



---

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE CENTER FOR  
UNCONVENTIONAL  
WEAPONS STUDIES

---

**OUTREACH JOURNAL**

**Issue No. 1285**  
*13 October 2017*

## Featured Item

### *"Hypersonic Missile Nonproliferation: Hindering the Spread of a New Class of Weapons".*

Written by Richard Speier, George Nacouzi, Carrie Lee and Richard Moore. Published by the RAND Corporation; September 2017

Hypersonic missiles — specifically hypersonic glide vehicles and hypersonic cruise missiles — are a new class of threat because they are capable both of maneuvering and of flying faster than 5,000 kilometers per hour. These features enable such missiles to penetrate most missile defenses and to further compress the timelines for a response by a nation under attack.

Hypersonic missiles are being developed by the United States, Russia, and China. Their proliferation beyond these three could result in other powers setting their strategic forces on hair-trigger states of readiness. And such proliferation could enable other powers to more credibly threaten attacks on major powers.

The diffusion of hypersonic technology is under way in Europe, Japan, Australia, and India — with other nations beginning to explore such technology. Proliferation could cross multiple borders if hypersonic technology is offered on world markets.

There is probably less than a decade available to substantially hinder the potential proliferation of hypersonic missiles and associated technologies. To this end, the report recommends that (1) the United States, Russia, and China should agree not to export complete hypersonic missile systems or their major components and (2) the broader international community should establish controls on a wider range of hypersonic missile hardware and technology.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

### US NUCLEAR WEAPONS

- [Evolving Challenges: Redeploying the Nuclear Tomahawk](#)
- [U.S. Nuclear Weapons Modernization](#)
- [Trump Sees Power as Military Strength — and Nukes as the Apex of that Power](#)
- [Minuteman III replacement: Key to Deterrence](#)

### US COUNTER-WMD

- [Missile Interception from Yemen to the South China Sea](#)
- [North Korea Might Have One Weapon That America Won't Be Able to Stop](#)
- [Measuring Radiation Doses in Mass-Casualty Emergencies](#)
- [Pentagon Shifts \\$440 Million More to Missile Defense](#)

### US ARMS CONTROL

- [Anti-nuclear-weapons Group Wins Nobel Peace Prize](#)
- [Implement the JCPOA \(Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action\)](#)
- [US-Russia Relations Comparable to 'Dark Days of Cold War' – Former Defense Secretary](#)
- [Gorbachev, last Soviet leader, wants Trump-Putin summit to save arms pact](#)

### ASIA/PACIFIC

- [Article 9 and Japan's Missile Defence Dilemma](#)
- [The Japan-US Relationship: How Strong is the Glue?](#)
- [VIDEO: John McCain Says Negotiating with North Korea is 'Odious Option'](#)
- [Nuclear Threat Greater than in Cold War, Paris Conference Hears](#)

### EUROPE/RUSSIA

- [Europe Helped Draft the Iran Nuclear Deal. Now Leaders Are Trying to Save It.](#)
- [Everything You Need to Know: Russia's 'Tactical' Nuclear Weapons](#)
- [Russia's Formidable S-400 Triumf Air Defense Missile System](#)
- [UK 'Firmly Committed' to Upholding Iran Nuclear Deal](#)

### MIDDLE EAST

- [With Iran Deal in Jeopardy, US Clears Missile Interceptor Sale to Saudi Arabia](#)
- [Iran Open to Talks Over Its Ballistic Missile Programme: Sources](#)
- [JCPOA Violators to Face Iran's Firm Reaction: Iran UN Envoy](#)
- [Report: Iran Tried 30+ Times to Buy Illegal Nuclear Technology in 2016](#)

### INDIA/PAKISTAN

- [India's Nuclear Arsenal](#)
- [How India Can Go After Pakistan's Nuclear Stockpile](#)
- [Pakistan Warns India Against Surgical Strikes On Its Soil](#)
- [Pakistan Building Tunnels to Store its Nuclear Weapons, Just 750 km from Delhi](#)

### COMMENTARY

- [Give War a Chance: How to Deal with North Korea](#)
- [Our Best Hope Against Nuclear War](#)
- [Trump's Iran Derangement](#)
- [Nuclear Disarmament and the Search for the Fortunate Islands](#)

## US NUCLEAR WEAPONS

RealClear Defense (Chicago, IL)

### **Evolving Challenges: Redeploying the Nuclear Tomahawk**

By Adam Cabot

October 4, 2017

In the few years since the United States retired the Tomahawk Land Attack Missile-Nuclear (TLAM-N) from service, circa 2013, the world has been faced with rapidly evolving challenges. Such as a Russia increasing willingness to use force to achieve strategic objectives, the ongoing island building and militarization of the South China Sea by the People's Republic of China and the nuclear posturing of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, corresponding with its ongoing development of ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons technology. With these challenges posing a potential threat to the United States and its allies, perhaps it was a premature decision to retire the TLAM-N from naval service. This non-strategic nuclear weapon would be useful in the current global climate as an additional option in negating evolving threats.

Let's look at Russia first. There is a clear tactical nuclear imbalance between the United States and Russia, both in quality and quantity. While the U.S. currently deploys 150 B-61 tactical nuclear gravity bombs, Russia has at its disposal, approximately 1850 non-strategic nuclear weapons capable of being fitted to a diverse range of platforms including the Iskander short-range ballistic missile, the sea-based Kalibr cruise missile and the A-135 missile defense system to name a few. Redeploying the TLAM-N to a select number of naval units would close this gap without breaching the INF treaty. While the B-61 needs to rely on the combat range of aircraft such as the F-16 and runs the gauntlet of avoiding surface to air missile defenses, the TLAM-N would have a significantly increased range, accuracy and ability to avoid ground-based air defense. If deployed on nuclear attack submarines such as the Los Angeles, Seawolf or Virginia class, the TLAM-N could potentially be launched from an undetected position within range of targets, as opposed to the aircraft carrying the B-61 which must contend with a greater risk of being detected well in advance of reaching its target. If Russia chose to invade the Baltic States, the currently deployed B-61s in Western Europe and Turkey would be unable to be deployed effectively due to limited range and penetration ability. The TLAM-N would circumvent this limitation, providing NATO with a viable strike option.

China is currently in the process of fortifying the South China Sea. In the case of war, China could effectively close this major shipping choke point and destabilize the global economy. In addition to this, China is not subject to the INF Treaty and has deployed a diverse group of land-based ballistic missile variants such as the DF-21D MRBM believed to be designed to destroy U.S. aircraft carriers. This has been classed as an Anti-Access Area Denial (A2/AD) weapon as it would potentially limit the ability of U.S. aircraft carriers to operate within the South China Sea region. If China were to close the South China Sea to shipping, there would be significant challenges to dislodging their forces. Redeployment of the TLAM-N opens the door to military and coercive options, from a reactive angle to combat Chinese forces already in position in the event of war and from a deterrence angle to prevent any Chinese aspirations to close South China Sea shipping lanes. At this point, the U.S. has no tactical nuclear option deployed in the Asia region. Redeploying the TLAM-N to naval units in the region could counter Chinese A2/AD weapon systems.

North Korea has made no secret of its desire to be able to reach the continental United States with high yield nuclear weapons. If it does not have this capability already, it appears to be on the way there. Currently, the only nuclear counterforce option available for dealing with North Korea is the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal. This would potentially take time to reach targets in North Korea

depending on which of the triad is utilized and depending on from where the missiles are launched, they could be mistaken by Russia and China as a First Strike attack against their forces. These problems can be overcome by deploying the TLAM-N on vessels within the U.S. Seventh Fleet. If intelligence was obtained that North Korea planned an imminent nuclear attack on South Korea, Japan or the United States, multiple TLAM-N cruise missiles could be launched directly at targets within North Korea with the ability to penetrate through ground-based air defense. Although deploying B-61 tactical nuclear weapons in South Korea is a potential future option that should not be discounted, the TLAM-N is a far superior option due to the B-61 carrying aircraft being vulnerable to surface to air missile batteries as discussed. Deploying the TLAM-N within this region may also have political benefits as South Korea would not necessarily need to base nuclear weapons in their territory.

Another crucial advantage to redeploying the TLAM-N is the reassurance it would provide to U.S. allies. In the current geopolitical landscape of multidimensional challenges and threats, redeploying tactical nuclear cruise missiles would send a message to nations both within and outside the U.S. extended deterrence umbrella that the U.S. is serious about increasing its options at a tactical level beyond conventional force projection.

Opponents to this outlook will evidently argue that this is a step backward for nuclear arms control and disarmament. This argument is often based on blind ideology. The U.S. made a decision to drastically reduce its tactical nuclear weapons force to the current point where only a handful of barely effective gravity bombs remain, yet all of the nuclear powers continue to modernize their arsenals and Russia retains a massive non-strategic nuclear weapons capability. A case in point is North Korea which pushes ahead at an alarming pace with nuclear warhead and ballistic missile advancement regardless of any non-proliferation efforts made by global powers and sanctions imposed. Steps taken by the U.S. to reduce reliance on nuclear weapons have not been met with the same actions by certain global actors.

The redeployment of the nuclear Tomahawk (TLAM-N) provides the U.S. with a range of options to deal with challenges at a tactical level that conventional weapons may not be able to counter. At a strategic level, the TLAM-N can have an increased deterrence effect to potential adversaries and a reassurance effect for allies. One must wonder if the TLAM-N would have been retired if decision makers had faced the current challenges faced by the world today. I would hope strategic reasoning and analysis would prevail, not blind ideology.

[https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/10/04/evolving\\_challenges\\_redeploying\\_the\\_nuclear\\_tomahawk\\_112426.html](https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/10/04/evolving_challenges_redeploying_the_nuclear_tomahawk_112426.html)

[Return to top](#)

Council on Foreign Relations (Washington, DC)

## **U.S. Nuclear Weapons Modernization**

By Ankit Panda

October 4, 2017

*U.S. strategic and tactical nuclear weapons on land, in the air, and at sea, will undergo costly and extensive modernization in the coming years.*

U.S. nuclear forces, operated by the Air Force and Navy, have entered a years-long period that will see the modernization of warheads, bombs, and delivery systems. Many of these land-, air-, and sea-

based systems, which constitute the so-called nuclear triad, entered service during the Cold War and will reach the end of their life cycles in the coming decades.

The ballistic missiles, submarines, bombers, fighters, and air-launched cruise missiles in operation today will be gradually phased out for newer systems. The United States will also develop new nuclear warheads and upgrade facilities that produce and maintain nuclear weapons. However, while some modernization efforts are already underway, debate persists in Washington over their direction and extent, especially given the massive investments they will require. The Congressional Budget Office estimates [PDF] that maintaining and modernizing U.S. nuclear forces will cost \$400 billion between 2017 and 2026.

How did the nuclear triad emerge?

The triad emerged and evolved, more by accident than design, over the four decades of the Cold War as the United States and Soviet Union responded to each other's advances. "No one set out to create the triad," says Stephen Schwartz, editor and coauthor of *Atomic Audit: The Costs and Consequences of U.S. Nuclear Weapons Since 1940*. "It arose out of interservice rivalry, pork barrel congressional politics, competition between defense contractors, fear of the Soviet Union, and highly redundant nuclear targeting."

Each leg of the triad reinforces the U.S. strategic nuclear deterrent, which has been the bedrock of national defense since the 1950s. In the early stages of their development, nuclear weapons were so large they could only be delivered by bomber aircraft. They were used for the first and only time against Imperial Japan, in 1945. The first intercontinental-range ballistic missiles were incorporated into the U.S. nuclear arsenal by the late 1950s. The first ballistic missile submarine for strategic deterrence began operations in the early 1960s.

What are the legs of the U.S. nuclear triad?

**Ground.** The ground-based leg of the U.S. nuclear triad, managed by the U.S. Air Force, is the largest of the three in terms of number of delivery platforms. It comprises four hundred Minuteman III intercontinental-range ballistic missiles (ICBMs), which were first deployed in 1970. ICBMs are missiles capable of striking targets more than 5,500 kilometers away. Each Minuteman III can deliver one warhead, though the missile originally designed to carry three to multiple targets. The United States keeps ICBMs on nearly constant alert. They are in underground silos spread out across thousands of acres of farmland in Colorado, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, and Wyoming.

**Sea.** The sea-based leg of the U.S. nuclear triad, by far the largest in terms of total deployed warheads, comprises more than two hundred Trident II submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), which can be launched from fourteen Ohio-class nuclear-powered submarines (SSBNs) based in Washington State, on the west coast, and Georgia, on the east coast. Twelve of the fourteen SSBNs are at sea at all times, with five each in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans always on "hard alert" in designated patrol areas, ready to launch their missiles within minutes of receiving an order from the president. Each Trident II SLBM can deliver four to five independently targetable nuclear warheads, although the missile is capable of carrying up to eight warheads.

**Air.** The air-based leg of the U.S. nuclear triad comprises two types of heavy bombers, which are based in Louisiana, Missouri, and North Dakota: forty-four B-52H Stratofortresses and sixteen stealth B-2A Spirits. The B-52H, which has been modified extensively over its fifty years of service, carries nuclear-tipped, air-launched cruise missiles. The B-2A, which became operational in 1997, can be armed with three different nuclear bombs. The Air Force used another aircraft, the B-1B Lancer, for nuclear missions until 1997, but has since modified it to carry only conventional weapons.

What other nuclear weapons does the U.S. have?

The United States also has approximately five hundred nuclear bombs adapted for tactical use with various fighter aircraft. About 150 of these are located at bases in five NATO ally states, but modernization plans may include reducing the total number of deployed tactical nuclear weapons. Though they have no fixed definition [PDF], tactical nuclear weapons are generally distinguished from strategic ones by their shorter delivery ranges, and they are designed for battlefield scenarios in which conventional weapons might otherwise be used. (Tactical nuclear weapons have never been used in battle.)

What modernization is planned for each leg of the triad?

Ground. The planned replacement for the Minuteman III ICBM, known for now as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD), is still in the design phase. In the meantime, the Air Force is continuing to upgrade the Minuteman III.

Sea. First deployed in 1981, Ohio-class submarines will be replaced beginning in the early 2030s with Columbia-class submarines, which are expected to operate through the 2080s. Assuming current requirements and cost projections hold, the Navy will likely operate between ten and twelve Columbia-class SSBNs, which will feature sixteen missile launch tubes, four fewer than the Ohio-class SSBNs have. The submarine-launched Trident II is undergoing improvements to extend its service life through the early 2040s. The Navy will likely reduce the number of deployed SLBM warheads as well.

Air. The U.S. Air Force is developing a new stealth bomber, the B-21 Raider, which will be capable of delivering both nuclear and conventional payloads. Meanwhile, the Air Force is expected to upgrade and keep the B-2A Spirit in service through 2058 [PDF] and the nuclear-capable B-52H through 2040.

The Air Force has put out contracts to develop a new weapons system, known as the Long-Range Standoff (LRSO) cruise missile, which may be capable of delivering both conventional and nuclear warheads and be interoperable across the U.S. nuclear bomber force. It is not expected to be operational until 2030.

What arms control agreements cap the U.S. nuclear arsenal?

Russia is the only other nuclear weapon state with an arsenal comparable to that of the United States. The New START Treaty [PDF] entered into force in February 2011 and limits U.S.- and Russian-deployed warheads to 1,550 and deployed delivery vehicles—individual ICBMs, SLBMs, and heavy bombers—to 700. The United States and Russia report their strategic warhead and delivery vehicle counts to each other on a biannual basis.

The United States entered another bilateral treaty, the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty [PDF], with the Soviet Union in 1988; it remains in place with Russia. To comply with the INF Treaty, both countries destroyed their ground-launched, ballistic, and cruise missile systems—both nuclear-capable and conventional—with ranges between five hundred and five thousand kilometers. However, the Obama administration said in 2014 that Russia's testing of certain missile systems [PDF] violated the agreement. Russia has reportedly deployed these banned systems, although Moscow denies that it has violated the treaty.

Why is nuclear modernization debated?

Shortly into his tenure, President Obama declared “America’s commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.” Despite this, most of the ongoing triad modernization began under his administration, and fewer U.S. nuclear weapons were eliminated under him than under any other post-Cold War president. President Donald J. Trump declared

shortly after his election in 2017 that he would seek to “greatly strengthen and expand [U.S.] nuclear capability,” and he ordered the Department of Defense to conduct a review of the U.S. nuclear posture, which is expected to be completed by early 2018.

Some aspects of nuclear modernization face political opposition, with critics noting that the triad itself is an artifact of Cold War–era strategic thinking. In 2017, a group of Democratic senators sought to slow development of the LRSO, citing strategic concerns and high costs. Others, including former Defense Secretary William J. Perry, have recommended abolishing the ICBM force, arguing that the other two legs of the triad would be sufficient for deterrence.

<https://www.cfr.org/backgrounders/us-nuclear-weapons-modernization>

[Return to top](#)

Washington Post (Washington, DC)

### **Trump sees power as military strength — and nukes as the apex of that power**

By Philip Bump

October 11, 2017

On Wednesday, NBC News reported that President Trump sought a dramatic increase in the number of nuclear weapons in the United States’ arsenal. It’s a position that runs contrary to recent presidential administrations, during which international treaties were developed with the aim of reducing nuclear weapon stockpiles around the world. But a request to boost our nuclear capabilities fits squarely with Trump’s understanding of power.

There’s an anonymous quote in Dexter Filkins’s recent overview of Rex Tillerson’s State Department that does a lot to explain this idea.

Tillerson has been at odds with Trump on a number of issues, with neither man going to great lengths to hide those differences. But in one way Tillerson is adhering strictly to what Trump wants to see from the diplomatic arm of his administration. Tillerson has been slow to fill vacant staff positions within the department; there are currently 37 Senate-confirmable positions open, nine months into the administration. Other lower-profile positions are also empty, intentionally, as Tillerson seeks to shrink the overall size (and cost) of the organization he runs.

That’s the context for this section of Filkins’s article.

As the Trump Administration pushed for cuts in diplomacy, it was proposing to increase defense spending by fifty-four billion dollars—roughly equal to the entire budget of the State Department. The choice seems to reflect a sense that force is more valuable than diplomacy in international affairs, and that other countries, even allies, respond better to threats than to persuasion. “All of our tools right now are military,” a former senior official in the Obama Administration told me. “When all of your tools are military, those are the tools you reach for.”

This, in a nutshell, is Trump’s theory of presidential power.

Trump came to the job from the private sector, from spending decades as the sole authority over his own company. He revealed his sense of what the job of president entailed when he said during the Republican convention last year that “I alone can fix” the problems the country faces. He never had a distinct strategy for building consensus on Capitol Hill and has, instead, pushed the boundaries of unilateral executive orders to enact his will. The president isn’t a CEO, but there are ways in which the president can act like a CEO, and Trump has embraced those tools.



Nowhere is that power more immediate than in the president's role as civilian commander of the armed forces. As president, Trump calls the shots for the nation's soldiers, sailors, marines and airmen. He can't launch a war without congressional authority but, as recent presidents have shown, he has a lot of leeway to take military action without a formal declaration of war. This is the closest Trump will get to CEO power in the White House — and it's a power for which he has an ingrained respect.

Trump never served himself, avoiding the Vietnam War draft by deferment while he was in college and later for bone spurs in his heels, a reason that has been met with scrutiny. He instead suggested that his time at the New York Military Academy — a boarding school north of New York City — offered him an equivalent experience.

