
The People’s Republic of China (PRC) continues to pursue a long-term, comprehensive military modernization program designed to improve its armed forces’ capacity to fight short-duration, high-intensity regional conflicts. Preparing for potential conflict in the Taiwan Strait remains the focus and primary driver of China’s military investment; however, the PRC is increasing its emphasis on preparations for contingencies other than Taiwan, such as contingencies in the East China Sea and South China Sea. Additionally, as China’s global footprint and international interests grow, its military modernization program has become progressively more focused on investments for a range of missions beyond China’s periphery, including power projection, sea lane security, counter-piracy, peacekeeping, and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief (HA/DR).
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The Korea Herald – Seoul, South Korea

Missile Defense Dispute Reignited
By Shin Hyon-hee
May 19, 2015
Controversy over Washington’s alleged push to station an advanced U.S. missile defense unit on the peninsula was reignited when U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry raised the issue for the first time during his trip to Seoul. At a meeting with U.S. troops and Foreign Service officers late Monday, the top diplomat cited North Korea’s ongoing creation of a nuclear arsenal and other “extraordinarily provocative activities” to stress the significance of the deployment of ships, forces and other assets here to prepare for “every eventual outcome.”

“Nobody quite knows what America’s first line of defense in Seoul will do,” Kerry said.

“This is why we need to deploy ships, forces ... and we are talking about THAAD,” he added, referring to the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense, which is designed to shoot down short-, medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles in the final stage of their flight.

South Korea and the U.S. quickly attempted to downplay his remarks, saying that the issue had not been discussed at all between the two governments including at his talks with Foreign Minister Yun Byung-se earlier in the day. The U.S. Embassy here also reaffirmed this stance.

“The secretary was attending an internal event and speaking to an internal U.S. audience,” it was quoted as saying by Seoul officials.

With Kerry’s comment, however, Seoul’s dilemma is expected to deepen given stiff resistance from China and Russia, which deem a THAAD deployment as de facto participation in the U.S.-led global missile defense program that they say is directed at them.

On Tuesday, Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti, commander of the U.S. Forces Korea, also said that the allies were “each considering” the matter and will engage in formal discussions “eventually.”

“At some point in the future I think we will consider it (deployment) when the time is right. ... Both the countries share consideration not only of military factors but also political factors,” he was quoted as saying by the Munhwa Ilbo after a forum in Seoul.

During his speech, he also introduced plans to adopt new military assets and integrate the existing ones as part of efforts to modernize the alliance and beef up its defense capabilities, citing Pyongyang’s growing threats in the wake of its recent submarine-launched ballistic missile ejection test and past intercontinental ballistic missile launches.
Scaparrotti has been the main driving force behind the debate since he said last June that THAAD would help head off mounting North Korean threats by providing a “greater sensor array, better awareness of the threats and add to the interoperability of all of our systems.”

In March, the USFK confirmed that it had conducted site surveys of places around the country where THAAD might be stationed.

The furor had slightly subsided following U.S. Secretary of Defense Ash Carter’s joint news conference last month with South Korean Defense Minister Han Min-koo where he said the two countries have yet to begin any discussions and that THAAD batteries were still in production.

Seoul has since maintained its so-called “three noes” line: “no consultations between the allies, no request from the U.S., and no decision made.”

The upbeat assessment and related remarks of top Washington officials is likely to speed up internal discussions — and controversy — in both countries and prompt official talks, observers say.

Rep. Yoo Seung-min, floor leader of the ruling Saenuri Party and a member of the parliamentary defense committee, said the THAAD issue should be on the agenda for a summit between President Park Geun-hye and U.S. President Barack Obama in Washington next month.

“North Korea’s ground-based missiles already pose existential military threats and now with the SLBM becoming an additional threat, the alliance can effectively counter them only if they establish an optimal missile defense scheme as soon as possible,” he told a party meeting Tuesday.

“It is abnormal for an ally to repeat the ‘three noes’ at a time when key officials from the State and Defense Departments as well as the USFK have floated THAAD and missile defense.”


Sputnik International – Russian Information Agency

Countering Russian Strategic Missile Threat Too Hard, Costly for US

Countering the threat of Russia’s intercontinental ballistic missiles is too hard and too costly for the United States, Vice Chairman of the US Joint Chiefs of Staff Admiral James Winnefeld stated on Tuesday.

19 May 2015

WASHINGTON (Sputnik) — The top of the list of threats to the survival of the United States itself is “a massive nuclear attack from Russia, or some other high-end adversary or potential adversary like China,” Winnefeld noted.

“We have stated that missile defense against these high end threats is too hard, and too expensive, and too strategically destabilizing to even try,” Winnefeld said of the threat of a Russian or Chinese nuclear attack in a speech at the Center for Strategic International Studies.

US missile defense is intended for situations when “it has the highest probability of being most effective,” Winnefeld explained.

Military and top civilian leadership have alleged that US homeland and regional European missile defense systems are intended to counter long-range missile threats from North Korea and Iran.

The primary US deterrent against Russia, Winnefeld added, is the nuclear triad.

“We will use the cost imposition piece to deter Russia by keeping all three legs of our nuclear deterrent strong and our nuclear command and control system robust.”

By the end of 2015, the United States will install the Aegis Ashore Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system in Romania, completing Phase 2 of the European Phased Adaptive Approach, Winnefeld said.

Moscow has repeatedly raised opposition to US proliferation of missile defense systems near its border, claiming it is a threat to Russia’s strategic nuclear deterrent.

The BMD systems were previously limited under the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty between the US and Russia to avoid a strategic imbalance. The United States backed out of that treaty in 2001.

http://spukniknews.com/military/20150519/1022335176.html
Sputnik International – Russian information Agency

US Aegis Ships Could Pose Threat to Russia - Russian Diplomat

Russian Embassy to Washington Counselor Alexander Trofimov says that US Navy Aegis ships based in Europe could secretly carry cruise missiles threatening Russia.

21 May 2015

WASHINGTON (Sputnik) — US Navy Aegis ships based in Europe could secretly carry cruise missiles threatening Russia, Russian Embassy to Washington Counselor Alexander Trofimov told a Congressional roundtable discussion on missile defense in Europe in the US Congress.

"Aegis can fire [anti-ballistic missile] interceptors and attack [cruise] missiles like the Tomahawk," Trofimov said on Wednesday.

Trofimov explained the defensive interceptors and offensive Tomahawk cruise missiles would be vertically deployed on the ships, making it difficult for air or space reconnaissance to identify them.

On May 1, 2015, the Arleigh Burke-class guided-missile destroyer USS Porter joined two other destroyers, USS Donald Cook and USS Ross, at the Naval Station Rota in Spain as part of the European Phased Adaptive Approach (EPAA) to ballistic missile defense (BMD).

A fourth Arleigh Burke-class warship, the USS Carney, will join them later in 2015.

All four ships have had their Aegis combat systems upgraded to handle BMD threats.

Trofimov said the deployment was continuing without any US-Russian dialogue to address Moscow's concerns that it was threatening the power balance in Europe.

"The new missile defense deployment is not just about missile defense. It is about threats to strategic stability," the diplomat said.

US President Barack Obama approved the EPAA in 2009. The EPAA uses mobile radars and interceptors mounted on Aegis-class Ticonderoga-class cruisers and Arleigh Burke-class destroyers.

http://sputniknews.com/military/20150521/1022394345.html
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Sputnik International – Russian Information Agency

US Defense Bill Bans Funding of Russian Nuclear Nonproliferation Efforts

The 2016 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) passed by the US House of Representatives on Friday bans providing assistance to Russia for nuclear nonproliferation initiatives.

16 May 2015

WASHINGTON (Sputnik) — The US Secretary of Energy can suspend the ban, according to the bill, if such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

"None of the funds authorized... for defense nuclear nonproliferation activities may be obligated or expended to enter into a contract with, or otherwise provide assistance to, the Russian Federation," the bill, passed on Friday, stated.

The NDAA also prohibits providing Russia with "hit-to-kill" missile defense technology data and integration of Russian missile defense systems with US or NATO capabilities.

The defense budget bill authorizes defensive lethal assistance to Ukraine, will withhold funding for the US implementation of the new START nuclear reduction agreement and stipulates that US military leaders will develop a plan to defeat Russia’s Club-K cruise missile system.

On Friday, the US House of Representatives passed the NDAA 269-151, which appropriates a total of $611.8 billion in defense spending for the 2016 fiscal year.

http://sputniknews.com/military/20150516/1022207922.html
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**Foreign Ministry: US Actions May Push Russia to Building up Nuclear Arsenals**

May 17, 2015

UN, May 17. /TASS/. The actions of the U.S. under certain conditions may push Russia to building up its nuclear arsenals, head of the Foreign Ministry's department on arms control, Mikhail Ulyanov said on Friday, on the sidelines of the conference at the United Nations on the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The basis of the suggestion the U.S. has voiced about cutting one-third of the warheads is the understanding the U.S. will be able to protect itself and allies even after the cutting.

"We cannot make a conclusion of the kind, and thus for us the U.S. initiative means contrary factors, where under certain conditions they may push us to building up [nuclear arsenals]," the diplomat said. "As yet, those are not our plans, but what the Americans are doing realistically makes it very complicated or even leaving no chances to make further steps in nuclear disarmament."

This is what happens in reality, he continued, and "this is what we are trying to explain here."

"Nuclear disarmament is made not in vacuum," and it is affected by many factors.

"Growing international negative tendencies undermine strategic stability, and thus the future of nuclear disarmament," he said. Those "negative factors" come not from Russia. "They come from the United States of America: the anti-missile defence, refusal from the talks on banning weapons in the space, the de factor refusal from ratification of the agreement on banning nuclear tests, and, finally, the major misbalance in regular arms in Europe."

Anyway, he continued, presently "the process of cutting continues and will be over by February 5, 2018 - seven years after a new START comes into force."

"This means, the process continues, and this is our major task," the diplomat said. "These obligations under the treaty will be fulfilled."

He said that during a previous conference at the UN, Russia reported its 3.9 thousand deployed nuclear warheads. "Five years later, the number we have is 1,582," he said. "This is a cutting by about two and a half times."

Russia is "quite satisfied" with NPT.

"We do not see factors, which could make our participation in the treaty contradicting with interests of the Russian Federation, but theoretically, because of actions by the U.S., this situation is probable, though we are not interested in it," the diplomat said. This is why, during the conference, Russia "suggests speaking first of all about eliminating factors in the way towards nuclear disarmament and about conditions for making new agreements possible."


---

Military.com – New York, NY

**Air Force Getting Closer to Testing Hypersonic Weapon, Engineers Say**

By Brendan McGarry

May 19, 2015

The U.S. Air Force is making progress in developing a hypersonic weapon based on the success of an experimental scramjet program, engineers said.

The service in 2013 conducted its fourth and longest flight of the so-called X-51 WaveRider. After separating from a rocket launched beneath the wing of a B-52 bomber, the hypersonic vehicle built by Boeing Co. climbed to 60,000 feet, accelerated to Mach 5.1 and flew for about three and a half minutes before running out of fuel and plunging into the Pacific Ocean.

At that speed, which is equivalent to about 3,400 miles per hour, a missile could travel from Washington, D.C., to Atlanta in just several minutes -- making it a potentially powerful weapon against enemy air defenses.

"We are the Air Force. What do we want to do with this technology? We want to weaponize it," Ryan Helbach, an official with the Air Force Research Laboratory, said last week during an exhibition at the Pentagon to showcase various military research projects. "The follow-on program to this is the High Speed Strike Weapon effort. It's taking a lot of the lessons learned and the technology and moving to a weapons acquisition."
The hypersonic missile program comes as the U.S. faces increasing competition from China and other countries working to capitalize on the defense technology. "Certainly, the U.S. is not the only country involved in developing hypersonic weapons," Mica Endsley, the Air Force's chief scientist, said in a recent interview with Military.com "They (China) are showing a lot of capability in this area. The advantage of hypersonics is not just that something goes very fast but that it can go great distances at those speeds."

