



NAPSNET Weekly FLASH Update 8 May, 2001

Recommended Citation

"NAPSNET Weekly FLASH Update 8 May, 2001", NAPSNet Weekly Report, May 08, 2001,
<https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-weekly/napsnet-weekly-flash-update-8-may-2001/>

Security

1. Bush Speech at NDU

In a speech delivered at the US National Defense University on May 1, President George W. Bush said that the US and its allies should move beyond the constraints of the ABM Treaty towards a new concept of deterrence that relies on both offensive and defensive forces, including a national missile defense system. While not formally announcing a US withdrawal from the ABM Treaty, Bush stated that the treaty no longer serves the interests of the US or its allies. Bush said, "Deterrence can no longer be based solely on the threat of nuclear retaliation," and he indicated that further nuclear arms cuts would be an element of this new framework. Although he pledged to "move quickly to reduce" US nuclear forces unilaterally, Bush at the same time reaffirmed the importance of nuclear weapons to the security of the US and its allies." Bush stated the US intention to "move beyond the constraints of the 30-year-old ABM treaty" in the pursuit of "a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses to counter the different threats of today's world," proliferation threats initiated by "some of the world's least responsible states."

"President Bush Speech on Deterrence and Missile Defense"

"Cold War Deterrents 'No Longer Enough,' Bush Says"

"Full Text: REMARKS BY THE PRESIDENT TO STUDENTS AND FACULTY AT NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY"

"White House Report on Missile Defense, April 30, 2001"

Bush stated that he was dispatching a delegation due to leave next week to consult with US allies, headed by Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage, Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, and Deputy National Security Advisor Steve Hadley.

"Text: Bush Calls for Nuclear Cuts, Missile Defense Development"

The US National Defense University is the same venue as used by then-President Clinton eight months ago to announce that he believed the technologies needed for a shield against ballistic missiles were not mature enough to commit to building one.

"Bush Favors Nuclear Weapons Cuts"

2. Bush Speech: Nuclear Issues

A BASIC press advisory states that the speech by US President George Bush was expected to affirm US commitment to deploying NMD while offering substantial unilateral cuts in the nuclear arsenal as compensation. These issues stand to upset international strategic stability and widen the transatlantic divide over actions that affect the global community. Bush's refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, plans to deploy a missile defence in the US have continued despite emphatic objections by Russia, the PRC, and NATO allies, and US Defense Department consideration of new nuclear weapons indicate increased opposition to all forms of international constraint on US defense policy.

"Bush Proclaims Nuclear Anarchy"

An editorial in the New York Times states, "The impulse behind Mr. Bush's plan is reasonable," and that both the US and Russia can reduce their nuclear forces through unilateral cuts. The editorial argues, however, that the "strategic architecture" envisioned by Bush has in mind, a world in which nations work together to reduce the threat of nuclear attack, cannot be realized if the US rashly moves ahead on its own to build a missile shield and abrogates the ABM treaty. The editorial also reviews familiar arguments that both Russia and the PRC, whose strategic positions would be threatened by missile defense, would be forced to react with increased investments in offensive weapons systems. The editorial argues that the development effort should continue because more nations are likely to perfect long-range missiles in the years ahead, but also that a commitment to deploy should not precede its development.

"Mr. Bush's Nuclear Blueprint"

President Bush's speech includes a pledge to "move quickly to reduce nuclear forces." Specific numbers were not given but an announcement is expected later this year. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists' Nuclear Notebook shows that the US currently maintains approximately 8800 nuclear warheads in its arsenal for delivery by sea- and land-based long-range ballistic missiles, air- and submarine-launched cruise missile, and gravity bombs. Under the START II Treaty, this arsenal will likely be reduced by some 3700 warheads to approximately 5100 by 2007. Of these warheads, 3500 are counted by START II, while the remaining 1600 warheads are outside current arms control agreements. Several thousand other nuclear warheads are thought to be in the so-called "inactive" stockpile and are also not counted by arms control agreements.