"I felt that I was in the military in the true sense because I dealt with those people" at the academy, he told Michael D'Antonio, the author of a biography of the president. (The author, the New York Times writes in its story about the comment, "seemed taken aback by this.")

Trump's reverence for military leaders is reflected in his Cabinet. His defense secretary is a former general (having received a waiver from Congress to serve in that position). His chief of staff and national security advisers are, as well. So was his first national security adviser, Michael T. Flynn.

That reverence is also reflected in Trump's regular photo ops with military members and repeated desire to have a military parade down Pennsylvania Avenue. Trump understands the brute force of military power. It's less clear that he has an appreciation for the nuances of what the State Department does.

On the campaign trail, the question of Trump's ability to launch nuclear strikes as president was a common refrain among supporters of his primary opponents and of Hillary Clinton. Trump was reported to have asked an adviser during the campaign why the United States doesn't use its nuclear weapons, given that it has them. (There are good reasons.) He embraced the idea that some proliferation was acceptable by other countries and, during the transition, got into a public feud with Russia in which he implied that he would embark on a new nuclear arms race.

If Trump drifts toward the raw power of the military over more nuanced ways in which he can leverage the United States' authority, there's no military more raw or more powerful than a nuclear weapon. The country's reduced-but-still-significant nuclear weapons could obliterate any number of countries in a near-instant, including, as Trump threatened from the lectern at the United Nations, North Korea.

That's a tangible expression of power, and it's not subject to veto. Trump can launch a nuclear strike without any intervention, likely becoming a global pariah but, certainly, demonstrating the power of the United States and its president.

So we get to Trump in that meeting asking why the arsenal can't be substantially larger instead of being winnowed into nothing. Reducing the number of nuclear weapons is, when extrapolated outward, a reduction of the central source of power Trump seems to understand.

This was the meeting after which Tillerson reportedly referred to Trump as a "f---ing moron."

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/10/11/trump-sees-power-as-military-strength-and-nukes-as-the-apex-of-that-power/?utm\\_term=.e57bb3a15052](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/10/11/trump-sees-power-as-military-strength-and-nukes-as-the-apex-of-that-power/?utm_term=.e57bb3a15052)

[Return to top](#)

RealClear Defense (Chicago, IL)

## **Minuteman III Replacement: Key to Nuclear Deterrence**

By Constance Douris

October 11, 2017

In order to deter nuclear aggression against its homeland and vital interests, the U.S. must demonstrate that its strategic arsenal is capable of surviving an attack and then retaliating with devastating force against the aggressor. In other words, the losses an attacker would suffer must demonstrably exceed any potential gains. Thus, the paradox of nuclear strategy is that when weapons are postured effectively, they will never be used. We buy and maintain nuclear weapons in the hope they will remain in their submarines and silos forever.

The nuclear triad consists of submarines, bombers and land-based intercontinental missiles (ICBMs). Each part of the triad uniquely complicates an aggressor's calculus when contemplating whether to attack the U.S. or its allies. Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis confirmed last month that the U.S. nuclear deterrent will remain a triad, stating he had been persuaded that "the triad and its framework is the right way to go."

The Pentagon is currently conducting a Nuclear Posture Review which is expected to be completed by December or early next year. The review is assessing each element of the triad to determine what the U.S. needs to retain its nuclear deterrent to stay ahead of emerging threats. Secretary Mattis specified that the review is not taking into account any specific adversary, but is being evaluated to "face unpredictable circumstances in the future."

The modernization of the land-based leg of the triad, called the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD), is of particular concern. This is because it will compete for funding with other acquisition priorities such as the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, B-21 bomber and KC-46 aerial refueling tanker. In addition, other parts of the nuclear triad are due for modernization at the same time, including the Navy's Columbia-class submarine program, the warheads and bombs maintained by the Department of Energy and nuclear command and control systems.

Minuteman-III missiles were first fielded in the 1970s and have undergone various upgrades since. According to Air Force Chief of Staff General David Goldfein, the currently deployed Minuteman-III ICBMs are 45 years old and are overdue for replacement. Hence, the Air Force requested \$5.6 billion over the next five years in the fiscal year 2018 President's Budget Request for the GBSD program

Minuteman-III ICBMs are located in underground silos in Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota. They have a range of at least 6,000 miles and are able to carry up to three warheads each. However, the U.S. currently deploys only one warhead per missile. As of June 2017, the U.S. has 400 deployed ICBMs with about 100 or so in reserve for testing, which occurs four or five times per year.

ICBMs are useful because they act as a targeting "sponge." An adversary would have to launch at least one warhead at each to destroy them all, depleting its arsenal. If an attacker fails to destroy all of the ICBMs, those remaining could be used to deliver a second-strike response, which would cause great damage to the aggressor. These missiles also force an adversary to target the continental U.S. to even attempt to destroy the entire nuclear arsenal.

The GBSD program cannot be delayed due to budget battles. This would put the reliability of the missiles at risk because the probability of failure at launch increases when their solid-propellant cores age. If there is a postponement of the program, the number of operational ICBMs would significantly drop in the 2030s and create a capability gap since the number of missiles an adversary would have to fire to destroy all the underground missiles would decrease.

In August 2017, the Air Force selected two contractors, Boeing and Northrop Grumman, to begin the second phase of the defense acquisition system, the Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction phase. The Air Force plans to decide on a single contractor for the third phase of the acquisition process in fiscal year 2021. This is where GBSD will be developed, built and tested.

Each component of the nuclear triad is essential to deterrence and needs to be modernized to ensure aggressors are dissuaded from launching a nuclear attack at the U.S. or its allies. Modernization of the land-based triad in particular must not be delayed otherwise its target sponge value and missile reliability will diminish. A nuclear attack is less likely to occur when potential adversaries understand that the U.S. will respond with unstoppable destruction.

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/10/11/trump-sees-power-as-military-strength-and-nukes-as-the-apex-of-that-power/?utm\\_term=.e57bb3a15052](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/politics/wp/2017/10/11/trump-sees-power-as-military-strength-and-nukes-as-the-apex-of-that-power/?utm_term=.e57bb3a15052)

[Return to top](#)

## US COUNTER-WMD

The Conversation (Cambridge, MA)

### Missile Interception from Yemen to the South China Sea

By Michael Armstrong

October 9, 2017

One year ago, the American warship USS Mason defended itself from attacking cruise missiles while patrolling the Red Sea. It was a minor affair with few shots fired and no one hurt. But it was noteworthy for its global security implications.

On Oct. 9, 2016, Mason's radar detected two anti-ship cruise missiles launching 48 kilometres away from rebel-held areas of Yemen. They flew low over the water at about 1,100 kilometres an hour, and would reach the ship in just over two minutes.

#### Missile defence layers

Mason is a guided missile destroyer designed for air and missile defence. Sailors control its weapons from the combat information centre, a windowless room lit with Aegis computer system screens. Those weapons create several layers of defences.

The ship first launched two long-range Standard interceptor missiles. It followed those with one medium-range Evolved Sea Sparrow interceptor. The interceptors would try to shoot down the incoming cruise missiles. The ship also launched a Nulka decoy to fool the cruise missiles' radar.

One cruise missile hit the water 19 kilometres away from the ship. It may have been hit by an interceptor. The other crashed on its own 14 kilometres out. The USS Mason consequently did not need to use its last line of defence, a short-range Phalanx gun, seen here:

A few days later, on Oct. 12, another cruise missile attacked Mason. It apparently was shot down 13 kilometres away, about 45 seconds before it would have struck. The ship fended off more cruise missiles on Oct. 15.

Other countries' warships employ similar defences, though with fewer layers. For example, Australia's Hobart-class destroyers have Aegis systems, Standard interceptors and Phalanx guns. Canada's smaller Halifax-class frigates carry Sparrows and Phalanx.

## Record books and textbooks

Another missile “anniversary” occurs this month. Anti-ship cruise missiles claimed their first success 50 years ago. On Oct. 21, 1967, Egypt sank the Israeli destroyer INS Eilat.

Since that time, the USS Mason is only the second warship believed to have downed a hostile cruise missile using an interceptor. That earns it a mention in naval history. Britain’s HMS Gloucester was the first. It destroyed an Iraqi cruise missile with a Sea Dart interceptor on Feb. 25, 1991.

Mason’s hostile cruise missile interception was also the first for the Aegis combat computer system. The U.S. introduced it several decades ago to counter missile-laden Soviet warships. It must have been gratifying for sailors and developers to see years of preparation pay off. The real Aegis-versus-missile fights seemingly unfolded in textbook fashion.

The U.S. Navy is now updating those textbooks. It studied Mason’s rare encounters for lessons in interception training and procedures. It then shared that knowledge across its surface fleet.

The rarity of real battles motivates my missile combat research. My mathematical models are simplistic substitutes for real experience. But hopefully they provide clues about relationships between offence and defence, effective salvo sizes and the value of attacking first.

## Dangerous contrasts

Other lessons, or warnings, also follow from the USS Mason attacks. For example, heavily armed Mason’s success contrasts with the fate of the unarmed transport ship Swift. An earlier cruise missile from Yemen set that transport on fire. As a U.S. admiral noted, ships now need “a fabulous set of radar and missiles” to survive near hostile coasts.

Mason’s high-tech defence also contrasts with warships’ continued vulnerability to low-tech threats. Examples include mines (for example, USS Princeton in 1991) and suicide boats (USS Cole, 2000). Collisions with other ships (USS Fitzgerald, 2017) or harbour bottoms (USS Antietam, 2017) are also risks. Against those threats, technological superiority provides little help.

A third contrast exists between the costs of attack and defence. The threatening cruise missiles were likely 10 times cheaper than the interceptors Mason used up in defence. They were also 1,000 times cheaper than the ship they might have sunk.

Strategic implications Nonetheless, the USS Mason’s success is reassuring for naval strategists. Fleets around the world rely on missile defences like those. They enable aircraft carriers, transports and other ships to perform their missions in hostile waters.

One caution: The Yemen rebels fired older cruise missiles, just a few at a time. Some newer ones fly twice as fast, giving defenders less than a minute to respond. Better-armed opponents could have trucks, ships, submarines and/or aircraft firing missiles by the dozen.

Many countries can thereby make their local waters very hazardous. Think Iran and the Persian Gulf, China and the South China Sea or Russia and the Baltic Sea.

Non-naval strategists might also be reassured. Warships with upgraded versions of the same computers, radars and interceptors provide limited ballistic missile defence to countries along the Mediterranean Sea or the Sea of Japan.

Similar land-based equipment in operation in Romania and under construction in Poland protects Europe against Middle East ballistic missiles. Japan likewise is building two land sites to defend against North Korea.

All told, there is a lot riding on the USS Mason’s experience.

<https://theconversation.com/missile-interception-from-yemen-to-the-south-china-sea-84676>

[Return to top](#)

The National Interest (Washington, DC)

## **North Korea Might Have One Weapon That America Won't Be Able to Stop**

By Harry Kazianis

October 10, 2017

*Biological weapons combined with chemical and nuclear weapons attached to long-range missiles would give Kim Jong-un the devastating military tools needed to kill millions of people—and hit the U.S. homeland. Food for thought every time the world's attention turns to the Korean peninsula.*

While the world might be worried about all things North Korea—especially its growing nuclear weapons arsenal—Pyongyang very likely has other nasty weapons of mass destruction that, given the right conditions, could be just as lethal.

What most refer to as biological weapons—stuff right out central casting that always make those 'end of the world' movies all so good—might just be North Korea's real weapon of war to fear.

While they certainly don't get as much attention as atomic bombs or chemical weapons such as Sarin, biological weapons can kill hundreds of thousands of people, and maybe even millions if deployed over a wide enough area. While exact facts and figures aren't perfect, there is strong evidence to suggest Pyongyang could possess anthrax weapons as well as possibly cholera, plague and even smallpox. And now that North Korea's missile arsenal is becoming ever more sophisticated by the day . . . well, you get the idea.

But developing such deadly agents in a controlled lab and deploying them in a war are totally different ball games. To give one a guide on how this could work, a recent report by the RAND corporation lays out the frightening details. And as you will see very quickly, it would not take much to kill thousands and spread mass panic:

"The Republic of Korea Ministry of Defense asserts that "[t]he North may also dare to launch a secret attack in the rear through its SOF [special operations forces] troops armed with biological weapons." Even a kilogram of many types of biological weapons could disrupt most military targets if delivered properly, and this quantity could easily be delivered by special operations forces. Missiles and aircraft could also deliver this quantity of biological weapons.

"Indeed, North Korea special forces are a likely means for delivering North Korean biological weapons. North Korea has some 200,000 special forces, a small fraction of which could deliver devastating biological attacks against South Korea, Japan, and even the United States. North Korea could use biological agents in isolation, perhaps as an escalated provocation in which it seeks to infect a limited number of people, or it could use biological agents as the leading edge of an invasion of the ROK, hoping for thousands or even more infections to weaken the ROK's defenses and will to fight. Biological weapon use in the latter context is particularly worrisome."

From there, things could go from bad to worse:

"North Korea could use biological weapons against a variety of military and civilian targets in South Korea. Biological weapons would likely be delivered as an aerosol of some kind that would be dispersed and then carried by the wind. Many people downwind of the release location would be exposed unless they wore some form of protection or were physically located in a place that protected them from exposure. This is particularly true if the attacker creates a line source by

spraying, for example, the BW agent while driving along a road perpendicular to the wind. According to one source, 1 kilogram of anthrax could spread lethal effects over 0.2 to 2.6 square kilometers, depending on wind and weather conditions. The nighttime population density of Seoul averages about 20,000 people per square kilometer, meaning that upward of about 50,000 people could be effectively exposed by 1 kilogram of anthrax. But in conditions less favorable to the attacker, including poor atmospheric conditions and many people living in high-rise buildings that lack central heating and ventilation, as few as 2,000 people might be effectively exposed by 1 kilogram of anthrax. Multiple attacks could increase these results.”

Biological weapons combined with chemical and nuclear weapons attached to long-range missiles would give Kim Jong-un the devastating military tools needed to kill millions of people—and hit the U.S. homeland. Food for thought every time the world’s attention turns to the Korean peninsula.

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/north-korea-might-have-one-weapon-america-wont-be-able-stop-22658>

[Return to top](#)

Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (Chicago, IL)

### **Measuring Radiation Doses in Mass-Casualty Emergencies**

By Mary Sproull, Kevin Camphausen, Gregory Koblentz

October 4, 2017

For the first time since 1981, when China deployed the DF-5 intercontinental ballistic missile, a new state has gained the capability to target the United States with a nuclear weapon. On July 4 and again on July 28, North Korea launched the Hwasong-14—a two-stage, liquid-fueled ballistic missile that demonstrated the capability to reach the continental United States. The US intelligence community assesses that North Korea has nuclear warheads compact and light enough to fit on the Hwasong-14 and that North Korea will be able to deploy a nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missile within one or two years. North Korea demonstrated another new capability on September 3, testing what it claimed was a thermonuclear weapon. While the exact configuration of this “advanced nuclear device” remains unknown, the device’s estimated yield is 140 kilotons, so the test represents a quantum leap in the destructive potential of North Korea’s nuclear arsenal.

Tensions between the United States and North Korea escalated dramatically in the wake of these missile and nuclear tests. Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un engaged in a frightening war of words. The tensions prompted Hawaii, Guam, and California to increase their preparedness for a possible nuclear strike.

The medical consequences of even a single nuclear detonation would be horrific. According to Jerome Hauer, former director of emergency management for New York City, no city in the United States is prepared for the casualties, chaos, and destruction that would follow a nuclear detonation. Medical management in particular would be complicated by damage to infrastructure and communication systems, lack of sufficient first responders, scarce resources, complicated triage needs, and an overwhelming number of patients.

But Hauer highlights another set of crucial challenges—those associated with the diagnosis and treatment of radiation-related injuries:

Beyond the difficult front lines of triage, survivors of a nuclear explosion will have a variety of injuries, some well known to modern hospitals but others more difficult to diagnose and develop a plan for. Acute radiation syndrome, in particular, results from exposure to radiation and does not

have to coincide with any other injury. It may be the only effect a survivor suffers, and it may not manifest soon after exposure.

Fortunately, new types of diagnostics to address this critical need are being developed in the field of radiation biodosimetry. Radiation biodosimetry is the estimation, through observation of biological variables, of received dose from previous radiation exposure; the new diagnostics use changes in various biological markers to estimate the severity of radiation doses. Progress in radiation biodosimetry science is beginning to translate into advanced, field-deployable technologies. The United States could significantly improve its preparedness for a radiological or nuclear disaster if, while better leveraging its existing capability for biological dosimetry assessments, it also integrated emerging technologies into its radiological emergency planning and response.

Although federal guidelines for radiological emergency planning and response highlight the importance of radiation dose assessment as a core need for medical management of mass radiation exposures, the ability to rapidly and reliably measure radiation exposure in large numbers of victims is extremely limited in the United States. A 2010 review of US preparedness for a large-scale radiological event found that the United States lacked a number of key capabilities required to implement that mission, including:

- executable interagency procedures for medical triage following a radiological event
- adequate biodosimetry laboratory capacity
- a strategic plan to activate surge capacity resources for biodosimetry capability
- operational guidelines for biodosimetry sample handling and reporting
- requirements for short-term and long-term monitoring of individuals exposed to radiation
- establishment and integration of emerging high-capacity biodosimetry technologies

These capabilities would be useful for responding to the detonation of a nuclear weapon, to a “dirty bomb” attack with radioactive material, or to an accident at a nuclear power plant such as the one that occurred at Japan’s Fukushima Daichii facility in 2011. In particular, enhancing preparedness for a radiological emergency requires immediate attention in three areas: establishing a surge capacity for biodosimetry labs; developing new biodosimetry assays; and integrating biodosimetry into operational response plans.

Surge capacity. In the United States, limited laboratory and point-of-care diagnostics are available to determine if someone has been exposed to radiation and, if so, to what degree. Moreover, currently available tools are poorly suited for management of a mass-screening scenario. The only point-of-care capabilities now available for biodosimetry assessment are lymphocyte depletion kinetics (measuring the rate of depletion of white blood cells to estimate received radiation dose) and clinical evaluation. Lymphocyte depletion kinetics is not conducive to triage biodosimetry because a baseline sample is needed soon after exposure for comparison with samples collected later at predetermined points in time. Clinical evaluation for dose assessment, such as time to onset of vomiting, can be useful for approximating dose—but can also be confounded by pre-existing medical conditions, psychological factors, and the effects of blast injuries. And clinical exams are of limited utility for large-scale screening due to the need for specially trained health care workers and the amount of time needed to complete exams.

The most widely used biodosimetry diagnostic is a technique not available in a point-of-care setting known as the dicentric chromosome assay. This assay, or diagnostic test, measures the number of abnormal chromosomes caused by radiation exposure to estimate received radiation dose, and is one of many types of cytogenetic assays that measure changes in chromosome structure. (Cytogenetics is “the branch of genetics that studies the structure of DNA within the cell nucleus.”) Dicentric chromosome assay is considered the “gold standard” for dose assessment, yet it is ill suited for mass screening because it requires a high level of technical skill, takes considerable time,

and must be conducted in an off-site laboratory setting. The United States has only two fully operational cytogenetic biodosimetry laboratories: the Energy Department's Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site in Oak Ridge, Tennessee and the Defense Department's Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute facility in Bethesda, Maryland. (Additional, auxiliary biodosimetry resources are housed at the Naval Dosimetry Center, also in Bethesda.)