She added, "For example, currently today to get from NY to LA is a five hour flight in a commercial aircraft. With a hypersonic weapon, you could do that same thing in about 30 minutes. You can go great distances at great speeds."

The nine-year, $300 million X-51 program was designed to demonstrate that the military could build a scramjet capable of accelerating, ingesting hydrocarbon fuel, and actively cooling in flight, Helbach said. Unlike a traditional engine, a scramjet, or supersonic combusting ramjet, has very few moving parts and relies on an air-breathing propulsion system to travel faster than the speed of sound.

But it needs a kick, like a boost from a rocket, to get there. So the WaveRider was first propelled by a solid rocket booster, a surface-to-surface missile called the MGM-140 Army Tactical Missile System, to about Mach 4.5, then separated and activated its scramjet engine built by Aerojet Rocketdyne. (A weaponized version of the vehicle would use another missile, not a ground system design.)

"There are no moving parts in the flow path, so that means there are no compressor blades to suck in the air, so we need something to get us up to above Mach 4 in order to get the compression into the engine," Helbach said. The Air Force program, which had a couple of failed tests, came several years after a similar NASA effort called the X-43, which in 2004 shattered speed records when it flew at nearly Mach 9.7, or about 6,600 miles per hour, for 10 seconds. But the engine couldn't withstand the temperatures involved.

"The engine basically melted because it got so hot," Helbach said. "They didn't actively cool it. So for our program, we actively cooled the engine, which means that along the outside of the engine, we cycled the fuel around it to suck out the heat from the engine, heat up that fuel, and then inject it into the combustor for the scramjet engine."

The X-51 was designed to start its engine using ethylene and transition to a hydrocarbon fuel called JP-7 -- the same type of endothermic fuel employed by the SR-71 Blackbird spy plane. "It basically means you can dump a lot of heat into that fuel," Helbach said. "When you crack the fuel, it actually makes it more combustible. It increases the amount of combustion you can create from the fuel."

For the follow-on weapons program, the Air Force has teamed with the Pentagon's research arm, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, to shrink the technology into a hypersonic weapon that could fit on most of the bomber fleet, according to Kenneth Davidson, manager of the hypersonic materials development at the Air Force Research Laboratory.

"If you look at the X-51, the size is slightly too big to put it on our current bombers," he said. "It was made as a demonstrator. There's no weapon in it. There are no sensors on board for controlling the guidance. So we're looking at making it more durable, getting the guidance control developed so that it can become a weapon system, developing the ordnance."

Carrying a small, conventional warhead, a hypersonic weapon could be used as a stand-off missile, so the military could strike targets at a safe distance without putting pilots and aircraft at risk. "You could then attack defensive targets, those heavily defended or the time-critical targets in a very timely manner -- if it's a moving target, before it can move," Davidson said. "And then ultimately, these would have a sensor so that they can track a moved target -- not necessarily something that is moving, but if the target moves or it gets into the area, they can see the target and hit it very, very accurately."

The High Speed Strike Weapon is affiliated with other demonstration projects being developed by DARPA, including the Hypersonic Air-breathing Weapon Concept and the Tactical Boost Glide, both of which have test flights scheduled for 2018 or 2019.

"Our goal is to make sure the Air Force has the knowledge in 2020 or over the next five years to be able to make
acquisition decisions using this technology," Davidson said. "Our goal is to provide a capability to stand off, launch these vehicles off the aircraft to hit time-critical dependent targets ... And ultimately from a manufacturing standpoint, it's got to be affordable."

Associate Editor Kris Osborn contributed to this report.

http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/05/19/air-force-getting-closer-to-testing-hypersonic-weapon.html?comp=1198882887570&rank=1

Kerry Hopes Iran Deal to Have 'Positive Influence' on N. Korea
May 17, 2015

U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said Saturday that he hopes a successful deal with Iran to curb its nuclear ambitions would have a "positive influence" on diplomatic efforts to persuade North Korea to abandon its own nuclear weapons program.

Speaking to reporters at a joint press conference with Chinese Foreign Minister Wang Yi in Beijing, Kerry said that if world powers successfully win an agreement from Iran by the June 30 deadline, it would demonstrate that the Middle East country can improve its economy with a peaceful nuclear program.

"If we can get an agreement from Iran," Kerry said, "that agreement would have some impact or a positive influence" in striving for "how you can come to the realization that your economy can be better, your country can be better."

"Hopefully, that could be a message (for North Korea)," Kerry said, adding that it was uncertain whether Pyongyang's leadership can "internalize" such a message.

Kerry said North Korea's economic and diplomatic isolation will further deepen if Pyongyang continues to refuse to abandon its nuclear weapons ambition.

Describing North Korea's nuclear ambitions as one of the "most complex" global security challenges that include the Ebola virus and Afghanistan, Kerry said the U.S. and China agreed to step up efforts for denuclearization of North Korea.

North Korea, which has conducted three nuclear tests, claimed that it has recently successfully test-launched a ballistic missile from a submarine. If confirmed, it would pose a major security threat to South Korea.

Asked about North Korea's reported submarine-based missile launch, Kerry replied that the North's "destabilizing behaviors are unacceptable."

Kerry said China has "unique leverage" to persuade North Korea to give up its nuclear ambitions and that both Washington and Beijing are committed to the "denuclearization of North Korea."

"North Korea's nuclear and missile programs are a threat to the regional stability and we have consistently agreed and enhanced cooperation to bring about North Korea's denuclearization," he said.

"North Korea needs to live up to its international obligations," Kerry said. "And it is obvious that North Korea needs to recognize that it will not succeed in developing" nuclear and missile arsenals.

In Seoul earlier this week, South Korea's intelligence agency reported to the National Assembly that North Korea had executed its defense chief for showing disloyalty to leader Kim Jong-un around April 30.

The developments come as South Korea, the United States, China, Japan and Russia have agreed on the need to hold "exploratory talks" with Pyongyang without any preconditions to test the reclusive nation's denuclearization commitment before resuming formal negotiations.

The six-party talks have been dormant since late 2008.

Since then, North Korea has advanced its nuclear capabilities by conducting its second and third nuclear tests, in 2009 and 2013. Some experts now warn that the communist nation's nuclear arsenal could expand to 100 bombs by 2020.

Kerry raised the issue of China's massive land reclamation efforts in the South China Sea and urged Beijing to make sure that it would not escalate tensions in the sea area that provides important shipping lanes.

Wang hit back at Kerry, saying China's determination to safeguard its sovereignty is "unshakable."
China claims sovereignty over nearly 90 percent of the South China Sea, raising tension with its neighbors, including the Philippines, Malaysia and Vietnam. Beijing is in a bitter dispute with Tokyo over islets in the East China Sea.

The U.S. has been concerned about China's increasingly assertive moves in the South China Sea. Later Saturday, Kerry held a meeting with Chinese Premier Li Keqiang, during which they exchanged views on issues of common concern, China's state media said without elaborating. After meetings with Chinese leaders, including President Xi Jinping, Kerry was to travel to South Korea on Sunday. (Yonhap)


The Independent – London, U.K.

China Upgrades its Nuclear Arsenal for First Time in Decades amid Resistance to US Interference in South China Sea Dispute
By Adam Withnall
Sunday, 17 May 2015

China has reportedly started making its nuclear missiles more powerful, in what has been interpreted as a show of force amid the ongoing dispute with the US and other nations in the South China Sea.

According to the Federation of American Scientists (FAS), China has maintained a stockpile of “several hundred warheads” for around three decades, not seeing the need to keep any of them mission-ready or to get into an expensive arms race with the US and Russia.

But that may slowly be changing, experts warn, as Beijing and Washington refuse to budge over a series of disputed islands.

Secretary of State John Kerry met with Chinese President Xi Jinping on Sunday, with the US pushing to position itself as lead negotiator between China and five other Asian governments.

But while Xi said US-China relations “have remained stable overall”, the meeting came as China declared “air defence identification zones”, built military airfields on controversially-reclaimed land and sent submarines through the Persian Gulf for the first time.

According to the New York Times, the process of upgrading its long-range missile arsenal will see the number of Chinese warheads that could potentially reach the US double.

It is reported to be upgrading up to half of its 20 intercontinental DF-5 ballistic missiles, so that each missile can carry three instead of one warhead.

The Times cited a Pentagon report released on 8 May that said China’s most powerful weapon now carried multiple warheads for the first time.

And experts said the decision to move forward with the technology – first developed by the US during the Cold War – was at least in part as a result of American anti-missile advances.

Hans M Kristensen, director of the FAS, said: “They’re doing it to make sure they could get through the ballistic missile defences.”

Obama administration officials have declined to comment on reports that it may deploy military assets to the South China Sea, where its attempts to ease tensions have been firmly rebutted.

The US insists sovereignty claims in the area must be negotiated – but China has baulked at the promise of US interference in the region and wants to negotiate with the ASEAN countries individually, a process they see as unfair.


International Business (IB) Times (U.S. Edition) – New York, NY
Japan Would Attack North Korea to Defend US after Missile Attack, Defense Minister Says
By Cristina Silva
May 18, 2015
Japan would retaliate against North Korea if Pyongyang launched a missile attack on the United States, Japanese Defense Minister Gen Nakatani said. Nakatani said Sunday Japan would defend the U.S. because a North Korea missile attack would likely result in serious damage.
Nakatani's remarks were expected to provoke a strong response from North Korea. They came as Washington and Tokyo have revised their defense guidelines to allow Japan to expand its role globally to help U.S. forces in military crises.
South Korea defense observers called Nakatani's vow to avenge the U.S. rare. "South Korea, the U.S. and Japan are supposed to share information on Pyongyang's possible missile launches under their trilateral arrangement for military intelligence," one South Korean defense leader told the Korea Times. "Japan needs to seek prior approval before launching an attack against Pyongyang as such an attack would have a great impact on the Korean Peninsula."
Japan has long had a difficult relationship with Kim Jon Un's North Korea. "Since the succession of Kim Jong-un, Tokyo has put greater emphasis on ensuring it is prepared militarily for a more unpredictable North Korea, and strengthened its support for UN Security Council sanctions on North Korean proliferation," the Council on Foreign Relations has noted.
In March, Japan said it would extend sanctions against North Korea for two more years amid stalled talks to recover abducted Japanese nationals. The nationals were kidnapped by Pyongyang in the 1970s and 1980s to train spies in Japan's language and culture, the BBC reported. The sanctions include remittance and travel bans. North Korean ships are also not allowed entry into Japanese ports.
Meanwhile, U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry urged China to impose new sanctions against North Korea Monday over its nuclear weapons program. "To date, to this moment, particularly with recent provocations, it is clear the DPRK [Democratic People’s Republic of Korea] is not even close to meeting that standard," Kerry told a joint news conference with the South Korean foreign minister, Yun Byung-se. “Instead it continues to pursue nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.”
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The Guardian (U.S. Edition) – New York, NY
North Korea 'Not Even Close' to Meeting Standards on Nuclear Weapons, says Kerry
Secretary of state says US is talking to China about boosting sanctions and highlights ‘grotesque’ public executions on whim of leader Kim Jong-un
By Reuters
Monday, 18 May 2015
The US is talking to China about imposing further sanctions against North Korea as the reclusive country is “not even close” to taking steps to rein in its nuclear weapons programme, the US secretary of state, John Kerry, has said.
Speaking on Monday in the South Korean capital, Kerry said Washington continued to offer North Korea the chance for an improved relationship in return for signs of a genuine willingness to end its nuclear programme. “To date, to this moment, particularly with recent provocations, it is clear the DPRK [Democratic People’s Republic of Korea] is not even close to meeting that standard,” Kerry told a joint news conference with the South Korean foreign minister, Yun Byung-se. “Instead it continues to pursue nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.”
North Korea is already under heavy US and UN sanctions for its missile and nuclear tests but Kerry said further penalties were being considered.
“I think never has the international community been as united as we are now, that, number one North Korea needs to denuclearise,” Kerry said, adding a pending nuclear deal with Iran could serve as an example to North Korea.
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“With respect to the methodology for boosting sanctions and other things, we [the United States and China] are discussing all of that now. China has obviously an extraordinary leverage. We will have security and economic dialogue with the Chinese in Washington in June and that will be the moment where we will table some of these specific steps.”

