

CRS Report for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) and High Power Microwave (HPM) Devices: Threat Assessments

Updated April 14, 2006

Clay Wilson
Specialist in Technology and National Security
Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 14 APR 2005		2. REPORT TYPE N/A		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) and High Power Microwave (HPM) Devices: Threat Assessments				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) David D. Acker Library and Knowledge Repository Defense Acquisition University Fort Belvoir, VA				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release, distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT SAR	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 20	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) and High Power Microwave (HPM) Devices: Threat Assessments

Summary

Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) is an instantaneous, intense energy field that can overload or disrupt at a distance numerous electrical systems and high technology microcircuits, which are especially sensitive to power surges. A large scale EMP effect can be produced by a single nuclear explosion detonated high in the atmosphere. This method is referred to as High-Altitude EMP (HEMP). A similar, smaller-scale EMP effect can be created using non-nuclear devices with powerful batteries or reactive chemicals. This method is called High Power Microwave (HPM). Several nations, including reported sponsors of terrorism, may currently have a capability to use EMP as a weapon for cyber warfare or cyber terrorism to disrupt communications and other parts of the U.S. critical infrastructure. Also, some equipment and weapons used by the U.S. military may be vulnerable to the effects of EMP.

The threat of an EMP attack against the United States is hard to assess, but some observers indicate that it is growing along with worldwide access to newer technologies and the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In the past, the threat of mutually assured destruction provided a lasting deterrent against the exchange of multiple high-yield nuclear warheads. However, now even a single, specially-designed low-yield nuclear explosion high above the United States, or over a battlefield, can produce a large-scale EMP effect that could result in a widespread loss of electronics, but no direct fatalities, and may not necessarily evoke a large nuclear retaliatory strike by the U.S. military. This, coupled with the possible vulnerability of U.S. commercial electronics and U.S. military battlefield equipment to the effects of EMP, may create a new incentive for other countries to develop or acquire a nuclear capability.

Policy issues raised by this threat include (1) what is the United States doing to protect civilian critical infrastructure systems against the threat of EMP, (2) how does the vulnerability of U.S. civilian and military electronics to EMP attack encourage other nations to develop or acquire nuclear weapons, and (3) how likely are terrorist organizations to launch a smaller-scale EMP attack against the United States?

This report will be updated as events warrant.

Contents

Background	1
EMP Commission Reestablished for 2006-2007	2
The EMP Commission's 2004 Report	2
Questions about Vulnerability to EMP	3
Electromagnetic Pulse Weapons	3
Description of High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse	4
Description of High-Power Microwave	5
Disruptive Capabilities of HEMP and HPM Weapons	6
Hardening Against HEMP and HPM Weapons	8
DOD Applications of HEMP and HPM	9
Capabilities of Other Nations	10
Ground Wave Emergency Network	12
Policy Analysis	12
Private Sector Vulnerability	12
Military Vulnerability	13
New Incentive to Develop a Nuclear Capability	14
Terrorist Use of HPM	15
Human Rights Objections	16
Legislative Activity	16
CRS Products	17

List of Figures

Figure 1. Estimated Area Affected by High-Altitude EMP	5
--	---

High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) and High Power Microwave (HPM) Devices: Threat Assessments

Background

A Commission to Assess the Threat from High Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP commission) was established by Congress in FY2001 after several experts expressed concern that the U.S. critical infrastructure and military were vulnerable to EMP attack.¹ At a July 22, 2004, hearing before the House Armed Services Committee, panel members from the EMP commission reportedly stated that a high-altitude nuclear burst could emit electromagnetic energy powerful enough to permanently disable many U.S. critical infrastructure computers, and also that as U.S. military weapons and control systems become more complex, they may be increasingly vulnerable to the effects of EMP. The consensus of the commission is that a large-scale EMP attack could possibly cause widespread damage to unprotected civilian and military electronic equipment for an extended period.²

Some observers indicate that the threat of an EMP attack against the United States may be growing along with worldwide access to newer technologies and the proliferation of nuclear weapons.³ A single, specially-designed, low-yield nuclear explosion high above the United States, or over a battlefield, can produce a large-scale EMP effect resulting in widespread loss of electronics, but possibly without direct fatalities. In the past, the threat of mutually assured destruction provided a lasting deterrent against the exchange of multiple high-yield nuclear warheads. However, an EMP attack directed against the United States involving no violent destruction, nor instant death for large numbers of U.S. citizens, may not necessarily evoke massive nuclear retaliation by the U.S. military, where, for example, large numbers of innocent civilians of a nation with a rogue leader might be killed. Today, the perceived lower risk of assured destruction by the United States, and the perceived vulnerability of U.S. civilian and U.S. military computers to the effects of an EMP attack may create a new incentive for other countries to develop or acquire a nuclear capability.

¹ Michael Sirak, "U.S. vulnerable to EMP Attack," *Jane's Defence Weekly*, July 26, 2004, [http://www.janes.com/defence/news/jdw/jdw040726_1_n.shtml].

² Daniel G. Dupont, "Panel Says Society At Great Risk From Electromagnetic Pulse Attack," *Inside the Pentagon*, July 15, 2004, p.1.

³ U.S. Congress, House Armed Services Committee, *Committee Hearing on Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack*, July 22, 2004.

EMP Commission Reestablished for 2006-2007

The EMP commission was reestablished by P.L. 109-163, the National Defense Authorization Act for FY2006. The new Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack (note that the new title no longer includes the phrase “High Altitude”, and adds the new word “Attack”) will continue with the same membership, and the Secretary of Defense is authorized to appoint a new member in the event of a vacancy.⁴ The EMP commission is tasked to monitor, investigate, and make recommendations about the vulnerability of electric-dependent systems of the Department of Defense, government agencies, and the private sector. The EMP commission is also directed to submit a report to Congress by June 30, 2007, to assess progress in protecting these systems from EMP attack, and to make recommendations for better protection of these systems.