To remediate the current shortage of cytogenetic laboratory capacity, the assistant secretary of preparedness and response (an official in the Health and Human Services Department) has proposed establishing a national cytogenetic biodosimetry network. This network would encompass approximately 150 existing clinical cytogenetics laboratories that routinely perform cytogenetic assays to check for birth defects and to detect and diagnose cancer. Ideally, this proposed Integrated Clinical Diagnostics System would increase the nation's biological dose assessment capability and would, to support triage during a radiological event, include the use of dicentric chromosome assay and lymphocyte depletion kinetics.

Automated platforms for cytogenetic biodosimetry are also under development. These platforms, such as the Rapid Automated Biodosimetry Tool, will adapt dicentric chromosome assay and other cytogenetic assays for mass-casualty screening. Increasing the number and capacity of laboratories capable of conducting this type of biodosimetry on a large scale is urgently needed. The Laboratory Response Network under the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has substantial laboratory resources available for chemical and biological events, but not for radiological events.

New assays. Due to the recognized limitations of current biodosimetry assessment capabilities in the United States, government entities such as the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the Radiation and Nuclear Countermeasures Program at the National Institutes of Health have funded research designed to identify novel biomarkers of radiation exposure. This research also facilitates late-stage development of biodosimetry devices that have the potential to quantify received radiation dose in a mass-screening setting. As a result of these funding initiatives, biodosimetry research has evolved from a relatively limited field of cytogenetic assessment (primarily depending on dicentric chromosome assay and evaluation of clinical symptoms) into a robust multidisciplinary field of radiation biology research that uses a variety of methodologies.

Research models of dose assessment, using newly identified radiation biomarkers, have been developed with the goal of developing deployable point-of-care biodosimetry assays. Technologies that can provide a point-of-care capability have entered late-stage development. Novel biomarkers have even been included in human case studies of accidental radiation exposures. For example, following a 2006 radiation accident in Dakar, Senegal, 63 individuals were screened for dose assessment using a combination of classic cytogenetic biodosimetry, analysis of lymphocyte counts, and measurement of new protein and metabolite biomarkers of radiation exposure.

Integrating biodosimetry. New biodosimetry technologies are rapidly emerging, but an important question remains: how these technologies will be used in the medical response to a radiological emergency. That uncertainty can best be addressed through four concrete measures.

First, existing biodosimetry capabilities need to be better integrated into federal radiological emergency planning and response. The first step in that process should be the creation of a concept of operations (a document that describes how a system works—from the perspective of someone who will use the system) for biodosimetry diagnostics in a civilian mass-care setting. Coordinating the federal medical response to a radiological emergency will be complex under the best of circumstances. Concepts of operations for biodosimetry at the triage level have been developed on a preliminary basis, but an interagency concept of operations for deployment of biodosimetry diagnostics in a civilian mass-care setting has not been fully developed. The specialized response



teams fielded by the Medical Radiobiology Advisory Team (under the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute), the Energy Department's Radiation Emergency Assistance Center/Training Site, the Health and Human Services Department, and the Veterans Administration's Medical Emergency Radiological Response Team represent vital assets within any response effort for a radiological event—yet they cannot undertake the medical management of large-scale radiological exposure on their own. For a mass-casualty incident involving radiation exposures, emergency preparedness plans need to address the complexity of medical management of radiation injury and establish operational guidelines for first responders and for use of available resources and infrastructure specific to radiation injury.

Second, federal response teams with practical experience in medical management of radiation exposures should be equipped with a deployable point-of-care biodosimetry diagnostic capability. In a mass-casualty event, the availability of point-of-care biodosimetry diagnostics would relieve the “worried well” problem—that is, physically uninjured people who seek medical treatment due to concern that they have been exposed to radiation. Availability of point-of-care biodosimetry diagnostics would also, by differentiating those who have been exposed from those who have received no radiation exposure, reduce the strain on local medical resources. As the technology developed by the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority and the Radiation and Nuclear Countermeasures Program at the National Institutes of Health matures into field-deployable systems, these new capabilities will also need to be integrated into concepts of operation for medical responses to radiological emergencies.

Third, training in medical management of radiation injuries needs to be integrated into the primary and continuing education of health care providers and first responders. This training is essential so that medical caregivers have a working knowledge of how to interpret biodosimetry diagnostics and utilize this information to guide triage and treatment. Formation of a cytogenetic radiation biodosimetry network under the proposed Integrated Clinical Diagnostics System could also provide a surge capacity for appropriately trained medical personnel in the event of a radiological emergency.

Finally, operational point-of-care response plans at the federal, state, and local levels need to be formalized for medical management of mass-casualty radiological events. These plans should better integrate biodosimetry diagnostics into the triage management work flow. Several software platforms, such as the Biodosimetry Assessment Tool produced by the Armed Forces Radiobiology Research Institute and the Radiation Emergency Medical Management web portal (managed by the Health and Human Services Department), use existing biodosimetry techniques—such as time to onset of vomiting, lymphocyte kinetics, and dicentric chromosome assay—for triage management. But these systems are not ideal for mass-casualty care. These improved plans and software platforms should be validated through tabletop and live exercises. Fully integrating biodosimetry into existing deployable medical response teams would help ensure that the complexity of the interagency response during a radiological or nuclear event does not hinder mass screening and the medical management of patients.

Duty to plan. A North Korean nuclear attack is a high-consequence event, but an event of low probability. Then again, a nuclear attack by a foreign nation is not the only radiological emergency in which advanced radiation biodosimetry capabilities would be useful. Radiological emergencies can also include nuclear power plant accidents and “dirty bomb” attacks by terrorists. As Johns Hopkins scholar Dan Hanfling and colleagues have highlighted, the United States has made great strides in emergency management preparedness for nuclear events. These improvements have come through modeling of projected infrastructure impact scenarios, establishing Protective Action Guides for civilians, and developing preliminary concepts of operations for medical management of

a nuclear event. Yet gaps remain in interagency planning, communicating with the public, and working toward deployable operational capabilities.

A key gap in US nuclear and radiological emergency preparedness is the lack of advanced dosimetry-based triage management. As Hanfling argues, we have a duty to plan—and “the right planning now will save countless lives after a nuclear attack.” Radiation biodosimetry is a critical element of that planning. Indeed, it is the future of radiological emergency management.

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/north-korea-might-have-one-weapon-america-wont-be-able-stop-22658>

[Return to top](#)

VOA News (Washington, DC)

## **Pentagon Shifts \$440 Million More to Missile Defense**

Author Not Specified

October 4, 2017

The Pentagon is injecting \$440 million more into missile defense, including yet another expansion of its fleet of missile interceptors, to counter North Korea’s accelerating push for a nuclear-armed missile capable of hitting the United States.

As a reflection of its urgency, the Pentagon asked Congress to let it shift funds from the current budget rather than wait for the next defense budget. The Pentagon had \$8.2 billion in its missile defense budget before the add-ons.

Where is money from?

The Pentagon Wednesday spelled out \$367 million of the shifted money, with the rest expected to be announced later. The spending has come under increased scrutiny as North Korea’s nuclear and missile programs have progressed and critics have questioned whether the Pentagon has developed missile defenses that would work in combat.

Some of the additional \$440 million is for projects that are classified secret, including \$48 million more for development of technology for cyber operations, according to a breakdown of the spending by the Pentagon’s budget office.

The Pentagon has never acknowledged that it has engaged in cyber operations against North Korea’s nuclear or missile programs. The New York Times earlier this year reported that in 2014, then-President Barack Obama ordered Pentagon officials to step up their cyber and electronic strikes against North Korea’s missile program in hopes of sabotaging test launches.

Alaska arsenal

The more conventional approach to countering North Korea’s missiles is what the Pentagon calls ground-based interceptors, which are anti-missile missiles that would be launched from underground silos at Fort Greely in Alaska in the event the U.S. decided to try to shoot down a North Korean missile aimed at the United States. The interceptors are designed to slam into an incoming enemy missile outside the Earth’s atmosphere, obliterating it by the force of impact.

The \$440 million in extra funds for missile defense include \$128 million to begin a new expansion of the missile interceptor force in Alaska. That includes \$81 million to begin increasing the number of interceptors from 44 to 64, and \$47 million to begin buying parts for 10 of the additional 20 underground silos in which the interceptors are installed.

The Pentagon had not publicly announced that it plans to increase the interceptor force by 20. The decision reflects concern that the current force is inadequate to face a North Korean nuclear and missile threat that is growing faster than anticipated.

<https://www.voanews.com/a/pentagon-millions-to-missile-defense/4057278.html>

[Return to top](#)

## US ARMS CONTROL

Los Angeles Times (Los Angeles, CA)

### **Anti-Nuclear-Weapons Group Wins Nobel Peace Prize**

By Alexandra Zavis and Tracy Wilkinson

October 6, 2017

As fears mount about the possibility of a nuclear conflict, the Nobel Peace Prize was awarded Friday to a coalition of disarmament activists who lobbied for the global treaty recently approved by the United Nations to ban atomic bombs.

The Norwegian Nobel Committee said it was honoring the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons for its work “to draw attention to the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons” and for its efforts to achieve the treaty that was adopted by 122 countries in July but has yet to take effect.

The award is an attempt to reinvigorate efforts for worldwide nuclear disarmament, a goal that appears increasingly out of reach at a time when North Korea has been carrying out provocative tests of its nuclear technology and trading threats of annihilation with President Trump. The heated rhetoric has raised fears that a miscalculation could spark a confrontation that spirals out of control.

At the same time, tensions are escalating between India and Pakistan, and between the United States and Russia, all of which are working to improve their nuclear arsenals and delivery systems.

The U.S. administration has also signaled that Trump could next week decertify the 2015 agreement that imposed curbs on Iran’s nuclear activities in exchange for sanctions relief, a decision that could lead to the unraveling of the landmark accord.

“We live in a world where the risk of nuclear weapons being used is greater than it has been for a long time,” Berit Reiss-Andersen, chair of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, said when she announced the prize in Oslo. “Some states are modernizing their nuclear arsenals, and there is a real danger that more countries will try to procure nuclear weapons, as exemplified by North Korea.”

Though she said the committee wasn’t “kicking anybody’s leg with this prize,” she noted that none of the nine nuclear-armed powers have so far supported the weapons ban.

The United States and close allies, including France and Britain, have sought instead to strengthen the nearly half-century-old Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which aims to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons but does not ban them outright.

After Friday’s announcement, U.S. officials reiterated their opposition to the new treaty, which they view as reckless and misguided.

“Unfortunately, we are seeing a deterioration in the overall security environment and growing nuclear capabilities of certain states,” a State Department official said, speaking anonymously in keeping with administration guidelines. “This treaty ignores the current security challenges that make nuclear deterrence necessary and risks undermining existing efforts to address global proliferation and security challenges.”

Although the Nobel committee was explicit in saying it was not sending a political message to a specific leader, it was clear that there were implications for both Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un, who have invoked the threat of nuclear force.

During the presidential campaign, Trump suggested the best path was to arm additional countries, such as South Korea and Japan, with nuclear weapons. And he once reportedly asked White House advisors why not use nuclear weapons, since the country possesses them.

“Is this going to lead to a settlement of the North Korean nuclear crisis?” said Daryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Assn., a Washington think tank. “No, the only way we are going to do that is if we have direct, unconditional talks that lead somewhere.”

“But it is clear from the Nobel committee’s statement and the timing that the award is a very strong and poignant rejoinder to the threats and counter-threats that are being lobbed between Kim Jong Un and Donald J. Trump.”

Secretary-General Jens Stoltenberg of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization welcomed the attention brought to the issue of preserving world peace but said what was needed was “a verifiable and balanced reduction of nuclear weapons.”

“Since the end of the Cold War, NATO allies have dramatically reduced the number of their nuclear weapons,” he said. “But as long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance.”

The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons, a Geneva-based coalition known by the acronym ICAN, disputes the premise that nuclear weapons are a legitimate and essential source of security.

“We can’t threaten to indiscriminately slaughter hundreds of thousands of civilians in the name of security. That’s not how you build security,” the group’s executive director, Beatrice Fihn, told reporters after Friday’s announcement.

The 10-year-old alliance, which says it has members in over 100 countries, pressed for the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, which would enter into force after it has been ratified by 50 parties. So far, only three have done so.

“This prize really is a tribute to the tireless efforts of many millions of campaigners and concerned citizens worldwide who, ever since the dawn of the atomic age, have loudly protested nuclear weapons, insisting that they can serve no legitimate purpose and must be forever banished from the face of our Earth,” Fihn said.

She said ICAN received a call about the award minutes before the official announcement, but she thought it was a prank until she heard the group’s name spoken during the televised ceremony.

Arms control advocates celebrated the news.

“People are worried. They correctly feel closer to nuclear war than at any time in decades,” said Joseph Cirincione, president of the San Francisco-based Ploughshares Fund, which has provided support to ICAN in the past.

The disarmament movement, he said, is at a “dead stop” with 15,000 nuclear weapons in the hands of leaders such as Trump, Kim and Russia’s Vladimir Putin. “It freaks people out, and it should,” he said.

He admitted to some initial doubts about the little-known group — until he attended a conference it sponsored in Geneva in December 2014. There, he said, he saw a true grass-roots coalition of civil society activists come together and convince scores of states to take a stand against nuclear proliferation.

The European Union’s foreign policy chief, Federica Mogherini, also welcomed the decision to honor ICAN, saying in a tweet, “We share a strong commitment to achieving the objective of a world free from nuclear weapons.”

Mogherini was herself thought to be a leading contender for this year’s peace prize with Iran’s foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif, for their work on the 2015 Iranian nuclear accord.

Others had more mixed feelings about the award going to ICAN.

Thomas Countryman, who served as assistant secretary of State for international security and nonproliferation during the last six years of the Obama administration, likened the move to the decision to honor President Obama with the peace prize in 2009 — years before his arms control efforts yielded results.

“It acknowledges potential and hope more than concrete achievement,” Countryman said from Belgrade, Serbia, where he had a speaking engagement.

He said it remains to be seen whether the new treaty — which he contends has its flaws — will accelerate the task of eliminating nuclear weapons. “But it will certainly stand as a strong global statement on the morality of the possession or use of such weapons,” he said. “In that sense, the award is very well-deserved.”

It is a message that resonates deeply in Japan, where those who lived through two atomic bombings in the closing days of World War II have long spoken out against nuclear weapons. The attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 killed an estimated 214,000 people.

“I’m delighted that ICAN, which has taken action to abolish nuclear weapons like us, won the Nobel Peace Prize,” Sunao Tsuboi, a 92-year-old survivor of the blasts, said in a televised statement, according to wire reports. “I want to offer my warmest congratulations.”

<https://www.voanews.com/a/pentagon-millions-to-missile-defense/4057278.html>

[Return to top](#)

Arms Control Wonk (Washington, DC)

## **Implement the JCPOA**

By Mark Hibbs

October 4, 2017

Very shortly, the United States government will make decisions about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) that may have immediate and profound implications for Iran and the U.S; for the future of the Middle East; and for global efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear arms.

The JCPOA ultimately rests upon the authority of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to verify that all of Iran’s nuclear activities are declared and peaceful. Without the agreement, IAEA

verification would be far more difficult. This should dissuade President Trump and the Congress from taking reckless actions that could curtail the IAEA's fact-finding, preempt American credibility in dealing with Iran in the future, and terminate enhanced oversight in a country that could respond by ramping up its nuclear program to a crisis level.

The unending polarized debate in the U.S. about the JCPOA has allowed both defenders and detractors to misrepresent the facts concerning the implementation of the accord. In their zeal to burnish the JCPOA, advocates assert that the IAEA has concluded that Iran is complying with the agreement. That's overstated, as are woefully gratuitous claims by declared opponents of the JCPOA that Iran is hiding current non-compliance because the Obama Administration "gave away any right to conduct meaningful inspections in Iran."

The IAEA is the JCPOA's verification agency. Its authority for drawing conclusions about nuclear activities in Iran, as in other states, derives from a bilateral comprehensive safeguards agreement (CSA) to which the IAEA is a legal party. The IAEA does two main things in Iran—monitoring and verifying. It monitors Iran's commitments to restrain its nuclear activities, such as on enriching uranium, stockpiling of heavy water, and manufacturing of gas-centrifuge parts. Some IAEA monitoring uses IAEA-verified declarations as a starting point. But the hardest part of the verification work remains to be done, to ensure that Iran's declarations about the scope and extent of its nuclear program are complete as well as correct.

Contrary to specious claims that the JCPOA prevents meaningful inspections, the agreement is a vehicle that should facilitate the IAEA's finding out whether all of Iran's nuclear activities are exclusively dedicated to peaceful uses. That's possible because under the agreement Iran will implement its Additional Protocol (AP), an instrument that gives the IAEA more access to information about a country's nuclear activities beyond what is required by its CSA.

Implementation of the AP can permit the IAEA to draw the so-called "broader conclusion" that all nuclear material in a state is in peaceful uses. To draw this conclusion in other states with a CSA and an AP in force, it can take the IAEA a number of years. In Iran, where the JCPOA has a broader scope, this process has been underway only for about 18 months.

The IAEA has never said that Iran is "in compliance" with the JCPOA. That's for two reasons. The first is that such a statement would have no legal basis because the IAEA is not a party. Reason two is that, whereas the IAEA has said that it is routinely monitoring and verifying Iran's adherence to limits it agreed to concerning specific nuclear activities, and that currently there are no indications that Iran is conducting undeclared activities contrary to JCPOA nuclear-related commitments, the IAEA has not yet concluded that Iran's declaration of its nuclear activities is complete and correct.

The process for getting to that conclusion would begin by the IAEA's initially focusing on, and, as appropriate, requesting access to, nuclear sites that have been declared by Iran. Over time, the IAEA would zero in on locations that host Iran's nuclear fuel-cycle industry, and thereafter, on myriad universities, laboratories, and other R&D installations—including military sites—that may be involved in doing work that is pertinent to Iran's nuclear program. Doing verification this way may disappoint critics looking for instant results, but it may build confidence while at the same time posing incrementally greater risk that Iran may not cooperate.

The IAEA is at an early stage in this process. In the hypothetical best case, a "broader conclusion" for Iran will result. How long this takes will depend upon the IAEA's information-collection and analysis capacity, but also on Iran's political will and the capacity of its nuclear accounting system to provide information to the IAEA. It is not certain that the IAEA will draw a "broader conclusion" in Iran. The IAEA has not done this for about 50 countries that have a CSA and an AP. None of these countries, however, have declared nuclear programs with sensitive nuclear activities.

The JCPOA is a complementary instrument that should permit the IAEA to provide greater assurance that Iran is in compliance with its safeguards agreement and to confirm the completeness of Iran's nuclear declaration. Besides the AP, the JCPOA includes a raft of other extra verification provisions. The sum total affords the IAEA a level of information about Iran's nuclear program that exceeds all other nuclear programs subject to safeguards.