Hong Lei, spokesman for the Chinese foreign ministry, declined to comment on Kerry’s remarks. China has a history of resisting tough moves against North Korea that have not been passed by resolutions of the UN security council, on which it sits with veto power.

Hong, at a daily news briefing, merely reiterated China’s calls for denuclearisation of the whole Korean peninsula. In 2005, Pyongyang walked away from a deal with the US, Russia, South Korea and China to end its nuclear programme in return for diplomatic and economic rewards.

It recently tested what it said was a submarine-launched ballistic missile, raising regional tensions about the prospect of a heightened threat that already includes nuclear arms development and an arsenal of ballistic missiles.

North Korea is technically still at war with the South after the 1950-53 conflict ended in a truce, not a peace treaty, and regularly threatens to destroy the South’s major ally, the US.

Kerry also said it was likely that the North would be referred to the international criminal court because of human rights violations, and singled out the country’s leader, Kim Jong-un, as responsible for continued rights violations.

He said Kim’s leadership was “one of the most egregious examples of reckless disregard for human rights and human beings anywhere on the planet,” citing what he called “grotesque, grisly, horrendous public displays of executions on a whim and a fancy by the leader”.

South Korea’s spy agency said last week that the North’s defence chief had been executed with anti-aircraft fire which, if confirmed, would be the latest in a series of high-level purges since Kim took charge in 2011.

The UN general assembly has recommended that the North be referred to the tribunal for crimes against humanity after a UN inquiry detailed abuses in the country including prison camps and use of torture.

Diplomats say China is likely to veto any such bid.

http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/may/18/north-korea-may-face-further-sanctions-john-kerry-indicates

**Kim Orders New Pyongyang Space Entity to Ready October Test-Launch of ICBM: Sources**

By Kyodo

May 19, 2015

WASHINGTON – North Korean leader Kim Jong Un has ordered a new aerospace entity to prepare to test-launch what the country calls a rocket carrying a satellite in October to mark the 70th anniversary of the founding of the country’s ruling party, sources in a number of governments said Monday.

Kim directly instructed the National Aerospace Development Administration earlier this year to implement the project that the United States, Japan and South Korea suspect will effectively be a test-launch of an intercontinental ballistic missile the secretive country is allegedly developing, according to two of the sources.

North Korea was widely regarded in December 2012 as having test-launched a long-range missile.

North Korea at that time launched an improved model of the Taepodong-2 long-range ballistic missile and put an unidentified object into space orbit, calling the vehicle the Unha-3 rocket carrying a satellite.

The Defense Ministry in Tokyo has said it suspects the rocket’s range could top 10,000 km if it were to be used as a long-range missile.

North Korea launched the rocket from the Sohae Satellite Launching Station in Tongchang-ri, in the northwest of the country.

Satellite imagery has since shown North Korea expanding the facility, suggesting it is aiming to launch a larger missile and that could come on the Oct. 10 anniversary of the Workers’ Party of Korea, one of the sources said.

The United States, Japan and South Korea, which typically work closely to deal with North Korean issues, are stepping up monitoring activities, with some officials suspecting Pyongyang has intentionally leaked the information as part of its political propaganda.
The Korean Central News Agency reported May 3 that Kim had inspected the newly built General Satellite Control and Command Centre of the National Aerospace Development Administration. The country’s state-run outlet quoted Kim as saying that “satellites” will be launched into outer space “at the time and locations set by (the party).”

North Korea later announced it successfully test-fired a ballistic missile from a submerged submarine, fueling speculation that Kim’s regime is trying to increase a variety of ballistic missiles. Pyongyang is also believed to be developing the Hwasong-13 rocket, which people in the Western intelligence community suspect is a mobile ICBM called KN-08.

http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2015/05/19/asia-pacific/kim-orders-new-pyongyang-space-entity-ready-october-test-launch-icbm-sources/#.VV0EhCyD5Dz

The Korea Herald – Seoul, South Korea

**U.S. Considering ‘Permanent Stationing’ of THAAD in S. Korea: Senior U.S. Official**

May 20, 2015

The United States is considering permanently stationing a THAAD missile defense unit in South Korea to help defend against North Korean threats, even though no final decision has been made, a senior U.S. official said Tuesday.

Frank Rose, assistant secretary of state for arms control, verification and compliance, made the remark during a security seminar, stressing THAAD is a purely defense system and poses no threat to other countries in the region.

"Although we’re considering the permanent stationing of a THAAD unit on the Korean Peninsula, we have not made a final decision and we've had no formal consultations with the Republic of Korea on a potential THAAD deployment," Rose said during the seminar hosted by the Institute for Corean-American Studies at the Rayburn House Office Building.

"However, let me be clear on a couple of points. THAAD is a purely defensive system that would improve our ability to intercept short- and medium-range missiles from North Korea. It does not and cannot impact broader strategic stability with Russia or China," he said.

The U.S. wants to deploy a THAAD missile interceptor battery to South Korea, where some 28,500 American troops are stationed, to better defend against ever-growing threats from North Korea's ballistic missile and nuclear programs. But the issue has become one of the most sensitive for the South because China and Russia see a potential THAAD deployment as a threat to their security interests and have increased pressure on Seoul to reject such a deployment.

Seoul and Washington have maintained that there have been no formal consultations or decision on the issue between the two countries. But the issue came to the fore again this week as U.S. Secretary of State John Kerry said in Seoul that a provocative North Korea is "why we are talking about THAAD."

Rose dismissed Chinese concerns that THAAD would pose a threat to its security interests in the region.

"I think part of what China is trying to do is create a wedge in the U.S. alliance system in the region," Rose said. The official also said the THAAD missile defense system has no capability to intercept long-range Chinese missiles. He also dismissed Chinese claims that the radar that comes with THAAD could be used to spy on China, saying the U.S. already has such radars in the region.

Rose also praised some senior South Korean officials for rejecting Chinese attempts to affect the issue.

"I've been very, very pleased with some of the statements that have come out of senior officials in the Republic of Korea, saying even though no decisions have been made, the U.S. has not made a request and no formal consultations have occurred today, let us be clear this is about defense and security of the Republic of Korea and we will make our decisions on our own without any input from you," he said. (Yonhap)


The Daily Telegraph – London, U.K.

**North Korea 'Photoshopped Kim Jong-un Submarine Missile Pictures'**
Experts claim missing missile exhaust at North Korea "submarine missile" launch show photographs are doctored, and Pyongyang may be years away from such technology
By Andrew Marszal, and Reuters
20 May 2015
Photographs showing Kim Jong-un proudly watching as a North Korean missile was launched from an underwater submarine were manipulated by state propagandists, experts claimed on Tuesday.
German aerospace experts said photos of the launch were "strongly modified", including reflections of the missile exhaust flame in the water which did not line up with the missile itself.
“Considering the track record of North Korean deceptions, it seems sensible to assume that any North Korean SLBM [submarine-launched ballistic missile] capability is still a very long time in the future, if it will ever surface,” Markus Schiller and Robert Schmucker, of Schmucker Technologie, told Reuters.
A photo on state TV showed a missile high in the sky leaving a trail of white smoke, whereas other photos from state media showed no white smoke, suggesting the two photos were of different missiles with different propulsion systems, Mr Schiller and Mr Schmucker said.
James Winnefeld, a US navy admiral, on Tuesday said the country's "clever video editors and spinmeisters" had disguised the fact that Pyongyang is still "many years" from developing submarine-launched ballistic missiles. He told an audience at the Centre for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS) in Washington that the isolated country may still be years away from developing the technology.
"They have not gotten as far as their clever video editors and spinmeisters would have us believe," he added.
North Korea, heavily sanctioned by the United States and United Nations for its missile and nuclear tests, said on May 8 it had successfully conducted an underwater test-fire which, if true, would indicate progress in its pursuit of building missile-equipped submarines.
It published photographs of Kim Jong-un watching as missiles were apparently fired from a submarine beneath the ocean surface.
But North Korea, which regularly threatens to destroy the United States, had a track record of offering faked proof to claim significant advances in missile technology, Mr Schiller Mr and Schmucker said, such as poorly built mockups of missiles on display at military parades in 2012 and 2013.
The North’s National Defence Commission, the main ruling body headed by leader Kim Jong-un, said on Wednesday the submarine-based missile launch was "yet a higher level of accomplishment in the development of strategic attack means". Pyongyang warned Washington boasted of its ability to miniaturise nuclear warheads, a claim it has made before and which has been widely questioned by experts and never verified.
It said in a statement carried by the official KCNA news agency said it has "long entered the stage of miniaturising and diversifying our means of nuclear strike," likely in reference to its effort to miniaturise a nuclear warhead for missiles.

North Korea says it Can Mount Nuclear Warheads on Missiles
By Andrew Davis
May 21, 2015
Hong Kong: North Korea said it has developed the technology to mount a nuclear warhead on a missile, signalling the country may now have the ability to launch a nuclear attack against the United States.
South Korea and the US military have been divided over whether North Korea could shrink a warhead sufficiently to fit it on a nuclear-tipped missile. A spokesman at the National Defence Commission in Pyongyang said the military has mastered the engineering and will diversify its nuclear weapons, the official Korean Central News Agency reported on Wednesday.
North Korea has successfully detonated three nuclear devices at a test site and has been improving the range of its ballistic missiles in defiance of United Nations sanctions over its weapons program. The US, China and South Korea have been unable to convince the Kim Jong-un regime to return to disarmament talks, and there are signs that North Korea is rapidly expanding its nuclear arsenal.

The announcement comes weeks after the country released video of Mr Kim watching what the official media said was the launch of a ballistic missile from a submarine. US and South Korean officials have questioned the veracity of the test, with Defence Ministry spokesman Kim Min Seok saying on May 11 that the North was still likely years away from being able to master a submarine missile launch.

South Korea has also questioned whether its rival can miniaturise a warhead, with Kim Min Seok saying in February there was no evidence that the government in Pyongyang has the ability to tip a missile with a nuclear warhead. That assessment contrasts with the position of William Gortney, the head of the US Northern Command, who said April 7 that North Korea does have the technology and has also managed to deploy a road-mobile intercontinental ballistic missile - the KN-08 - capable of reaching the US.

"Our assessment is that they have the ability to put a nuclear weapon on a KN-08 and shoot it at the homeland," Admiral Gortney said. "We have not seen them do that" and "we haven't seen them test the KN-08."

North Korea last tested a nuclear device in February 2013; just how many warheads North Korea has been able to build remains a mystery. Top Chinese nuclear weapons experts have increased their estimates of North Korean warhead production beyond most previous US projections, the Wall Street Journal reported on April 23.

The Kim regime has 20 warheads and has the capacity to produce enough weapons-grade uranium to double its arsenal by next year, the paper reported, citing people briefed on the matter. That compares with the estimate of 10 to 16 warheads released in February by US researcher Joel Wit.


The Hindu – Chennai, India

U.S. Doubts N Korea’s Claim on Nuke Weapons
Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)
May 21, 2015
WASHINGTON: The United States on Wednesday cast doubt on Pyongyang’s claimed capacity to miniaturise and diversify its stockpiled nuclear weapons.

