAC), told reporters at the opening of the air show.

The Sukhoi T-50, also called the PAK FA, is meant to be a rival to the US F-22 Raptor. It made its maiden flight in the Russian Far East in January 2010.

India has helped Russia develop the new jet, and said recently it would cover 35 percent of the estimated \$6 billion development costs.

<http://www.dailypioneer.com/361154/New-stealth-fighter-jet-for-Russia-India.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

New 'Missile Shield' to Be Built Around Moscow After 2015

15 August 2011

Russia will deploy new S-500 air defense systems around Moscow after 2015, a leading Russian aerospace defense chief said on Monday.

"This deadline is set in a contract with the Defense Ministry. The project is currently at the engineering design stage," former Almaz-Antei corporation chief designer Igor Ashurbeili said in an exclusive interview with RIA Novosti.

Almaz Antei is Russia's main producer of medium and long-range air defense missile systems, and its S-300 and S-400 systems are among the most capable in the world, with the ability to intercept theater-range ballistic missiles as well as aircraft and cruise missiles.

S-500 will not be self-propelled like its predecessors S-300 and S-400, but towed, due to its large size and heavy weight.

"But it should be mobile in order to protect not only Moscow, but also any threatened region [in Russia]," Ashurbeili said.

"The current A-35 anti-ballistic missile [ABM] network around Moscow was built in the early 1970s and is largely obsolete now," he said.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

*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

Ashurbeili said one type of interceptor missile currently in service is practically not serviceable, while the other "has warheads stored separately from their carriers."

Moscow's existing missile shield was of limited size and was not updated due to the constraints of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty signed with the United States in the 1970s.

The United States abrogated the treaty during President George W Bush's presidency.

Russia has expressed concern over NATO's plans for a missile defense shield for Europe, claiming it undermines Russia's own nuclear deterrent.

MOSCOW, August 15 (RIA Novosti)

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20110815/165792381.html

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

Los Angeles Times

Russia and China Accused of Cyber-Spying Campaign to Steal U.S. Secrets

Rep. Mike Rogers, chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, cites cyber attacks as the top threat to the United States outside of Al Qaeda. He particularly blames Russia and China.

By Ken Dilanian, Los Angeles Times

August 12, 2011

Reporting from Washington — The military and intelligence services of Russia and China are conducting a sustained campaign to steal American commercial and military secrets through cyber espionage, according to the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, and he warned that sophisticated computer hacking poses a major danger to U.S. interests.

"Nation states are investing huge amounts of time, personnel and money to steal our data," Rep. Mike Rogers (R-Mich.) said Friday in a speech to an association of retired U.S. intelligence officers. "We are not as prepared as we need to be."

Rogers' remarks were framed as a warning against overly steep cuts in the intelligence and defense budgets, and he cited cyber attacks as the top threat to the United States outside of Al Qaeda. He particularly blamed Russia and China.

"Clearly the intelligence agencies and the military [from both countries] are involved," he said afterward.

Rogers' views are widely shared by national security officials, but the allegations are rarely voiced in public. The origins of many cyber attacks are deliberately hidden, and efforts by the Pentagon's National Security Agency to identify the sources rely on classified systems that officials are loath to discuss.

The issue is politically sensitive, and U.S. officials say there is no consensus on how to respond to computer-based attacks that they believe are tied to specific governments.

Evidence of state-sponsored cyber-espionage appears to be growing. A report last week by McAfee Inc., an Internet security firm owned by Intel Corp., described a five-year cyber assault against some 70 U.S. businesses, defense contractors and government agencies.

McAfee called it the work of a nation state but stopped short of accusing China. Other analysts quickly did. China's government has denied the allegations and has consistently denied cyber-spying on the United States, as has Russia. The McAfee report did not name most of the victims nor say what the attack yielded.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

In January 2010, Google Inc. said it had been hit by an attack originating in China, and said the cyber-spies had sought to steal emails from Chinese government critics. Google stopped cooperating with Chinese censorship of its search engine and subsequently withdrew from China.

A 2009 report by University of Toronto researchers traced a cyber attack called GhostNet that targeted foreign embassies, government agencies and offices used by the Dalai Lama, the exiled spiritual leader of Tibet, to Internet addresses on an island in the South China Sea where the People's Liberation Army has an intelligence base.

A senior U.S. intelligence official, who declined to speak publicly about an intelligence matter, said this week that China was deriving "enormous benefit from exploiting" the United States and other industrialized nations through the Internet.

"We are in a place where I think the benefits of cyberspace, which are huge, have been greatly outstripped by the risks of cyberspace," the official said.

<http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-cyber-china-20110813,0,7549165.story?track=rss>

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

BusinessWeek

Friday, August 12, 2011

US Ports Spend Big on Post-9/11 Security

By RUSS BYNUM, Associated Press

SAVANNAH, Ga. - The marshlands around the nation's fourth-busiest container port used to be considered enough of a barrier that Port of Savannah officials didn't bother to build a full fence around the bustling main terminal. Now security is so tight that roughly 4,000 times a day, steel containers from arriving ships are loaded onto tractor-trailers that, before hitting the highway, must pass through giant radiation detectors designed to sniff out nuclear bombs.

In the 10 years since the Sept. 11 attacks, the federal government has spent \$2.5 billion on a sweeping security overhaul at U.S. seaports from Seattle to New Orleans to Eastport, Maine, paying for everything from perimeter fencing to motion sensors and training for security officers. Federal agencies with a direct role in safeguarding seaports, namely the Coast Guard and Customs and Border Protection, have added whopping sums such as \$420 million for a unified ID card system for 1.6 million truck drivers, longshoremen and other port workers nationwide.

The big challenge has been keeping a closer watch on imported cargo without imposing a costly slowdown on foreign trade. There's also a huge cost to the nation's 185 public seaports themselves, often passed along in tariffs and fees to the shippers. The Savannah port, for example, tacks on a \$5.75 security fee for every cargo container it handles.

"It clearly is unfortunate and an extreme cost financially on international commerce," said Curtis Foltz, executive director of the Georgia Ports Authority, who can see the lines of trucks pulling their cargo through radiation scanners from his office window. "But there's no real alternative today."

U.S. ports worry Congress will make deep cuts in port security funding in the fiscal 2012 budget. An appropriations bill that recently passed the House included \$1 billion in cuts to the Department of Homeland Security, largely by slashing its grant programs.

The American Association of Port Authorities says U.S. ports stand to lose half or more of the funding they're counting on to fulfill security improvement plans that look five years ahead.