### Put the JCPOA to the Test

Setting aside premature or misleading claims that the JCPOA "is working" or Iran is "not complying," the agreement's nuclear provisions thus far have not been severely challenged in the field. That may change over time, as the IAEA continues to do its work and becomes increasingly beset with sensitive issues—including any information that suggests that Iran may not have declared all its nuclear activities.

The United States government should therefore consider the verification opportunity costs of taking actions that might terminate the JCPOA. Instead of putting the JCPOA in jeopardy, the U.S. would be well advised to permit the implementation of the agreement to go forward and, together with other parties, encourage the IAEA to vigorously pursue its obligations under the agreement.

To facilitate implementation, JCPOA parties should make adjustments in the agreement where needed, and the parties and the IAEA should identify and counteract developments that could damage confidence about implementation. Effective verification may be hindered by internal bureaucratic approval procedures and by lack of pursuit by personnel; recalcitrant state parties; and deficiencies in the agreement itself. Potential obstacles in the text include the absence of definitions for key terms of reference and for specific IAEA verification activities. There will be difficult-to-overcome concern that the IAEA will be pressured by parties to the agreement to make political—not technical—verification judgments. More attention may have to be given to Russian misgivings about how the IAEA collects and uses third-party information, which first came to a head in 2012. Unless member states request and obtain from the IAEA additional reporting on the IAEA's verification activities and findings, there will be less transparency compared to before the JCPOA, because implementation of the AP obligates the IAEA to respect its confidentiality provisions.

Some issues could be addressed in a straightforward manner among the parties and the IAEA as appropriate. Iran could agree to provide the IAEA a declaration about its current and past activities in areas that are pertinent to nuclear weapons-making. Technical criteria could be established for certain equipment and technologies related to nuclear weapons-making that would prompt an IAEA request for clarification or access from Iran. The IAEA could establish clear procedures for forming and withdrawing the "broader conclusion." Doing these things would contribute to greater confidence that IAEA safeguards conclusions—including on Iran—are impartial and are based on technical findings.

Nuclear verification is at the heart of the JCPOA. To the IAEA, the JCPOA is a bird in the hand—a tool that for at least a decade can enhance verification of Iran's safeguards agreement and contribute to keeping Iran from reaching for nuclear weapons. That said, all JCPOA parties and the IAEA must know that if the IAEA does not unflinchingly implement the agreement, its credibility, and the credibility of the JCPOA, will be damaged. In ten to fifteen years, some key provisions will sunset. The prospects that Iran will thereafter indefinitely restrict its nuclear behavior to the current and effective level called for in the JCPOA will depend on success in multilateral diplomacy. That will be less likely if the United States does not support the agreement that it concluded with Iran two years ago. <http://www.armscontrolwonk.com/archive/1204247/implement-the-jcpoa/>

[Return to top](#)

RT (Moscow, Russia)

## **US-Russia Relations Comparable to 'Dark Days of Cold War' – Former Defense Secretary**

Author Not Attributed

October 9, 2017

Former US Defense Secretary William Perry has warned that relations between the US and Russia have entered a “new Cold War,” and that current global conditions could lead to nuclear conflict.

Speaking at the International Luxembourg Forum on Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe in Paris on Monday, Perry asked rhetorically: “Have we forgotten the Cuban missile crisis?”

He went on to recall a number of other close calls between the US and Russia during the Cold War, when human or machine error almost sparked nuclear conflict.

“We are beginning a new Cold War, with the worst possible outcome a nuclear war between the US and Russia. Relations today between the US and Russia are comparable to the dark days of the Cold War. How could we have let that happen?” he said, according to a forum press release.

Perry warned that an escalation of the current global situation could have major consequences in a matter of hours, specifically noting the possibility for escalation between the US and Russia, India and Pakistan, or North and South Korea.

“We could have the same number of casualties as all of World War II, only these would happen in six hours instead of six years,” he said, as quoted by the Times of Israel.

Perry previously took aim at US President Donald Trump, telling CNN in March that “one has to give careful thought” on what to say regarding nuclear issues.

“It's hard to imagine that...tweeting meets that test,” he said, referring to Trump's preferred method of communication.

Former British Prime Minister Tony Blair also spoke at the forum, on the subject of the Iran nuclear agreement which Trump has referred to as the “worst deal ever negotiated.”

“The sensible thing is to preserve the current agreement,” Blair said, while declining to explicitly mention Trump.

Blair added that sticking to the agreement “means, for now at least, that Iran's nuclear program can be stalled.”

Trump has indicated that he will not be recertifying the deal – a process required by a provision in a 2015 US law. It requires the president to inform Congress every three months if Tehran is adhering to the terms of the agreement in exchange for international sanctions relief. The deadline for recertification of the deal is October 15.

Meanwhile, Blair also warned of threats posed by “irrational” North Korea, amid increasing tensions between Washington and Pyongyang.

The two countries' governments have been involved in a war of words for months, with Trump repeatedly referring to North Korean leader Kim Jong-un as “Rocket Man” following numerous nuclear and ballistic missile tests and threats.

Trump has dismissed the idea of diplomatic talks with Pyongyang, adding that history has shown that conversations don't work.

“Only one thing will work!” he wrote on Twitter on Saturday, without elaborating.



On Monday, US Defense Secretary James Mattis elaborated on Trump's vague remark, saying the US army should be ready for "military options" at the president's disposal.

"There is one thing the US Army can do and that is you have got to be ready to ensure that we have military options that our president can employ if needed," Mattis said at the annual US Army meeting.

North Korea launched its sixth nuclear test in September, prompting anger from Trump and a new round of sanctions from the UN.

The two-day International Luxembourg Forum on Preventing Nuclear Catastrophe is aimed at analyzing threats of proliferation of nuclear weaponry and to draft proposals and recommendations as to further ways of reducing nuclear weapons and strengthening nuclear and missile non-proliferation regimes.

<https://www.rt.com/usa/406165-cold-war-nuclear-perry/>

[Return to top](#)

Reuters (New York, NY)

### **Gorbachev, last Soviet leader, wants Trump-Putin summit to save arms pact**

By Andrew Osborn

October 12, 2017

Mikhail Gorbachev, the last Soviet leader, said on Thursday a landmark arms control treaty that helped end the Cold War was in peril and called for a summit between U.S. President Donald Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin to save it.

Gorbachev, 86, said U.S.-Russia relations were in the throes of a "severe crisis" and that the treaty, which banned all Soviet and American short and intermediate-range land-based nuclear and conventional missiles, was now at serious risk.

Gorbachev signed the pact - the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) treaty - in 1987 along with then U.S. President Ronald Reagan in Washington. Russia, after the 1991 Soviet collapse, took on its obligations.

Both sides have accused each other of violating the treaty in recent months however, stoking fears it might break down as U.S.-Russia ties continue to deteriorate amid allegations that Moscow interfered with the 2016 U.S. presidential election, something Russia flatly denies.

Gorbachev, writing in government newspaper Rossiiskaya Gazeta, said the INF treaty was in danger and that Trump and Putin needed to meet and discuss the problems of nuclear disarmament and strategic stability.

"It has turned out to be the most vulnerable link in the system of limiting and reducing weapons of mass destruction," Gorbachev wrote of the landmark treaty.

"If the system of curbing nuclear arms crumbles, and that is exactly what the collapse of the INF treaty can lead to, the consequences will be catastrophic."

The INF treaty required the United States and the Soviet Union to eliminate and forego all nuclear ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with a range of 500 to 5,500 Km, eliminating an entire category of weapon.

Appealing to Trump and Putin, Gorbachev said he wanted to see a “fully-fledged” U.S.-Russia summit of the kind he took part in toward the end of the Cold War.

“It’s totally abnormal for the presidents of nuclear powers to meet somewhere ‘on the sidelines’ (of an event) and that they have only met once,” Gorbachev wrote, referring to a meeting between Trump and Putin at the G-20 summit in Germany in July.

“If the INF treaty could be saved, it would be a powerful signal for the whole world that the biggest nuclear powers understand their responsibility and take their obligations seriously,” wrote Gorbachev.

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-russia-usa-gorbachev/gorbachev-last-soviet-leader-wants-trump-putin-summit-to-save-arms-pact-idUSKBN1CH1F4>

[Return to top](#)

## ASIA-PACIFIC

Global Risk Insights (London, UK)

### Article 9 and Japan’s missile defence dilemma

By Charles Lyons Jones

October 5, 2017

*After North Korea’s recent missile tests over Japan, new questions have been raised about the ‘pacifist clause’ of the Japanese Constitution and the effectiveness of Japan’s missile defence strategy. How could Shinzo Abe respond?*

Just as it seemed like tensions in the Korean peninsula could not get any higher, North Korea decided to launch the Hwasong-12 intermediate-range ballistic missile (IRBM) over the Japanese island of Hokkaido. This was the fourteenth test of a ballistic missile conducted by North Korea in 2017 — leaving the country with nine operational ballistic missiles, according to the Center for Strategic and International Studies. Of these nine missiles, only the No-Dong has Japan within its optimal firing range of between 1,200-1,500 kilometres. Given that Tokyo is a mere 1285 kilometres from Pyongyang, this is the missile that is likely to keep the Japanese Self-Defence Force on its toes.

#### Japan’s self-defence legislation

At present, Japan’s missile defence strategy against North Korea is focussed on ensuring a successful interception of the No-Dong medium-range ballistic missile. In fact, it may be the only North Korean missile Japan’s Self-Defence Force can intercept under domestic law. The reason for this lies in the Japanese Constitution. Written in the aftermath of World War II, Article 9 stipulates that “Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes.” In this sense, the Japanese Self-Defence Force is only allowed to defend against a foreign attack. This means that Japan can only intercept missiles that are due to land in its territory. Any other missile cannot be intercepted as it would constitute a “use of force as means of settling international disputes” that do not explicitly involve Japan. That is why Japan’s missile defences are based upon interception of the No-Dong.

After understanding these legal constraints upon the Japanese Self-Defence Force, it becomes clear why North Korea’s latest missile test was so provocative. The Hwasong-12 has an optimal firing

range of around 4,500 kilometres which means that North Korea will probably never fire the missile at Japan. It would be much more likely for North Korea to try and fire it over Japan en route to another destination. This is where the test of the Hwasong-12 comes in to play. By firing the missile over Japan, North Korea calculated that Japan's elaborate missile defences would sit idle and increase the chances of a successful test. According to the Yonhap News Agency, the Hwasong-12 flew 550 kilometres above Japanese territory which meant it navigated 450 kilometres above the upper threshold of Japan's airspace. Japan could not legally intercept the missile and North Korea likely gleaned a lot of useful data. In short, the aforementioned missile test was a rational calculation from Pyongyang.

#### A push for Japan to reform Article 9

However, there was one calculation that Kim Jong-un missed. By manifesting the serious issues with Japan's missile defence strategy, Kim Jong-un has provided Shinzo Abe with a grand political opportunity. Abe can now point to Article 9 of the Japanese constitution and say that its re-interpretation needs to be finalised well before the current deadline of 2020 on the grounds that it is needed to defend against the threat from North Korea. Should this argument sway the National Diet, Japan could have the legal backing needed to play an active role in defending against an array of North Korean missiles. Tuesday's test is likely to help Abe convince the Diet about the merits of re-interpreting Article 9 sooner rather than later.

Abe now needs to think about how to garner public support for re-interpreting Article 9 and bolstering Japan's missile defence systems. The former should be the riskiest for Abe as there has long been public opposition to the re-interpretation of Article 9. However the latter would entail risks of its own in a modern, pacifist Japan despite the fact its citizens have been made acutely aware of the threat that North Korea represents. Abe's management of these domestic risks may well determine how Japan can contribute to the security of the United States in East Asia.

#### Abe's urgent task

Japan's alliance with the United States has helped the two militaries enhance interoperability. Nowhere is this interoperability more important than in missile defence. For example, should North Korea decide to launch an IRBM to Guam in the near future, the best chance at a successful intercept would come from a sea-based missile defence system. However, a successful sea-based intercept often has more to do with positioning than capability. Therefore, even if a Japanese Kongō-class destroyer was to be in a better position to intercept the North Korean IRBM than an American Arleigh Burke-class destroyer, the Japanese could not lawfully attempt the intercept under Article 9. Hence the chances of intercepting a North Korean IRBM headed to Guam are reduced dramatically. This is how Article 9 poses a risk to America's security in East Asia.

A lot depends on how Shinzo Abe handles the next few weeks. If Abe is to convince both the public and Diet that Japan must re-interpret Article 9 quickly, Japan will be in a much better position to defend itself and the United States against North Korea's missile threats. If Abe cannot do this successfully, both Japan and the United States face greater risks from North Korea's ballistic missiles.

<http://globalriskinsights.com/2017/10/article-9-japan-missile-defence-dilemma/>

[Return to top](#)

Asia Times (Hong Kong, China)

## **The Japan-US relationship: How strong is the glue?**

By Grant Newsham

October 6, 2017

*In Japan questions are being asked about possible 'de-coupling' of the Japan-US defense relationship if Tokyo seeks an independent nuclear capability*

The Japan-US relationship – like most nation-to-nation ties – is strongest when it's unstressed and North Korea's push for atomic weapons offers plenty of stress.

One result of this is talk in Tokyo on whether Japan should develop its own nuclear arsenal instead of relying on America's.

It is also a reminder that Tokyo has long had doubts – even if never stated too loudly – about America's commitment to defending Japan.

And in Japan questions are being asked about possible 'de-coupling' of the Japan-US defense relationship if Tokyo seeks an independent nuclear capability. But it's also possible Japan might decide it doesn't need the relationship at all.

Although the 65-year-old alliance is still sound enough, it's not unbreakable – especially now that threats to Japan are no longer academic as they mostly were until a decade ago.

But what would it take to unravel the Japan-US alliance, with the first step being Japan building its own nukes?

It would take some significant incident in which America doesn't do what Japan expects. What Japan expects is the Americans to protect Japan.

The Japan-US alliance is routinely described by both countries' officials as 'never been stronger.' But the Japanese have had concerns for a while.

When the North Koreans first fired a ballistic Taepodong missile over Japan in 1998 and the Americans pressed Japan to not respond, a Japanese official commented: "Which one (North Korea or Japan) is your ally?"

And around 2010 when the Senkaku islands territorial dispute with China heated up, there was serious concern on the Japanese side that America would not get involved if China moved on the islands.

The US Government's confused initial response over the Senkakus suggested the worries were not unfounded.

While President Obama later offered specific assurances relating to the dispute when visiting Tokyo in 2014 and US officials have confirmed this repeatedly ever since, doubts still linger. Especially as China steadily increases its civilian fishermen, coast guard, and military presence in Japanese waters near the Senkaku islands.

Meantime, North Korean nuclear tests and missile launches overflying Japan and even landing in Japanese waters are greatly worrying Tokyo.

There's even talk of Japan developing a 'strike' capability to knock out North Korean missile launchers, along with the murmurings of developing nuclear weapons – something Japan can do without breaking much of a sweat.

One former official commented privately to the effect: Fifteen years ago it was a secret that we were even thinking about thinking about nuclear weapons. About seven years ago it was a secret we were talking about it. Now we don't care if people know.

Former Defense Minister, Shigeru Ishiba who hopes to one day be Prime Minister, got attention recently for suggesting Japan consider a nuclear capability.

But as with many of Ishiba's statements about defense, there's an element of menace – suggesting that if the Americans don't guarantee a nuclear strike when Japan snaps its fingers that Japan just might have to build it's own weapons and then who knows what they might do.

Ishiba, like many Japanese politicians and officials, doesn't understand Americans respond better to flattery than to being ordered around.

Regardless, the US government needs to clearly recognize Japanese expectations. A North Korean missile striking Tokyo will certainly get a violent US response. A Chinese invasion force landing in Kyushu? Same thing.

But what about a North Korean missile landing 50 miles offshore or hitting an unpopulated area in rural Japan? Or Chinese fishermen landing on the Senkakus and refusing to leave, while China's Navy floats nearby warning Japan not to interfere?

Even in these borderline cases, Japan expects US support to the hilt and to include using force.

One can't exactly predict when, where, or how such an incident will happen, but the US needs to thoroughly think this through, discuss it with the Japanese, and prepare itself psychologically to use force.

There will of course be a constituency in the US calling for a muted response – disguised as principled statesmanship – in order to avoid war with North Korea at any cost, or upsetting the economic relationship with Beijing over 'some rocks' in the East China Sea.

Fair enough, but if the US hesitates and doesn't back Japan fully, then be prepared to see the alliance unravel. This will also raise doubts among partners, potential partners, and enemies worldwide about all US alliances.

Of course, Japan can improve the odds of full US support by doing its part to spend a lot more on defense and improve cooperation between all US and Japanese military forces.

Suggesting that the Japan-US alliance might come apart is typically met with the sound of 'harrumphing' from academics, bureaucrats, and senior military officers on both sides.

But the Japan-US alliance is based on the idea the Americans will defend Japan.

Now that enemies have finally materialized, try backing off that commitment and we'll see the glue binding the relationship together was soluble.

<http://www.atimes.com/article/japan-us-relationship-strong-glue/>

[Return to top](#)

USNI News (Annapolis, MD)

## **VIDEO: John McCain Says Negotiating with North Korea is ‘Odious Option’**

By Ben Werner

October 5, 2017

Convincing North Korean leader Kim Jong Un to give up his nuclear arsenal would require the U.S. to somehow guarantee that country's survival, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) said in a video interview on Thursday.

“That is an odious option,” McCain said, in a wide-ranging interview conducted by The Washington Post's Bob Woodward for the U.S. Naval Institute 2017 Naval History Conference – Military and Politics: Proper Participation or Perilous Partisanship?

The Senate Armed Services Committee chairman said it's not easy weighing a nuclear-free Korean peninsula against ensuring Kim Jong Un's grip.

“Who wants to see a guy who blows up his uncle with an anti-aircraft gun remain in power? ... This may be one of the greatest challenges that the United States of America and the world has faced since the Cuban Missile Crisis,” he said. “Kim Jong Un has to understand not through speeches at rallies, but he has to understand that if he continues on his path, he's, he's done. He has to understand that.”

More than 300 North Korean government officials were executed in an ongoing round of political purges during the five years Kim Jong Un has been in power, according to “The Misgoverning of Kim Jong Un's Five Years in Power” a report released in late December by the South Korean think tank Institute for National Security Strategy. Anti-aircraft machine guns were among the methods used to executive officials, including the 2013 execution of Jang Song Thaek, Kim Jong-un's uncle, according to some news reports.

Against this backdrop, President Donald Trump has suggested he's not optimistic about a negotiated solution to North Korea's nuclear weapons production.

“I told Rex Tillerson, our wonderful Secretary of State, that he is wasting his time trying to negotiate with Little Rocket Man...” Trump tweeted on Sunday, using his nickname for Kim Jong Un.

“...Save your energy Rex, we'll do what has to be done!” Trump said in a follow-up tweet.

Trump's comments were sent to his vast social media audience and covered by the national press. Woodward asked McCain if there is there is a war camp in Washington, building what he described as an “aura of we need action, we can't be pushed around?”

“There is legitimacy to that view, because three administrations in a row have negotiated with the North Koreans and gotten nothing to show for it,” McCain said.

Is the key to negotiating North Korea understanding what the nation wants to achieve, Woodward asked, citing what many experts consider Kim Jong Un's ultimate goal of achieving respect, engagement, normalization, but not war with U.S.

“He doesn't want to destroy his country,” Woodward said. “He knows the peril he puts his country in.”