“Regarding that specific claim of miniaturisation, we do not think they have that capacity,” State Department spokesperson Marie Harf told reporters, Xinhua reported.

North Korea said earlier in the day that it has entered the phase of miniaturisation and diversification of its nuclear weapons for quite some time, with the successful test-firing of a strategic ballistic missile from a submarine on May 8.

The Asian country also blasted the US, Japan and South Korea for their claim that Pyongyang’s test-firing of the submarine-launched ballistic missile is a threat and provocation, saying it is North Korea’s right to beef up its defence ability.

“But we do know they’re working on developing a number of long-range missiles, including intercontinental ballistic missiles,” Harf said.

“That could eventually threaten our allies, our partners...So that’s obviously something we’re very concerned about in terms of that capability. We just don’t think they have it,” she added.


TASS Russian News Agency – Moscow, Russia

Iskander-M Missile Systems to Be Deployed in Kaliningrad Region till 2018
The Ground Forces’ guided missile brigades are being rearmed with this complex, according to the schedule
May 16, 2015
MOSCOW, May 16. /TASS/. Russian Ground Forces’ guided missile brigade stationed in the westernmost Kaliningrad region will be reequipped with the Iskander-M ballistic missile systems till 2018, Maj Gen Mikhail Matveyevsky, commander of the army’s missile forces and artillery, said on Saturday.
When asked by the Russian News Service radio station whether the brigade in the Kaliningrad region would be reequipped with the missile complexes, Matveyevsky replied: "There are no doubts about it."
"The Ground Forces’ guided missile brigades are being rearmed with this complex, according to the schedule," he said.
http://tass.ru/en/russia/795113
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British Navy Investigates Sailor’s Disaster Warning over Nuclear Subs
By Michael Holden, Reuters
18 May 2015
LONDON, May 18 (Reuters) - Britain's Royal Navy said on Monday it had launched an inquiry after a sailor who served on its submarines armed with nuclear weapons said the vessels had major security flaws and were a "disaster waiting to happen".
In a lengthy dossier released on the internet, Able Seaman William McNeilly, who describes himself as a weapons engineer, said Britain's Trident nuclear defence system was vulnerable both to enemies and to potentially devastating accidents because of safety failures.
"Our nuclear weapons are a target that's wide open to attack," wrote McNeilly, who served on board HMS Vanguard, one the four submarines that carry the Trident missiles. He has since gone absent without leave.
"All it takes is someone to bring a bomb onboard to commit the worst terrorist attack the UK and the world has ever seen," he added.
The Royal Navy said it totally disagreed with McNeilly's "subjective and unsubstantiated personal views", describing him as a "very junior sailor". But it added it was investigating both his claims and the "unauthorised release" of his dossier.
"The naval service operates its submarine fleet under the most stringent safety regime and submarines do not go to sea unless they are completely safe to do so," a spokeswoman said.
McNeilly said people were not properly checked or searched before being able to get near or on the submarines, and that even nightclubs had stricter security.
"I know most people know the Trident programme is a disaster waiting to happen, but they never tell the public," he wrote.
Police and naval officials were trying to find McNeilly, although a Ministry of Defence spokeswoman declined to say whether he faced arrest for breaking the Official Secrets Act.
"Our main concern is to find him and make sure he's safe," she said.
Under Trident, Britain always has one nuclear submarine on patrol. The fleet is based at the Faslane naval base near Glasgow, Scotland's biggest city.
A decision on replacing the ageing four Vanguard-class submarines is due next year and Prime Minister David Cameron's government has said it backs the multi-billion pound renewal.
The Scottish National Party (SNP), which won all but three of the 59 seats in Scotland in this month's general election, is firmly opposed.
"These revelations, if true, are extremely concerning. It reads as a nightmare catalogue of serious safety breaches," said Angus Robertson, the SNP's leader in London. "They add to what appears to be a chaotic, shambolic safety culture on these aged subs."

*Reporting by Michael Holden; Editing by Tom Heneghan*

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/reuters/article-3086169/British-Navy-investigates-sailors-disaster-warning-nuclear-sub.html
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Bloomberg Business – New York, NY

**Russia Deployed Nuclear-Capable Gear, NATO Commander Says**

By Ian Wishart
May 21, 2015

Russia has deployed equipment during the conflict in eastern Ukraine that can be used for nuclear weapons, NATO’s top military commander said.

While there’s no “direct evidence” that the Kremlin has made deployments of nuclear arms, U.S. Air Force General Philip Breedlove said on Thursday, “that does not mean that they may not have happened.”

“Lots of the systems that the Russians use to deliver nuclear weapons are dual-use systems -- they can be either conventional or nuclear -- and some of those systems are deployed,” Breedlove said.

Violence has continued in Ukraine’s easternmost regions despite a cease-fire agreed to in February, with NATO accusing Russian President Vladimir Putin of deliberately destabilizing the area following Russia’s annexation of Crimea last year.

“We do not need to make any adjustments to our nuclear posture,” Breedlove told reporters in Brussels. “First and foremost, we have a secure, a safe and a very capable nuclear response and that’s our mission -- to keep it that way.”

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization said last week that it was “deeply concerned” about Russia’s statements about possible stationing of nuclear weapons and their delivery systems in Crimea. Putin told a documentary film aired on Russian television two months ago that he was ready to put his country’s nuclear forces on alert when he annexed the Crimean peninsula in March 2014.

**Baltic Nations**

During the lull in fighting since the February cease-fire, Russia has “resupplied and stockpiled forces” in eastern Ukraine, Breedlove said.

He said NATO will assess a joint request from the Baltic nations -- Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia -- for more troops to counter increased threats from Russia, with which they share a border. The three countries said they want NATO to provide more than the increased air patrols and rotating U.S. troop presence secured last year.

“Any request that a nation sends forth in such a serious manner, we will look at,” Breedlove said.
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TASS Russian News Agency – Moscow, Russia

**Iran, P5+1 Still Far from Solving Probable Military Component of Iran’s Nuclear Programme**

*Debates are going on about the list of facilities in Iran that international experts would be granted access to and on what grounds they would obtain this access*

May 16, 2015

VIENNA, May 15. /TASS/. Iran and six world powers, comprising UN five permanent members - Russia, the United States, Britain, France and China - alongside Germany, have failed to reach a solution to a possible military component of Iran’s nuclear programme, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergey Ryabkov told reporters on Friday.

Debates are going on about the list of facilities in Iran that international experts would be granted access to and on what grounds they would obtain this access.

**Issue No.1166, 22 May 2015**
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"The question is in the access: how much, how often and why the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) can gather information in Iran," Ryabkov said. "Another aspect is a parallel process of a step-by-step solution to the issues [of possible military aspects of Iran’s nuclear programme] that is underway between Iran and the IAEA."

"Both processes mean gathering of information, its analysis and a search for a clue to the issue if it is enough for saying that the theme has been exhausted and ceased to be problematic and worrying," he said.

"The Iranians have been reasonably insisting that the process should be drawing to a close and that after a certain amount of efforts the bottom line should be drawn and the theme should not be taken up again if the collected data satisfy the IAEA experts," Ryabkov said.

"Now we are at the stage of coordinating parameters of the access that would be provided so that a lid could be put over the theme of former military research," the Russian deputy foreign minister said.

http://tass.ru/en/world/795025
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Mehr News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Parl. to Decide on Additional Protocol

Sunday, 17 May 2015

TEHRAN, May 17 (MNA) – Head of Parliament National Security and Foreign Policy Commission has said the US officials have expressed contradictory positions on the number of Fordow centrifuges.

Alaeddin Boroujerdi who was speaking to reporters on the sidelines of Parliament’s open session on Sunday said that the implementation of the Additional Protocol should be decided on the Commission; “In 7th Parliament as well, we had suspended the volunteer implementation of the Additional Protocol by the government of the time, and it is still in effect; we have control over the Protocol, and should decide on the issue,” he asserted.

In response to a question whether the final deal in the nuclear negotiations required Parliament approval, Boroujerdi asserted that the parliament cast doubt on the very deal itself; about different bills addressed by the Parliament about nuclear negotiations, he said that “today, we debated in the Commission a scheme part of which passed by the Parliament; we will receive proposals by the parliamentarians to render a more complete plan”.

About a remark by Abbas Araghchi, Deputy FM who had said that according to Additional Protocol, inspections would be carried out by the IAEA, Boroujerdi held that Parliament should decide on this as well; “we believe that administrative and military centers should remained untouched by inspections provisioned by Additional Protocol should any final deal is agreed,” he noted.

Boroujerdi quoted a statement by Leader of the Islamic Republic about whether the July 1st would be the ultimate day of the deal. “Leader believed that the date was not once and for all and it was not sacrosanct; what is important for the Islamic Republic of Iran is to attain national interests by the final deal,” he told reporters.

“The US officials feared that they had agreed to a number of centrifuges in Fordow which is by their own standards disproportionately high; accordingly, they cite now a different figure for the number; this is a two-way road, and we would retaliate as well if necessary,” Boroujerdi noted.

About the threats by Saudi Arabia on inspections of Iranian ship carrying humanitarian aid to Yemen, Boroujerdi roundly rejected the possibility; “Saudi-led illegitimate coalition have no rights to inspect the ship; the US envoy to Yemen has agreed that Iran’s ship harbor in Al-Hudayda Port,” he added.
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**Report: Saudis May Purchase Pakistani Atomic Bomb**

*US, UK said to warily eye prospect of a Mideast nuclear arms race amid growing fear of Iranian nukes among Gulf states*

By Judah Ari Gross

May 17, 2015

Saudi Arabia has reached out to its ally Pakistan to acquire “off-the-shelf” atomic weapons as a nuclear arms race begins to shape up with Shiite rival Iran, US sources said.

“For the Saudis the moment has come,” a former US defense official told the UK’s *Sunday Times*. “There has been a longstanding agreement in place with the Pakistanis and the House of Saud has now made the strategic decision to move forward.”

The anonymous former official said the US did not believe that “any actual weaponry has been transferred yet,” but declared that “the Saudis mean what they say and they will do what they say.”

Tensions between Tehran and the kingdom have grown in the past few months as Saudi Arabia stepped up its air campaign against Iran-backed Houthi rebels in Yemen. King Salman of Saudi Arabia refused an invitation to attend a landmark summit hosted by US President Barack Obama last week, amid ongoing angst over US-led nuclear talks with Iran.

Former Saudi intelligence head Prince Turki bin Faisal expressed the kingdom’s desire for a nuclear weapon last month at the Asan Plenum, a conference held by the South Korean-based Asan Institute for Policy Studies.

“Whatever the Iranians have, we will have, too,” he said, according to *The New York Times*.

Faisal also warned that the Iranian nuclear deal “opens the door to nuclear proliferation, not closes it, as was the initial intention.”

According to the *Sunday Times* report, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan have enjoyed a mutually beneficial relationship for decades. Saudi Arabia has given Pakistan billions of dollars in subsidized oil, while the latter has unofficially agreed to supply the Gulf state with nuclear warheads.

“Nuclear weapons programs are extremely expensive and there’s no question that a lot of the funding of Pakistan’s nuclear weapons program was provided by Saudi Arabia,” Lord David Owen, who served as England’s foreign secretary from 1977-1979, told the weekly publication.

“Given their close relations and close military links, it’s long been assumed that if the Saudis wanted, they would call in a commitment, moral or otherwise, for Pakistan to supply them immediately with nuclear warheads,” he added.

However, the report added, Lt.Gen. Khalid Kidwai, who helped pioneer Pakistan’s nuclear program, denied that Pakistan had ever granted Saudi Arabia access to its nuclear technology.