"Offensive Deterrence: What Will Be Cut?"

Richard Butler, diplomat in residence at the Council on Foreign Relations and former chairman of the United Nations special commission to disarm Iraq, argues in an editorial in the New York Times that there has been little public debate over missile defense in light of its costs. Butler argues that the financial costs are possibly light compared to the international cost both politically and in the new life the defensive shield will give to nuclear weapons. He argues that by building missile defense to cope with the small threat of attack by rogue states, the US creates a greater threat by ensuring new weapons development by Russia and the PRC and by encouraging rogue states to invest in alternative delivery systems for chemical and biological weapons. Butler concludes by arguing that because they are more cost-effective than missile defense, "Reduction of the nuclear threat can best be accomplished directly through arms control and disarmament."

"Restarting the Nuclear Race"

3. De-Alerting of US Nuclear Weapons

The Council for a Livable World published an Issue Brief that argues that the nuclear force posture review, being conducted by the US Defense Department, "should result in the removal of all nuclear weapons from hair-trigger alert." The Brief points to the potential for the failure of early detection systems in Russia causing unintended nuclear launches. The Brief argues that if the US and Russia stand down their nuclear weapons, they can increase mutual confidence that neither will launch a surprise attack, reduce the chance of an overreaction to a false alarm and reduce the possibility of unauthorized launch. The Bush administration, the Brief also argues, "should avoid further destabilization of the existing US-Russian nuclear relationship by exercising restraint on NMD and respect for the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty."

"Standing Down U.S. and Russian Nuclear Weapons: The Time for Meaningful Action is Now "

William Arkin writes in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists that President Bush' promises to take US nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert and make unilateral reductions in the arsenal are unlikely to be kept. "Even if there were, the intent would be to preserve the nuclear game rather than move towards a world without nukes," Arkin concludes. He explains that the current nuclear posture review is being undertaken in isolation from Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld's larger military review, and that there is no creative thinking on how to move beyond the Cold War nuclear model. "Arkin Writes: Nuclear Posturing"

4. US Nuclear Force Posture Review

Officials in the Bush administration and external experts are reporting that the inter-agency nuclear strategy review will result in major changes to the US nuclear posture. These changes will include drastic cuts to the number of nuclear warheads, removing several bombers from the nuclear force for conventional missions, lowering the readiness of certain missiles, and shifting some targets from Russia to the PRC.

"US considering shift in nuclear targets: daily"

Options under considerations by the Bush Administration for changing the US nuclear posture includes taking most B-52 and B-2 bombers out of the nuclear force, and shifting some targets from Russia to China, according to an article in the Washington Post. If carried out, the change could dramatically reduce the number of nuclear warheads assigned to Russian targets but at the same time increase the weapons assigned to targets in China.

"U.S. Considers Shift In Nuclear Targets"

"Fact Sheet on US nuclear arsenal"

"Background on changes in US nuclear targeting"

The National Security Archive published a collection of declassified documents about US nuclear strategy. The documents, which were released to the Archive under the US Freedom of Information Act, provide new information about development of the so-called launch-on-warning doctrine, which continues to dominate US nuclear planning in the 21st century. "These documents bring to light the longstanding practice of quietly gearing the nuclear war plan for launch on warning while keeping the public and most civilian policy-makers in the dark about the risk of launching on false warning," commented Bruce Blair, a former Air Force nuclear missile officer and currently president of the Center for Defense Information in Washington DC.

"Documents About US Nuclear Strategy"

5. Nuclear Theory

Michael Kinsley states in the Washington Post that despite US President George Bush's assurances that deterrence is an anachronistic concept, Mutually-Assured Destruction (MAD) continues to function and complicates the case for strategic defense as long as the US lacks an infallible missile shield. Kinsey argues that the strategic stability guaranteed by MAD will remain because of our arsenals, regardless of any decision the US may make regarding the 1972 ABM Treaty. Kinsey argues that following the logic of deterrence, "It would be nice to have a strategic defense system just good enough to snare an incoming nuke from an Iraq or Afghanistan -- and no better." He concludes with the argument, "...When you add up all the situations where it can't or shouldn't be allowed to work... and start thinking about the cost, its theological enthusiasts seem to be making a leap of faith the country needn't follow."
"Still MAD"

Missile Defense

1. US Commentary on Speech

Michael R. Gordon writes in the New York Times that US President George Bush outlined his vision but did not outline how this vision would be achieved. Bush said, "We need a new framework that allows us to build missile defenses," referring to his administration's perception of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty as outdated, but he did not specify what the new framework for arms control would follow.