The EMP Commission’s 2004 Report

On July 22, 2004, the EMP commission presented a report to the House Armed Services Committee, consisting of the following five volumes:

- Volume 1 is an unclassified Executive Summary.
- Volume 2 is a classified Threat Assessment.
- Volume 3 is an unclassified Assessment of the U.S. Critical Infrastructure.
- Volume 4 is a classified discussion of Military Topics.
- Volume 5 is a classified Assessment of Potential Threats.

The report stated that EMP is capable of causing catastrophic consequences for the nation, and that the current vulnerability of our critical infrastructures, which depend so heavily on computers and electronics, can both invite and reward attack if not corrected.⁵

Specifically referring to the U.S. military, the report states:

... EMP test facilities have been mothballed or dismantled, and research concerning EMP phenomena, hardening design, testing, and maintenance has been substantially decreased. However, the emerging threat environment, characterized by a wide spectrum of actors that include near-peers, established nuclear powers, rogue nations, sub-national groups, and terrorist organizations that either now have access to nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles or may have such access over the next 15 years have [sic] combined to place the risk of EMP attack and adverse consequences on the U.S. to a level that is not acceptable.... Our increasing dependence on advanced electronics systems results in the potential for an increased EMP vulnerability of our technologically advanced

⁴ P.L. 109-163, Section 1052, reestablishes the EMP commission.

⁵ William Graham, et al., *Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, Volume 1: Executive Report 2004*, [<http://www.house.gov/hasc/openingstatementsandpressreleases/108thcongress/04-07-22emp.pdf>].

forces, and if unaddressed makes EMP employment by an adversary an attractive asymmetric option.”⁶

The EMP commission proposed a five-year plan for protecting critical infrastructures from EMP and from other large-scale terrorist attacks. The five-year plan is briefly summarized in Volume 3 of the report, and more details of the plan may be made available to the public in 2006. However, some portions of the five-year plan that are related to military equipment may remain classified.

Questions about Vulnerability to EMP

Some analysts discount the likelihood of a large-scale EMP attack against the United States in the near term, and the extent of possible damage, stating that the critical infrastructure reportedly would survive, and that military communications would continue to operate and a high percentage of civilian phone calls would continue to connect. These analysts state that limited testing has shown that modern commercial equipment may be surprisingly resistant to the effects of electromagnetic pulse, and that some military systems using commercial equipment are also retrofitted to be made more EMP resistant before they are fielded.⁷ However, other analysts maintain that some testing done by the U.S. military may have been flawed, or incomplete, leading to faulty conclusions about the level of resistance of commercial equipment to the effects of EMP. These analysts point out that EMP technology has been explored by several other nations, and as circuitry becomes more miniaturized, modern electronics become increasingly vulnerable to disruption. They argue that it could possibly take years for the United States to recover fully from widespread damage to electronics resulting from a large-scale EMP attack.⁸

Electromagnetic Pulse Weapons

An electromagnetic pulse (EMP), characterized as an energy weapon potentially threatening to national security, usually is created by two methods. High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse (HEMP) is an instantaneous electromagnetic energy field produced in the atmosphere by the power and radiation of a nuclear explosion, and that is damaging to electronic equipment over a very wide area, depending on the

⁶ William Graham, et. al., Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, Volume 1: Executive Report 2004, [<http://www.house.gov/hasc/openingstatementsandpressreleases/108thcongress/04-07-22emp.pdf>], p.47.

⁷ Stanley Jakubiak, statement before the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

⁸ Lowell Wood, Statement before the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999; Jack Spencer, “America’s Vulnerability to a Different Nuclear Threat: An Electromagnetic Pulse,” *The Heritage Foundation Background*, No.1372, May 26, 2000, p.6.; and Carlo Kopp, “The Electromagnetic Bomb — A Weapon of Electrical Mass Destruction,” *Air and Space Power*, 1993, [<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/kopp/apjemp.html>].

design of the nuclear device and altitude of the burst. High-Power Microwaves (HPM) can also produce intense energy effects, including instantaneous electromagnetic pulses, and are created through special equipment that transforms battery power, or powerful chemicals (either by reaction or explosion), into intense microwaves that are very damaging to electronics within a much smaller area.


In addition, while HEMP weapons are large in scale and require a nuclear capability along with technology to launch high altitude missiles, HPM weapons are smaller in scale, and can sometimes involve a much lower level of technology, which may be within the capability of several non-state organizations. HPM can cause damage to computers similar to HEMP, although the effects are limited to a much smaller area. The technical accessibility, lower cost, and the apparent vulnerability of U.S. civilian electronic equipment could make small-scale HPM weapons attractive for terrorist groups in the future.

Description of High-Altitude Electromagnetic Pulse

HEMP is produced when a nuclear weapon is detonated high above the Earth's surface, creating gamma-radiation that interacts with the atmosphere to create an instantaneous intense electromagnetic energy field that is harmless to people as it radiates outward, but which can overload computer circuitry with effects similar to, but causing damage much more swiftly than a lightning strike.⁹ The effects of HEMP became fully known to the United States in 1962 during a high-altitude nuclear test (code named "Starfish Prime") over the Pacific Ocean, when radio stations and electronic equipment were disrupted 800 miles away through parts of Hawaii. The HEMP effect can span thousands of miles, depending on the altitude and the design and power of the nuclear burst (a single device detonated at an appropriate altitude over Kansas reportedly could affect all of the continental United States)¹⁰, and can be picked up by metallic conductors such as wires or power cables, acting as antennas to conduct the energy shockwave into the electronic systems of cars, airplanes, and communications equipment.