McCain agreed, saying he thinks North Korea wants respect, but any negotiations also must consider the reality of how much Kim Jong Un is likely relying on possessing nuclear weapons as a way to protect his regime.

Other nations voluntarily gave up their nuclear programs, and the regimes haven't fared well. McCain mentioned Libya and Ukraine are examples of why Kim Jong Un would be hesitant to negotiate a nuclear deal. Both nations devolved into states of civil war after abandoning their nuclear capabilities.

"He looks at Libya, he looks at, Ukraine, he looks at these other countries that agreed to get rid of their nuclear inventory, and then ended up dead or out of power," McCain said.

"So, if you're looking at it from his viewpoint, look these other people agreed to give up their nuclear weapons and look what happened to them. It's going to be a very high price to pay for him to agree to stop his activities."

North Korea's very weak economy also complicates any nuclear disarmament negotiations, McCain said. Nuclear weapons are about all the nation has to bargain.

"Would we be paying attention to North Korea if it wasn't for the issue of, of nuclear weapons?" McCain said. "I don't think so. So that is his whole card, and for us to think that he's going to bargain that away in exchange for almost anything is not true."

<https://news.usni.org/2017/10/05/john-mccain-negotiating-north-korea-odious-option>

[Return to top](#)

RFI English (Paris, France)

## **Nuclear threat greater than in Cold War, Paris conference hears**

By Christina Okello

October 10, 2017

*Leading nuclear experts, meeting in Paris, have warned that the escalating North Korean crisis could spark a global chain of nuclear strikes worse than the Cold War. The warnings come as North Korea celebrates the founding of its ruling Korean Workers Party.*

"A deliberate threat by North Korea cannot be dismissed entirely," Viatcheslav Kantor, president of the Luxembourg Forum, an NGO whose declared mission is to "prevent nuclear catastrophe", told an audience of high-level diplomats on Monday.

The forum's 10th anniversary came against a backdrop of renewed concerns about the potential for nuclear war.

In the United States last weekend Republican Senator Bob Corker accused President Donald Trump of trying to start world war three in his ongoing row with North Korea.

"The situation on the Korean peninsula is at a critical level, with constant aggravations due to the North Korean president's [Kim Jong-un] nuclear and missile provocations," said Kantor.

Kim was expected to stage another missile test on Tuesday 10 October as his country marked Party Foundation Day, the anniversary of the creation of the country's ruling party, which is also its only legal one.

Nuclear non-proliferation treaty threatened

Russian lawmaker Anton Morozov, who recently visited the country said Pyongyang had provided calculations suggesting it could now hit the US west coast.

"Time is running out," former Russian foreign affairs minister Igor Ivanov warned the meeting.

His comments come as more nuclear states are ramping up their capability, threatening, he reckons, the validity of the 1968 nuclear weapons non-proliferation treaty.

"In the worst case scenario, a chain reaction could occur in which nuclear proliferation leads to expansion of the nuclear club from nine to 15 or more members by the year 2035," he said.

For Britain's former Prime Minister Tony Blair, the proliferation of nuclear weapons capability is "the most serious threat to the future of humankind".

That future would see a proliferation of regional conflicts and more terrorists gaining access to nuclear explosive devices, Ivanov insisted.

#### Worse than the Cold War

"Today's world is much more dangerous than a relatively stable bipolar Cold War architecture," the Russian former minister said. "Those days the rise of China, the nuclear India and Pakistan were unthinkable, not to mention the current madness of the North Korea nuclear regime."

Times have changed. For the worse, thinks former US Defence Secretary William Perry. He lived through the threat of nuclear war, even being woken up in the night by a false alarm about an imminent attack from the Soviet Union and thinks the threat remains Russia.

"Given the present mistrust and hostility, I'm especially concerned about Russian actions in the nuclear field," he said. "Putin has dropped Russia's policy of a no first use of nuclear weapons and suggested that nukes could be the weapon of choice if Russia feels threatened. He's put rebuilding the Cold War nuclear arsenal as his highest priority. And of course the United States is following suit."

#### Blair defends Iran nuclear deal

So how can the arms race be controlled?

Through cooperation, says Blair. "Without China and Russia in alignment with the USA and Europe, it is hard to see how non-proliferation can be successful."

Blair, who today is chairman of the Institute for Global Change, also distanced himself from Trump's criticism of the 2010 Iran nuclear deal, a deal described by the US president in a tweet as "horrendous", blaming it on Senator Bob Corker, who had criticised his line on the question.

"We can debate the wisdom of the deal and some of its terms but now it has been done," Blair argued. "It has a process of verification; it means for now at least that the nuclear programme of Iran can be stalled and the sensible thing, in my opinion, is to preserve it."

Despite his controversial decision to commit Britain to the 2003 invasion of Iraq on the basis of nuclear arms that proved non-existent, the former prime minister opposed using military action in North Korea, saying it was premature.

#### Worse case scenario

Perry for his part also thought that military action could backfire and provoke Pyongyang to use its nuclear weapons against neighbouring South Korea and Japan, sparking a regional nuclear war.

He also warned of the danger of nuclear confrontation between India and Pakistan. In his closing statement, Perry played a video of what that scenario would look like, before ending on a note of optimism.

"On balance I think we can work this out without a conflict," he said. "But I think we are taking unnecessary risks of blundering into a nuclear war and that is the risk with an existential consequence."



<http://en.rfi.fr/asia-pacific/20171009-experts-warn-us-n-korea-tensions-could-blitz-cold-war>

[Return to top](#)

## EUROPE/RUSSIA

The Washington Post (Washington, DC)

### **Europe helped draft the Iran nuclear deal. Now leaders are trying to save it.**

By Erin Cunningham

October 6, 2017

European officials and business executives are quickly mobilizing a counter effort to the expected U.S. rebuff of the Iran nuclear accord, encouraging companies to invest in Iran while urging Congress to push back against White House moves that could hobble the deal.

The European stance — sketched out on the sidelines of an Iran-focused investment forum in Zurich this week — is an early signal of the possible transatlantic rifts ahead as the United States' European partners show no sign of following the White House call to renegotiate the landmark pact with Tehran.

“The nuclear deal is working and delivering, and the world would be less stable without it,” Helga Schmid, the secretary general of the European foreign policy service, said in a speech at the Europe-Iran Forum.

This amounted to a warning shot that Washington may once again find itself isolated from key Western allies, who already broke with the White House over issues such as President Trump's call to withdraw from the Paris climate accord.

Trump plans to declare next week that the 2015 Iran deal — which curbs Iranian nuclear activities in exchange for sanctions relief — is no longer in the U.S. national interest, according to U.S. and European officials. Such a move would then give Congress 60 days to vote to reimpose sanctions.

This could pave the way for the deal's collapse, or more likely Europeans and others such as China and India could try to keep their growing economic and diplomatic engagement with Iran — with the United States on the outside looking in.

“The risk [of sanctions] is there, but my perception is that everybody outside the U.S. who participated in the deal wants to increase relations with Iran,” Ulrich von Zanthier, director of financial risk management at KPMG, a global audit and advisory firm, told the conference.

If the United States reintroduces sanctions, “it is what it is,” he said. “But at the moment, we can do business, so let's do business.”

European diplomats and business leaders said they hope the 60-day period will provide them with a diplomatic buffer zone in which they can convince Congress to salvage the agreement.

“There's a period of 60 days where things need to work out in a way that upholds the [agreement] with the U.S. still in it,” said a senior executive at a Europe-based multinational company who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss sensitive matters related to Iran sanctions.

“There's no real alternative” to the deal, the executive said, adding that “it's an illusion to think you can reopen and renegotiate.”

The agreement, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, was the result of years of negotiations between Iran and world powers. It was hailed as a victory for global diplomacy and nuclear nonproliferation and allowed Iran to resume oil exports and foreign companies to tap into a vast consumer market.

Since then, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the U.N. watchdog tasked with monitoring Iran's nuclear program, has repeatedly certified the country's compliance with the deal.

Still, the Trump administration has said the agreement does not go far enough in countering Iran's ballistic-missile program and support for groups that the United States considers terrorists, such as Lebanon's Hezbollah.

In one sign of possible openings to ease U.S. concerns, a Tehran-based Western diplomat said this week that European and Iranian officials already had begun discussions over Iran's ballistic-missile program and support for proxy groups in places such as Syria and Iraq.

"It will take time to make progress on those issues," the diplomat said. "But it's not a matter of bringing Iran back to the table for negotiations on those issues, because the discussion is ongoing."

Trump is expected to announce a major policy shift on Iran next week — one that will more aggressively target Iranian security services and push for more radical enforcement of the deal, officials say.

The deal has been "put into question in harsh terms by some in recent months," said Schmid, the foreign policy group chief, referring to the U.S. administration.

"As Europeans, we will do everything to make sure it stays," she added.

Iranian leaders also have insisted that the pact cannot be renegotiated. On Friday the head of Iran's nuclear agency, Ali Akbar Salehi, warned that Iran would be forced to abandon the accord if other countries followed the U.S. lead to possibly reimpose sanctions.

"But if the U.S. leaves the deal on its own with the others adhering to it, the situation will be different," Salehi told Iran's Fars News Agency.

Part of the European effort to save the deal includes reassuring European companies and banks that they have political support for their investments, even as some businesses have struggled to navigate Iran's volatile economy.

But for others, the risk may be too great.

Before the nuclear deal, the United States imposed what are known as secondary sanctions, under which the Treasury Department penalizes companies or people who do business with Iran. The fear is that the United States may revive those strict regulations — putting foreign companies doing business in Iran under the cloud of possible U.S. clampdowns.

"Iran is a big market. It's also quite a stable country," said the executive from the multinational company. But multinational companies "have to consider markets around the world, and Iran today is still relatively small compared to Europe or the U.S."

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/europe-helped-hammer-out-the-iran-nuclear-deal-now-eu-leaders-seek-to-save-it-from-trump-pressure/2017/10/06/9fe10f76-aa0b-11e7-92d1-58c702d2d975\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.064629b80220](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/europe/europe-helped-hammer-out-the-iran-nuclear-deal-now-eu-leaders-seek-to-save-it-from-trump-pressure/2017/10/06/9fe10f76-aa0b-11e7-92d1-58c702d2d975_story.html?utm_term=.064629b80220)

[Return to top](#)

The National Interest (Washington, DC)

## **Everything You Need to Know: Russia's 'Tactical' Nuclear Weapons**

By Dave Majumdar

October 5, 2017

*First is the name: While non-strategic nuclear weapons are sometimes referred to as “tactical” nuclear weapons, the term is a misnomer. In reality there are tactical and strategic effects that a can weapon deliver.*

In recent months there has much hysteria in Washington about Russia allegedly lowering its nuclear threshold and particularly about Moscow’s arsenal of non-strategic nuclear weapons. However, there is little evidence that Moscow has lowered its nuclear threshold—nor are there concrete figures available for how many non-strategic nuclear weapons the Kremlin has in its inventory.

### Non-Strategic Nuclear Weapons:

While non-strategic nuclear weapons are sometimes referred to as “tactical” nuclear weapons, the term is a misnomer. In reality there are tactical and strategic effects that a can weapon deliver. The fact is that any nuclear weapons usage inherently has strategic implications even if it was used on the battlefield as a tactical weapon. Thus, the term non-strategic nuclear weapon (NSNW) is a much better term.

“A nuke is a nuke,” retired Lt. Gen. David Deptula, a former Air Force intelligence chief and current dean of the Mitchell Institute told The National Interest. “No such thing as a ‘tactical’ nuke. The terms ‘tactical’ and ‘strategic’ refer to outcomes or effects, not material things like aircraft or weapons.”

Arms control and non-proliferation experts also agree on that point.

“I do not like the term tactical because it implies short-range. Better to talk about non-strategic—i.e., those that are not covered by START [Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty] or INF [Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces],” former Soviet and Russian arms control negotiator Nikolai Sokov, now a senior fellow at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Middlebury Institute of International Studies at Monterey told The National Interest.

Arms control and non-proliferation experts are divided on exactly how many NSNWs Russia currently has in its inventory. The Russian government has not released any official figures, Hans Kristensen, director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, told The National Interest.

“There are no official numbers anywhere, so this is one of the problems.” Kristensen said. “Of course the intelligence agencies have their own estimates and they never really use them, what they do instead is sort of do is refer to public sources.”

In the public discussion, there are many estimates on the size of the Kremlin’s post-Soviet NSNW arsenal. Some estimates suggest that the Kremlin has as few as 1200 NSNWs in its inventory while others estimate that Moscow could have as many as 5000 such weapons. Even at the highest estimates, today’s Russian Federation only maintains a fraction of the massive Soviet arsenal, which Kristensen said ranged on the order of 20,000 to 21,000 NSNWs before its 1991 collapse.

Kristensen’s own estimates for the size of the Russian NSNW arsenal ranges from 1800 to 2000 weapons, which aligns with most of the best experts in the field such as Sokov and Igor Sutyagin, a senior fellow at the Royal United Services Institute (RUSI).

“Estimates for Russian NSNW vary a lot,” Sokov said. “My best estimate—which is a few years old—is around 2,000, divided almost evenly between the Air Force and the Navy; to the best of my knowledge, none in the Ground Forces.”

The estimates vary so much because experts have to extrapolate data from statements made by U.S. and Russian officials since the end of the Cold War, Kristensen said. Moreover, there are some disagreements among analysts on how to calculate the number of warheads because exactly how the weapons are counted makes a difference. Some weapons are operational and deployed onboard ships and submarines, while others might be in storage. “The actual forces that are operational is lower because a fair number of them are out for repair just like ours,” Kristensen said. “So the number that is actually assigned operationally to the force is even lower than the inventory.”

There are disputes as to whether any of the Russian warheads are actually deployed onboard Russian warships on a day-to-day basis. Sokov believes that the Russian military keeps its NSNWs in storage during peacetime operations. “Please keep in mind that warheads for all naval NSNW used to be stored on shore—as per PNIs (Presidential Nuclear Initiatives)—and I have not seen indications that this has changed,” Sokov said. “Same with air—stored at bases. In both cases, this includes short-range assets and strategic cruise missiles—i.e., above 600 km using START definitions. I am sure that Iskander is nuclear capable, but have not seen data on whether warheads are immediately available for deployment. There are also some for air defense still and for missile defense around Moscow.”

Sokov said that the Russians have actually cut their NSNW inventory below any of the agreements it made with the United States. “Now, Russia has implemented PNIs and went even below (under PNIs, it should have gone down to about 7,000, according to Alexey Arbatov), now it’s probably about 2,000,” Sokov said. “Still, since the fall of 2004, Russia does not recognize PNIs, it’s more of a political decision rather than posture-driven.”

Another factor to keep in mind is that some longer-range Russian nuclear weapons such as cruise missiles have dual strategic and tactical roles. Indeed, all new Russian delivery systems can be built in conventional and nuclear variants, including Kalibrs, Kh-101/102, Iskanders and other weapons, Sokov said. “Longer-range NSNWs certainly have a big role, especially for limited use missions,” Sokov said. “Very central, and Moscow will want to keep these weapons, although big numbers are not needed. For short-range, I frankly do not see a mission. To the best of my knowledge, Russia continues to slowly reduce the NSNW arsenal probably working to ‘clean’ the inventory by removing the heritage elements it no longer needs.”

Why does Russia maintain such a large NSNW inventory?:

In Kristensen’s view, Russia’s inventory of NSNW’s helps to offset its comparatively weaker conventional military forces relative to the NATO alliance as well as offsets Moscow comparatively smaller strategic nuclear arsenal relative to the United States.

“Russia uses tactical nuclear weapons to make up the difference—so to speak—in the stockpile with the U.S.,” Kristensen said. “Its strategic inventory is less—significantly less—than the U.S. And since they have more of a regional mission, they actually rely more on the tactical nukes for those shorter range regional missions.”

Russia’s conventional forces—though they are being modernized—are still weak compared to the United States and NATO. During any prolonged conflict, the Russian military would likely be defeated. “Russia’s conventional forces are incapable of defending Russian territory in a long war,” Kristensen said. “It would lose and as a result of that, they have placed more emphasis on more usage of tactical nuclear weapons as a leveler.”

In effect, the Russians are doing what NATO did during the Cold War. NATO conventional forces were outmatched by Soviet conventional forces during the Cold War, thus they had to rely on nuclear weapons. The current situation is an inversion of the Cold War military balance. “The Russians are doing the same thing,” Kristensen said.

How would Russia use its tactical nuclear weapons?:

There is much debate about exactly how and when Russia might use its nuclear weapons—particularly its non-strategic warheads. But the real answer is that Western analysts simply do not know.

“It’s not known,” Kristensen said bluntly. “Russia has some vague statements about its mission with weapons in various regions—so to speak. Their public doctrine does not help us a whole lot because it has two giant categories in which it comes down to the survival of the state.”

Modern Russia renounced the Soviet Union’s pledge to never use nuclear weapons first in 1993 as its conventional forces atrophied rapidly in the chaos of the 1990s. In 2010, it was suggested that Russia would issue policy guidance that would lower its nuclear threshold, but that did not exactly happen.

“When the doctrine was issued, the threshold actually went up, not down,” Olya Oliker, a prominent expert on Russian military forces at the Center for Strategic and International Studies wrote for *The National Interest*. “Russia’s doctrine then, and now, as this language was reaffirmed in 2014, allows for nuclear weapon use ‘in response to the use of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction against it and/or its allies, as well as in the event of aggression against the Russian Federation with the use of conventional weapons when the very existence of the state is in jeopardy.’”

In Oliker’s view, there is little evidence to suggest that the so-called de-escalation or “escalate to deescalate” doctrine exists. “Doctrine may not always define what countries actually do. But it seems relevant that a higher threshold was put in place in 2010, when debates suggested a lower one might come, and remained in place in 2014, when Russia revised its doctrine in response to a worsening relationship with the United States and its NATO allies,” Oliker wrote. “This is not to say that de-escalation is entirely out of the picture for Russia. In fact, it has its proponents. But the fact that Russian analysts and even the occasional official advocate for it publicly indicates to me that it is not, in fact, current policy.”

Indeed, other researchers have found scant evidence that Russia has lowered its nuclear threshold. “Clearly, the Russian threshold for employing nuclear weapons for signaling purposes is lower than the West’s,” Kristin Ven Bruusgaard is a Stanton Nuclear Security Fellow at CISAC, Stanford University and a Ph.D. student at King’s College London wrote for *War on the Rocks*. “This explains the numerous examples of what Western policymakers call irresponsible nuclear saber-rattling. While it seems prudent to make the Russians ‘think twice about nuclear threats Moscow’s saber-rattling does not equate to a lower threshold for using nuclear weapons. Russian doctrine, declaratory strategy, and strategic debate all indicate the opposite: Improved conventional and non-military capabilities will delay the point at which Russia may use nuclear weapons in conflict.”

Will the introduction of long-range precision-guided conventional weapon reduce Russia’s dependence on nuclear weapons?:

The consensus among arms control experts is that Russia will reduce its dependence on nuclear weapons as more long-range conventional precision-guided weapons enter its inventory. NSNWs will still be a feature of Russian military doctrine, but there will be less emphasis on that aspect of the Kremlin’s power.