"Military Analysis: Grand Plan, Few Details"

Following US President Bush's speech at NDU, The Lehrer NewsHour hosted a debate by experts on missile defense, including Joseph Cirincione, director of the Non-Proliferation Project at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; Keith Payne, director of the National Institute for Public Policy; Jacqueline Grapin, an author and journalist, and co-founder of the European Institute; and Lawrence Kaplan, a senior editor at the New Republic for foreign and defense policy. Cirincione stated that outside of Russia, the PRC, Great Britain and France, there are only a handful of countries that we worry about when it comes to ballistic missiles, and that these threats are limited and can be better answered with diplomatic, not military measures. Payne argued that the number of states with ballistic missiles and capable of threatening the US will grow in the next 15-20 years, so the US and its allies must act now to build defenses against those future threats. Grapin stated that Europeans are coming around to the need for missile defense, but also have a stronger fear of the repercussions for arms control and the spiraling arms race that threatens if Russia and the PRC react. Regarding the possibility that missile defense will cause an arms race, Payne stated, "I believe that a credible U.S. commitment to missile defense is going to discourage countries from building missiles, they're going to understand we're going to put money into it."

"Newshour Online: MISSILE DEFENSE DEBATE"

Kurt Gottfried, chairman of the Union of Concerned Scientists, argues in response to US President George Bush's speech that there is no reason to quickly abrogate the 1972 ABM Treaty as it will some time until we can determine if missile defense is viable and worth the security costs of breaking out of the ABM Treaty. Gottfried states that while Bush's offer to cut the US nuclear arsenal is welcome, Bush's "aggressive NMD plan will block deep cuts in Russia's nuclear arsenal and efforts to take their weapons off hair-trigger alert," and will also push the PRC to build up its missile forces.

"Bush's Missile Defense Plan: Fire, Aim, Ready!"

Charles Krauthammer writes in the Washington Post that US President George Bush proposed an end to the current international arms control regime. He states that under the "Bush Doctrine," the US will design its offensive and defensive forces, including new nuclear weapons and missile defense, to meet the specific threats the US will face. Further, the end of extended deterrence means that the US no longer requires its massive nuclear arsenal as a bargaining chip, and will therefore cut its nuclear forces unilaterally. Krauthammer argues that criticism of abandoning the ABM Treaty for a system that does not work fails because the US held back for so many years on defense technologies to make them ABM treaty-compliant."

"The Bush Doctrine"

Steven Mufson and Walter Pincus write in the Washington Post that significant advancements in the technology of missile defense are needed before an effective missile shield could be deployed. John Pike, a specialist in space weapons and missile defense, said Bush appeared to be talking about "systems that don't work to deal with threats that don't exist."

"Missile Defense Talk Outstrips Technology"

2. US MD Diplomacy

Prior to his speech at NDU confirming that the US will pursue a missile defense system in consultation with US allies and in conjunction with unilateral nuclear arms cuts, US President George Bush made a series of short calls to German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, French President Jacques Chirac, Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chretien, British Prime Minister Tony Blair and NATO Secretary General George Robertson "to begin the consultation process." The conversations lasted about ten minutes each, according to a senior US official. The US official said that the US did not expect Russia to be excited about the prospects for missile defense. The US official, when asked how much money the Bush administration plans to spend on developing missile defenses and other details, said, "We will look at what's necessary. The goal here is to go against limited threats. This is not to go against thousands of warheads."