⁹ A nuclear explosion produces gamma rays, which interact with air molecules in a process called the Compton effect. Electrons are scattered at high energies, which ionizes the atmosphere, generating a powerful electrical field. This EMP effect is strongest at altitudes above 30,000m, and lasts so briefly that current cannot start flowing through a human body to cause harm to people. [<http://www.physics.northwestern.edu/classes/2001Fall/Phyx135-2/19/emp.htm>].

¹⁰ The Federation of American Scientists, "Nuclear Weapons EMP Effects," [<http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/emp.htm>].

Figure 1. Estimated Area Affected by High-Altitude EMP

Source: Heritage Foundation, Jack Spencer, *America's Vulnerability to a Different Nuclear Threat: An Electromagnetic Pulse*, Backgrounder #1372, May 26, 2000, [<http://www.heritage.org/Research/MissileDefense/bg1372.cfm>].

Description of High-Power Microwave

Microwaves are characterized by electromagnetic energy with wavelengths as small as centimeters or millimeters, and can be used at moderate power levels for communications or for radar.¹¹ High Power Microwaves can be produced as a weapon when a powerful chemical detonation is transformed through a special coil device, called a flux compression generator, into a much stronger electromagnetic field.¹² Other methods, such as combining reactive chemicals or using powerful batteries and capacitors, can also be used to create a reusable HPM weapon. HPM energy can be focused using a specially-shaped antenna, or emitter, to produce effects similar to HEMP within a confined area, or over a limited distance. Unlike HEMP, however, HPM radiation uses shorter wave forms at higher-frequencies which make it highly effective against electronic equipment and more difficult to harden against.

¹¹ For example, microwaves with wavelengths about 5.7 cm long (C-band), or 20 cm long (L-band), or 3 cm long (X-band) are often used for radar or communications.

¹² A Flux Compression Generator consists of explosives packed inside a cylinder, all of which is contained within a cylindrical copper coil structure. The explosive is detonated from rear to front, causing the tube to flare in a wave that touches the copper coil, which produces a moving short circuit. This compresses the magnetic field and creates an electromagnetic pulse that is emitted from the front end, which is then directed by a special focusing antenna. [<http://www.physics.northwestern.edu/classes/2001Fall/Phyx135-2/19/emp.htm>].

A mechanically simple, suitcase-sized device, using a chemical explosive and special focusing antenna, might theoretically produce a one-time, instantaneous HPM shockwave that could disrupt many computers within a 1-mile range.¹³ Also, HPM energy at higher power levels (megawatts), and powered for a longer time interval, reportedly could cause physical harm to persons near the source emitter, or possibly in the path of a narrowly focused energy beam.¹⁴

Disruptive Capabilities of HEMP and HPM Weapons

Studies related to the effects of electromagnetic weapons have been published infrequently, or remain classified.¹⁵ Nevertheless, it is known that a powerful HEMP field as it radiates outward can interfere with radio frequency links and instantly produce damaging voltage and currents in electronic devices thousands of miles from the nuclear explosion. Effectiveness is increased if the electronic devices are connected to any metal that could also act as an antenna. Because infrastructure computer systems are interconnected, a widespread HEMP effect could lead to possible long-term disruption of power, fuel distribution, transportation systems, food and water supplies, hospitals, and law enforcement communications, as well as military communications systems which utilize the civilian infrastructure.

A HEMP attack directed against the United States continent might involve a one-megaton nuclear warhead, or a smaller one that is specially-designed, using a burst several hundred miles above the mid-western states to affect computers on both coasts.¹⁶ However, creating a HEMP effect over an area 250 miles in diameter, an example size for a battlefield, might only require a rocket with a modest altitude and payload capability that could loft a relatively small nuclear device. If a medium or higher range missile with a nuclear payload were launched from the deck of a freighter at sea, the resulting HEMP could reportedly disable computers over a wide area of the coastal United States.

The disruptive effects of both HEMP and HPM reportedly diminish with distance, and electronic equipment that is turned off is less likely to be damaged.¹⁷

¹³ Dr. Robert C. Harney, Naval Postgraduate School, Apr. 12, 2004, personal communication.

¹⁴ Victorino Matus, "Dropping the E-bomb," *The Weekly Standard*, Feb. 2, 2003, [http://theweeklystandard.com/Utilities/primer_preview.asp?idArticle=2209&R=9F0C225C3].

¹⁵ William Graham, *Electromagnetic Pulse Threats to U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, hearing before the Military Research and Development Subcommittee, House Armed Services Committee, Oct. 7, 1999; and Carlo Kopp, "The Electromagnetic Bomb — A Weapon of Electrical Mass Destruction," *Air and Space Power*, 1993, at [<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/kopp/apjemp.html>].

¹⁶ [<http://www.physics.northwestern.edu/classes/2001Fall/Phyx135-2/19/emp.htm>].

¹⁷ Experts may disagree on whether the damaging effects of HPM actually diminish following the familiar inverse-square-of-the-distance rule. Michael Abrams, "The Dawn of the E-Bomb," *IEEE Spectrum*, Nov. 2003, [<http://www.spectrum.ieee.org/WEBONLY/>]
(continued...)

To produce maximum coverage for the HEMP effect, a nuclear device must explode very high in the atmosphere, too far away from the earth's surface to cause injury or damage directly from heat or blast. Also, HEMP produced by the nuclear explosion is instantaneous — too brief to start current flowing within a human body — so there is no effect on people. However, microwave energy weapons (HPM) are smaller-scale, are delivered at a closer range to the intended target, and can sometimes be emitted for a longer duration. These capabilities can cause a painful burning sensation or other injury to a person directly in the path of the focused power beam, or can be fatal if a person is too close to the microwave emitter.¹⁸ Both HEMP and HPM can permanently immobilize vehicles with electronic ignition and control systems.