"With the debt-ceiling crisis, we're just getting hammered," said Susan Monteverde, the group's vice president for government affairs.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



At the Port of Long Beach, Calif., the nation's second-busiest, operations director Sean Strawbridge estimates that every dollar his port has received in federal security grants -- \$100 million since 2002 -- has required an equivalent amount of the port's own money. While grants may pay for new technology, such as sonar to watch for underwater intruders, they don't pay for additional staff to operate such equipment, he said.

The security upgrades at Long Beach and its next-door neighbor, the top-performing U.S. port at Los Angeles, have a payoff that goes beyond guarding against nuclear bombs and saboteurs, Strawbridge said.

"We don't just look at this from a standpoint of protecting against terrorism," he said. "But also how do we keep the port resilient against catastrophic events, such as earthquakes."

Before 9/11, state port authorities typically established their own security rules and terrorists weren't really on their radar. U.S. ports were primarily on the lookout for cargo thieves, stowaways, drug smuggling and human trafficking. In those days, there wasn't even a fence around some parts of the 6-mile perimeter of Savannah's sprawling main terminal, said Kevin Doyle, security chief for the Georgia ports. Marsh and other natural barriers in those gaps were deemed adequate.

Not anymore. The fencing got replaced, or installed where there was none before, and motion sensors were added. Security cameras and patrol officers keep watch at the Savannah port's perimeter around the clock.

The Coast Guard now cross-checks crew lists for arriving ships in advance against terror watch lists. Customs and Border Protection officers screen similar cargo manifests submitted at least a day before arrival.

They essentially flag potentially suspicious cargo containers for closer inspection by doing what airport security officers aren't allowed to do with passengers -- they use a form of profiling. Containers coming from an unfamiliar shipper, or with unusual or suspect goods inside, may get opened for physical inspection or scanned with an X-ray machine or similar imaging device.

While virtually every cargo container arriving at U.S. ports is scanned for radiation, Customs officers look inside only a fraction of those large steel boxes either by opening them or using imaging scans. The agency did not respond to a request by The Associated Press asking what percentage of cargo containers it pulls for closer inspection.

Lisa Brown, who oversees port operations for U.S. Customs and Border Protection in Savannah, said methods used to virtually screen cargo using shipping manifests and technology have enabled the government to improve security without placing an undue burden on the shipping industry.

"As we evolve in our technologies, we also have to evolve in our mindset for thinking we have to cut open every container," Brown said.

Congress disagrees. A 2007 port security law included a requirement that all overseas ports shipping goods to the U.S. must find a way to X-ray 100 percent of cargo heading to America by the end of next year.

Port officials in the U.S. and overseas call the rule an unnecessary step that would increase costs, especially if U.S. trade partners then required ports here do the same thing. Homeland Security Secretary Janet Napolitano said last month she's deferring the change, as allowed by the law, until 2014 at the soonest.

Post-9/11 concerns about port security also prompted Congress to require the government to give closer scrutiny to foreign investment in companies managing U.S. port operations and other key infrastructure. That 2007 law followed congressional outrage when regulators approved a Dubai-owned company to manage some operations at six U.S. ports.

As a result of the controversy, the Dubai firm sold to a U.S. company its operations at the ports of New York/New Jersey, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Miami, New Orleans and Tampa, Fla.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Henry Willis, who studies port security for the RAND Corp. think tank, said he worries the U.S. is adding expensive layers of security at cargo ports at the expense of other areas more vulnerable to terrorism.

The U.S. has seen evidence of terrorists plotting maritime attacks, from the USS Cole bombing in 2000 to the recently discovered idea hatched by Osama bin Laden to capture oil tankers and blow them up at sea. However, Willis noted, nothing has pointed to terrorists trying to smuggle bombs into U.S. ports aboard ships. Why wouldn't they use more conventional methods, he said, such as entering the U.S. by land or using small boats, much like drug smugglers?

"There are other places we have huge gaps," Willis said. "For some of the security applications being considered, it's akin to putting additional locks on the front door when your back door is open."

<http://www.businessweek.com/ap/financialnews/D9P2MPG81.htm>

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

Reuters – U.S. Edition

Factbox: For Cuts, Pentagon Must Choose Among Weapons, Personnel

Monday, August 15, 2011

(Reuters) - A decision to cut \$350 billion in security spending over the next decade will force the Pentagon to make difficult trade-offs that could lead to layoffs, canceled weapons systems or a smaller nuclear arsenal.

Following are some of the areas likely to be considered for cutbacks as the Defense Department attempts to reduce spending as required by the new deficit reduction law passed by Congress and signed by President Barack Obama.

PERSONNEL

About 45 percent of the Pentagon's base budget -- which was \$526 billion this year -- goes for pay and benefits for the Defense Department's 2.3 million employees. Nearly 20 percent of the growth in the defense budget over the past decade has been due to rising personnel costs.

Defense analysts have suggested taking a knife to the \$250 billion in personnel costs by shrinking the overall size of the department or changing the pay and benefit structure.

"Personnel costs really are a major driver in the defense budget, so reducing the number of personnel can generate a significant amount of savings," said Todd Harrison, an analyst at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, an independent national security think tank.

"I think they will want to reduce the total active duty end strength a bit. With the \$350 billion cut, they won't have to do much," Harrison said, adding that the civilian work force would probably be trimmed back proportionately as well.

Analysts at the Center for American Progress, a liberal Washington think tank, recommended in a recent report that the Pentagon eliminate 74,200 Army and 27,000 Marine positions along with a similar number of civilians in an effort to save \$39.16 billion through 2015.

"The United States is unlikely to deploy large land armies in the near future due to the tremendous cost of these wars in both blood and treasure," said the analysts, led by Lawrence Korb, a former assistant secretary of defense.

PAY AND BENEFITS

The Pentagon also may look at reforming the military's pay and benefit structure -- everything from base salary and housing allowances to medical costs and retirement funding.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The overall annual per-person cost for active duty military personnel has risen by 46 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars over the past decade, to \$121,600, Harrison said.

"They certainly can't continue allowing personnel costs to grow at that rate, but to really rein in the growth they'll have to make changes to healthcare benefits that they provide," he said.

Healthcare costs have been rising rapidly and now amount to about \$52.5 billion annually. Some 9.6 million people are covered, including active-duty troops, their families, retirees and reserves.

Former Defense Secretary Robert Gates and others frequently mentioned one area they believe is ripe for reform - the cost of health coverage for those who retire from active duty after 20 years or so and then go into the private-sector work force.