"Bush Confers With Allies on Missile Defense"

"Missile Shield Is Sought by 2004"

Prior to his speech at NDU, US President Bush called Russian President Vladimir Putin to discuss US intentions to deploy missile defense. Kremlin spokesmen reported that Bush promised not to pursue a unilateral plan. Russia has opposed a unilateral missile defense by the US and has even promised to agree to amendments to the 1972 ABM Treaty if the US offers concessions on missile defense and nuclear disarmament. Senator John F. Kerry said, "This spills over directly into China policy, and the new administration's problems with China. What's the rush? This is essentially a satisfy-your-base, political announcement. It serves no other purpose."

"Bush Calls Putin in Attempt to Pave Way on Missile Plan"

3. Reactions to Speech: PRC

There was no government response from the PRC after US President Bush's speech announcing US intentions to build a shield against ballistic missile attacks, but the state-run Xinhua News Agency quoted unidentified analysts as saying the decision will "spark a new arms race and create a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction." Xinhua said, "The U.S. missile defense plan has violated the Anti-Ballistic Missile treaty, will destroy the balance of international security forces and could cause a new arms race."

"World Wary About Bush Missile Plan"

"China Warns on Missiles; Russia Ready to Talk"

According to the New York Times, the PRC has begun planning to attack US missile defenses rather than defeat them directly with more or more advance missiles. PRC top arms control official Sha Zukang suggested that the PRC would concentrate on a range of relatively low-cost responses, such as developing plans to attack the radar network and communication nodes that would form the nervous system of the US missile defense system. Sha said, "Once the United States believes it has both a strong spear and a strong shield, it could lead them to conclude that nobody can harm the United States and they can harm anyone they like anywhere in the world." Sha also stressed that deep cuts in the US nuclear arms arsenal would not placate the PRC if the cuts were made in parallel with the development of a missile defense.

"China Looks to Foil U.S. Missile Defense System"

4. Reactions to Speech: Australia, New Zealand

New Zealand Foreign Minister Phil Goff and Disarmament Minister Matt Robson responded to Bush's speech by stating, "The establishment of the missile defense system runs the risk of halting and reversing multilateral progress toward the elimination of nuclear weapons." While many Asian allies of the US refrained from making statements on the speech, Australia was the most positive, saying that it shared US concerns over potential missile threats from some governments. A Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said Australia would allow the use of joint military bases such as the Pine Gap facility in central Australia for missile shield communications.

"World Wary About Bush Missile Plan"

"

5. Reactions to Speech: Russia

In his first public response to US President George Bush's speech, Russian President Vladimir Putin said that he welcomed US consultations on the future of arms control and on missile defense. Putin said, "First, we should not destroy the established system of international security, and second, we must act together to perfect it."

"Russia: US Must Collaborate on Nukes"

Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov, visiting in India, spoke at a joint press conference with Indian External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh shortly after US President Bush's NDU speech. Ivanov said, "We believe that in such a delicate area as security we cannot make any unthought-out steps and we cannot destroy what is already working well in the interests of international stability and security without guarantees that other proposals may work better." Singh added, "The widest possible discussions must take place if any amendment is envisaged in the 1972 treaty." Both ministers were otherwise non-committal on Bush's statements on the 1972 ABM Treaty, but they were supportive of Bush's proposed nuclear arms reductions. Ivanov said Russia would be able to "convey a more specific position" on the proposed missile defense system only after consultations with the US.

"Russia, India Cautious Over Bush Arms Plan"

"China Warns on Missiles; Russia Ready to Talk"

"Russia Alters Tone, Welcomes Talks on Missile Shield"

Russian military and diplomatic sources re-iterated warnings of the dangers of scrapping the ABM treaty, with the sources quoted as saying, "Many in Washington understand that the destruction of ABM and deploying an anti-missile shield could undermine the system of strategic stability which exists in the world today and lead to a new arms race."