A high altitude nuclear explosion (that creates HEMP) produces three major energy components that arrive in sequence, and which have measurably different effects that can be cumulatively damaging to electronic equipment. The first energy component is the initial energy shockwave which lasts about one microsecond, and is similar to extremely intense static electricity that can overload circuitry for every electronic device that is within line of sight of the burst. A secondary energy component then arrives, which has characteristics that are similar to a lightning strike. By itself, this second energy component might not be an issue for some critical infrastructure equipment, if anti-lightning protective measures are already in place. However, the rise time of the first component is so rapid and intense that it can destroy many protective measures, allowing the second component to further disrupt the electronic equipment. The third energy component is a longer-lasting magnetic signal, from about one microsecond to one full second in duration. This geomagnetic signal causes an effect that is damaging primarily to long-lines electronic equipment. A localized magnetic effect builds up throughout the length of the transmission lines and then quickly collapses, producing a magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) “heave,” or “late-time,” power surge that overloads equipment connected to the power and telecommunications infrastructure. This late-time effect adds to the initial HEMP effect, and systems connected to long-lines power and communications systems may be further disrupted by the combined effects. Smaller isolated systems do not collect so much of this third energy component, and are usually disrupted only by the first energy component of HEMP.¹⁹

¹⁷(...continued)

publicfeature/nov03/1103ebom.html]. Some experts state that the severity of HEMP effect depends largely on the bomb design, so a specially-designed low yield bomb may pose a larger HEMP threat than a high yield bomb. Lowell Wood, statement before the House Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

¹⁸ Victorino Matus, “Dropping the E-bomb,” *The Weekly Standard*, Feb. 2, 2003, [http://theweeklystandard.com/Utilities/printer_preview.asp?idArticle=2209&R=9F0C225C3].

¹⁹ The Federation of American Scientists, “Nuclear Weapons EMP Effects,” [<http://www.fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/emp.htm>], and Report of the Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) Attack, Vol.1: Executive Report 2004, p.5.

An HPM weapon has a shorter possible range than HEMP, but it can induce currents large enough to melt circuitry, or it can cause equipment to fail minutes, days, or even weeks later. Recently, a U.S. Comanche helicopter, flying in New York while performing a radar test involving HPM weapons, generated a low-level energy pulse that reportedly disrupted for two weeks the global positioning systems (GPS) being used to land commercial aircraft at an airport in Albany, New York.²⁰

Older electrical components, such as vacuum tubes, are generally built more massively, and are more tolerant of electromagnetic pulse. However, as modern electronics shrink in size, circuitry is becoming increasingly vulnerable to electromagnetic interference. Therefore, countries with infrastructure that relies on older technology may be less vulnerable to the disabling effects of HEMP or HPM than countries that rely on a higher level of technology.²¹

Hardening Against HEMP and HPM Weapons

Electronic equipment may be hardened by surrounding it with protective metallic shielding which routes damaging electromagnetic fields away from highly sensitive electrical components. This method, known as Faraday cage protection, is traditionally used to protect electronic equipment from a lightning strike. However, power surges HEMP or HPM weapons could possibly involve peak currents of tens of millions of amps which can pass through a protective Faraday cage. Additionally, equipment placed within a Faraday cage may also be made vulnerable by any wires running into to the cage which can conduct the electromagnetic shockwave into the equipment. Depending on the power level involved, points of entry into the shielded cages can sometimes be protected from electromagnetic pulse by using specially-designed surge protectors, special wire termination procedures, screened isolated transformers, spark gaps, or other types of specially-designed electrical filters. Critical systems may also be protected by increasing the number of backup units, and by keeping these units dispersed and out of range of the electromagnetic pulse source emitter.²²

Hardening most military systems, and mass-produced commercial equipment including PCs and communications equipment, against HEMP or HPM reportedly would add from 3% to 10% to the total cost, if the hardening is engineered into the

²⁰ Kenneth R. Timmerman, "U.S. Threatened with EMP Attack," *Insight on the News*, May 28, 2001, [<http://www.insightmag.com/news/2001/05/28/InvestigativeReport/U.Threatened.With.Emp.Attack-210973.shtml>].

²¹ Lowell Wood, statement before the House Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

²² Electrical systems connected to any wire or line that can act as an antenna may be disrupted. [<http://www.physics.northwestern.edu/classes/2001Fall/Phyx135-2/19/emp.htm>]. Army Training Manual 5-692-2, April 15, 2001, "Maintenance of Mechanical and Electrical Equipment at Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Facilities, *HEMP Protection Systems*, Chapter 27, [<http://www.usace.army.mil/publications/armytm/tm5-692-2/chap27VOL-2.pdf>].

original design. To retro-fit existing military electrical equipment with hardening would add about 10% to the total cost.²³

DOD Applications of HEMP and HPM

Underground testing of nuclear devices done in 1992 at the Nevada Test Site were designed to research protection techniques to harden military systems against HEMP effects resulting from a nuclear exchange.²⁴ The Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 prohibits nuclear explosions in the atmosphere, in space, and under water. Since then, testing to calibrate the effects of large-scale HEMP on the critical infrastructure has been restricted. The design of new simulators to help measure these effects would call for complex computations to represent the large number of possible interactions between components found in the circuit boards, network connections, wireless systems, hardware modules, and operating environments of modern electronic systems that support the critical infrastructure.