“It’s not going to do away with it, of course, but like in our military—once we got more advanced conventional weapons—our planners reduced reliance on tactical nuclear weapons,” Kristensen said. “It’s likely we will also see that happening to some extent in the Russian military forces.”

Sokov agreed with Kristensen’s assessment. “Conventional missions for these assets (Iskander, Kh-101/102 etc.) are, in my view, more important than nuclear ones,” Sokov said. “Nuclear missions are a ‘back-up’ for the case of a really big bad conflict, which has extremely low probability—basic deterrence in several variants. Conventional missions are about actual use in support of foreign policy – Syria is the example of the main role of these assets.”

Sokov believes that Russia is fundamentally changing its nuclear posture as its long-range conventional precision strike capabilities improve. “I believe that we are dealing with a fundamental, long-term transition in Russian posture and strategy with the introduction of long-range precision-guided conventional assets,” Sokov said. “Nuclear missions will decline in relation to conventional—that is, in relative, not absolute terms.”

Ultimately, Russia’s reliance on nuclear weapons depends on policy makers not in Moscow, but in Washington. How the United States alters its posture to rely more on nuclear weapons (or not)—now that precision weapons are no longer the sole purview of the Pentagon—will determine to what extent the Russians will rely on their own nuclear forces.

“Whether reliance on nuclear weapons will decrease, too, like it did for the United States in the 1990s depends almost solely on the United States,” Sokov said. “Until recently, the United States held a monopoly on long-range conventional strike capability so it could afford reducing reliance on nuclear weapons. Whether this US/NATO policy will continue now that monopoly is almost lost, remains to be seen. I am particularly concerned that NATO – especially the newer members – might want to enhance reliance on nuclear weapons and then Russia will certainly respond in kind—i.e., conventional missions will supplement nuclear instead of replacing them. That’s the key dynamic to watch in the next 5-7 years.”

Only time will tell.

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/everything-you-need-know-russias-tactical-nuclear-weapons-22607>

[Return to top](#)

TASS (Moscow, Russia)

## **Russia’s formidable S-400 Triumf air defense missile system**

Author Not Attributed

October 9, 2017

*The S-400 Triumf is a Russian long-and medium-range air defense missile system*

Russia’s Federal Service for Military and Technical Cooperation reported on October 9, 2017 that Moscow and Riyadh had reached an agreement on the delivery of S-400 air defense missile systems and other armaments to Saudi Arabia.

The S-400 Triumf (NATO reporting name: SA-21 Growler) is a Russian long-and medium-range air defense missile system. It is designed to destroy air attack and reconnaissance means (including stealth aircraft) and any other aerial targets amid intensive counter-fire and jamming.

Development and entry into service

The work on the conceptual design of the point air defense missile system initially designated as the S-300PM3 was launched by the Almaz research and production association (currently the Almaz research and production association named after Academician Alexander Raspletin, Moscow) in the mid-1980s under the supervision of Chief Designer Alexander Lemansky. This work was intensified in the late 1990s and on February 12, 1999 the system was demonstrated for the first time at the Kapustin Yar practice range (the Astrakhan Region) to then-Defense Minister Igor Sergeev. The trials of the most advanced air defense missile system were carried out in the 2000s.

On April 28, 2007, the S-400 went into service and the first battalion of the newest surface-to-air missile systems assumed combat duty on August 6 that year in the town of Elektrostal (the Moscow Region). Six weeks later, On September 27, 2007, the Triumph's developer, Alexander Lemansky who saw the launch of his missile system into serial production, died at the Kapustin Yar practice range. The system's first live-fire exercises were successfully carried out at the Kapustin Yar practice range in 2011.

The S-400 is based on the S-300PMU2 air defense missile complex. It differs from its predecessors by its extended combat range and the capability of using new surface-to-air missile systems. It is capable of detecting and destroying low-observable (stealth) and fast-moving aerial targets.

S-400 system and its integral parts

The S-400 Triumph comprises the following:

- a combat control post;
- a three-coordinate jam-resistant phased array radar to detect aerial targets;
- six-eight air defense missile complexes (with up to 12 transporter-launchers, and also a multifunctional four-coordinate illumination and detection radar);
- a technical support system;
- missile transporting vehicles;
- a training simulator.

The S-400 system can also additionally include an all-altitude radar (detector) and movable towers for an antenna post. All the S-400's means are mounted on the wheeled all-terrain chassis (produced by the Minsk Wheeled Tractor Factory and the Bryansk Automobile Enterprise) and can be transported by rail, water and air transport.

The S-400 can selectively operate with the use of no less than 5 missile types of various takeoff weights and launch ranges to create a layered air defense zone.

The S-400 is also capable of exercising control of other air defense missile systems (the Tor-M1, the Pantsyr-S1), providing highly effective air defense even amid a mass air attack with the use of electronic warfare means.

Technical characteristics

- target detection range - up to 600 km;
- aerodynamic target kill range - from 3 to 250 km;
- tactical ballistic missile destruction range - from 5 to 60 km;
- target destruction altitude - from 2 to 27 km;
- engageable target velocity - up to 17,300 km/h;
- the number of targets engaged at a time - up to 36 (up to six with one air defense missile complex);
- the number of simultaneously guided missiles - 72;

- the time of the system's deployment from its march position - 5-10 min, the time of making the system combat ready from the deployed position - 3 min;
- the operational service life of ground-based systems - no less than 20 years, air defense missiles - no less than 15 years;

Russian Aerospace Force Deputy Commander-in-Chief Viktor Gummyonny said on April 8, 2017 that missiles capable of "destroying targets in outer space, at long distances and large speeds" had started arriving for S-400 systems.

S-400 systems on combat duty in the Russian Armed Forces

According to public sources, 19 regiments armed with S-400 complexes were on combat duty in the Russian Armed Forces as of April 2017. Overall, these regiments included a total of 38 battalions and 304 launchers in Elektrostal, Dmitrov, Zvenigorod, Kurilovo (Moscow Region), Nakhodka (the Primorye Territory), Kaliningrad, Novorossiysk (the Krasnodar Territory), Polyarny (the Murmansk Region), Petropavlovsk-Kamchatsky (the Kamchatka Territory), Novosibirsk, Vladivostok, Sevastopol and other places.

The state armament program envisages the arrival of 56 S-400 battalions for troops by 2020, which will make it possible to rearm 28 two-battalion air defense missile regiments.

A battalion of Triumf surface-to-air missile systems was deployed on November 25, 2015 from the Moscow Region to Syria's Hmeymim air base accommodating the Russian air task force. Later on, according to media reports, another S-400 battalion was deployed in the Syrian province of Hama.

<http://tass.com/defense/969685>

[Return to top](#)

BBC News (London, UK)

## **UK 'firmly committed' to upholding Iran nuclear deal**

Author Not Attributed

October 9, 2017

*Theresa May has reaffirmed the UK's strong commitment to the deal with Iran designed reduce its nuclear programme.*

During a phone call with her Israeli counterpart, the prime minister said the deal "neutralised the possibility of the Iranians acquiring nuclear weapons for more than a decade".

However, the UK's stance could leave it at odds with the United States.

President Trump is expected to announce soon he will not recertify that Iran is in compliance with the deal.

US media say the president will announce next Thursday that he will not be certifying the deal, on the grounds it does not serve US security interests.

Should that happen, the US Congress would then have to decide whether or not to reapply sanctions or demand further action by Iran.

Downing Street said that in a phone call on Monday, Mrs May had agreed with Benjamin Netanyahu that the international community should push back against what she called "Iran's destabilising regional activity".



But she did not repeat the White House's demand that this behaviour should be considered as a whole alongside the nuclear deal, which came into force in October 2015.

"They discussed Iran, with the prime minister noting the importance of the nuclear deal with Iran which has neutralised the possibility of the Iranians acquiring nuclear weapons for more than a decade," a Downing Street official said.

"The prime minister said the UK remains firmly committed to the deal and that we believe it is vitally important for regional security.

"The prime minister said it was important that the deal is carefully monitored and properly enforced, and that both sides deliver on their commitments.

"They agreed that the international community needed to be clear-eyed about the threat that Iran poses to the Gulf and the wider Middle East, and that the international community should continue working together to push back."

President Trump has lambasted the Iran deal as the worst of its kind ever struck by a US administration.

In his first speech to the UN last month, he said the deal was an "embarrassment" and labelled Iran as a "economic depleted rogue state".

BBC diplomatic correspondent James Landale said the dispute could leave Britain at odds with one of its closest allies on a hugely important issue of foreign policy.

During their conversation, Mrs May and Mr Netanyahu also discussed trade issues and security co-operation in the fight against terrorism.

<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-41550630>

[Return to top](#)

## EUROPE/RUSSIA

Defense One (Arlington, VA)

### **With Iran Deal in Jeopardy, US Clears Missile Interceptor Sale to Saudi Arabia**

By Marcus Weisgerber

October 6, 2017

*The timing of THAAD sale is reminiscent of Patriot interceptor sale approved two weeks after Iran deal signed in 2015.*

The U.S. State Department on Friday cleared Saudi Arabia to buy 360 THAAD interceptors that would be used to defend against missiles fired at the kingdom by Iran.

If the \$15 billion sale goes through, it would be the largest export of the sophisticated missile defense system, which is built by Lockheed Martin. The approval comes amid reports that the Trump administration is preparing to decertify the Iran nuclear deal brokered by the Obama administration and other nations in 2015.

"This sale furthers U.S. national security and foreign policy interests, and supports the long-term security of Saudi Arabia and the Gulf region in the face of Iranian and other regional threats," the Defense Security Cooperation Agency, the arm of the Pentagon that oversees foreign arms sales,

said in a statement Friday. “This potential sale will substantially increase Saudi Arabia’s capability to defend itself against the growing ballistic missile threat in the region.”

The timing of the THAAD deal approval is reminiscent of the Obama administration’s approval of 600 Patriot missile interceptors for Saudi Arabia just two weeks after the signing of the Iran deal.

THAAD interceptors — which can shoot down missiles at greater distances than Patriot — are built to collide with missiles outside of the Earth’s atmosphere during their final phase of flight. The United Arab Emirates is the only other nation to buy its own THAAD interceptors, although other nations, including Qatar, have expressed interest.

President Trump announced the Saudi THAAD sale during a visit to the kingdom in May, however Congress was formally notified of the sale on Friday. In all, the State Department approved the sale of 44 THAAD launchers, 360 interceptors, 16 command-and-control stations, seven radars and 43 trucks to move them around.

THAAD interceptors — formally called the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system — has recently gained notoriety after the U.S. deployed it to South Korea amid threats from North Korea. The U.S. has also deployed THAAD interceptors to Guam.

<http://www.defenseone.com/business/2017/10/iran-deal-jeopardy-us-clears-missile-interceptor-sale-saudi-arabia/141632/?oref=d-skybox>

[Return to top](#)

Reuters (New York, NY)

### **Iran open to talks over its ballistic missile programme: sources**

By Parisa Hafezi, Jonathan Saul and John Walcott

October 6, 2017

Iran has suggested to six world powers that it may be open to talks about its ballistic missile arsenal, seeking to reduce tension over the disputed programme, Iranian and Western officials familiar with the overtures told Reuters.

Tehran has repeatedly vowed to continue building up what it calls defensive missile capability in defiance of Western criticism, with Washington saying the Islamic Republic’s stance violates its 2015 nuclear deal with the powers.

But the sources said that given U.S. President Donald Trump’s threats to ditch the deal reached under his predecessor Barack Obama, Tehran had approached the powers recently about possible talks on some “dimensions” of its missile programme.

“During their meeting on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly last month, Iran told members of the (world powers) that it could discuss the missile programme to remove concerns,”

an Iranian source with knowledge of the meeting told Reuters on condition of anonymity.

U.S. and Western officials did not confirm the matter was discussed at the Zarif-Tillerson meeting. But two U.S. officials said Iran had recently been “keeping it alive” by feeding certain media reports and via third parties such as Oman.

A former U.S. Defense Department official said Iran’s overtures had reached Washington in recent weeks.

“Iran has put feelers out saying it is willing to discuss its ballistic missile programme and is using contacts ... officials who were ‘holdovers’ from the Obama administration,” the former official said.

Iran’s reported approach came after Trump called the nuclear accord “an embarrassment” and “the worst deal ever negotiated”. He is expected to announce soon that he will decertify the deal, a senior administration official said on Thursday.

Such a step could unravel the breakthrough agreement - seen by supporters as crucial to forestalling a Middle East arms race and tamping down regional tensions, since it limits Iran’s ability to enrich uranium in exchange for sanctions relief.

#### “RECYCLING OFFERS”

The other five powers are Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China, all of whom have reaffirmed commitment to the deal.

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif met his counterparts from the six powers, including U.S. Secretary of State Rex Tillerson for the first time, on the fringes of the U.N. gathering on Sept. 20.

“The Americans expressed their worries about Iran’s missile capability and Zarif said in reply that the programme could be discussed,” the Iranian source told Reuters.

A U.S. official with first-hand knowledge of dealings with the Islamic Republic said Zarif had been recycling offers that “have been lying dormant on the table for some time.

“Zarif knows that if Trump goes ahead and decertifies Iran, it (Iran) will be on the high ground, and the U.S. will be isolated among the (six powers),” the official said.

Iran’s Foreign Ministry spokesman Bahram Qasemi said on Friday Tehran’s ballistic missile programme was for defence purposes only and non-negotiable.

“Iran has in all bilateral diplomatic meetings, including the recent visit of ... Zarif to New York, emphasised that its defensive missile programme is not negotiable,” Qasemi was quoted as saying by Iranian media.

The U.S. mission at the United Nations referred Reuters to the U.S. State Department for comment. The State Department declined to comment on whether possible talks on missiles were addressed at the meeting or whether Iran had recently communicated such interest.

But it said Washington remained committed to “countering the full range of threats the Iranian regime poses to the U.S., our allies, and regional stability, including its ballistic missile development”.

The Trump administration has imposed fresh unilateral sanctions on Iran, saying its missile tests violate the U.N. resolution that formalised the nuclear deal. It calls on Tehran not to undertake activities related to missiles capable of delivering nuclear bombs.

Iran says it has no such plans and denies breaching the resolution.

Iran has one of the biggest ballistic missile programmes in the Middle East, viewing it as an essential precautionary defence against the United States and other adversaries, primarily Gulf Arab states and Israel.

#### KHAMENEI CONSULTED ON MISSILE OVERTURE

A senior Iranian official, who also asked not to be named, said pragmatist President Hassan Rouhani, Zarif and Revolutionary Guards commanders have had several meetings with Supreme

Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who has the last say on all Iranian policy, to secure his backing for missile talks.

“The leader was not optimistic during the meetings because he does not trust Americans. Others argued that the heightening tension over the missile programme could be resolved through talks,” said the official, involved in backroom negotiations.

Any talks would not aim to end or suspend Iran’s missile programme but to “negotiate some dimensions of it, like limiting production of some missiles with specific ranges”, he said.

“Diplomacy worked well in ending the nuclear stand-off ... The dispute over the missile programme also can be resolved through talks,” the official said.

A third Iranian official said Tehran would be willing to discuss long-range missiles. He did not elaborate.

A U.S. official with extensive experience negotiating with Iran said “putting this out there publicly as Zarif has done puts pressure on the (Trump) administration”.

A Western official said the administration had assessed Zarif’s approach to be “a stalling tactic by Tehran”.

Another Western official said Iran must present concrete details for missile talks: “What will need to be seen are the specifics on load capability, the distance range of missiles and how many kilograms can a missile warhead carry.”

When asked if Iran appeared willing to negotiate on its missile programme, a French diplomat said: “We talk about everything with them, including the ballistic programme.

“Our objective is that this leads to concrete acts. On the ballistic issue they repeat that it’s all defensive and has nothing to do with nuclear.”

<https://www.reuters.com/article/us-iran-missiles-diplomacy/iran-open-to-talks-over-its-ballistic-missile-programme-sources-idUSKBN1CB22P>

[Return to top](#)

Mehr News (Tehran, Iran)

### **JCPOA violators to face Iran’s firm reaction: Iran UN envoy**

Author Not Attributed

October 10, 2017

*Khoshroo, Iran’s permanent Envoy to UN in New York, declared that Iran is ready to a blow a firm response to any signatory party of the nuclear deal who renege the accord.*

Gholamali Khoshroo, the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran addressed the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly with the agenda on disarmament and international security early on Tuesday.

The Iranian diplomat reaffirmed that the nuclear deal between Iran and 5+1 countries ended a fabricated crisis and as truly confirmed by the representatives of many states the agreement has been a landmark achievement of diplomacy in international relations.

Saying that Iran has been fully committed to the agreement, the Iranian envoy urged the other parties involved in the agreement to be committed to their promised obligations outlined in the deal.

He boasted that Iran's observance of the letters of the agreement has been confirmed repeatedly in the last released reports of the IAEA.

Here comes the full text of his address:

In the Name of God, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful

Mr. Chairman,

I would like to begin by wholeheartedly congratulating you, Ambassador Bahr al-Ulum, distinguished Permanent Representative of Iraq, on your well-deserved election to chair this important Committee. I am confident that your able leadership will lead the Committee towards a successful conclusion. I also congratulate other bureau members for their election and assure you of the full support and cooperation of my delegation.

I should also thank the outgoing Chair, distinguished Ambassador Sabri of Algeria, for his successful leadership in steering the work of the Committee.

My delegation associates itself with the NAM statement delivered by Indonesia.

Mr. Chairman,

Since the previous meeting of the Committee, we have witnessed promising and unpromising disarmament developments.

The first promising development was the adoption by the Disarmament Commission of "Recommendations on practical confidence-building measures in the field of conventional weapons". It was achieved as a result of a flexible position by NAM. This needs to be complemented with the adoption of "Recommendations for achieving the objective of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation of nuclear weapons", which indeed requires a strong political will and flexibility by the nuclear-weapon States.

The next and more important development was the adoption of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. It was indeed a strong collective reaction to the violation of obligations of the nuclear-weapon States on nuclear disarmament. As an active participant in its negotiations, Iran voted in favor of the Treaty and will continue to support its overall objective. This Treaty is a step forward in nuclear disarmament, which needs to be complemented by the conclusion of a comprehensive convention on nuclear weapons as called for by the Assembly for years.

We should also recall the successful conclusion of the 8th Review Conference of the Biological Weapons Convention as a promising development.

Mr. Chairman,

Nevertheless, regrettably, last year we have also witnessed the alarming trends of new nuclear arms race and new nuclear arms modernization race. These are real setbacks in establishing a nuclear-weapon-free world. Such trends would negatively affect the international peace and security as well as the existing legal regime on nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Therefore, they have to be stopped.

In this context, I should also refer to the continued stalemate in the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the Middle East, as a result of the stubborn policies of the Israeli regime. The only way to start this process is the prompt and unconditional accession of the Israeli regime to the NPT, as a non-nuclear weapon party, and placing of all its nuclear installations and activities under

the IAEA full-scope safeguards. As the nuclear weapons of Israel continue to threaten the peace and security of the region and beyond, the establishment of such a zone -- proposed by Iran in 1974 and supported by the consensual UNGA annual resolutions over the past 40 years -- is very urgent.

While according to the UN reports “conventional arms are the predominant means of killing and destruction”, regrettably overproduction of these weapons by major arms producing countries and their export to regions of conflict continued unabated. The living example of these alarming developments is the excessive import, by certain oil-rich countries in the Persian Gulf, of conventional weapons, most of which are used for death and destruction in Yemen.