"Russia and China attack US missile plan"

"Hostile response to missile defence plan"

6. Reactions to Speech: Europe

US allies in Europe responded positively to Bush statements regarding nuclear arms reductions and his intention to closely consult with US allies, but did not comment on US plans to pursue missile defense. Jean-Louis Dufour, a strategic analyst with the Paris research institute CERI, said Bush had made little more than a superficial attempt to consult allies on his plan before his speech. "It's an extremely complex question and he kissed it off in 10-minute telephone conversations," Dufour said, adding that a missile defense system would eventually divide Europe. German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer, speaking in Washington, said, "The ABM Treaty worked well. We want control mechanisms that worked well in the past [to be replaced] only by better ones or more effective ones. We don't want there to be a new arms race." UN Secretary General Kofi Annan said that instead of abandoning the ABM Treaty, "there is a need to consolidate and build upon existing disarmament and nonproliferation agreements." Canada also warned the US against acting outside the international consensus. Canadian Foreign Minister John Manley said, "A unilateral abrogation of the ABM Treaty would be very problematic for us."

"China Warns on Missiles; Russia Ready to Talk"

"Global Reaction to Missile Plan Is Cautious"

The Economist reported that the measures proposed by US President George Bush in his speech amount to a revolution in arms control. Bush said that since "today's Russia is not yesterday's Soviet Union," it is now time to discard the assumption that the greatest threat to strategic stability, and to western security, is the prospect of a nuclear war between the US and the former Soviet Union. The Economist states, however, that Bush's apparently straightforward logic ignores the fact that the US has not developed yet a functioning missile defence system and that Bush may complete a second term before any such system can be fielded with confidence.

"Bush's call to arms"

"Bush Commits U.S. to Missile Defense"

The BBC reported that former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher applauded President George W Bush's plan to develop a global missile defence shield, and that she urged Prime Minister Tony Blair to support Bush and to stop "shilly-shallying" on this issue. Thatcher said, "The West is faced by an ever-increasing number of dangerous states with access to weapons of mass destruction. It is in all our interests that America should recognize and act speedily on this grave and growing threat. Britain, as America's staunchest ally, should not only make available whatever facilities we can." The US national missile defense (NMD) system as designed will depend upon use of the two radar stations at the Fylingdales radar base in Britain's North Yorkshire.

"Thatcher backs Bush over missile plan"

The UK's The Guardian reported that British Prime Minister Tony Blair was warned last night that he was being put in a near-impossible position by Bush's campaign. Donald Anderson, Labour chairman of the Commons foreign affairs committee said, "This may be the moment of truth. It will be seen in the context of Kyoto and growing unilateralism in Washington. It is a problem for Russia and China, and for Tony Blair. He tries to be a bridge, but how can you be a bridge between such contrary views?"

"Bush starts selling 'Son of Star Wars'"

Janes' Defense Weekly reports that if the Bush administration should fail to win support from its European allies and Russia on a new framework to replace the ABM Treaty as it stands, the US is likely to withdraw unilaterally from the Treaty in the same manner that it withdrew from the Kyoto environmental agreement earlier this year. The consultations Bush promises to hold with Russia and its allies are not just about gaining support and possible suggestions on a new framework to replace the ABM Treaty, but also to gauge a clear understanding of which countries are willing to participate in jointly developing missile defenses. According to JDW, European allies already facing tight defense budgets have the choice of participating in the expensive development and deployment of missile defense, politically but not economically supporting the US proposal, or to oppose the US ABM system in its entirety. JDW argues that while Britain is likely to quietly permit bases in its territory to be upgraded for use in the NMD system, countries that are interested in area missile defense for forward deployed troops, such as Germany and France, are likely to prefer to continue to depend upon traditional nuclear deterrence to prevent attacks from rogue states. JDW also states that the threat from missile proliferation is greater for conventional warheads than WMD-armed warheads because of the greater acceptability of their use by nations looking to deter the big powers from intervening in their local conflicts.

"US missile defence plans consign ABM Treaty to history, but where do the allies go from here?"