DOD research on pulsed-power HPM electromagnetic weapons is currently being done at Kirtland Air Force Base, in Albuquerque, New Mexico. Weapons now being developed by the U.S. military for electronic warfare can disrupt the trajectory of missiles while in flight, and can overpower or degrade enemy communications, telemetry, and circuitry. Other HPM weapons being tested by the military are portable and re-usable through battery-power, and are effective when fired miles away from a target. These weapons can also be focused like a laser beam and tuned to an appropriate frequency in order to penetrate electronics that are heavily shielded against a nuclear attack. The deepest bunkers with the thickest concrete walls reportedly are not safe from such a beam if they have even a single unprotected wire reaching the surface.²⁵

During Operation Iraqi Freedom, many Iraqi command bunkers and suspected chemical-biological weapons bunkers were deeply buried underground and thought to be difficult to disable using conventional explosives. New HPM weapons were reportedly considered for possible use in attacks against these targets because the numerous communications and power lines leading into the underground bunkers offered pathways for conducting powerful surges of electromagnetic energy that could destroy the computer equipment inside.²⁶ The term “non-kinetic” is sometimes used to describe the group of weapons with the above capabilities. This term includes weapons designed to emit directed energy that, in short pulses, may disable computer circuitry, or in other applications, may cause temporary physical discomfort.

²³ Lowell Wood, statement before the House Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

²⁴ Associated Press, “Experts Cite Electromagnetic Pulse as Terrorist Threat,” *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, Oct. 3, 2001.

²⁵ Michael Abrams, The Dawn of the E-Bomb, *IEEE Spectrum Online*, Nov. 2003, [<http://www.spectrum.ieee.org/WEBONLY/publicfeature/nov03/1103ebom.html>].

²⁶ Will Dunham, “U.S. May Debut Secret Microwave Weapon versus Iraq,” *Reuters*, Feb. 2, 2003, [<http://www.globalsecurity.org/org/news/2003/030202-ebomb01.htm>].

DOD has developed the “Active Denial System,” which is a non-lethal weapon system designed to emit millimeter-wavelength energy that can be directed to penetrate 1/64 of an inch below the surface of a person’s skin. This agitates water molecules and produces the sensation of heat, causing the targeted person to stop whatever they are doing and flee the area of the beam. The effect reportedly ends the moment the person is out of the microwave beam.²⁷

Because instantaneous HPM energy can reflect off the ground and possibly affect piloted aircraft above, much testing currently involves HPM devices on Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs), and the Air Force Conventional Air-Launched Cruise Missile system. By 2010, DOD reportedly plans to field several air-launched UAVs using disposable and reusable HPM weapons to disrupt enemy computers.²⁸

Capabilities of Other Nations

Reportedly, several potential U.S. adversaries, such as Russia or China, are now capable of launching a crippling HEMP strike against the United States with a nuclear-tipped ballistic missile, and other nations, such as North Korea, could possibly have the capability by 2015.²⁹ Other nations that could possibly develop a capability for HEMP operations over the next few years include United Kingdom, France, India, Israel, and Pakistan.

In 2005, Iran reportedly acquired several medium and intermediate-range ballistic missiles from North Korea, with a range of 2,500 miles.³⁰ Also, reportedly, Iran has tested several of their Shahab-3 ballistic missiles, which exploded in mid-flight. While these explosions appear to be the result of a missile self-destruct mechanism, Iran has officially described the tests as fully successful. It was noted by witnesses at a recent hearing of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, that this contradiction could indicate practice by Iran for the execution of an HEMP attack.³¹

²⁷ Brian Bergstein, Military Mulls Use of “Star Trek” Weapons, *LiveScience*, July 13, 2005, [http://www.livescience.com/technology/ap_050713_phasers.html]. Vehicle-Mounted Active Denial System (V-MADS), GlobalSecurity.org, [<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/systems/ground/v-mads.htm>].

²⁸ David Fulghum and Douglas Barrie Farnborough, “Directed-Energy Weapon for UAV, cruise and air-to-ground missile payloads nears production,” *Aviation Week & Space Technology*, July 26, 2004, p. 34.

²⁹ Michael Sirak, “U.S. vulnerable to EMP Attack,” *Jane’s Defence Weekly*, July 26, 2004, [http://www.janes.com/defence/news/jdw/jdw040726_1_n.shtml], and House Armed Services Committee, hearing on *Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack*, July 22, 2004.

³⁰ Alon Ben-David, *Iran Acquires Ballistic Missiles from DPRK*, Jane’s Intelligence and Oversight, December 29, 2005.

³¹ Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, March 8, 2005. Jane’s Information Group, *Shahab break-ups suggest possible EMP trial*, May 1, 2005, Jane’s Rockets and Missiles. Joseph Farah, *Iran plans* (continued...)

However, other observers caution that these and similar actions might simply be a scare tactic used by Iran, but without much substance.³²

According to a recent DOD report, China is actively pursuing the development of electromagnetic pulse weapons, and is devoting significant resources to development of other electronic warfare systems and laser weapons. The report also notes that China's leaders view offensive counter space weapons and other space-based defense systems as part of inevitable scenarios for future warfare. The report notes that China could have 30 ICBMs capable of striking the United States by 2005, and as many as 60 by the end of the decade. Also, China may reportedly replace 20 of its current ICBMs with a longer-range version by the end of this decade, or sooner.³³

Vladimir Lukin, the former Soviet Ambassador to the United States, and former Chairman of the International Affairs Committee for the Russian Parliament, reportedly has stated that Russia currently has a capability to create a HEMP effect over the United States.³⁴ During 1962, the then Soviet Union conducted a series of atmospheric nuclear tests and observed HEMP effects that included surge protector burnouts, power supply breakdowns, and damage to overhead and underground buried cables at distances of 600 kilometers. Since then, Russia has reportedly made extensive preparations to protect their infrastructure against HEMP by hardening both civilian and military electronic equipment, and by providing continuous training for personnel operating these protected systems.³⁵ Other sources have reportedly stated that Russia may also have some of the leading physicists in the world currently doing research on electronic warfare weapons and electromagnetic pulse effects.³⁶

³¹(...continued)

to knock out U.S. with 1 nuclear bomb, April 25, 2005, WorldNewsDaily.com, [http://wnd.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=43956].