Their health insurance payments have not risen since the 1990s. Prices are so low that retirees have no incentive to take health insurance through their civilian employer rather than sticking with the military's plan. Congress has rejected attempts to raise the price in the past, but the Obama administration is now seeking a \$5 per month increase.

The Center for American Progress estimated the Pentagon could save \$42 billion through 2015 by reforming the healthcare system to require military retirees who work to pay a greater proportion of their healthcare costs.

The Sustainable Defense Task Force, a group of defense analysts and academics, foresaw even greater savings in a report last year. They said the Pentagon could save \$115 billion through 2020 by changing the compensation and healthcare systems.

WEAPONS PURCHASES

With the United States still engaged in three conflicts overseas and unemployment topping 9 percent, analysts say lawmakers may find it politically difficult to tackle personnel and compensation issues in the military. As a result, weapons programs may be the first to be sliced by the budget knife.

Some of the weapons systems likely to draw scrutiny:

F-35 Joint Strike Fighter - Lockheed Martin's F-35 Joint Strike Fighter is a likely candidate, if for no other reason than its size. The Pentagon has been planning to buy 2,443 of the aircraft through 2035 at a cost of \$382 billion.

The Sustainable Defense Task Force last year recommended canceling both the Navy and the Marine Corps versions of the F-35 and replacing them with other aircraft, saving \$9.85 billion through 2020.

But canceling the Marine F-35 would eventually leave the corps without a strike fighter capable of taking off from the Navy's 11 amphibious assault ships. The vessels currently carry Harrier jump jets, which are nearing the end of their service life.

What would become of the assault ships?

One possibility, said Harrison, would be to fund the Marine Corps F-35 and instead eliminate one of the Navy's full sized aircraft carriers. The short-takeoff aircraft could be used off of the assault ships.

Joint Tactical Radio System - The joint tactical radio is aimed at enabling communications among soldiers, airmen, Marines and others operating in a given theater.

The Pentagon is planning to spend another \$27 billion to complete it in the coming years. It has had technical issues and some of the resulting radios cost about 10 times the versions they replace.

"I think it will make the services question whether or not they need the advanced capabilities the radios provide, whether or not it's worth the cost," Harrison said.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Aerial refueling tanker - The new Air Force refueling tanker program received bad publicity when Boeing announced just months after winning the contract that the cost of the first set of planes would be higher than the contract price.

Pentagon officials said the cost overruns were Boeing's problem -- it had offered a below-cost price in hopes of making money on the planes ordered after the initial development.

But the announcement angered some lawmakers and gave the program a black eye, contributing to the sense that the Pentagon procurement process needs reform. The Sustainable Defense Task Force has recommended that the tanker project be delayed, at a savings of \$9.9 billion.

Despite the concerns about the tanker, Harrison said he did not think the project would be cut. "The Air Force has needed this tanker for more than a decade," he said.

NUCLEAR ARSENAL

The U.S. government could make substantial savings by reducing the size of its nuclear arsenal.

Under the New START nuclear arms treaty with Russia ratified this year, deployed nuclear warheads are due to be cut to 1,550 in seven years. In securing Senate approval, the administration promised to spend billions on modernizing the nuclear arsenal.

Analysts say the United States could save huge amounts of money by reducing the nuclear arsenal even further and eliminating one leg of the so-called triad of delivery systems -- missiles, bombers and submarines.

The Sustainable Defense Task Force recommended cutting deployed nuclear warheads to 1,000 on seven nuclear submarines and 160 Minuteman missiles while eliminating the nuclear bomber force.

It estimated savings of \$113.5 billion through 2020.

Reporting by David Alexander; Editing by Warren Strobel and Kieran Murray.

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/08/15/us-usa-defense-cuts-idUSTRE77E4JH20110815>

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

Telegraph – U.K.

Yemen: Barack Obama Warned that al-Qaeda Planning Ricin Attack

Counter-terrorism officials are said to have warned President Barack Obama that an al-Qaeda affiliate in Yemen is trying to produce the deadly nerve agent ricin for use in bomb attacks on the US.

By Jacqui Goddard

13 August 2011

The New York Times, citing classified intelligence documents and unnamed officials, reports that terrorist operatives have been making efforts to buy large quantities of castor beans – which contain the toxic ricin protein – and shift them to a remote tribal area controlled by insurgents for processing.

Ricin is so poisonous that inhalation of a few minute grains is enough to kill an adult. It was used in deadly incidents including the 1978 assassination in London of Bulgarian dissident Georgi Markov and, in 2002, was the subject of a bioterrorism scare in the UK capital following a police raid on a facility said to be plotting its manufacture.

US officials are reported to have told Mr Obama that an attack is not imminent and that the terrorist arm has yet to formulate a means for dispersing it as a weapon.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

*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

They believe that the ultimate goal is to find an effective means of packing the white powder around explosives and detonating the devices in packed public areas such as shopping malls and airports, the New York Times revealed.

The president is said to have received regular briefings on the matter since first being alerted to it last year.

Al-Qaeda's wing in Yemen has openly raised the subject of ricin use before, though only in speculative terms.

In a posting on its English-language web journal last year entitled "Tips for our brothers in the United States of America", it stated: "Brothers with less experience in the fields of microbiology or chemistry, as long as they possess basic scientific knowledge, would be able to develop other poisons such as ricin or cyanide."

Obama administration officials believe that the greatest terrorism threat to the US now comes from al-Qaeda's affiliate in Yemen, due to a near-total collapse of the government there that has allowed the movement to expand and strengthen its presence.

The US government is working with what is left of Yemen's intelligence agencies and those of neighbouring Saudi Arabia to try to root out terror plots early.

Concerns over ricin have highlighted the threat that al-Qaeda linked groups – chiefly al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula – continue to pose to the US and its interests.

An unidentified senior American official told *The New York Times*: "That line of threat has never abated. That's being taken seriously by this government. What we know about AQAP is that they do what they say."

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/yemen/8699400/Yemen-Barack-Obama-warned-that-al-Qaeda-planning-ricin-attack.html>

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

Bellingham Herald, Bellingham, WA

August 15, 2011

Al-Qaida Chief Urges Attacks on 'Criminal' America

By MAAMOUN YOUSSEF, Associated Press

CAIRO -- Al-Qaida's new leader called on his followers to continue to fight the United States despite the killing of Osama bin Laden, calling America a "criminal country" that has corrupted the world.

In a video posted on militant websites Sunday, Ayman al-Zawahri also said the uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia have provided opportunities for the group to spread its message.