The main concern shared by US and European officials was that if Saudi Arabia were to acquire an atomic weapon, it could spur other Sunni nations to follow suit.

An anonymous British military official also told *The Sunday Times* that Western military leaders “all assume the Saudis have made the decision to go nuclear.”

The official added, “The fear is that other Middle Eastern powers — Turkey and Egypt — may feel compelled to do the same and we will see a new, even more dangerous, arms race.”

This position was also mirrored by other, non-Saudi Gulf states at a summit last week between the US and several Arab countries. One unnamed Gulf state leader attending the Camp David summit told *The New York Times*, “We can’t sit back and be nowhere as Iran is allowed to retain much of its capability and amass its research.”


---

Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) – Tehran, Iran

20 May 2015

**Supreme Leader: No Inspection to Military Sites Allowed**

Tehran, May 20, IRNA – Supreme Leader of Islamic Revolution said on Wednesday that Iran will not allow inspection to any military sites.

Addressing the graduation ceremony of Islamic Revolution Guards Corps, Ayatollah Ali Khameneie said that Iran will not allow interview with the nuclear scientists either.
'Permission for doing such things will absolutely not be available and the enemies should know that the Iranian nation and the government will at no case retreat in confrontation with their totalitarian and bullying demands,' the Supreme leader said.
The Commander-in-Chief of the armed forces expressed deep concern about the attempt made by certain governments in the Persian Gulf region pushing forth proxy wars towards the Iranian borders.
'If any notorious act takes place, the Islamic Republic of Iran's reaction will be very severe,' the Supreme Leader said.
Ayatollah Khamenei said that the Iranian nation's prestige was revived thanks to Islam and the revolutionary ideals of the Iranian nation and thank God, the Islamic Republic of Iran is powerful enough to thwart the challenges.
'We feel no fear of being faced with such challenges, since being challenged is a sign of being dynamic, alive, active and moving forward,' added Ayatollah Khamenei.
'The Iranian nation will pass through the challenges mightily, having trust in God, and with high self-confidence,' he said.
Ayatollah Khamenei said that one of those challenges is the oppressive approach and totalitarianism of the western governments in the nuclear talks.
'The enemies have still not well understood the Iranian nation and government and that is the reason why they have aggressive demands, because the nation, and the government that is a part of this nation, will never yield to arbitrary demands,' the Supreme Leader said.
'The more we will retreat in confrontation with the totalitarian demands of the western governments, the more they will advance.'
The Supreme Leader said that a strong wall comprised of trust in God and national might needs to be constructed against such totalitarian demands.
'I will not permit the aliens to come and talk with the scientists, the dear children of this nation, for interrogation.'
Ayatollah Khamenei said that the dear officials of our country who are bravely moving in this field should know the only way to confront the rude and shameless enemy is having a resolute will and refraining from passiveness.
'The officials and negotiating team must convey the message of the Iranian nation's grandeur in the nuclear talks.'
http://www.irna.ir/en/News/81615980/

Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran
R&D, Iran's Red Line in Nuclear Talks: President Rouhani
May 21, 2015
TEHRAN (Tasnim) – Iranian President Hassan Rouhani on Thursday referred to research and development (R&D) as a red line for Iran in its nuclear talks with world powers, reaffirming that the country's negotiating team will stick to the lines set by the Supreme Leader.
"R&D is our red line and the negotiators are well aware of the red lines," Rouhani said in Tabriz, northwest of Iran. The Government is committed to the guidelines set by the Supreme Leader and will not sign any deal (with world powers) that would give foreigners access to the country's scientific and military secrets, he added. Referring to the Additional Protocol of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) which gives the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to the country's nuclear facilities, Rouhani stressed that the government is responsible for implementing the protocol, but it will not deviate from the red lines in this regard. Earlier on April 9, Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamenei categorically rejected foreign access to Iran's "security and defensive" sectors under the pretext of nuclear monitoring.
Iran and Group 5+1 (Russia, China, the US, Britain, France and Germany) have been negotiating to hammer out a lasting accord that would end more than a decade of impasse over Tehran's peaceful nuclear program. In their latest round of talks, on April 2, the two sides reached a framework nuclear agreement after more than a
week of intensive negotiations in Lausanne, Switzerland, with both sides committed to push for a final, comprehensive accord until the end of June.
The framework provides a series of solutions that will be the basis of a comprehensive joint plan of action. 
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Press TV – Tehran, Iran
US Threatens Not to Sign Nuclear Deal with Iran Due to Inspection of Sites
Thursday, May 21, 2015
Washington has threatened "not to sign" a final nuclear agreement with Tehran unless the Iranian government gives access to its possible military dimension-related sites and nuclear scientists.
"If we don’t get the assurances we need on the access to possible military dimension-related sites or activities, that’s going to be a problem for us," State Department spokeswoman Marie Harf said in Washington on Wednesday.
"We and Iran have agreed that we will undertake a process to address possible military dimensions (of past nuclear work), and part of that includes access," Harf said. "Under the Additional Protocol ... which Iran will implement and has said they will implement as part of this deal, the IAEA does get access."
“If we cannot agree in the final instance to something that meets our bottom line for what we need in terms of access, we’re not going to sign a final deal. And that’s just something we’ve been very, very clear about,” she added.
The remarks were made after Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei said that Iran would not allow inspection of its military sites.
Iran says the United States is making fresh demands in the nuclear negotiations.
"They are making new comments in the negotiations. Regarding the inspections, we have said that we will not allow foreigners to carry out inspections of any military sites," Ayatollah Khamenei said on Wednesday.
"The enemies should know that the Iranian nation and officials will, by no means, give in to excessive demands and bullying,” the Leader underlined.
The US and its negotiating partners reached a framework nuclear agreement with Iran in Switzerland on April 2. Tehran and the P5+1 group – the US, Britain, France, China, Russia and Germany – are currently working to draw up a final accord by the end of June.
Iran has repeatedly stressed that it will not allow inspections of its military facilities and insists that the nuclear deal must only include nuclear issues.
“Iran will brook no excessive demands. The agreed parameters are those confirmed by the two sides in Lausanne and these parameters need to be stipulated in a written agreement by Iran and the P5+1,” Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif said earlier this month.
http://www.presstv.ir/Detail/2015/05/21/412102/US-nuclear-deal-Iran-inspection-military-sites
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Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) – Tehran, Iran
22 May 2015
Iran Won't Bow to West Pressure in Nuclear Talks: Zarif
Tehran, May 22, IRNA - Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif said here on Friday that Iran will not cave in to any excessive demands by the Western side in nuclear negotiations.
Zarif underscored that Iran nuclear negotiating team is fully obliged to respect nuclear red lines, Fordow nuclear facility in particular.
Touching upon the US excessive demands in inspecting Fordow nuclear facility and other military sites, he reiterated that Iran nuclear negotiating team have repeatedly announced that under no circumstance Iran will give in to excessive demands by the western side.
Foreign Ministry spokesperson Marzieh Afkham said on Thursday that the western governments must respect Iranian sovereignty rights to resolve the nuclear dispute.
Afkham made the remarks in a response to provocative remarks of acting spokeswoman for the United States Department of State Marie Harf. She said on Wednesday that there would be no final nuclear agreement if Iran denied access to military sites. Foreign ministry spokeswomen underlined that without respecting Iranian sovereignty rights, no agreement would be reached between Iran and P5+1. The nuclear dispute between Iran and the western governments must be resolved in accordance with the International Law and the Charter of the United Nations respecting sovereign quality of the member states, Afkham said. Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamenei made clear on May 20 that Iran will not allow inspectors to the military sites and interview with nuclear scientists.


Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) – Tehran, Iran
22 May 2015

Araqchi: Drafting Nuclear Text Slow, Talks to Continue
Tehran, May 22, IRNA – Senior nuclear negotiator, Abbas Araqchi described process of drafting comprehensive nuclear deal as slow, adding that talks will continue on Tuesday in Vienna. Araqchi accompanied by his colleague Majid Takht-e Ravanchi have started the fourth round of nuclear talks as of Wednesday in Vienna which continued until Friday. Araqchi further noted that drafting of the main text and its appendices at the expert and political levels was conducted in the past three days. Expert sessions on sanctions and nuclear issues were held simultaneously during the same period. Deputy foreign minister for legal and international affairs pointed out that given the complexities and their wide dimensions, drafting of the text is slow. New round of meetings for drafting nuclear deal will resume as of Tuesday in Vienna.


Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran
No Inspection Whatsoever of Iran’s Military Sites Allowed: IRGC Officer
May 22, 2015

TEHRAN (Tasnim) – West’s call for access to Iran’s military sites under the guise of nuclear inspection is tantamount to espionage, commander of the Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC) Aerospace Force said, noting that Iran’s response to espionage is “hot bullets.”

“We will not allow them (Westerners) to inspect our military and defense centers, and our response to any measure in the name of inspection -either coordinated or not- around the (military) centers or at any distance and in any shape will be the response that is given to espionage, namely hot bullets,” Brigadier General Amir Ali Hajizadeh said in a meeting with a group of foreign military attachés, held in Tehran on Friday. The commander made it clear that the ploys the White House and its allies use to infiltrate into Iran have become worn-out, a hint at the West’s insistence on inspection of Iran’s military sites under a comprehensive nuclear deal with Tehran. The remarks by the Iranian commander came after Supreme Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyed Ali Khamenei on Wednesday stressed that Iran will not allow the inspection of its military sites. The Supreme Leader ruled out any request for interviews with Tehran’s nuclear scientists, and described it as an instance of “interrogation”.

“I would not let foreigners come (here) and talk to the Iranian nation’s dear scientists... who have expanded this wide knowledge to this stage,” Imam Khamenei explained.
Iran and Group 5+1 (Russia, China, the US, Britain, France and Germany) have been negotiating to hammer out a lasting accord that would end more than a decade of impasse over Tehran's peaceful nuclear program. On April 2, the two sides reached a framework nuclear agreement after more than a week of intensive negotiations in Lausanne, Switzerland, with both sides committed to push for a final, comprehensive accord until the end of June.


The Nation – Lahore, Pakistan

Nuclear Program is for Pakistan's own Self Defense: Foreign Office

Independent News Pakistan (INP)

May 21, 2015

Islamabad: Pakistan has emphatically stated that its nuclear program is purely for its own legitimate self defense and maintenance of credible minimum deterrence.

At his weekly news briefing in Islamabad today, Foreign Office Spokesperson Qazi Khalilullah strongly rejected media reports that Saudi Arabia wants to acquire nuclear weapons from Pakistan. He said there is no Pakistan-Saudi nuclear deal.

Qazi Khalilullah pointed out that there has been entirely baseless and mischievous campaign in the international media about Pakistan's indigenous nuclear program. He said the story carried by the Sunday Times on Pakistan's nuclear program appears to be part of that campaign and is utterly unfounded.

The spokesperson made it clear that Pakistan has a robust command and control structure and comprehensive export controls. He said Pakistan supports objectives of non-proliferation as well as nuclear safety and security.

Khalilullah confirmed the agreement between Pakistan's premier intelligence agency Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) and the Afghan intelligence outfit National Directorate of Security (NDS) aimed at bolstering fight against terrorism.

He said that the accord between the two agencies was part of a bilateral agreement in the field of security and counter-terrorism.

On the Yemen issue, the spokesperson said Pakistan is and will remain in touch with Saudi Arabia on the issue. He said we have already expressed our concerns over shelling from Yemen on Najran in Saudi Arabia. He said about fifteen thousand Pakistanis are living there and we have requested the Saudi authorities to ensure their security.

He expressed the confidence that Saudi Arabia will make all possible arrangements for the safety of Pakistanis. When asked about relations with India, the spokesperson said Islamabad is committed to good relations with all neighbors including India. He said Pakistan desires peace and stability in the region and will continue to play its role in this regard.