³² Officials in Iran have also reported that in March 2006, they successfully tested their "Fajr-3" long-range missile, which they claim has a range of 2000 miles, and which is invisible to radar. However, other intelligence sources reportedly argue that the "Fajr-3" is merely an upgraded artillery shell with a very short range. *"Iran Claims Test of Fajr-3 Missile 'Invisible' to Radar, Interceptors"*, April 3, 2006, MissileThreat.com, [http://www.missilethreat.com/news/200604030826.html].

³³ FY04 Report to Congress on PRC Military Power, Annual Report on The Military Power of the People's Republic of China, [http://www.defenselink.mil/pubs/d20040528PRC.pdf].

³⁴ The statement was reportedly made on Apr. 30, 1999, to a U.S. Congressional delegation that traveled to Vienna to meet with officials from the Russian Duma to discuss a framework for a peaceful solution of the then crisis in Kosovo. Hearing before the Military Research and Development Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services House of Representatives, Oct. 7, 1999, [http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/security/-has280010.000/has280010_0.HTM].

³⁵ Lowell Wood, statement before the House Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

³⁶ Barry Crane, a physicist and former F-4 pilot now working at the Institute for Defense Analysis, has visited Russia's top electromagnetic pulse laboratories and design bureaus, (continued...)

Ground Wave Emergency Network

During the Cold War, the US Military designed an innovative communications system to relay emergency messages between strategic military areas in the continental United States, using signals that travel by means of low frequency ground waves — electromagnetic fields that hug the ground — rather than by radiating into the atmosphere. The Ground Wave Emergency Network, or GWEN system, was intended to allow continuous communications despite EMP disruptions. However, the hardware was reportedly transistor based, leaving the system with some level of vulnerability to EMP. In addition, the fixed locations of GWEN sites were known to adversaries, and thus vulnerable to direct attack.³⁷

As the Cold War ended, the U.S. military took steps to reduce its nuclear arsenal and associated infrastructure.³⁸ After 1998, the USAF decommissioned GWEN assets and replaced the entire system with the Single Channel Anti-Jam Man-Portable (SCAMP) Terminal. SCAMP uses extremely high frequency (EHF) technology, is resistant to EMP, and offers more flexibility than GWEN because the equipment is lightweight, transportable, and interoperable with DOD satellite networks.³⁹

Policy Analysis

Private Sector Vulnerability

What is the United States doing to protect critical infrastructure systems against the threat of electromagnetic pulse? What is the appropriate response from the United States to a nuclear HEMP attack, where there may be widespread damage to electronics, but relatively little, or possibly no loss of life as a direct result? How could the United States determine which nation launched a HEMP attack? After experiencing a HEMP effect, the United States may retain its capability to use strategic weapons for nuclear retaliation, but will the U.S. industrial base and critical infrastructure be crippled and incapable of supporting a sustained military campaign? During such time, would the United States be capable of making an effective

³⁶(...continued)

and has stated that many Russian electromagnetic pulse specialists may also be now working on contract in China. Kenneth R. Timmerman, May 28, 2001, “U.S. Threatened with EMP Attack,” *Insight on the News*, [<http://www.insightmag.com/news/2001/05/28/InvestigativeReport/U.Threatened.With.Emp.Attack-210973.shtml>].

³⁷ Rosalie Bertell, “Background on the HAARP Project,” *Global Policy Forum*, Nov. 5, 1996, [<http://www.globalpolicy.org/soecon/envronmt/weapons.htm>].

³⁸ Admiral Richard W. Mies, Commander in Chief, United States Strategic Command, statement before the Senate Armed Services Committee Strategic Subcommittee on Command Posture, July 11, 2001, p.11, [<http://www.defenselink.mil/dodgc/lrs/docs/test01-07-11Mies.rtf>].

³⁹ Federation of American Scientists, *AN/PSC-11 Single Channel Anti-Jam Man-Portable (SCAMP) Terminal*, Mar. 2000 [<http://www.fas.org/spp/military/program/com/an-psc-11.htm>].

response should other nations chose to make military advances in other parts of the world?

Some assert that little has been done by the private sector to protect against the threat from electromagnetic pulse, and that commercial electronic systems in the United States could be severely damaged by either HEMP or smaller-scale HPM.⁴⁰ Officials of several U.S. power stations and public utilities have stated that their electrical systems currently have no protection against electromagnetic pulse.⁴¹ However, electric power and telephone utilities have been known to fail as a result of solar storms which cause effects similar to, but less severe than HEMP from a nuclear blast. Commercial electronic surge arresters used for lightning strikes reportedly do not clamp fast enough to protect against the instantaneous effects of electromagnetic pulse, and some may also not have great enough current carrying capacity.⁴²

Military Vulnerability

In 2005, DOD reportedly completed its response to the 2004 commission report, but it has not yet implemented a proposed EMP Action Plan (classified), which was recently submitted to the Secretary of Defense.⁴³

The effects of large-scale HEMP have been studied over several years by the Defense Atomic Support Agency, the Defense Nuclear Agency, and the Defense Special Weapons Agency, and is currently being studied by the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA). However, the application of the results of these studies has been uneven across military weapons and communications systems. Some analysts state that U.S. strategic military systems (intercontinental ballistic missiles and long-range bombers) may have strong protection against HEMP, while most U.S. weapons systems used for the battlefield do not, and that this uneven protection is undoubtedly known to our potential adversaries.⁴⁴ Some analysts reportedly state that limited testing has shown that modern commercial equipment may be surprisingly resistant to the effects of electromagnetic pulse, and in addition to the SCAMP system, some military systems using commercial equipment are retrofitted

⁴⁰ House Armed Services Committee, *Committee Hearing on Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack*, July 22, 2004.