The 12-minute message is the third from the Egyptian-born al-Zawahri since he was named al-Qaida's new leader in June following the killing of Osama bin Laden by U.S. commandos in Pakistan.

Wearing a white robe and turban with an automatic rifle at his side, al-Zawahri said the Muslim jihad, or holy war, against America "does not halt with the death of a commander or leader" - a clear reference to bin Laden.

"Chase America, which killed the leader of the mujahedeen and threw his body into the sea," he said. "Go after it so that history will say that God enabled his worshippers to attack a criminal country which has spread corruption in the world."

Shifting to the Middle East, al-Zawahri said the uprisings that toppled longtime autocrats in Tunisia and Egypt have presented al-Qaida an opening to spread its message.

"In Tunisia and Egypt, opportunities for preaching have been opened and only God knows until when these opportunities will last," he said. "Therefore, the Muslims and the mujahedeen should benefit and take advantage of them to reveal the truth."

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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

Al-Qaida has repeatedly tried to forge a role for itself in the uprisings across the Arab world this year, though it played no role in their outbreak and has little in common with the mainly youth activists behind the protests. Most uprisings leaders say they seek greater freedoms, not Islamic states.

He said these countries' constitutions should be brought in line with Islamic Sharia law.

The video could not be independently verified.

<http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2011/08/15/2142817/al-qaida-chief-urges-attacks-on.html>

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

Desert News – Salt Lake City, UT
OPINION

A Nuclear Iran would Pose Huge Threat to the World

By Lawrence J. Haas, McClatchy-Tribune Information Services
Sunday, August 14, 2011

WASHINGTON — Make no mistake: U.N. Security Council sanctions and additional U.S. and European pressures are hurting Iran.

Tehran is having a harder time importing food and other key goods, its foreign investment is drying up, financial firms and shipping companies are turning down its business, and its central bank is running short of hard currency.

What sanctions are not doing, however, is achieving their goal — to persuade Tehran to abandon its pursuit of nuclear weapons. Not only is Iran making more progress in its nuclear program, it's acting more boldly in its region, threatening U.S. interests while distributing weapons that are killing U.S. troops.

Because neither current nor additional sanctions alone will deter Tehran, and because a nuclear Iran would be a disaster for the United States and the world, Washington must seriously consider a military option.

Such an option — ranging from an embargo on vital goods to a covert sabotage of Iran's nuclear sites to an overt strike on them — brings two benefits.

First, a believable U.S. threat of force might get Tehran's attention, forcing the regime to ponder whether its nuclear pursuit is worth a military confrontation. Second, military force ultimately might be the only way to destroy Iran's program or slow it down significantly enough to avert a disaster.

Sanctions are hard to enforce under any circumstances, and those against Iran are no exception. Iran's nuclear progress continues apace. It's producing low-grade uranium at its highest rate ever and reportedly has enough uranium to build four atomic bombs.

Tehran announced recently that it's preparing to triple production of higher grade uranium by installing more advanced centrifuges at its plant in Qom. As British Foreign Secretary William Hague has written, that could cut the time Iran needs to make weapons-grade material to two to three months. Tehran is also making progress in its ballistic missile program.

That means Iran eventually will be able to deploy nuclear weapons on missiles that can travel longer distances.

The United States recently leveled two other charges against Tehran — that it's helping al-Qaida funnel cash and people into Pakistan for global terrorist operations, and that the weapons it is shipping to Iranian-backed militias in Iraq are killing U.S. troops at an unprecedented pace. The weapons include roadside bombs that can penetrate even well-protected U.S. vehicles and rockets filled with explosives that target U.S. bases.

Israeli intelligence says Iran has capitalized on recent regional unrest to extend its influence in at least Syria, Lebanon and Egypt. It assisted Syria in suppressing demonstrations against the regime, helped plan the

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

*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

confrontations through which crowds tried to breach Israel's borders with Syria and Lebanon, and sought closer ties with Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood before planned September elections.

With nuclear weapons, Iran could deter the United States and others from trying to rein it in. The regime then would be far better positioned to extend its influence across the region and beyond, destabilize other governments, protect the terrorists that it sponsors and funds and, in the worst case, provide nuclear weapons to one of its terrorist clients or use such a weapon itself.

The United States can't take that chance. Sanctions will not work by themselves. Washington needs a military option both to give sanctions a better chance of working and to consider if all else fails.

Lawrence J. Haas is senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the American Foreign Policy Council.

<http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700170428/A-nuclear-Iran-would-pose-huge-threat-to-the-world.html>

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

Wall Street Journal
OPINION/Comment
August 15, 2011

A Cold War Missile Treaty That's Doing Us Harm

The U.S.-Soviet INF pact doesn't address the Iranian threat.

By JOHN R. BOLTON and PAULA A. DESUTTER

"Treaties, you see, are like girls and roses: They last while they last." So said Charles de Gaulle a half-century ago, but he could have been describing the 1988 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces agreement signed by the United States and the Soviet Union. The INF Treaty has far outlived its usefulness in its current form—so it should either be changed or thrown out.

The Cold War strategic reality that existed in 1988 has passed into history. And yet the U.S. (and Russia) remain constrained by the INF Treaty's terms, even while today's strategic threats—China, Iran and North Korea—come from states outside the treaty. Despite the Kremlin's growing propensity for international troublemaking, both Moscow and Washington have a common interest in not having their hands tied by a treaty that binds them alone.

The INF Treaty (which Russia accepted as binding upon the Soviet Union's collapse) prohibits the possession of ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. It created an extensive verification regime, and while there were several serious problems with Soviet compliance, they were addressed and ultimately resolved satisfactorily. All Soviet and U.S. INF-range missiles—over 2,500—were verifiably eliminated by the 1991 deadline.

INF was thus one of the few arms-control agreements to be effectively implemented, verified and enforced. It actually succeeded in addressing a significant threat to U.S. interests, and it vindicated President Reagan's determination, over considerable opposition, to counter Soviet nuclear capabilities by deploying intermediate-range ballistic and cruise missiles in Europe in the first place. If only other U.S. arms-control efforts had been coupled so directly with assertive weapons-deployment strategies to achieve U.S. and allied strategic objectives.

Since 1991, however, nations not covered by the treaty have been steadily increasing their missile capabilities, especially in the intermediate ranges. China, for example, has been rapidly increasing its cruise and ballistic arsenals. These arsenals imperil not only Taiwan but U.S. bases and naval forces in the Western Pacific, especially as China becomes increasingly belligerent and politically assertive, as in the South China Sea.