He said Pakistan is cooperating with the international community to root out terrorism from the region and the world.

To a question, Qazi Khalilullah said Pakistan wants an Afghan led and Afghan owned reconciliation process and is extending all possible cooperation to Kabul in that regard. He said Pakistan and Afghanistan are cooperating in different sectors including the intelligence sharing.

When asked whether the United States has raised concerns over the issuance of fake degrees by a Pakistani company, the spokesperson said no country including the United States has raised concerns with Pakistan. He said everybody is looking forward for investigation into the scandal.
The Economic Times – Mumbai, India
Pakistan Rejects Reports on Selling Nuclear Arms to Saudi Arabia
By Press Trust of India (PTI)
21 May, 2015
ISLAMABAD: Amid reports that Saudi Arabia has taken a "strategic decision" to acquire "off-the-shelf" nuclear arms from close ally Pakistan, the government here today rejected as "baseless" any such move to sell atomic weapons.

Pakistan's Foreign Office spokesperson Qazi Khalillulah at a news briefing here said "Pakistan's nuclear programme was purely for its own legitimate self-defence and for maintaining a credible minimum deterrence". The 'Sunday Times' of London had recently quoted unnamed senior US officials as saying that Saudi Arabia had "taken the 'strategic decision' to acquire 'off-the-shelf' atomic weapons from Pakistan".

"Pakistan's nuclear programme is meant for its security and there is a strong command and control system over it. Pakistan is aware of its responsibilities as a nuclear state," Khalillulah said, rejecting the 'Sunday Times' report about a nuclear deal between Pakistan and Saudi Arabia.

Khalillulah pointed out that there has been an "entirely baseless and mischievous campaign in the international media about Pakistan's indigenous nuclear programme". He said the story carried by the Sunday Times on Pakistan’s nuclear programme appears to be part of that campaign and is "utterly unfounded".

The spokesperson said Pakistan supports objectives of non-proliferation as well as nuclear safety and security. He also said Pakistan is and will remain in touch with Saudi Arabia on the issue of the conflict in Yemen. "We have already expressed our concerns over shelling from Yemen on Najran in Saudi Arabia," he said.

The spokesperson said that about 15,000 Pakistanis were living in the area and Pakistan had asked Saudi authorities to ensure their security.

Last month, Pakistan decided against its sending troops as requested by Saudi Arabia to support its forces fighting the Shia Houthi rebels in Yemen.


The Diplomat – Tokyo, Japan
OPINION/Flashpoints
China’s MIRVs: Sign of a Cold War to Come?
What caused China’s interest in multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle warheads?
By Robert Farley for The Diplomat
May 18, 2015

Big news hit the front page of the New York Times on Saturday, in the form of a long article on China’s efforts to miniaturize its nuclear arsenal. The article, using the annual Pentagon report on Chinese military capabilities as its primary source, noted that the decision to tackle the technical problems associated with miniaturization suggest (but only suggest) a larger shift in nuclear weapons doctrine. As the Times article notes, China has long had the latent capacity to MIRV its nuclear missiles, a step that the United States, the Soviet Union, France, and the United Kingdom took long ago.

The Diplomat has closely followed developments in China’s policy of minimal nuclear deterrence, observing that while China had not yet decided to make the leap toward a nuclear warfighting strategy, the modernization and recapitalization of its force over the past decade could open the door to more offensive options.
Hans Kristensen has argued that this represents a major change in China’s nuclear posture, and a bad day for efforts at limiting the role that nuclear arms play in geopolitics. Others see this shift in more evolutionary terms, as holding to long-established technological red lines put clear limits on China’s ability to maintain a sophisticated deterrent. No one believes that France or the United Kingdom, which have long used MIRVs on submarine-launched ballistic missiles, seriously entertain the offensive use of nuclear weapons. Moreover, it’s worth noting that few American policymakers would even momentarily entertain enduring the level of nuclear insecurity that China lives with on a daily basis.

Does this decision come as a direct response to U.S. anti-ballistic missile efforts? Possibly, but these efforts have been in the works since the middle of last decade. Notably, U.S. efforts have yet to yield a workable defense system that an American president could entrust to defend against even a limited Chinese strike. Still, the notion that BMD loomed large in Chinese thinking can’t be discounted, and would suggest that China has only adjusted, and not fundamentally changed, its choice of deterrent posture.

The broader issue may be how China views the potential for long-term hostility between the U.S. and the PRC. While Americans are generally inclined to wildly overstate the importance of American behavior to the decision-making of foreigners, it can hardly be lost on Beijing that even the “dovish” party in the United States envisions a long-term period of confrontation. The Obama administration has even attempted to sell its primary multilateral economic effort, the TPP, on the grounds of security concerns about China. There can be little question, however, that U.S. analysts who have long warned about China’s threat to the United States will feel vindicated by this report. It seems likely that the decision to MIRV will support, rather than deter, U.S. pursuit of missile defense systems, which in turn may push China towards a larger nuclear program (especially if China envisions an offensive warfighting doctrine). At some point, we’ll be forced to ask whether Washington and Beijing need to take another page from the Cold War rulebook, and consider bilateral nuclear limitation talks.

Robert Farley is an assistant professor at the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce. His work includes military doctrine, national security, and maritime affairs.

http://thediplomat.com/2015/05/chinas-mirvs-sign-of-a-cold-war-to-come/

Russia Threatens to Build More Nuclear Weapons

By Zachary Keck
May 18, 2015

Russia may increase the size of its nuclear arsenal, a senior Russian official revealed on Friday. Speaking at the 2015 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty conference in New York, Mikhail Ulyanov, the Director of the Department for Non-Proliferation and Arms Control at the Russian Foreign Ministry, said that Russia may be forced to increase the size of its nuclear arsenal in response to provocative U.S. actions. Noting that the United States and Russia have drastically reduced the size of their respective arsenals in recent years, and that the United States has proposed reducing their arsenals by another third, Ulyanov stated “U.S. actions have led to the appearance of completely contradictory factors which, in some circumstances, may even push Russia to begin increasing [its nuclear arsenal]."

The official elaborated on the alleged U.S. provocations, which included: “U.S. missile defense program, the U.S. refusal to negotiate on the ban on weapons in outer space, the U.S. military’s Prompt Global Strike (PGS) system, Washington’s de facto refusal to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and the serious imbalance in conventional weapons in Europe.”

Ulyanov clarified that Russia wasn’t currently actively considering increasing the size of its nuclear arsenal, but such a move would have to be considered should America’s action remain unchanged. Since the end of the Cold War, the United States and Russia have slashed the size of their nuclear arsenals, from roughly 70,000 warheads at the height of the Cold War to less than 15,000 today. Of the 15,000 warheads in Russia and U.S. arsenals today, only about 3,500 are considered operational. The rest are in their inventories.

Still, despite the decline in numbers, nuclear weapons have arguably become more important in Russia’s national security since the end of the Cold War, thanks to its declining conventional military power. During the Cold War,
for instance, Russia maintained a no-first use pledge when it came to nuclear weapons. By 1993, however, Russia had abandoned that pledge. Furthermore, in 1999 and 2000, Russia introduced a policy of de-escalatory nuclear strikes into its military doctrine. The 2000 Russian military doctrine explained that de-escalation is “a strategy envisioning the threat of a limited nuclear strike that would force an opponent to accept a return to the status quo ante.” The 2010 update of the doctrine similarly stated: “The Russian Federation reserves the right to utilize nuclear weapons in response to the utilization of nuclear and other types of weapons of mass destruction against it and (or) its allies, and also in the event of aggression against the Russian Federation involving the use of conventional weapons when the very existence of the state is under threat.”

Vladimir Putin has put a new premium on nuclear weapons since beginning his third term as president in 2012. Just months before taking power again, for example, Putin wrote an op-ed in Foreign Policy magazine in which he stated: “We should not tempt anyone by allowing ourselves to be weak. We will, under no circumstances, surrender our strategic deterrent capability. Indeed, we will strengthen it.” Since taking office, he has made good on that pledge by repeatedly holding snap nuclear drills to ensure Russia’s strategic deterrent would function properly during times of crisis. The United States has also accused Russia of violating the 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which banned all land-based missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,000 kilometers, when it deployed the Yars (RS-26) intercontinental ballistic missile.

Zachary Keck is managing editor of The National Interest.

http://www.nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/russia-threatens-build-more-nuclear-weapons-12912
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A Nuclear Triad Is Far Superior to a Dyad or Monad
By Constance Baroudos, M.A.
May 18, 2015

Last month, Frank Kendall, Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, noted that the nuclear force modernization budget is unaffordable based on current forecasted defense funds. In response to dwindling resources, some suggest eliminating one or two legs of the nuclear triad to decrease costs. However, the U.S. needs to retain all three components of the strategic arsenal to deter aggressors and reassure allies. The nuclear deterrent causes potential adversaries to recognize that a loss exceeds any gain that could result from launching a nuclear attack on America or its allies. Three legs make up the U.S. nuclear triad: strategic bombers, submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) — each component complements the force as a whole by providing distinct capabilities. Strategic bombers provide flexibility since they can be recalled after deployment. Recall capability is vital considering contemporary deterrence must tailor to different actors — what deters one potential enemy may not deter another and what deters an adversary today may not be sufficient to deter him tomorrow. Bombers also serve as visible signals of protection to allies because they can be forward deployed in a crisis. More than 30 nations around the world rely on U.S. extended deterrence in place of developing their own nuclear capability. Trident II SLBMs provide an assured second-strike capability with a full load range of about 4,230 nautical miles and a maximum speed of about 18,030 miles per hour. Not only do the 14 Ohio-class submarines carry 24 missiles each, they are also undetectable in the ocean. Since an enemy cannot locate and destroy SLBMs, they are guaranteed to survive in the event of a nuclear attack. ICBMs are the most stabilizing leg of the triad — they are on alert and controlled by the president to allow a timely response. Each missile carries a warhead of about 300 to 500 kilotons and can be found in hardened underground silos at Air Force bases in Montana, North Dakota, Nebraska, Colorado and Wyoming. The U.S. is in the process of having 400 armed missiles, with 50 unarmed missiles in reserve, to comply with the New START Treaty by 2018.
Even though these missiles are the cheapest leg of the triad, they pose a serious targeting challenge for an adversary. Due to the Ohio-class submarine’s invisibility and guaranteed survival, some believe that the strategic deterrent can solely depend on the sea leg. Such a drastic change in policy would be a huge mistake. Keeping in mind that many submarines are at one of two ports at any given moment and some are out of commission due to maintenance cycles, the harbors could be tempting targets for aggressors — especially if it were the only standing leg of the deterrent. Additionally, a future technological breakthrough that would allow challengers to identify underwater craft in the ocean would increase chances of attack.

ICBMs provide stability because they are challenging targets. Since these missiles sit in hardened silos far away from one another, it is impossible for an enemy to entirely destroy them. Even if an adversary attempted to do so, an aggressor would need substantial nuclear forces to penetrate the hardened silos. In turn, the considerable force required would deplete the aggressor’s arsenal and America would respond with a deadly second-strike. However, if ICBMs were nonexistent, the number of targets an adversary would aim to demolish on American soil would dwindle from about 450 to a handful, increasing the likelihood of conflict. Strategic bombers allow the U.S. to deescalate regional conflicts and reassure allies that Washington has their backs in a crisis. After all, nations under the nuclear umbrella risk their cities to defend them because they trust that the U.S. will provide protection. If the air leg were eliminated, allies would likely not trust America to use its land and sea legs to shield them from harm. Therefore, these nations may feel the need to develop their own nuclear arsenals or ally with another nuclear-armed state.