7. US MD Development Programs

US Defense Department advisors are attempting to devise a missile defense system that can be deployed prior to the end of President George Bush's term, writes Paul Richter in the Los Angeles Times. Richter states that deployment of even a limited system by that time would help Bush curry favor with conservatives who favor missile defense. The system envisioned by the Clinton administration was planned for deployment in 2005, but that timeline slipped to 2006 or 2007 with test failures. Richter reports that missile defense critics argue that deploying a limited system would increase the security risks to the US by encouraging potential adversaries either to build up their arsenals or figure out ways to demobilize the US system. Joe Cirincione of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace said, "I'm against this scarecrow option. There's very little chance that it would actually work, and it could be worse than nothing at all."

"Missile Shield Is Sought by 2004"

The Center for Defense Information released new updates on the proposed US missile defense system on May 1, 2001. In addition to reporting that Lockheed Martin will expand its role in the program to include additional booster work, the CDI reported that a non-binding advisory committee created by US President George Bush to review a range of Defense Department programs and policies has recommended that the US build an ambitious, multi-layered missile defense system with ground, sea, air, and space components. CDI also reported that the US Navy will review its missile defense roles.

"Technological Challenges in National Missile Defense"

A report by BASIC states that Europeans have traditionally received news of US plans for national missile defense with significant apprehension because of the threat to global strategic stability and arms control agreements. The report states, though, that theater missile defenses has received greater support than NMD from Europeans who see themselves as more threatened by WMD-bearing missiles because of Europe's greater proximity to known threats. The additional possibility that components of a European TMD system could contribute directly to a US NMD system may also be appealing to Europeans looking to secure for themselves a long-term role in US strategic network. The report argues that while the Russian proposal for a European-wide missile defense system against medium and short-range missiles is lacking in crucial details, the act of proposing itself removes barriers to construction of the system on general principle. According to the report, the US is successfully blurring the lines between "national" and "theater" missile defense and getting European countries on board and investing in missile defense systems, specifically detailing programs under development by Britain, France and Italy, Germany and the Netherlands, and NATO.

"European Missile Defence: New Emphasis, New Roles"

"

The Washington Post published a FAQ or "Frequently Asked Questions" document on missile defense by Charles Babington.

"A Primer on Missile Defense"

Proliferation

1. Russia-NATO Talks

Russia released a press statement discussing the April 23 meetings between Russian and NATO officials on the problems of the nonproliferation of WMD and their means of delivery. Russian officials argued that the deployment of missile defenses are justified, despite the threat of undermining strategic stability in undermining the ABM treaty, absent changes in the strategic situation facing Russia and Europe. Both sides pointed out the importance of taking political and international legal measures to ensure the nonproliferation of missile weapon delivery vehicles and the related technologies.

"Russia, NATO Experts' Consultations Held in Moscow on Problems of Nonproliferation of WMD and Their Means of Delivery"

2. Weapons in Space

Michael Krepon, President Emeritus of the Henry L. Stimson Center and co-editor of *Global Confidence Building: New Tools for Troubled Regions*, writes in *Foreign Affairs* that now US Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld chaired a second commission less well known than the panel that investigated missile defense, the Commission to Assess United States National Security Space Management and Organization which released its report in January warning of the imminent threat to US space-based assets from attack. The US must avoid militarizing space, Krepon argues, because, "The repercussions will include new international competition to put weapons in space, further strains in alliance relations, closer strategic cooperation between Russia and China, deeper partisan division at home, weakened nonproliferation treaties, and, ironically, greater difficulties in developing one of the Bush administration's cherished goals -- missile defense." Krepon reviews the history of space-based and anti-satellite weapons during the Cold War, but argues that Reagan-era rationales for pursuing antisatellite weapons no longer apply. Anti-satellite programs are an example of asymmetrical warfare- they are less expensive than conventional or missile-defense arms races but allow a weaker opponent to gain an edge (at least temporarily) over a stronger one."
"Lost in Space: The Misguided Drive Toward Antisatellite Weapons"