Iran, North Korea and other rogue states seeking nuclear weapons are also developing ballistic-missile delivery capabilities. Their programs will inevitably progress to the missile ranges that the INF Treaty was designed to

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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

eliminate. Thus, while the U.S. home front may not be immediately vulnerable, our deployed forces, friends and allies will.

To reduce the threat from INF-range missiles, we must either expand the INF Treaty's membership or abrogate it entirely so that we can rebuild our own deterrent capabilities. We need ballistic-missile defenses, but President Obama is rapidly scaling down U.S. missile-defense programs—so our need for an INF-range second-strike capability is acute. (Russia, which borders both China and North Korea and is proximate to Iran, feels this problem even more acutely than we do.)

Expanding the treaty's membership might seem like the Obama administration's preference, given its pursuit of a nuclear weapons-free world. But most devout arms controllers have long opposed multilateralizing the INF Treaty, fearing that such a massive effort would interfere with their more-favored approaches, such as the Missile Technology Control Regime. Of course, that regime, like arms control generally, only inhibits those countries already prepared to be inhibited.

The more persuasive argument against globalizing the INF Treaty is precisely that China, Iran and North Korea are least likely to join. While ponderous negotiations proceeded at a glacial pace, Moscow and Washington would remain bound by the treaty's prohibitions while missile development elsewhere would continue full speed ahead.

If the INF Treaty isn't expanded, we can expect Moscow to suspend its compliance with it, as it did with the Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty originally signed in 1990. In that case, the U.S. shouldn't ignore Russia's violations but should suspend its own compliance with INF or, better still, withdraw entirely.

President Obama's goal of a nuclear-free world is doomed for many reasons, but its inherent dangers are only made more manifest by the continuing spread of INF-range missiles. The U.S. motto on the INF should be: Expand it or expunge it. Given the odds against expansion, we should start thinking now about how to ramp up our INF-range missile capabilities. Assuming, of course, we still have a defense budget.

Mr. Bolton, a senior fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, was undersecretary of state for arms control and international security from 2001-05. Ms. DeSutter was assistant secretary for verification, compliance and implementation from 2002-09.

http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424053111903918104576500273389091098.html?mod=googlenews_wsj

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

THE DIPLOMAT – Japan

OPINION/Flashpoints

THE DIPLOMAT Blogs

China's Nuclear Sub Needs

Rumours of a radiation leak from a Chinese nuclear submarine highlight the challenges of nuclear deterrence.

August 15, 2011

By Manpreet Sethi

The past couple of weeks have seen a number of reports over a rumoured radiation leak from a 094 type Chinese nuclear submarine stationed near Dalian port. The incident is said to have occurred as electronic equipment was being installed on the sub.

Did it really happen? While some newspaper reports certainly seem to suggest so, officials have clamped down on discussion of the issue. This is hardly surprising since China has never been open about its nuclear assets (unless proudly displaying them during its national parades) and this would be especially the case over failures in these systems during regular research and development and deployment. This means that until there's greater overall transparency in Chinese official reports, such alleged incidents remain simply rumours.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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

However, the news highlights the broader issue of nuclear-powered submarines armed with nuclear tipped missiles, and the growing importance of a sea-based dimension to nuclear deterrence. It's well understood that deployment of strategic weapons at sea meets the criterion of survivability much better than other nuclear delivery options. And survivability of the nuclear arsenal is critical for credible nuclear deterrence. This is even more so in the case of countries that have a no first use nuclear doctrine. Since they have declared that they wouldn't be the first to use nuclear weapons, the credibility of their ability to absorb a first strike but still have a sufficient arsenal to cause unacceptable damage to an adversary assumes high importance.

It's therefore natural that China places special focus on acquiring an operational sea-based deterrent capability. Acknowledging the vulnerability of its few land-based inter-continental ballistic missiles to a US first strike, Adm. Liu Huaqing had concluded even before the start of this millennium that: 'In the face of a large scale nuclear attack, only less than 10 percent of the coastal launching silos will survive, whereas submarines armed with ballistic missiles can use the surface of the sea to protect and cover themselves, preserve the nuclear offensive force and play a deterrent and containment role.' In the 1980s, China had developed the type 092 SSBN. But this never truly became operational because of numerous technical problems. Of course, it served as a great learning experience and the new Jin class is a derivative of that.

For the moment, the sea leg of the Chinese nuclear triad is likely to rest on Julang 2 (JL-2), a second generation SLBM that is to be deployed on the indigenous 094 nuclear-powered submarine. This is believed to be ready for deployment, and so could have been undergoing some work towards its operationalization when the radiation leak is suspected to have happened. Whatever the details of the matter, though, the point that needs to be highlighted is that as long as countries decide to retain nuclear weapons, and base national security on credible nuclear deterrence, nuclear submarines will continue to be built and deployed.

Indeed, many of the nuclear weapon states are actually moving towards relying solely on sea-based deterrent. The UK maintains only nuclear submarines for nuclear delivery. Arguing that nuclear deterrence was still needed as 'an insurance policy in an uncertain world,' the British parliament decided in 2007 that the country would build new nuclear submarines to replace the Vanguard submarines likely to be obsolete by the mid-2020s. France, too, had dismantled its land-based missile silos in 1996, and since maintains a dyad of submarines and aircraft as nuclear delivery platforms.

There's little doubt that China considers the development of the sea-based leg of the nuclear triad as critical for the credibility of its nuclear doctrine of no first use, and Beijing is moving steadily towards operationalization of its new Jin class of subs. Still, it would do well to acknowledge that new dangers will accompany the new capability. In anticipation of these, and given that China can't afford the loss of one of its nuclear subs – materially, politically, psychologically or environmentally – it's critical that the nation develop a clear understanding of the challenges and potential dangers. A certain amount of transparency, including when things go wrong, will help alleviate unnecessary misperceptions and misunderstandings in the region and beyond.

Manpreet Sethi heads the project on Nuclear Security at the Centre for Air Power Studies (CAPS), New Delhi. Sethi lectures regularly at all training establishments of the Indian Armed Forces, including the National Defence College. She is author of Nuclear Strategy: India's March Towards Credible Deterrence (2009).

<http://the-diplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2011/08/15/chinas-nuclear-sub-needs/>

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

Foreign Policy

OPINION/FP Special Report

Get Ready for the Democratization of Destruction

The way the world's militaries wage war is going to change -- drastically.