Contrary to popular belief, nuclear weapons are used every second of each day to prevent a nuclear attack on the U.S. and its allies. Since these deadly weapons have worked perfectly to prevent nuclear war, many people have forgotten why they are necessary. If enemies were to only focus on attacking one or two delivery platforms, America would lose its deterrence advantage. Furthermore, the triad allows the U.S. to forego chemical and biological stockpiles while still capable of an overwhelming force against an adversary. The nuclear triad is the only weapon structure that has worked without fail to prevent the use of nuclear arms. Some opponents believe that a more peaceful world would result if the U.S. were to dismantle its nuclear force, assuming other countries will follow. This is a fairy tale. Nuclear technology cannot be uninvented — it is a threat that Washington must deter. According to the British strategist Sir Michael Quinlan, “Better unquestionably to have nuclear weapons but not war, than to have war but not nuclear weapons.” Even Winston Churchill warned the U.S. Congress in 1952, “Be careful, above all, not to let go of the atomic weapon until you are sure — and more than sure — that other means of preserving peace are in your hands.” America must ensure it has a powerful and diversified triad with a hedge that is larger than deployed forces to adapt to current and future threats and prevent the calculus of aggressors from changing.

All three legs of the triad are critical to national security because they overwhelm potential enemies with multiple targets, guarantee a deadly second-strike response, and satisfy allies’ perceptions of safety. Even so, America’s nuclear infrastructure and capabilities are decaying. To maintain a strong nuclear force, Congress must understand its continued relevance to international stability and provide an ample amount of resources to modernize all three legs of America’s strategic triad and the nuclear infrastructure that allows it to survive. If Washington fails to modernize its deterrent, regional conflicts are likely to increase and countries under the nuclear umbrella may decide to develop independent nuclear capabilities and pair up with other allies for protection.

Constance Baroudos is a Policy Analyst and Program Director at the Lexington Institute. Her current research interests include ballistic missile-defense and nuclear strategy.

http://lexingtoninstitute.org/a-nuclear-triad-is-far-superior-than-a-dyad-or-monad/
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Commentary: North Korea's 'Fake' Missiles Stir to Life
By Uzi Rubin
May 18, 2015

On May 9, a beaming Kim Jong Un watched his country's first sub-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) leaping out of the water after being launched from a submerged North Korean submarine. The missile, a spitting image of the Soviet era SSN6, was dubbed "Bukkeuksaeong 1" (Polaris 1) by the North Koreans, a thinly veiled allusion to the US first-generation SLBM of the 1960s.

The new Polaris 1 successfully breached the ocean's surface and ignited its rocket motor, probably for a brief burn to ensure that it hits the water not too far away. Reports about a North Korean SLBM program have been circulating lately and satellite photos have already revealed a static onshore test rig for the ejection of submarine-launched missiles.

Nevertheless, the May 9 test fleshed out the program from the realms of academic speculation into the limelight of world attention. No matter how one looks at it, from a pure technological perspective it was an impressive achievement that sent shock waves around the world. By right, this should also provoke some soul-searching among the habitual critics of missile defense.

Those critics love to argue that missile defense can't work, and that anyway there are no worthwhile threats to defend against. When missile defense does work, as it spectacularly did over Israel's skies last summer, critics "prove" that it really didn't, regardless of what millions of Israelis saw with their own eyes.

When rogue bullies like North Korea parade ever heavier and longer-range ballistic missiles, they dismiss them as dog and pony shows, as mockups for propaganda purposes or as obsolete Soviet-era equipment that was lifted from Russian junk yards.

Oceans of ink have been spilled to preach that their design did not make sense, that they were clumsy representations of missiles being developed, that fabricating them would require gigantic indigenous technical effort that was inconceivable because of North Korea's pitiful economy.

Patronizingly, they point out that similar US ballistic missiles represented decades of expertise in rocket motors and vast sums of intellectual, technological and financial capital, alluding that the rogues, somehow, lack the intellectual resources or huge oil income to emulate past US past feats.

According to this article of faith, there is no imminent threat to the US and its allies from the rogues' missiles, hence no need for the US to irk Russia by deploying missile defenses.

When North Korea unveiled the long-predicted Musudan/BM25 intermediate-range ballistic missile in an October 2010 parade, it was met by a chorus of skepticism from missile defense bashers. As we now know, the Musudan/BM25 is a stretched land-mobile version of the SSN6, the Soviet Union's first SLBM, which utilizes a more modern propulsion system than that of the older Scuds.

For the skeptics, though, the newly unveiled missiles rolling down Pyongyang's main thoroughfare were mockups, mere stage props crafted to force observers into believing that the Musudan was based on the SSN6. Nothing to worry about, they said, because it was more plausible to assume that North Korea was still limited to ancient Scud technology.

The thought that a rogue regime like North Korea's might eventually send nuclear ballistic missile submarines to patrol the shores of Japan and the US surely sends shudders down the spines of Western analysts. This specter might compel more investments in missile defenses everywhere. Confronted with this prospect, it would not be too surprising if the habitual skeptics rally once more to trivialize the North Korean achievement, perhaps explaining it away as a photo shop propaganda ploy or reiterating their arguments about North Korea's allegedly limited intellectual resources and its pitiful economy.

In this regard, history proves at least two fundamental things: First, that industrialized nations have no monopoly on brainpower: Rogue countries can raise educated classes of technological leaders. Second, dictatorships can squeeze out ample resources from "pitiful economies" for regime-saving technological breakthroughs. After all, it was only five years after Alamogordo that the USSR, still in ruins from World War II, exploded its first nuclear bomb. Nine years later came Sputnik.

Mao's "Great Leap Forward," which ended in 1961, shrunk China's GDP and killed millions by starvation. Yet one year later, China exploded its own nuclear bomb. Mao's disastrous "Cultural Revolution" was still raging in 1970...
Let no one draw comfort from the false notion that the rogues are somehow incompetent. The May 9 North Korean test was a clarion call that showed both competence and determination. The missiles that annually roll down Pyongyang’s avenues might be geometrical representations, but the North Korean missile program is neither a mockup nor a fake. It is real, it is dangerous, and it should be defended against.

Uzi Rubin is president of the Rubincon consulting firm and founder of Israel’s Missile Defense Organization.


How to Demolish the North Korean Submarine Missile Threat

Preemptive strikes and missile defense won’t be enough to stop North Korea’s new submarine-launched missiles.

By Koh Swee Lean Collin

May 18, 2015

The recent reported test of North Korea’s KN-11, dubbed Pukgeukseong-1 (Polaris-1) submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) has created quite a buzz. In fact, not long before the test took place, the South Korean defense ministry remarked that there were no signs that Pyongyang would launch missiles in the near future despite the visit by North Korean leader Kim Jong-Un to the country’s satellite command and control center, operated by the National Aerospace Development Administration. Washington took the recent development seriously, accusing Pyongyang of contravening existing United Nations Security Council resolutions by staging the test. South Korean government authorities sought to downplay the test, pointing out that it was no more than an ejector test and the missile was assumed to have flown only 100 meters upon lift-off. This appears to correspond with the subsequent assessment reached by the U.S. intelligence community, that a compressed-gas ejection system test was conducted instead of a launch from a submarine. The Indians, for instance, tested their SLBM from an underwater pontoon numerous times before being confident enough to begin preparations to test it from their latest nuclear submarine, INS Arihant. It is therefore, plausibly to say, simply a matter of time before Pyongyang finally tests the SLBM from a submarine. Notwithstanding the actual status of the SLBM, it is clear that North Korea is in the process of developing such a capability. Seoul has since called Pyongyang’s SLBM development, believed to still be in early stages, a “serious challenge.”

Indeed, the focus on North Korea’s ballistic missile activities has always been territorially-bounded—from the static Rodong missile silos to the newer, more survivable mobile launchers. As was recently pointed out on The National Interest, by conducting the SLBM test, Pyongyang has demonstrated that it is on the way to a second-strike capability. That the test took place at sea, and not on land as it has always been the case in the past, certainly took the world by surprise.

Scarcely information has transpired from the SLBM test, besides the latest assessments. What we do know is that there were earlier reports of a shore-based ejector-launch test. There were also grainy satellite pictures of a hitherto unknown type of submarine measuring an estimated 65.5 meters, likely a diesel-electric powered ballistic missile submarine (SSB in short), which was later dubbed the Sinpo class. Previous rhetoric from Pyongyang offered hints into more ambitious endeavours for its missile buildup, including talk about building a “more elite” nuclear deterrent.

As enigmatically it may sound, by now it should be clear that what North Korea means by a “more elite” nuclear deterrent is one that includes a sea-based element. This sea-based deterrent certainly adds to the shroud of ambiguity that Pyongyang often thrives on to make its intent and moves appear uncertain, thereby compelling its perceived adversaries to react with caution.

Some commentators forecasted a chain series of events that will plausibly heighten tensions on the Korean Peninsula, for example driving Seoul to expedite missile defense plans (including the controversial proposal to install the Theater High-Altitude Air Defense system, a move which has been roundly opposed by China, North
Korea and Russia), as well as incentivizing its option of pre-emptive strikes against Pyongyang’s nuclear and missile arsenals. However, it had also been pointed out that the North Korean SLBM, if deployed effectively, may nullify the utility of pre-emptive strikes, because SLBM launchers are more difficult to target. This is true. Compared to its land and air-based counterparts, the sea-based deterrent is undeniably more secure. Ballistic missile submarines are traditionally known to be some of the quietest: hard to detect and destroy.

In particular, nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) can roam the world’s oceans by exploiting its infinite power and underwater endurance, thus presenting ASW difficulties. With SLBMs of intercontinental-range, the SSBN can easily strike deep into enemy homeland from an appreciable long standoff distance, beyond the adversary’s anti-submarine warfare (ASW) coverage.

It is therefore a race for time. Before the SSBN can reach its pre-designated launch point to lob its payload at the target, the adversary’s ASW forces have to swiftly locate and destroy the boat. Only nuclear-powered attack submarines (SSNs) backed by long-range aerial and surface ASW forces can possibly counter such a threat. However, not every navy has the luxury of such a highly-demanding set of forces at its disposal.

Based on existing information, we can surmise that North Korea does not operate any SSBN. All its existing submarines are conventionally-powered. The boat that reportedly conducted the recent test is with little doubt a SSB. Being diesel-electric powered, the SSB is not only handicapped by range but also by endurance. In fact, the Korean People’s Navy (KPN) is not known to have any air-independent propulsion to prolong the underwater endurance of its submarines.

Most importantly, the SSB cannot muster sufficient power using its diesel engines to outrun hunter-killer submarines. At the very most, this SSB can silently creep out of its hiding spot, reach its pre-designated position and stay quietly submerged by running on batteries. Because of its finite power capacity, this SSB will have to surface or snorkel for air to recharge its batteries. And a surfaced or snorkeling submarine is a sore thumb sticking out of the sea, an inviting ASW target.

As I had briefly discussed in a previous commentary, the most plausible scenario of the North Korean sea-based nuclear deterrent in action is one that will see the SSBN securely sheltered in a submarine cave and quietly deployed in times of crisis. Because of its inherent technical characteristics, despite having stronger oceangoing capability compared to the KPN’s existing stable of coastal submarines, the SSB is unlikely expected to head too far out to the sea.

But the key militating factor is North Korea’s lack of aerial and surface cover to protect the submarine, at least up till the moment it discharges its lethal payload. The Korean People’s Army Air Force is handicapped in capacity. It has no air-to-air refueling tankers to boast of, and its most capable fighter jet is the MiG-29 Fulcrum, which has limited operational radius.

The KPN is far from being a bluewater navy. It lacks long-range power projection capabilities to protect the SSB against intervening ASW forces. Despite its reported construction of a pair of light frigates ostensibly configured as an offshore patrol vessel or ASW platform, the KPN’s existing fleet remains hamstrung in projecting force into distant waters. At the most, it remains a coastal defense-oriented navy.