3. Missile Proliferation

The Center for Nonproliferation Studies of the Monterey Institute of International Studies and the Mountbatten Centre for International Studies at the University of Southampton released a new Occasional Paper on ballistic missile proliferation. The report includes discussions by Camille Grand and Timothy V. McCarthy on ballistic missile threats, and by Darryl Howlett, Mark Smith and James Clay Moltz on responses to ballistic missile proliferation.
"International Perspectives on Missile Proliferation and Defenses"
"Full Text"

4. DPRK Ballistic Missiles

DPRK leader Kim Jong-il told European officials on Thursday that the DPRK will launch no ballistic missiles until at least 2003. Swedish Prime Minister Goran Persson said after their meeting that Kim said he would "wait and see" if the Bush administration wants to resume progress toward better relations before resuming the missile tests. ROK government officials indicated that DPRK-ROK relations were on hold, pending the US review of its policy towards the DPRK. A US State Department official indicated that the US would welcome a statement by Kim Jong-il indicating that its missile test freeze would continue through 2003.

"N. Korea Extends Missile Test Halt"

Javier Solana, the European Union security affairs chief, said Friday that DPRK leader Kim Jong-il has not renounced the right to export missile technology, despite his pledge to extend a moratorium on missile tests until 2003. Solana said, "The answer was much more negative" when discussions in the DPRK turned to missile technology sales. He added, "(Kim Jong-il) claims that the export of (missile) technology is part of trade and that if he finds people who want to buy it, he will sell it." Analysts said that the US will find it hard to persuade Kim to give up his missile capabilities outright because he considers them central to his goal of creating a powerful state. Stephen Bradner, an adviser to US forces in the ROK, wrote in a recent paper, "He will almost certainly consider these capabilities central to his own historic mission and therefore to his notion of his own identity."

"N. Korea to Continue Selling Missiles"

"E.U. Says North Korea Won't Stop Arms Exports"

Arms Control

1. US on CTBT

Chairman of the CTBT Preparatory Commission Jaap Raamaker has said that the Bush administration has initiated a review of its defence policy and any US Senate decision on CTBT ratification can only be expected after that, and this could take many months. Raamaker stated that when the Senate debate took place on this treaty, they were concerned that with verification and the guarantee of the safety, security and reliability of their nuclear stockpile once the treaty has entered into force. Raamaker both downplayed the importance of insisting of the capability of 100 percent verifiability demanded by the US, stating on the one hand that some countries deliberately choose to make their testing public as an aspect of their deterrent, such as by India and Pakistan, while also noting, "The technology of verification has improved enormously since the negotiations on the treaty ended."

"U.S. ratification of CTBT may be delayed"

Military

1. Russian Submarine

Norwegian armed forces spokesman Commander Per Hoiby reported to Reuters news agency that a Russian Victor-III class nuclear submarine was towed to port after an apparently minor incident in the Barents Sea on April 14, 2001. Hoiby said that the submarine had been trailing "smoke or exhaust...It could, for instance, have been a problem with a diesel generator," which nuclear submarines sometimes use when their nuclear installation is out of order. The Russian Northern Fleet vice-chief Igor Dygalo said that it was "sudden naval exercises" to train towing the submarine in emergency situation. Dygalo said the submarine returned to the training field of the Northern Fleet in Barents Sea the next day. 15 ships, 4 submarines, aircraft and helicopters of both fleets took part in the joint navy exercises of the Northern and Baltic Fleets from the 9th till the 14th of April. In May, 1998, Russia's Northern Fleet units reported that they were engaged in a military exercise training for an emergency situation on a Delta-class submarine, and officials had to admit later that an accident had occurred with the nuclear submarine.

"Russian nuclear submarine towed to port"

[\(return to top\)](#)

View this online at: <https://nautilus.org/napsnet/napsnet-weekly/napsnet-weekly-flash-update-8-may-2001/>

Nautilus Institute

608 San Miguel Ave., Berkeley, CA 94707-1535 | Phone: (510) 423-0372 | Email:

nautilus@nautilus.org