BY ANDREW KREPINEVICH

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



September/October 2011

As Niels Bohr famously observed, "Prediction is very difficult, especially if it's about the future." But we need not be caught entirely unaware by future events. The rapid pace of technological progression, as well as its ongoing diffusion, offer clues as to some of the likely next big things in warfare. Indeed, important military shifts have already been set in motion that will be difficult if not impossible to reverse. Sadly, these developments, combined with others in the economic, geopolitical, and demographic realms, seem likely to make the world a less stable and more dangerous place.

Consider, to start, the U.S. military's loss of its near monopoly in precision-guided munitions warfare, which it has enjoyed since the Gulf War two decades ago. Today China is fielding precision-guided ballistic and cruise missiles, as well as other "smart" munitions, in ever greater numbers. They can be used to threaten the few major U.S. bases remaining in the Western Pacific and, increasingly, to target American warships. Like Beijing, Iran is buying into the precision-guided weapons revolution, but at the low end, producing a poor man's version of China's capabilities, to include anti-ship cruise missiles and smart anti-ship mines. As these trends play out we could find that by the beginning of the next decade, major parts of the Western Pacific, as well as the Persian Gulf, become no-go zones for the U.S. military: areas where the risks of operating are prohibitively high.

Even nonstate groups are getting into the game. During its war with Israel in 2006, Hezbollah fired more than 4,000 relatively inaccurate RAMM projectiles -- rockets, artillery, mortars, and missiles -- into Israel, leading to the evacuation of at least 300,000 Israelis from their homes and causing significant disruption to that country's economy. Out of these thousands of munitions, only a few drones and anti-ship cruise missiles were guided. But as the proliferation of guided munitions -- G-RAMM weapons -- continues, irregular warfare will be transformed to the point that the roadside bomb threats that the United States has spent tens of billions of dollars defending against in Iraq and Afghanistan may seem trivial by comparison.

More... The spread of nuclear weapons to the developing world is equally alarming. If Iran becomes a nuclear power, the pressure on the leading Arab states as well as Turkey to follow suit is likely to prove irresistible. With ballistic-missile flight times between states in the region measured in single-digit minutes, the stability of the global economy's energy core would be exceedingly fragile.

But the greatest danger of a catastrophic attack on the U.S. homeland will likely come not from nuclear-armed missiles, but from cyberattacks conducted at the speed of light. The United States, which has an advanced civilian cyberinfrastructure but prohibits its military from defending it, will prove a highly attractive target, particularly given that the processes for attributing attacks to their perpetrators are neither swift nor foolproof. Foreign powers may already have prepositioned "logic bombs" -- computer code inserted surreptitiously to trigger a future malicious effect -- in the U.S. power grid, potentially enabling them to trigger a prolonged and massive future blackout.

As in the cyber realm, the very advances in biotechnology that appear to offer such promise for improving the human condition have the potential to inflict incalculable suffering. For example, "designer" pathogens targeting specific human subgroups or designed to overcome conventional antibiotics and antiviral countermeasures now appear increasingly plausible, giving scientists a power once thought to be the province of science fiction. As in the cyber realm, such advances will rapidly increase the potential destructive power of small groups, a phenomenon that might be characterized as the "democratization of destruction."

International stability is also increasingly at risk owing to structural weaknesses in the global economic system. Commercial man-made satellites, for instance, offer little, if any, protection against the growing threat of anti-satellite systems, whether ground-based lasers or direct-ascent kinetic-kill vehicles. The Internet was similarly constructed with a benign environment in mind, and the progression toward potential sources of single-point system failure, in the forms of both common software and data repositories like the "cloud," cannot be discounted.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Then there is the undersea economic infrastructure, primarily located on the world's continental shelves. It provides a substantial portion of the world's oil and natural gas, while also hosting a web of cables connecting the global fiber-optic grid. The value of the capital assets on the U.S. continental shelves alone runs into the trillions of dollars. These assets -- wellheads, pumping stations, cables, floating platforms -- are effectively undefended.

As challenges to the global order increase in scale and shift in form, the means for addressing them are actually declining. The age of austerity is upon us, and it seems likely if not certain that the U.S. military will confront these growing challenges with relatively diminished resources. The Pentagon's budget is scheduled for \$400 billion or more in cuts over the next decade. Europe certainly cannot be counted on to pick up the slack. Nor is it clear whether rising great powers such as Brazil and India will try to fill the void.

With technology advancing so rapidly, might the United States attempt to preserve its military dominance, and international stability, by developing new sources of military advantage? Recently, there have been dramatic innovations in directed energy -- lasers and particle beams -- that could enable major advances in key mission areas. But there are indications that competitors, China in particular, are keeping pace and may even enjoy an advantage.

The United States has the lead in robotics -- for now. While many are aware of the Predator drones used in the war against radical Islamist groups, robots are also appearing in the form of undersea craft and terrestrial mechanical "mules" used to move equipment. But the Pentagon will need to prove better than its rivals at exploiting advances in artificial intelligence to enhance the performance of its unmanned systems. The U.S. military will also need to make its robot crafts stealthier, reduce their vulnerability to more sophisticated rivals than the Taliban, and make their data links more robust in order to fend off efforts to disable them.

The bottom line is that the United States and its allies risk losing their military edge, and new threats to global security are arising faster than they can counter them. Think the current world order is fragile? In the words of the great Al Jolson, "You ain't seen nothin' yet."

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/08/15/get_ready_for_the_democratization_of_destruction?page=full
|

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

World Politics Review

OPINION/Column

Global Insights: Harmonizing U.S. Military Tools

By Richard Weitz

16 August 2011

In thinking about how to support the twin goals of deterrence and assurance, the Obama administration has been struggling with how best to integrate U.S. nuclear weapons, conventional forces and missile defenses into a coherent strategic posture. Now budgetary pressures are making the trade-offs involved in striking the necessary balance for such an initiative even sharper.

These three military tools interact in complex ways. Nuclear forces are very powerful but for the most part unusable due to their destructiveness and the taboo associated with their use. Their main value is therefore to deter adversaries and reassure allies, thereby helping to avert wars, arms races and further horizontal nuclear proliferation. Conventional forces are the easiest to employ but are more constrained by budgetary and other resource limitations. Finally, ballistic missile defenses (BMD) have become increasingly prominent as a means to supplement the reassurance function of nuclear weapons. For this reason, they have enjoyed support from the Obama administration, despite the skepticism that many of its members had previously expressed toward BMD technologies.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



Another challenge facing U.S. strategic policymakers is how to balance the deterrence and reassurance functions of U.S. military power with the possible negative effects U.S. capabilities can have when they evoke concerns in other countries. For example, while U.S. missile defense deployments are reassuring to U.S. friends and allies in Europe, Asia and the Middle East, they have been met with alarm in Russia, China, Iran and North Korea. Policymakers in these countries worry that the U.S. could become more confrontational and U.S. allies more emboldened if they came to believe that BMD systems could negate the missile arsenals of adversary states. These countries might respond by building up their own nuclear forces in response, with the resulting negative security spiral possibly triggering an arms race and a net decline in regional security.