Mr. Chairman,

This year, we have also witnessed the continued implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), concluded by P5+1 and Iran and put an end to a manufactured crisis. As rightly mentioned by many distinguished delegates in this Committee, its conclusion proved the important role that diplomacy can play in international relations. Hereby, I would like to sincerely thank all distinguished delegates who acknowledged the JCPOA’s significance and called for its continued and full implementation by all its participants. In its part, Iran fully implemented all its nuclear related commitments under the JCPOA, as verified and confirmed by the IAEA, reflected in its 8 consecutive reports. Iran will continue implementing its commitments under the JCPOA inasmuch as it gains all the intended benefits, which intrinsically and necessarily, requires its full and continuous implementation by all other JCPOA participants too. To make it clear, any continued significant non-implementation of the JCPOA commitments by one of its participants will definitely be faced with a proportionate reaction by Iran. Expectations from the JCPOA implementation needs to be proportionate and adjusted with its limited scope. As acknowledged by the international community, conclusion of the JCPOA was a win-win achievement, and to remain so, its full and continued implementation by all its participants is essential. Diplomacy and such a cardinal principle of international law as the *pacta sunt servanda* (agreements must be kept) would be the main losers and victims of a possible withdrawal from the JCPOA or continued significant failure in its implementation by one of its participants. Therefore, such a party have to bear the responsibility, and be aware, of all the ramifications of its act.

To conclude, Mr. Chairman, I wish to stress that we have a special collective responsibility in addressing alarming trends in disarmament and international security realm. In its turn, my delegation stands ready to cooperate with the bureau and committee members in fulfilling this responsibility and creating a safer world for the present and future generations.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

<http://en.mehrnews.com/news/128493/JCPOA-violators-to-face-Iran-s-firm-reaction-Iran-UN-envoy>

[Return to top](#)

The Jerusalem Post (Jerusalem, Israel)

## **REPORT: IRAN TRIED 30+ TIMES TO BUY ILLEGAL NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY IN 2016**

By Benjamin Weinthal

October 10, 2017

*German report says: Iran spreading atomic, biological or chemical weapons of mass destruction.*

Iran tried to secure illegal technology that can be used for its nuclear and missile weapons programs, intelligence reports from German states covering 2016 reviewed by The Jerusalem Post reveal.

In North Rhine-Westphalia, Iran's regime made "32 procurement attempts... that definitely or with high likelihood were undertaken for the benefit of proliferation programs," the state's intelligence agency wrote in a report this month.

The intelligence data will likely furnish further ammunition to those who want US President Donald Trump to decertify the nuclear agreement Tehran signed in 2015 with five world powers. Trump is slated to announce on Thursday whether he will certify the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) – the formal name for the nuclear accord.

The North Rhine-Westphalia report classifies Iran as a country that engages in proliferation, and is involved in "spreading atomic, biological or chemical weapons of mass destruction." Tehran also engages in illicit proliferation activity regarding missile delivery systems, the report says.

The agency also wrote that Iran uses front companies in Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and China to bypass sanctions and restrictions on its atomic and missile programs.

North Rhine-Westphalia is Germany's most populous state with about 18 million residents, and is home to advanced engineering and technology companies.

The state's intelligence agency previously said Iran made 141 attempts to obtain illicit proliferation equipment and technology in 2015.

According to the state's most recent report, the vast majority of Iran's illegal procurement efforts in 2016 concerned technology for its rocket programs.

An intelligence report from the state of Saxony-Anhalt in August said Tehran works "unabated" on its missile program." With ballistic missiles and long-range rockets, Iran will be in the position to be able to threaten not only Europe," the intelligence officials wrote.

The report from Hesse state in September said proliferation states Iran, Pakistan, North Korea and Sudan use "guest academics" for espionage related to nuclear and other weapons programs. "An example for this type of activity occurred in the sector of electronic technology in connection with the implementation of the enrichment of uranium. The intelligence agency further noted, foreign intelligence services employ "research exchanges at universities in the sector of biological and chemical procedures."

In response to a Post media query, the spokesman for Hesse's intelligence agency declined to comment on whether Iran was involved in espionage in the academic arena.

When asked if Chancellor Angela Merkel's administration reported the illicit export attempts by Iran to the United Nations Security Council, German diplomats told the Post: "We have no indication of Iran violating its JCPOA commitments. Quite on the contrary, the recent 2016 Report of the Federal Office for the Protection of the Constitution [the country's domestic security agency] states that there is no evidence of Iran violating the JCPOA. Having said that, we remain worried by Iran's

missile program. The aforementioned report as well as reports from regional intelligence authorities show that Germany is highly vigilant in this regard and will continue to do so. However, this issue is outside the scope of the JCPOA and needs to be dealt with separately.”

It is unclear why Berlin insists that Iran’s attempts to illegally secure nuclear technology are outside of the JCPOA . German-Iranian bilateral trade relationship is expected to exceed €10 billion per year. Germany’s Foreign Minister Sigmar Gabriel has traveled to Iran with large business delegations to strike business deals. Major German enterprises such as Siemens and Mercedes Benz are active in the Islamic Republic.

The Post reported in July that state of Hamburg’s intelligence agency wrote: “There is no evidence of a complete about-face in Iran’s atomic polices in 2016” [after it signed the nuclear accord in 2015]. Iran sought missile carrier technology necessary for its rocket program.” Germany’s domestic intelligence agencies in each state are the rough equivalent of the Shin Bet (Israel Security Agency).

An intelligence report from the southwestern state of Baden-Württemberg in June stated, “Regardless of the number of national and international sanctions and embargoes, countries like Iran, Pakistan and North Korea are making efforts to optimize corresponding technology.”

According to the report, Iran sought “products and scientific knowhow for the field of developing weapons of mass destruction as well missile technology.”

The 181-page document cites Iran’s cyberware, espionage, terrorism and weapons of mass destruction procurement activities 49 times. A Chinese import-export company contacted a company in the German state that sells “complex metal producing machines,” the intelligence agency wrote. The technology would aid Iran’s development of ballistic missiles, it wrote.

Germany’s Federal Office for Economic Affairs and Export Control issued an end-use receipt for the Chinese purchase. Intelligence officials notified the manufacturer that the merchandise was slated to be illegally diverted to Iran. “This case shows that so-called indirect-deliveries across third countries is still Iran’s procurement strategy,” wrote the intelligence officials.

Another state intelligence report from June said that in the 2016, “German companies located in Rhineland-Palatinate were contacted for illegal procurement attempts by [Pakistan, North Korea and Iran]. The procurement attempts involved goods that were subject to authorization and approval on account of legal export restrictions and UN embargoes.

These goods, for example, could be used for a state’s nuclear and missile programs.”

<http://www.jpost.com/Middle-East/Iran-News/Tehran-tried-32-times-in-2016-to-buy-nuclear-and-missile-technology-507146>

[Return to top](#)



## INDIA/PAKISTAN

The Nation (Lahore, Pakistan)

### India's nuclear arsenal

Author Not Attributed

October 6, 2017

India's nuclear-powered submarine was reported damaged in an accident on October 3. This latest incident adds to the already lengthy list of nuclear mishaps the country has faced in the last four or so decades. It begs the exploration of the current status of the Indian nuclear arsenal and the dangers it poses.

Taking advantage of the chaos created by North Korea, India is quietly expanding its nuclear and missile capabilities. In an updated report on the worldwide deployment of nuclear weapons, published by the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, the authors, Hans Kristensen and Robert Norris note, "India's missile force is evolving rapidly," as it develops "larger missiles with longer ranges and shorter response times."

India's first submarine base is currently under construction and this fact led the authors to raise the question of whether or not India will begin to deploy nuclear weapons on to their nuclear-powered submarines under normal circumstances? An important query because deploying nuclear weapons on to submarines raises serious alarm to other important issues to consider.

The first thing to consider is what it will mean for strategic balance in the region. There is a great deal of volatility in the Indian strategic culture. Clearly, there is an unstable right wing mentality, consider the recent beef related lynching of innocent teenagers or claims that Hindus invented nuclear technology thousands of years ago. Let's not forget the recent armed provocation at the Chinese border. Now imagine, if India begins deployment of nuclear weapons on to their submarines, it will give them confidence of a secure second strike capability; according to their past behaviour they are very likely to provoke a conflict with one of their neighbours, which could escalate to full-scale war, a nightmare scenario on its own.

Second, this development could lead to a regional arms race at sea; further risking the use of these weapons. In 1974, prestige, not genuine security concerns led India to develop nuclear weapons, essentially nuclearizing South Asia; remember that their first nuclear explosion was a result of their violation of terms of a multilateral peaceful uses agreement that they had with Canada and the United States.

The deployment of nuclear weapons on to submarines will most definitely lead to nuclearizing the Indian Ocean, which is total madness, and the international community has a responsibility to demand India stop this pursuit or face consequences, similar to the demands being made of North Korea to curb its nuclear aggression.

The third thing to consider, deploying a nuclear weapon on to a submarine will lower the nuclear threshold; the authority to use a nuclear weapon will rest in the hands of the submarine commander. A very scary thought bearing in mind the extremist tendencies of the Indian polity, society, and its armed forces. What if the command of one of these submarines is given to a Hindu extremist and this person decides to wage a holy Hindu war against non-Hindus?

Additionally, there are many technical safety and security questions that must be addressed. It is unclear what actually happened to the Indian nuclear-powered submarine, which was reported to have been in an accident on October 3. The government has remained quiet about the

circumstances and extent of damage, which is unacceptable, considering the possibility of the environmental impact an accident like this could have had on the seas.

India paid no heed to expert warnings of building a nuclear reactor on its eastern coast at Kalpakkam, an area prone to seasonal cyclones, the reactor has also faced many technical glitches.

These are extremely dangerous developments; I argue these rapid Indian advancements and policy shifts are more dangerous than what is happening in North Korea at the moment.

According to “India’s Nuclear Exceptionalism,” a report published by Harvard University, India is capable of producing nearly 2,200 nuclear weapons. Last year, Adrian Levy, a Guardian journalist reported that India was constructing an entire city devoted to building nuclear bombs. Kristensen and Norris in their study bring our attention to India’s “rapidly evolving” missile program and their ambitious plans of arming submarines with nuclear weapons. These developments are completely absurd, and pose great danger to the region, possibly the world.

The international community should no longer allow India to quietly get away with stockpiling nuclear weapons, and should put an end to their attempts at nuclearizing the Indian Ocean. Allowing India to get away with this kind of behaviour will encourage others, like North Korea. The international community has a responsibility to put equal pressure on both North Korea and India to put an end to their nuclear aggression, and suspend their missile programs.

Taking advantage of the chaos created by North Korea, India is quietly expanding its nuclear and missile capabilities.

<http://nation.com.pk/columns/06-Oct-2017/india-s-nuclear-arsenal>

[Return to top](#)

News18.com (New Delhi, India)

## **How India Can Go After Pakistan's Nuclear Stockpile**

By Uday Singh Rana

October 7, 2017

*While Pakistan is now modifying its F16s to carry nuclear weapons and, if reports are to be believed, it has a marginally larger stockpile than India; it is at a disadvantage when it comes to nuclear weapon delivery.*

Chief Birender Singh Dhanoa on Thursday said “if the need arises”, the IAF had the capability to disarm Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal by conducting what he called a “full-spectrum” operation. But when would such a “need” arise? What situation would cause India to strike back and how does India’s ‘no-first-use’ doctrine affect such an operation? News18 tries to answer some of these questions.

Addressing a press conference on the eve of Air Force Day, Dhanoa said, “Air Force has the capability to locate, fix and strike across the border.... We are ready to take on any challenge.” Dhanoa’s statement came in response to questions on Pakistan’s claim of possessing short-range nuclear weapons to counter the “cold start doctrine adopted by the Indian Army”.

According to reports, Pakistan has stored its nuclear stockpiles in at least six different locations. These are reportedly in Akro (Sindh), Gujranwala (Punjab), Khuzdar (Balochistan), Pano Aqil (Sindh), and Sargodha (Punjab). Except for the base in Khuzdar, all bases are in provinces that share a border with India.

A report by US-based experts Hans M Kristensen and Robert S Norris released last year estimated that Pakistan had anywhere between 130-140 nuclear weapons, as opposed to India's estimated stockpile of 110-120 weapons. The report also suggested that Pakistan had modified its F16 fighter jets, of which it reportedly has 76, to carry nuclear weapons.

Unlike Pakistan, India has a 'no-first-use' policy on nuclear warfare. This means that India has vowed never to be the aggressor in a nuclear war but will retaliate with full force if weapons of mass destruction were used against it. So does that mean India does not necessarily need nuclear weapons to destroy Pakistan's stockpile?

Air Vice Marshall (Retd) Manmohan Bahadur said, "Obviously, you can't go full-Rambo and pull out their nuclear weapons through a non-nuclear operation. I think what the Chief meant when he made those comments was that India was tracking Pakistan's stockpile and would continue to do so in both peace times and war times. No country in the world, not even the US, has the capability to perform what is called a 'Splendid Nuclear Strike' – a strike that would entirely obliterate a country. But we can easily destroy the Pakistani arsenal if we are able to track it effectively."

So how does the no-first-use policy affect India's response? According to Bahadur, "Pakistan has coined a term called Tactical Nuclear Weapons (TNWs), which it claims it can use for strategic advantage in war. This term is absolute sense. There is no such thing as a 'tactical or regular nuclear weapon. A nuke is a nuke. The correct term for these TNWs would be battlefield ballistic missiles. The only difference is in yield. The bomb dropped on Hiroshima was 20 Kiloton while this one will be much lighter. Naturally, the blast radius would also be limited to the battlefield"

A "TNW" or Battlefield Ballistic Missile is meant to be used not on civilian targets but on military targets. Pakistan, Bahadur said, plans to use these low-yield missiles on Indian troops if India were to cross a so-called "Red Line". He added, "When they say Red Line, they probably mean a scenario in which Indian troops manage to enter Pakistani territory or are close to breaking up Pakistan like we did in 1971. Of course, India has made it clear that a so-called TNW is a nuclear weapon and it would make Pakistan a nuclear aggressor. If such a situation ever arises, India would then be free to retaliate with full force and obliterate the Pakistani stockpiles."

While Pakistan is now modifying its F16s to carry nuclear weapons and, if reports are to be believed, it has a marginally larger stockpile than India; it is at a disadvantage when it comes to nuclear weapon delivery.

Pakistan relies heavily on surface-to-surface missiles and even though it may have nuclear capable F16s, the size of the Pakistan Air Force (PAF) fleet is less than half that of the IAF. PAF reportedly has around 800 active fighter aircraft in total while the IAF has over 1,700. Pakistan Navy does not have any known nuclear capable submarines.

"They (Pakistan) are also trying to modify some of their ships to carry nuclear weapons. However, ships will be very ineffective when it comes to stealth missions. We will easily be able to detect their ships through our satellites," Bahadur said.

India, on the other hand, can deliver nuclear weapons through air, surface and submarines. The IAF would become very critical in such a scenario. IAF has three different aircraft - Sukhois, Mirages and Jaguars – that have the capability to carry nukes. These aircraft make up around 425 fighter jets in the IAF, although it is unclear how many can carry a nuclear payload.

Bahadur said, "Because of our no-first-use policy, we are not on 24X7 trigger alert. However, in the event of a nuclear confrontation, India would have ample warning signs. A nuclear buildup will take time before the threat is immediate. But once we have activated our nukes, it would be a matter of minutes before our missiles reach any point in Pakistan."

<http://www.news18.com/news/india/how-india-can-go-after-pakistans-nuclear-stockpile-1539223.html>

[Return to top](#)

The Economic Times (Mumbai, India)

## **Pakistan warns India against surgical strikes on its soil**

Author Not Attributed

October 5, 2017

Pakistan's Foreign Minister Khawaja Asif today warned India against carrying out surgical strike or targeting its nuclear installations, saying if that happens nobody should expect restraint from his country.

Referring to the statement of India's Air Chief Marshal B S Dhanoa that the Indian armed forces are ready for a full spectrum operation, Asif said Pakistan wants to live in peace and harmony with its neighbours.

But if India carries out any surgical strike in Pakistan or strikes at its nuclear installations "nobody should expect restraint from us", he warned.

Speaking at the US Institute of Peace, a Washington-based think-tank, Asif said the "relationship with India is at a lowest ebb at the moment".

Responding to a question on India, he said, "sadly India did not respond" to Pakistani efforts to improve relationship.

"What is going on in Kashmir is the biggest roadblock to normalisation to talks," Asif said.

The Pakistani Foreign Minister asked the US not to treat his country as a "whipping boy" and said Washington has already lost the war in Afghanistan and is only trying to salvage the situation in the war-torn nation.

Asif, who is here as part of efforts to rebuild bilateral ties frayed after President Donald Trump accused Pakistan of sheltering terror groups, said his meetings with Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and National Security Advisor H R McMaster were good.

"Was not bad," Asif quipped, giving a sense of his talks with top leadership of the Trump administration, which has been seeking accountability from Islamabad in the war against terrorism including continued presence of terror safe havens in Pakistan.

Asif in a way acknowledged that the madrasas were training ground for terrorists.

"These madrasas were nurseries for American jihad in Afghanistan. People who took those decisions will burn to hell. We are actually living in hell because of that decision," he said, adding that Pakistan is paying the price of such a decision.

"The meeting went well with Tillerson and McMaster (meeting) was good. (It) was not bad," Asif said, noting that the two countries need to pursue contacts with each other.

He favoured adopting an approach of talks and exchange of views more vigorously.

The US, he said, is focusing solely on safe haven allegations or blaming Pakistan for what they have not achieved in Afghanistan.

"There are many more dimension of what is going on in Afghanistan," he said.

"A corrupt government in Kabul, increasing narcotics trade, the Afghan Army selling arms to the Taliban, losing terrorist and bringing Daesh (ISIS) to Afghanistan" he said.

"Let's see this conflict in its entirety, in totality. Do not treat Pakistan like a whipping boy. That's not acceptable. We want to cooperate with the US. We are the direct beneficiary of peace and stability in Afghanistan," he said.

Standing by his remarks on some of the terrorist groups and terrorist leaders at the Asia Society in New York last week, Asif said they are a liability.

"We will find ways and means to wrapping up this business. This is a liability. (but) this cannot be wrapped up overnight," he said.

Responding to a question, Asif said there are problems in US-Pakistan ties.

"We do have problems with the US. We have deficit of trust. We are trying to mend those deficits," he said.

Pakistan, he said, sees more role for Russia and China in the region.

Relationship with Russia has improved in recent years.

"We need and have proposed any peace solution in Afghanistan should be backed by regional powers which includes the Russian federation," he said in response to a question.

"Madrassas, whether we accept or agree with them or not, are the biggest NGO in Pakistan...There are over 20,000 madrasas. Out of these huge number, a very low number of them are infected. Possibly they number around 300-400. The government is managing these madrasas," he said.

<http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/defence/pakistan-warns-india-against-surgical-strikes-on-its-soil/articleshow/60960577.cms>

[Return to top](#)

Z News (Noida, India)

## **Pakistan building tunnels to store its nuclear weapons, just 750 km from Delhi**

Author Not Attributed

October 11, 2017

*The site is reportedly coming up in Mianwali, which is 350-km from Amritsar and 750-km from Delhi.*

Pakistan is reported to have built up a stock of 140 nuclear weapons and is now building underground tunnels to store them, according to a report by WION.