⁴¹ Associated Press, "Experts Cite Electromagnetic Pulse as Terrorist Threat," *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, Oct. 3, 2001.

⁴² Army Training Manual 5-692-2, "Maintenance of Mechanical and Electrical Equipment at Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C4ISR) Facilities, *HEMP Protection Systems*, Apr. 15, 2001, Chapter 27, [<http://www.usace.army.mil/publications/armytm/tm5-692-2/chap27VOL-2.pdf>].

⁴³ Personal communications with several HASC and Senate staff, February, 2006.

⁴⁴ Because of the very specialized nature, strategic weapons use essentially no commercial equipment. However, DOD increasingly uses commercial equipment in other tactical weapons. Stanley Jakubiak and Lowell Wood, statements before the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

to increase resistance to EMP.⁴⁵ However, there is disagreement among observers about whether test procedures used by the U.S. military may have been flawed, leading to erroneous conclusions about the effects of electromagnetic pulse on commercial electronics.⁴⁶

The U.S. military has adopted a policy where possibly vulnerable commercial electronic equipment is now used extensively in support of complex U.S. weapons systems. For example, a large percentage of U.S. military communications during Operation Iraqi Freedom was reportedly carried by commercial satellites, and much military administrative information is currently routed through the civilian Internet.⁴⁷ Many commercial communications satellites, particularly those in low earth orbit, reportedly may degrade or cease to function shortly after a high altitude nuclear explosion.⁴⁸ However, some observers believe that possible HEMP and HPM vulnerabilities of military information systems are outweighed by the benefits gained through access to innovative technology and increased communications flexibility that come from using state-of-the-art electronics and from maintaining connections to the civilian Internet and satellite systems.

New Incentive to Develop a Nuclear Capability

A single nuclear device exploded at an appropriate altitude above the continental United States could possibly affect our industrial capacity, economic stability, and military effectiveness. Does knowledge of this vulnerability, combined with the proliferation of nuclear technology, provide a newer incentive for potential adversaries to develop or acquire a nuclear weapons capability? Will countries now view the development and acquisition of nuclear weapons, even a small arsenal, as a strategy for cyber warfare?

During the Cold War, a HEMP attack was viewed as the first step of a nuclear exchange involving many warheads, but the threat of mutually assured destruction provided a lasting deterrent. Today, the proliferation of nuclear technology makes the threat of HEMP more difficult to assess. Would the leader of a rogue state be motivated to use a small nuclear arsenal to launch a crippling HEMP strike against

⁴⁵ Stanley Jakubiak, statement before the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee, Hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999.

⁴⁶ Lowell Wood, statement before the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee, hearing on *EMP Threats to the U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, Oct. 7, 1999; and Jack Spencer, "America's Vulnerability to a Different Nuclear Threat: An Electromagnetic Pulse," *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounders*, No.1372, May 26, 2000, p.6.; and Carlo Kopp, "The Electromagnetic Bomb — A Weapon of Electrical Mass Destruction," *Air and Space Power* 1993, [<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/kopp/apjemp.html>].

⁴⁷ Jefferson Morris, "DISA Chief Outlines Wartime Successes," *Federal Computer Week*, June 6, 2003; and "GAO: DOD Needs New Approach to Buying Bandwidth," *Aerospace Daily*, Dec. 12, 2003.

⁴⁸ U.S. Congress, House Armed Services Committee, *Hearing on Commission to Assess the Threat to the United States from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack*, July 22, 2004.

the United States, with no resulting fatalities, if it believed the U.S. would likely not retaliate with a nuclear salvo that would destroy thousands, or millions of innocent people? Would a HEMP strike over a disputed area during a regional conflict be seen as a way to defeat the communications links and network centric warfare capability of the U.S. military, and gain maximum battlefield advantage from an existing supply of smaller nuclear warheads?⁴⁹

Terrorist Use of HPM

A smaller-scale HPM weapon requires a relatively simple design, and can be built using electrical materials and chemical explosives that are easy to obtain. It is estimated that a limited-range suitcase-sized HPM weapon could be constructed for much less than \$2,000, and is within the capability of almost any nation, and perhaps many terrorist organizations.⁵⁰ Recently, DOD recruited a scientist to create two small HPM weapons for testing using only commercially available electrical components, such as ordinary spark plugs and coils. One device was developed that could be broken down into two parcels so it could be shipped by regular mail, for example, from one terrorist to another. The second HPM device was constructed to fit inside a small vehicle.⁵¹ Aside from specially-trained dogs, experts reportedly say there are no scientific methods that currently allow easy detection of an explosive device hidden in a vehicle or inside a suitcase before it can explode.⁵²

It is difficult to assess the threat of a terrorist organization possibly using a smaller-scale HPM weapon against the United States critical infrastructure. It could be argued that an HPM bomb by itself, may not be attractive to terrorists, because its smaller explosion would not be violent enough, and the visible effect would not be as dramatic as a larger, conventional bomb. Also, constructing an HPM device is still somewhat more technically complex than constructing a conventional bomb. However, observers have reported that the leadership of terrorist organization may increasingly become aware of the growing advantages from an attack launched against U.S. critical information systems. In addition, the use by a terrorist group of

⁴⁹ Jack Spencer, "America's Vulnerability to a Different Nuclear Threat: An Electromagnetic Pulse," *The Heritage Foundation Backgrounder*, No.1372, May 26, 2000, p.3.

⁵⁰ Some experts may disagree about whether most terrorist organizations are capable of building an inexpensive HPM weapon powered by a flux-compression generator. Michael Abrams, "The Dawn of the E-Bomb," *IEEE Spectrum Online*, Nov. 2003, [<http://www.spectrum.ieee.org/WEBONLY/publicfeature/nov03/1103ebom.html>], and Carlo Kopp, "The Electromagnetic Bomb — A Weapon of Electrical Mass Destruction," *Air and Space Power*, 1993, [<http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/kopp/apjemp.html>].