So far, the Obama administration has struggled to find the right balance between reassurance and deterrence. It has endorsed the vision of a world without nuclear weapons and has taken some steps toward this end, but its key national security documents reaffirm the U.S. intent to retain nuclear weapons as long as they exist anywhere else. The administration has sought to reconcile these policies with its ambitious arms control agenda. It has achieved some success in negotiating a new strategic arms control agreement with Russia, even if many contentious issues were excluded from the New START agreement. But it has not been able through direct engagement or sanctions to prevent North Korea from expanding its nuclear weapons capacity, or to keep Iran from making progress in its nuclear program.

In terms of regional security agendas, the issues of nuclear weapons and missile defense have been most prominent in Europe and Asia. The continuing proliferation of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles, combined with the Obama administration's policy of generally de-emphasizing the role of nuclear weapons in world politics, has raised questions about the credibility of U.S. extended security guarantees -- including its nuclear umbrella -- to defend U.S. allies from external threats in both regions. As a result, in both Europe and Asia, some security specialists perceive U.S. policy as internally inconsistent and therefore insufficiently credible.

NATO's recent focus has been the potential nuclear weapons threat from Iran, although many of NATO's new members in Eastern Europe also worry about future aggression from Russia. At the November 2010 summit in Lisbon, the alliance decided to integrate European missile defense programs with those of the United States, with the goal of providing comprehensive protection for NATO members' populations, territory and forces. Although the focus of the BMD efforts has been on countering Iran's growing ballistic missile capabilities, Russia-NATO collaboration regarding missile defense remains elusive. As a result, continuing tensions in this area threaten to derail U.S.-Russian arms control cooperation in many areas, including on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe. If the alliance also decided to maintain its nuclear-sharing framework at the Lisbon summit, it was largely in order to induce Russia to negotiate its superior tactical nuclear weapons holdings, which by some estimates are 10-20 times larger than those of NATO Europe.

In Asia, recent attention has focused on the need to reassure South Koreans regarding their security in the face of continuing provocations from the North as well as Pyongyang's acquisition of nuclear weapons and long-range ballistic missiles. Many South Koreans doubt that the United States really would respond to a nuclear attack on Seoul with a retaliatory strike against Pyongyang, especially if the DPRK might respond by attacking U.S. forces in Japan, or even striking the U.S. homeland directly, with nuclear-armed ballistic missiles.

For this reason, some observers have suggested that Washington return U.S. tactical nuclear weapons to South Korea. They argue that this would better deter the North Korean leadership, since the weapons would be more visible and could more plausibly be fired following a DPRK attack. But South Korea's neighbors would not welcome such a move.

As for missile defenses, certain conditions make them less useful in the case of South Korea than perhaps elsewhere. First, the DPRK has a large number of short-range missiles capable of hitting targets in South Korea, against which missile defense systems would be less effective. Second, given their proximity, the DPRK can easily attack South Korea through a variety of means beyond missile attacks. Third, South Korea's participation in an



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

integrated missile defense architecture that included the United States and Japan might cause China and Russia to worry that such a coalition was seeking to negate their strategic deterrence.

Obama administration officials see missile defenses, precision-guided conventional weapons and possibly cyberweapons as potential alternative means to pursue their general objective of decreasing the role of nuclear weapons in U.S. national security policy. But budgetary pressures will likely force Pentagon planners to make trade-offs among these programs; both the submarine and bomber legs of the nuclear triad will need to be modernized soon, even as the Defense Department is also exploring potentially revolutionary improvements in conventional and BMD capabilities based on new technologies and concepts. These include hypersonic vehicles, powerful but agile directed energy weapons for destroying adversary missiles, and sea-borne rail guns.

The Obama administration has had trouble reconciling its broad objective of reducing U.S. reliance on nuclear weapons with the need to keep U.S. international security guarantees credible. Unfortunately, there is no easy answer given that resource constraints make trade-offs unavoidable, and there is no magic bullet technology in the pipeline that could accomplish all missions.

Richard Weitz is a senior fellow at the Hudson Institute and a World Politics Review senior editor. His weekly WPR column, Global Insights, appears every Tuesday.

<http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/9787/global-insights-harmonizing-u-s-military-tools>

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

Defense Professionals.com
OPINION/Early Warning Blog

Deficit Reduction and National Defense: Everything Shouldn't be on the Table

August 16, 2011

By Daniel Goure, Ph.D.

One of the silliest statements coming out of the various deficit reduction discussions is that “everything is on the table.” This is usually taken to mean political cows such as Social Security, Medicare, defense and tax increases. But there are other items, not easily quantifiable, that are vital to this nation's well-being that cannot be on the table.

One of these is deterrence of war. We have the ongoing experience of the fiscal and human costs of two relatively small conflicts. The prospects of a larger war in the Middle East or East Asia are all but unthinkable. Yet, those regions are home to rogue states that have shown a propensity to use military means to achieve political ends, sponsor terrorism, seek to acquire nuclear weapons and maintain large military establishments. In addition, Russia maintains a large nuclear arsenal, including thousands of tactical nuclear weapons pointed at Europe and Asia, and China is building up its arsenal of strategic ballistic missiles and dual-capable theater missiles.

Deterring future wars requires, first of all, a secure and credible U.S. nuclear arsenal. This arsenal must be of sufficient size and varied deployment modes so as to ensure that whatever the circumstances, adversaries will know that the U.S. can respond to a nuclear attack on the homeland, U.S. allies and forward deployed forces with an appropriate but also devastating response. In practice this means maintaining the ICBM force, designing a new generation of missile carrying submarines and building a new long-range bomber. It also means deploying the next generation of early warning satellites.

It also requires sufficient conventional military capability that is either forward deployed in regions of interest or capable of being moved there in time to counter any aggression. These aggressors most likely would seek to use surprise and speed to achieve victory in a local war before the U.S. can intervene. Deterring this threat means maintaining forward deployed capabilities, particularly naval forces such as aircraft carriers and cruise missile-armed submarines, theater missile defenses and tactical air units. It also means having rapidly deployable

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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

capabilities that can reinforce forward deployed forces. Long-range strike systems, air and sea lift and aerial refueling are all critical to deterring conventional conflict. So too is advanced air and space-based reconnaissance, electronic warfare capabilities, anti-submarine warfare and mine countermeasures.