The site is reportedly in Mianwali, which is located 350-km from Amritsar and 750-km from New Delhi, the report added.

The report adds that the facility comprises three interconnected tunnels, each 10 metres in height and 10 metres in width.

The tunnels are linked by wide roads, broad at the corners to facilitate the movement of transporter erector launchers from where missiles are filed.

All the tunnels have separate entry and exit gates.

Available intelligence suggests that each tunnel can store anything between 12 and 24 nuclear weapons.

The entire area is heavily fenced, with barricades built to prevent any harm to the facility.

<http://zeenews.india.com/india/pakistan-building-underground-tunnels-close-to-delhi-to-store-nuclear-weapons-2049234.html>

[Return to top](#)

## COMMENTARY

Washington Examiner (Washington, DC)

### **Give war a chance: How to deal with North Korea**

By Kevin James

October 6, 2017

To engage in nuclear deterrence is to play Russian roulette, and to think that we can eliminate the risk of a North Korean nuclear attack on the United States by deterring the Kim regime is a delusion.

The logic of deterrence requires that your nuclear-armed opponent put into place the capability to retaliate if you launch a first strike at them. Unfortunately, this capability necessarily creates the possibility that your opponent launches a first strike at you by mistake.

The U.S.-Soviet experience with deterrence shows beyond any possible doubt that military misunderstandings, human error, and technical malfunctions will generate false alarms of an enemy attack and that these false alarms can easily lead to accidental nuclear war. Indeed, using engineering methods designed to examine system failure probabilities, Barrett, Baum, and Hostetler estimate that the U.S. and the USSR had up to a 7 percent chance per year, or up to a 50 percent chance per decade, of accidentally nuking each other.

So, when members of the foreign policy establishment such as Susan Rice push the deterrence option by writing "we can ... tolerate nuclear weapons in North Korea — the same way we tolerated ... Soviet nuclear weapons during the Cold War," you should be terrified rather than reassured.

But you are still not terrified enough. The U.S.-Soviet experience with deterrence roulette shows that the chance of a deterrence failure increases as: 1) episodes of political tension become more frequent and/or more severe; and 2) your opponent's ability to tell that a false alarm actually is false declines. Both factors imply that deterrence roulette with North Korea is far more likely to end in disaster than was deterrence roulette with the Soviets.

North Korea has a long history of engaging in highly provocative behavior, and nuclear weapons won't change that. We can be certain that U.S./North Korean relations will be extremely tense most of the time.

Dealing correctly with false alarms requires that the officers in North Korea's nuclear command and control chain exercise (in the words of a recent Chatham House report) independent and "prudent judgement, which might involve disobeying previous orders" to figure out what is really going on. How likely is this?

Studies of human error in the context of airplane crashes show that people from cultures with a more collectivist orientation and that are more uncertainty averse tend to deal with complex and stressful situations by following rules and avoiding independent judgements (and so are more likely to crash planes). South Korean culture is among the most highly collectivist and uncertainty-

averse in the world, and it is safe to assume that North Korean military culture will be even more extreme along these dimensions.

Of course, culture is not destiny. Kim Jong Un could take active steps to counter these cultural tendencies. But, any steps that Kim does take must be consistent with his highest priority of preserving his regime.

The biggest threat to Kim's regime is a military coup. And if one fears a military coup, the very last thing that one will instill in one's officer corps is an ethos that emphasizes independent judgement. Kim does not want military officers who think for themselves, he wants military officers who unquestioningly follow orders. In short, the North Korean officer corps is spectacularly ill-suited to exercise the prudent judgement that avoiding accidental nuclear war requires.

There is now no non-military option that will prevent North Korea from developing the capability to launch a nuclear attack on the U.S. Once that capability is in place, we are playing deterrence roulette. There is then a very high chance over the next decade or two that North Korea will treat a false alarm as an actual attack and respond by launching a nuclear attack on the US that kills millions of Americans. In this case the US will of course retaliate and eradicate the North Korean regime and destroy its military, but this war will do nothing to repair the catastrophe that North Korea's first strike inflicts.

Or, instead of playing deterrence roulette and hoping for the best, we could eliminate the North Korean nuclear threat by getting our retaliation in first.

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/give-war-a-chance-how-to-deal-with-north-korea/article/2636363>

[Return to top](#)

The Washington Post (Washington, DC)

## **Our best hope against nuclear war**

By David Ignatius

October 3, 2017

Consider what is, for the moment, an entirely hypothetical question: What might Defense Secretary Jim Mattis do if he received an order from President Trump to launch a nuclear attack on North Korea in retaliation, say, for a hydrogen bomb test that had gone awry?

Certainly, Mattis could try to talk the president out of the attack, if he thought the action was unwise. He could request delays to prepare for contingencies or gather intelligence. He could even, perhaps, argue that the action raised legal questions, because it might cause disproportionate civilian casualties in North and South Korea and thereby violate the laws of war.

Yet, in the end, legal experts argue that Mattis would have to follow the orders of his commander in chief. That's the way our system works. If Mattis's efforts at persuasion failed, he could resign. But if he stayed on the job and refused a lawful presidential order, he could be fired.

"The president's view, and whatever orders stem from that view, carry the day," wrote Jack Goldsmith, a Harvard University professor and a widely respected authority on national security law, in a recent post on the Lawfare blog. (Harvard law student Sarah Grant co-wrote the post.)

But take a closer look if you worry that Trump's impulsive decisions could crash the ship of state against the rocks. Research reveals some fascinating instances when another erratic president, Richard Nixon, was checked by his subordinates.

Let's start with a little-known confrontation that involves, yes, North Korea. On April 14, 1969, North Korean fighters shot down a Navy EC-121 reconnaissance plane over international waters, killing all 31 crew members. Nixon wanted to retaliate militarily, as did his national security adviser, Henry Kissinger. But Defense Secretary Melvin Laird was wary, fearing that the United States wasn't ready for the consequences that might follow.

So Laird slow-rolled the process. He delayed action. He presented studies. He halted the additional surveillance flights needed to gather intelligence before a strike. Citing a Pentagon logistics study, he told Nixon that he doubted "we have the capability now to handle a major confrontation in Korea."

And Laird prevailed. The retaliatory strike Nixon wanted never happened. Reading the account by Richard Hunt published by the Historical Office of the Secretary of Defense, it seems that Laird accomplished a classic case of bureaucratic obstruction.

Nixon could make mercurial, intemperate statements, much like Trump. In August 1969, terrorists hijacked a TWA flight and flew the plane to Damascus, Syria. According to Evan Thomas in "Being Nixon," the president received the news as he was having cocktails in San Clemente, Calif.

"Bomb the airport," Nixon ordered. This time, Kissinger was cautious. Thomas quotes him as deciding "to give the president the opportunity to have second thoughts." Kissinger slowed movement of aircraft carriers to the eastern Mediterranean. Laird was also wary. He planned to cite "weather delays" to tarry the carriers even more.

The next morning, while being briefed on carrier movement, Nixon asked Kissinger if "anything else" had happened. Kissinger said, "No," and Nixon answered, "Good." Kissinger wrote later that he "never heard another word about bombing Damascus."

A final example of sand in the presidential gears comes from Jeffrey H. Smith, a former CIA general counsel who during the Nixon era was a young Army lawyer. Smith recalled in a recent post on Just Security that in 1974, a few days before Nixon's resignation, he was shown a message from the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to subordinate commanders, advising that if they received any White House "execute orders" to use force, they should confirm them first with the chairman or the secretary of defense.

Thomas explains in his book: "Worried that the president might do something desperate, Defense Secretary James Schlesinger passed the word that all commands to the troops from the White House must pass through him." Schlesinger later claimed that he just wanted to reinforce the chain of command. This episode has also been explored by Garrett Graff in Politico.

What could our imaginary Mattis do if he tried similar methods of caution but the president still wanted to launch what Mattis and his commanders viewed as an unwise attack?

Well, there's a remedy for that in our Constitution. The 25th Amendment provides that the vice president and a majority of the Cabinet officers can inform Congress that the president is unable "to discharge the powers and duties" of his office. The vice president would take over, unless more than a third of the House and Senate backed the president.

But mind you, this is all hypothetical. As the Nixon stories show, even the most willful presidents usually end up listening to Pentagon advice.



[https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/our-best-hope-against-nuclear-war/2017/10/03/7df61d86-a883-11e7-92d1-58c702d2d975\\_story.html?utm\\_term=.f4560e6f5f1f](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/global-opinions/our-best-hope-against-nuclear-war/2017/10/03/7df61d86-a883-11e7-92d1-58c702d2d975_story.html?utm_term=.f4560e6f5f1f)

[Return to top](#)

The New York Times (New York, NY)

## **Trump's Iran Derangement**

By Roger Cohen

October 11, 2017

If President Trump decertifies the Iran nuclear deal this week, as seems likely, “it will show total disrespect for America’s allies,” Wolfgang Ischinger, the former German ambassador to the United States, told me. That’s the least of it. This — and I know competition is stiff — would be the rashest, most foolish act of the Trump administration to date.

The president’s refusal to certify an accord his own defense secretary, James Mattis, says Iran is upholding, and is in the American national interest, would send a strong signal that the United States has become a bait-and-switch power whose word is worthless.

It’s America’s word as solemn gage that has underwritten global security since 1945. Goodbye to all that.

Uncorked, Senator Bob Corker, the Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has grown bubbly. He’s compared Trump’s White House to “an adult day care center” in which only the likes of Mattis are keeping the child-sovereign’s tantrums from causing disaster. He’s suggested that, through infantile recklessness, Trump could set us “on the path to World War III.”

Exhibit A in this pattern of puerility would be the decertification of a multilateral deal that is working and is supported by China, Russia, Britain, France and Germany, powers with which Trump may even have a passing acquaintance.

Bait and switch, I said. The accord is a nuclear nonproliferation deal, not a grand bargain with Iran. It was concluded, as most breakthrough diplomatic accords are, with a hostile power. It was designed to curb the potential threat from the Islamic Republic, not change the nature of the regime overnight. It was about centrifuges, not Iranian support for Hezbollah; enriched uranium, not Iran’s terrible human rights record. It represents a difficult compromise between two countries — the United States and Iran — whose accumulated grievances stretch back decades but whose unyielding confrontation benefits neither.

Iran’s nuclear program was pitched into reverse by the agreement after a decade of rapid development. The number of centrifuges was slashed. Iran’s uranium stockpile was all but eliminated; enrichment levels are capped at 3.7 percent, a long way from bomb grade; outside inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency is rigorous. The IAEA, like Mattis, has found that Iran is in compliance.

Would it have been nice if Iran had been persuaded to dismantle its nuclear program and its scientists induced to consign their mastery of the nuclear fuel cycle to amnesiac oblivion? Sure. Dream on. Diplomacy takes place in the real world, as those mouthing off about North Korean nuclear dismantlement will discover. It involves trade-offs equally painful for both sides that produce an imperfect outcome better than the alternative.

(If anyone needs reminding of the alternative, North Korea has nukes. Iran does not — and is now further from one than it was. One of the extraordinary aspects of Trump’s caprice is his apparent willingness to open a second nuclear front, like some loony generalissimo who wakes up feeling an Asian conflagration is insufficient, a Middle Eastern one is needed, too.)

Thanks to Dexter Filkins at The New Yorker we have a verbatim account of Secretary of State Rex Tillerson’s first encounter last month with the Iranian foreign minister, Mohammad Javad Zarif. Tillerson is an ineffective secretary of state whose major contribution to truth-telling has been to call his boss, Trump, a moron. Still, as long as he’s around, he’s beholden to the Trump line on Iran, whatever his own reservations.

So Tillerson tells Zarif: “No one can credibly claim that Iran has positively contributed to regional peace and security.” This is true, but irrelevant to the nuclear deal. He tells Zarif that lifting sanctions under the accord “has enabled Iran’s unacceptable behavior.” This is untrue and so by definition irrelevant. He says of Iran and the United States, “the relationship has been defined by violence — against us.” The violence has gone both ways, and this is irrelevant.

Bait and switch: Imagine if Iran said it planned to rip up the nuclear agreement because the United States elected a Saudi-loving, Iran-hating president in Trump; and his dancing with the Saudi royals, combined with his Qatar derangement syndrome, had not “contributed to regional peace and security.”

Filkins writes of the encounter: “An aide to Tillerson later told me, ‘It was one of the finest moments in American diplomacy in the last fifty years.’ ”

I am paid to produce words. I regret that this sentence renders me speechless.

Of course, a Trump refusal to certify may not unravel the deal, but it would put it on life-support, as well as doing lasting damage to American credibility.

The Republican-controlled Congress may not reimpose sanctions — a step that would kill the accord — or take other legislative action to scuttle it, but Trump will already have done enough damage to make any nation question why it should conclude a deal with the United States. Only Trump could contrive to cede the moral high ground to Iran.

Trump will also have made the Middle East more dangerous, reinforced Iranian hard-liners, angered allies and done a disservice to Israeli security. He is in a class of his own.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/11/opinion/trump-iran-nuclear-deal.html>

[Return to top](#)

RealClear Defense (Chicago, IL)

## **Nuclear Disarmament and the Search for the Fortunate Islands**

By Rod Lyon

October 11, 2017

This year’s award of the Nobel Peace Prize to the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) has stirred mixed reactions. The Norwegian Nobel Committee states that the organisation received the prize ‘for its work to draw attention to the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons and for its ground-breaking efforts to achieve a treaty-based prohibition of such weapons’. Some commentators have seen the award as rewarding a new,

more activist, civil-society-based approach to peace, bypassing the old institutionalised, state-centred model. Others are less charitable (see here and here, for example).

Certainly the award maintains the committee's reputation for surprising choices. Its reasoning's arguable too. For one thing, I wouldn't have thought the humanitarian consequences of direct use of nuclear weapons were in need of much publicity. They've been well known since the bombing of Hiroshima. For those of a more scientific mind, Samuel Glasstone and Philip Dolan's 1977 text, *The effects of nuclear weapons*, covers the ground. And as for the nuclear ban treaty, it's primarily a diplomatic symbol of disarmament—a norm-setter—rather than a practical instrument.

More ominously, though, the award can be seen as reinforcing the judgement that the tide's going out on nuclear disarmament, not coming in. Several years back, one international security analyst drily observed that any year in which the international community had time to focus on the problem of small arms (like AK-47s) was actually a good year in international security. A similar observation might be made here: with all due respect to ICAN, any year in which the most notable achievement in the disarmament field is a civil society group's advocacy of disarmament is actually an awful year for the broader objective.

Some will think those judgements too harsh, and I suppose much depends on how one sees ICAN's signal achievement during the year—namely, its advocacy of the new Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons. Fans say the treaty's unique and special—the first time the international community has outlawed nuclear weapons. Others hold a bleaker view. I must confess my sympathies lie with that second group. The ban treaty was adopted in July at the United Nations by 122 nations that gave up exactly nothing. None of the 122 actually deploys nuclear weapons or benefits from an extended nuclear guarantee from a nuclear-weapon state. And all of them have already previously undertaken, in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, not to build nuclear weapons.

Still, the treaty's a worrying sign: as the requirements of nuclear arms control are becoming more demanding, large segments of the world appear to have been lulled into the false security of believing that the best approach to nuclear weapons is just to ban them. That's a dopey idea. So far, it has taken the combined efforts of many players, over decades, to define a global nuclear order that—in William Walker's words—turns on two linked systems: a managed system of deterrence and a managed system of abstinence. At a single stroke, the ban treaty delegitimises the first and defines an alternative vision of the second.

In their efforts to insist that nuclear weapons are just like long-lived anti-personnel landmines—marginal to international security—ban advocates risk pulling down the long pole in the tent of the current global order. By making the perfect the enemy of the good—after all, its signatories don't believe any nuclear weapons are 'good'—the ban treaty will probably make great-power nuclear arms control harder, not easier. Gradual, verifiable reductions in nuclear arsenals, which have seen US and Russian warhead numbers fall by tens of thousands and increased strategic stability between the superpowers, are, in any event, becoming more difficult to negotiate now that the ceilings are dropping to levels more commensurate with anticipated missions and relations between the great powers are souring. But having the ban enthusiasts shout unhelpfully from the sidelines that the real number should be zero warheads, not 1,550, or 1,000, or 300, is just going to make the process even more constipated.

Nuclear-weapon states that sign the ban treaty—and none look likely to do so—would (under Article 4) receive a period of grace within which to rid themselves of their satanic burdens. But no such period of grace would extend to signatories—like Australia—that currently shelter under another state's nuclear umbrella. Under the subclauses of Article 1, they're obliged to renounce

their own nuclear umbrella and denounce the broader existence of nuclear umbrellas in the modern world.

In short, we'd confront a world of unreality if we headed down the path that the winners of the Nobel Peace Prize propose. Putting things in their proper perspective, the pursuit of nuclear disarmament is the geopolitical equivalent of poet Ernest Dowson's search for the fortunate islands. Dowson's hero, of course, was doomed to a protracted and potentially fruitless search 'in the seas of no discovery'. ICAN's approach is much more direct: it proposes finding the fortunate islands by banning the unfortunate ones.

[https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/10/11/nuclear\\_disarmament\\_and\\_the\\_search\\_for\\_the\\_fortunate\\_islands\\_112464.html](https://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2017/10/11/nuclear_disarmament_and_the_search_for_the_fortunate_islands_112464.html)

[Return to top](#)

## **ABOUT THE USAF CUWS**

The USAF Counterproliferation Center was established in 1998 at the direction of the Chief of Staff of the Air Force. Located at Maxwell AFB, this Center capitalizes on the resident expertise of Air University, while extending its reach far beyond - and influences a wide audience of leaders and policy makers. A memorandum of agreement between the Air Staff Director for Nuclear and Counterproliferation (then AF/XON), now AF/A5XP) and Air War College Commandant established the initial manpower and responsibilities of the Center. This included integrating counterproliferation awareness into the curriculum and ongoing research at the Air University; establishing an information repository to promote research on counterproliferation and nonproliferation issues; and directing research on the various topics associated with counterproliferation and nonproliferation.

The Secretary of Defense's Task Force on Nuclear Weapons Management released a report in 2008 that recommended "Air Force personnel connected to the nuclear mission be required to take a professional military education (PME) course on national, defense, and Air Force concepts for deterrence and defense." As a result, the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, in coordination with the AF/A10 and Air Force Global Strike Command, established a series of courses at Kirtland AFB to provide continuing education through the careers of those Air Force personnel working in or supporting the nuclear enterprise. This mission was transferred to the Counterproliferation Center in 2012, broadening its mandate to providing education and research to not just countering WMD but also nuclear deterrence.

In February 2014, the Center's name was changed to the Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies to reflect its broad coverage of unconventional weapons issues, both offensive and defensive, across the six joint operating concepts (deterrence operations, cooperative security, major combat operations, irregular warfare, stability operations, and homeland security). The term "unconventional weapons," currently defined as nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, also includes the improvised use of chemical, biological, and radiological hazards.

The CUWS's military insignia displays the symbols of nuclear, biological, and chemical hazards. The arrows above the hazards represent the four aspects of counterproliferation - counterforce, active defense, passive defense, and consequence management.