⁵¹ Kenneth R. Timmerman, "U.S. Threatened with EMP Attack," *Insight on the News*, May 28, 2001, [<http://www.insightmag.com/news/2001/05/28/InvestigativeReport/U.Threatened.With.EMP.Attack-210973.shtml>].

⁵² Tim Starks, "High-Tech Fixes for Low-Tech Warfare, Experts Say," *CQ Homeland Security - Technology*, Aug. 3, 2004.

a new weapon directed at U.S. information systems would attract widespread media attention, and may motivate other rival groups to follow along a new pathway.⁵³

Additionally, the explosives used in a smaller, or suitcase-sized HPM device could simultaneously be used to disperse radioactive materials, making it a so-called “dirty bomb”. This combination would offer a possible two-for-one effect, where the dispersed radioactive materials could generate immediate near-panic, while the HPM-damaged computers might not be noticed until days later. This potential double effect could improve the attractiveness of using an HPM device as a terrorist weapon.

Human Rights Objections

HEMP and HPM energy weapons primarily damage electronic systems, with little or no direct effect on humans, however, these effects may also be difficult to limit or control. HEMP or HPM energy fields, as they instantly spread outward, may also affect nearby hospital equipment or personal medical devices, such as pace-makers, and may damage critical electronic systems throughout other parts of the surrounding civilian infrastructure. For this reason, some international human rights organizations may object to the development and use of HEMP or HPM as weapons.

Testing for directed microwave energy weapons used for controlling or dispersing crowds reportedly shows that these types of weapons cause a painful burning sensation on the skin, but the effects are temporary, and cause no long-term physical damage.⁵⁴ However, some observers report that a very powerful, instantaneous HPM beam could possibly injure persons in the beam path, or could be fatal if persons are too close to the energy-focusing antenna.⁵⁵ Others may question what might happen if some persons were caught in the crush of the crowd and were unable to flee the microwave energy beam quickly.

Legislative Activity

In 1997, the House National Security Committee held a hearing on the Threat Posed by Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) to U.S. Military Systems and Civil

⁵³ Jerrold M. Post, Kevin G. Ruby, and Eric D. Shaw, “From Car Bombs to Logic Bombs: The Growing Threat from Information Terrorism,” *Terrorism and Political Violence*, vol. 12, no. 2 (summer 2000), pp.97-122.

⁵⁴ United States Air Force Fact Sheet, *Active Denial System*, September, 2005, [<http://www.de.af.mil/Factsheets/ActiveDenial.pdf>]. David Ruppe, “Directed-Energy Weapons: Possible U.S. Use Against Iraq Could Threaten International Regimes,” *Global Security Newswire*, Aug. 16, 2002, [<http://www.globalsecurity.org/org/news/2002/020816-dew.htm>].

⁵⁵ Victorino Matus, “Dropping the E-bomb,” *The Weekly Standard*, Feb. 2, 2003, [http://theweeklystandard.com/Utilities/prINTER_preview.asp?idArticle=2209&R=9F0C225C3].

Infrastructure,⁵⁶ and in 1999, the House Military Research and Development Subcommittee held a hearing on the potential threats to United States civilian and military systems from and electromagnetic pulse attack.⁵⁷

In March 2005, Senator Jon Kyl chaired a hearing of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, to review the findings of the 2004 EMP commission, discuss jurisdiction for implementing EMP recommendations, and also discuss possible new EMP threats. The EMP commission, which was created under the 2001 Defense Authorization Act, came into existence before the Department of Homeland Security was created. During the March 2005 hearing, it was emphasized that Homeland Security Presidential Directives 7 and 8 both provide the authority for the federal government, through DHS, to protect against terrorist attack, which may include EMP attack. Therefore, it was suggested that DHS could possibly take over jurisdiction for implementing the commission's five-year plan.⁵⁸ Also, the new and growing nuclear and missile capabilities of Iran were discussed.

The EMP commission's 2004 report focuses mainly on the effects of HEMP and not necessarily on HPM. Testimony during the 2004 presentation raised questions, such as: (1) how would the United States respond to a limited HEMP attack against the U.S. homeland or against U.S. forces, where there is loss of technology, but no loss of life; (2) does the current lack of U.S. preparedness invite adversaries to plan and attempt a HEMP attack; and (3) are the long-term effects of a successful HEMP attack, leading to possible widespread starvation and population reduction, potentially more devastating to the U.S. homeland than an attack by surface nuclear weapons?

CRS Products

CRS Report RL32114. *Computer Attack and Cyber Terrorism: Vulnerabilities and Policy Issues for Congress.*

CRS Report RL32411. *Network Centric Warfare: Background and Oversight Issues for Congress.*

CRS Report RS21528. *Terrorist 'Dirty Bombs': A Brief Primer.*

CRS Report IB92099. *Nuclear Weapons: Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.*

⁵⁶ U.S. Congress House National Security Committee, *Threat Posed by Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP) to U.S. Military Systems and Civil Infrastructure*, No. 105-18, July 16, 1997, [http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/security/has197010.000/has197010_0.HTM].

⁵⁷ U.S. Congress, House Armed Services Committee, *Electromagnetic Pulse Threats to U.S. Military and Civilian Infrastructure*, No. 106-31, Oct. 7, 1999, [http://www.fas.org/spp/starwars/congress/1999_h/has280010_0.htm].

⁵⁸ Opening Statement by Dr. Lowell Wood, Chairman Commission to Assess the Threat to the U.S. from Electromagnetic Pulse Attack, before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Terrorism, Technology and Homeland Security, March 8, 2005, p.4.