Another item that cannot be on the table is the safety and stability of the global commons. The global economic order is held together by the ability to freely transit the domains of seas, airspace, outer space and cyber space. Disruption of any one of these domains could wreak untold damage. As the world's largest economy, the U.S. must be particularly sensitive to threats to the global commons.

Securing the global commons requires the maintenance of a wide range of military capabilities. These include not only traditional naval and air forces but sea, air and space surveillance capabilities. One area in which the U.S. military must grow its capabilities is for both offensive and defensive cyber warfare.

A third item that cannot be on the table in any deficit negotiations is the defense industrial base. This defense industrial base has produced the successive generation of weapons systems and other capabilities that have ensured the security and freedom of the West. Investments in cutting-edge research and development have resulted in the invention of many of the technologies on which not just our military superiority but our economic advantage are based. These include computers, the Internet, communications satellites, nuclear power, medical and industrial lasers and jet engines.

Losing the ability to design and develop the next generation of advanced military technologies would have a catastrophic effect on the nation's security and potentially the U.S. economy. Once design and engineering teams are disbanded their critical knowledge base can be lost. Equally significant is the loss of the skilled workforce and even tooling that occurs when production lines are shuttered. Without a continuing flow of new programs, the defense industrial base could collapse, taking with it our future security.

A final item that cannot be on the table is the capability to conduct counter-terrorism operations around the world. The loss last week of 30 SEALs and other members of the U.S. military reminds us of just how precious a resource this is. Defeating terrorism requires the maintenance of a wide range of human skills and specialized technologies.

To say that everything is on the table is a bromide. The members of the super committee know this. Our ability to deter war, protect the global commons, design and build future military capabilities and fight terrorism cannot be on the table. Any deficit reduction scheme that puts one or more of these on the table is dead on arrival.

Daniel Goure, Ph.D., Early Warning Blog, Lexington Institute.

<http://www.defpro.com/news/details/26865/?SID=c8a80be35ce9b28936a5a1cf7505be7f>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

OPINION

Between Disarmament Plans

By Dr Maleeha Lodhi (NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT)

16 August 2011

Confusion rather than clarity has been generated by recent diplomatic moves in the international arena to start negotiations for a treaty banning the production of bomb making nuclear material.

The UN's Conference on Disarmament (CD) is the world's sole multilateral negotiating body on disarmament. It is in this 65-nation forum where discussions for a Fissile Material Cut Off Treaty (FMCT) have been going on inconclusively for decades.

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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



The Obama Administration has been trying to force the pace on this issue. But its recent efforts, rather than bring it any nearer the goal of getting negotiations started have instead prompted activity on multiple diplomatic tracks.

Faced with a stalemate in the CD due to Pakistan's insistence that the proposed treaty cover fissile material stockpiles and not just future production, Washington has tried to intensify pressure on Islamabad by threatening to take the negotiations outside the CD – in what some call a Plan B.

In February, Secretary of State Hilary Clinton indicated that the US would consider finding a different venue for the FMCT talks. Several efforts to test the ground in this regard were launched, albeit indirectly. Last year UN Secretary General Ban ki Moon was encouraged to convene a High Level Meeting on the FMCT in New York to mobilise a consensus outside the CD. The meeting ended up reinforcing rather than resolving the discord within the CD. In February this year Washington's allies convened an 'Experts Side Event on FMCT Definitions' in Geneva to initiate informal discussions on aspects of the treaty. This too got nowhere, as Pakistan, China and several other countries stayed away.

The viability of a Plan B was cast in doubt by these rather modest opening moves. The thinly veiled threats to shift the FMCT talks to an alternate venue hardly persuaded Pakistan to change its principled position on the proposed treaty. Meanwhile the unintended effects of these US-sponsored moves was that other nations got in on the act and began to launch their own efforts – most notably in the UN General Assembly last month – aimed at breaking the deadlock in the CD. This confronted Washington with the prospect of the FMCT process slipping out of its control.

The CD's consensus rule allows member countries to protect their interests, as agreement is required by all states. Any process outside that forum has no such safeguard and makes talks a risky proposition for the US as for other nuclear weapon states. Thus when a group of European countries joined by South Africa, Chile and others launched an effort for a plenary debate in the UN General Assembly on the CD's working, this evoked a mixed response from Washington.

The overall refrain during the debate about breaking the CD deadlock may have been helpful for the US, but other aspects of the discussion posed dilemmas. Proposals for ad hoc committees in the GA or a UN conference on all four issues before the CD – Nuclear Disarmament, Negative Security Assurances, Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space and FMCT – raised the prospect of the process broadening, minus the consensus rule, to issues on which the US and its allies have blocked progress in the CD.

In a meeting of the P-5 in Paris that ended on July 1, the US tried to push this and proposed creating a P-5 Contact Group to negotiate an FMCT. The idea floated was that once this had been done it could be expanded to include the other three nuclear weapon states and countries with nuclear energy capacity.

However, the Contact Group proposal was opposed by China. Apart from rejecting any move to take the FMCT negotiations to another venue, Beijing bilaterally counselled Washington to address Pakistan's legitimate security concerns in view of the nuclear exceptionalism accorded by the US to India.

The aim of the various diplomatic maneuvers undertaken by the US and other nations has been to find a way of overcoming the stalemate in the CD rather than deal with the roots of that impasse. The answer to that is not to dance around the established multilateral disarmament process but insure that the FMCT negotiations take into account the security concerns of all states and not just the priorities of the powerful few. The problem does not lie in the CD's rule of consensus being criticised by some. It lies squarely in the ongoing effort to push through a proposed treaty that undermines the security of a member state – Pakistan.

In its present form the FMCT is unacceptable to Pakistan, which will continue to press its objections against what it sees as a discriminatory instrument. Without the treaty taking into account the asymmetry in existing fissile material stocks the imbalance between Pakistan and India would be frozen, leaving Pakistan at a permanent strategic disadvantage. Unless Pakistan's legitimate security concerns are addressed it will not succumb to



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

diplomatic maneuvers. Countries sign up to international agreements when their fundamental interests are accommodated. That principle also forms the basis of Pakistan's position.

Dr Maleeha Lodhi served as Pakistan's ambassador to the United States and the United Kingdom

http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticle.asp?xfile=data/opinion/2011/August/opinion_August78.xml§ion=opinion&col=

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

Issue No. 932, 16 August 2011

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