What these all mean is that the North Korean SLBM threat can only be conceived of in two deployment modes. The first envisages a “suicide mission” that sees the SSB deploy as far out to the seas as its capability allowed in times of crisis. For example, the vessel could reach the pre-designated launch point in the Sea of Japan, and survive long enough to fire its payload before it is tracked down and destroyed.

In view of the history of North Korean submarine incidents involving Pyongyang’s special operations forces, it is plausible to envision that the SSBN may be deployed for such a mission. KPN submarine units are amongst Pyongyang’s elite military branches, and their crews are considered some of the most politically reliable. In this deployment mode, the SLBM may possibly target American bases in Japan. But it is unlikely that the SLBM can target the U.S. west coast because of potential limitations of the SLBM itself, to say nothing of those of the SSB.

The second possibility is for the SSB to deploy within the coastal confines of North Korea, well within its local air and surface cover. This approach exploits the geographical characteristics of the Korean coastline. There are numerous bays, inlets and outer isles, for instance, that may offer ideal “hiding spots” for the SSB. The target may encompass the American bases in Japan, but more plausibly the target will be South Korea itself.

This is a potential scenario that cannot be ignored when one considers that in March 2014, North Korea is believed to have tested its medium-range Rodong missiles at a higher-than-usual launch angle, according to South Korean military authorities. The Rodong has an estimated 1,000-1,500 kilometers range and intended for mainly targeting
U.S. bases in Japan. A higher-than-usual launch angle essentially shortens the missile range and allows it to evade South Korean and American missile defenses and hit South Korea proper. If this technique is mustered by the North Koreans, the KN11 SLBM or possibly subsequent “improved” derivatives may possess such a capability. This not only nullifies any prospective pre-emptive strike strategy adopted by Seoul, but it also potentially undermines South Korean and American missile defenses. Therefore, more suitable countermeasures against the North Korean SLBM possibly cannot rely on having a pre-emptive strike capability or using missile defense.

Of course, pre-emptive strikes and missile defense both add to overall countermeasures against the burgeoning North Korean ballistic missile capabilities. Still, what seems to be at least equally if not more essential is to possess good ASW capabilities. In particular, ASW capabilities will need to allow South Korea and the United States to track, target and destroy the SSB in real-time and at long-ranges. As such, what is worrying may not simply be the adoption of a pre-emptive strike capability or hastening of missile defense development on the Korean Peninsula, but rather the need for South Korea and America’s response to reach the maritime domain. Because time is of the premium when dealing with the SLBM threat, the onus is not just on real-time detection and targeting, using ocean reconnaissance satellites or unmanned aerial vehicles, for example, but also rapid-response ASW prosecution capabilities. Extending Seoul’s envisaged “Kill Chain” to the maritime domain is one logical solution.

Suppose that the capabilities to detect and track the North Korean SSB in real-time are available, will existing conventional means be sufficient to neutralize the threat? Long-range maritime patrol aircraft and surface warships armed with ASW helicopters and long-range standoff ASW weapons such as the vertical-launch anti-submarine rocket are well-known types of assets for such a role. But will South Korea’s diesel-electric powered attack submarines suffice in such a role? Such boats are certainly underpowered, and thus limited in their hunter-killer role against such time-sensitive targets as a SSB or SSBN.

For now, as part of the American-South Korean alliance, the U.S. Navy’s SSNs will fill this undersea void. But what will the situation be like in future? Will Seoul eventually consider the need to introduce its own SSNs, and how will that influence Japan’s decision to do the same? While these are only potential scenarios, it does warrant the need for caution by paying greater attention to North Korea’s SLBM and SSB developments and the potential consequences they may entail for the region.

Koh Swee Lean Collin is associate research fellow at the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies, a constituent unit of the S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies based in Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.


Return to Top

Foreign Policy – Washington, D.C.
OPINION/The Cable
U.S.: Iran Deal Doesn’t Change Need for Missile Defense Shield in Europe
By John Hudson
May 19, 2015

A top U.S. military officer said Tuesday that an emerging nuclear deal with Iran will not affect U.S. plans to build a missile defense shield in Europe, despite strong objections from Moscow.

Russia “shouldn’t worry about this,” said Adm. James Winnefeld, the vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. “They should actually be encouraged that we are helping our allies there potentially defending us against Iran.” The U.S. has long justified the missile interceptor bases in Romania and Poland as a necessary safeguard against Iran. Now that world powers and Tehran near a final deal on Iran’s nuclear program, Russia has repeatedly demanded that Washington scrap plans for the defense shield that Moscow sees as a threat to its own security. Moscow has been increasing pressure on European countries that have offered to host installations for the defense shield, and last month warned Poland and Romania against participating in the U.S.-led program.

“Non-nuclear powers where missile-defense installations are being installed have become the objects of priority response,” Gen. Valery Gerasimov said at a conference last month in Moscow, according to the Wall Street Journal.
Russian Defense Minister Sergie Shoigu also said U.S. claims that a defense shield is designed to deter Tehran were a lie. “Today it is clear that the missile threat from Tehran that the U.S. and other countries of the alliance invented was a bluff,” he said at the same conference.

Winnefeld, speaking Tuesday at the Center for Strategic and International Studies, offered a lengthy rebuttal. First, he said the defense shield could technically not pose a threat to Russia, given the sophisticated ballistic missile capabilities of Moscow’s military. “A reasonably powerful country like Russia could overwhelm that missile defense system fairly quickly,” he said.

Second, he noted that even if international negotiators reach a nuclear deal, Iran could break the agreement at any time — a risk the U.S. needs to prepare for, given the amount of time it takes to develop a missile defense shield. “A ballistic missile defense system isn’t something that you turn on overnight,” he said.

He also emphasized that the Iran negotiations do not address the country’s ballistic missile capabilities, which means the country could still pose a conventional military threat even if it adheres to a final deal. “I think there’s every reason for us to continue what we’re doing,” he said.

The Russian Embassy in Washington did not respond to a request for comment Tuesday.

Greg Thielmann, a missile defense expert at the Arms Control Association, said Winnefeld is correct that the U.S.-led defense shield, as currently planned, would not hobble Russia’s missile capabilities — which Moscow sees as an important way to deter adversaries.

However, Thielmann questioned Winnefeld’s claim that a missile defense shield is a worthwhile investment, even if Iran swears off its nuclear ambitions. He said the cost-benefit analysis to counter a conventional ballistic missile does not add up.

“There’s no way in hell it makes any sense to protect France from a ballistic missile with a conventional warhead in this scenario,” Thielmann said. “It’s a hugely disproportionate expenditure of money without a nuclear warhead.”

*John Hudson is a senior reporter at Foreign Policy covering diplomacy and national security.*

https://foreignpolicy.com/2015/05/19/u-s-iran-deal-doesnt-change-need-for-missile-defense-shield-in-europe/

---

The National Interest – Washington, D.C.

OPINION/The Buzz

**Meet America's New 'Bunker-Buster' Super Bomb**

By Zachary Keck

May 20, 2015

The U.S. Air Force has developed a new, lighter bunker-buster bomb that can be launched from the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter.

*Flight Global* reports that David E. Walker, the Air Force’s chief scientist, says that the U.S. Air Force research laboratory has proven the technology for its high velocity penetrating weapon (HVPW). The HVPW program, which was launched in 2011, was aimed at building a 2,000lb, rocket-propelled bomb that would be small enough to be integrated onto the F-35 and other non-strategic bombers.

Like other bunker-buster missiles, such as the gigantic 30,000lb Massive Ordnance Penetrator (MOP), the HVPW is designed to destroy buried targets like underground bunkers and tunnels. However, unlike MOP and traditional bunker-busters, his new kinetic weapon is rammed into the ground like a pile driver instead of being accelerated naturally by gravity. The force with which the HVPW strikes the ground allows it to penetrate underground targets while still being compact enough to be carried on the F-35.

“The idea is to get a heavy weapon effect with a much lighter weapon and a more compact weapon,” Walker, whose official title is Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Science, Technology, and Engineering in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition, told *Flight Global*. “That technology, we’ve proven that the concept works.”

Still, Walker emphasized that it isn’t clear how the U.S. Air Force will proceed with the HVPW program, which will depend on funding and the priority given to other bunker buster bombs. “The analysis of alternatives will determine what we’re going to do and how much actual funding we’ve got to go forward.”

When the Air Force first unveiled the program in 2011, it presented the HVPW as specifically designed to be carried on the F-35 joint strike fighter. However, Walker explained that the bomb could also be eventually used on other aircraft.
“It's not just with the F-35, but for our entire fleet. How can I get a much more compact, lighter-weight capability which allows me to have more carriage? It's very important in the future to have that capability.”

The United States' has numerous potential uses for a bunker-buster capability in general. The one most often discussed, most often with regards to MOP, is to attack Iran’s nuclear sites, particularly the Fordow fuel enrichment plant, which is buried deep inside mountains (should a comprehensive nuclear deal with Iran be reached, the Fordow plant would be converted into an exclusively research and development facility.)

Less often discussed is how a bunker-buster capability could be deployed against China’s nuclear weapons arsenal. Although China is believed to have a fairly small nuclear arsenal, with roughly 300-400 warheads, Beijing conceals its arsenal within an extensive underground tunnel system to deter adversaries from trying to conduct counterforce strikes that destroy China’s strategic deterrent.

Interestingly, the 2014 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) ordered U.S. Strategic Command to submit a report on the “underground tunnel network used by the People’s Republic of China with respect to the capability of the United States to use conventional and nuclear forces to neutralize such tunnels and what is stored within such tunnels.”

Thus, any new American bunker-buster capability is surely to be viewed with suspicion by leaders in Beijing. This is doubly true when the bunker-buster bombs can be carried by F-35 joint strike fighters, which many Asian nations—including Japan—are purchasing.

Zachary Keck is managing editor of The National Interest.
http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/the-f-35s-new-bunker-buster-super-bomb-12933
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China’s Cold War Nostalgia
By Noah Feldman, Bloomberg
May 22, 2015

CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS – “Mad Men” may be over, but no one told Chinese President Xi Jinping. China’s decision to put multiple warheads into its intercontinental ballistic missiles, an approach traditionally associated with a first-strike threat, is projecting China’s stance back into a Cold War mindset. The development is symbolically significant, because China has had multiple warhead technology, known as MIRV, for years, but has never before chosen to deploy it. The decision puts the United States on notice that China won’t react passively to increasing containment efforts in the Pacific. And it also tells a domestic audience that Xi’s vision of the “Chinese dream” isn’t simply economic but also deeply nationalistic and even militaristic.

It’s not news that China has been taking an increasingly confrontational stance in the East and South China seas, staking claims to rocky, uninhabited islands and projecting naval force. What’s remarkable about the warhead deployment is that it isn’t primarily directed at China’s Pacific neighbors, who don’t have their own nuclear weapons — it’s directed at the U.S.

At a micro level, China is making another move in an iterated game. The Americans moved to support Prime Minister Shinzo Abe in his expansion of Japan’s defense forces. The Chinese then moved with the announcement of joint naval maneuvers with Russia in the Mediterranean.

At a higher level, China is responding to the perception among its foreign policy thinkers that the U.S. seeks to contain China, limiting its rise and keeping it as a regional power rather than a great world power. In practice, recent U.S. efforts at containment have been a little anemic. U.S. President Barack Obama’s much heralded “pivot” to Asia turned out not to involve significant augmentation of naval forces in the Pacific Ocean. And, of course, Obama has publicly maintained that he’s not even aiming at containment — a rhetorical position that reflects a desire not to antagonize the Chinese.

But at the broadest geostrategic level, China’s warhead deployment is meant to emphasize that China intends to become a genuine global power alongside the U.S. That means acting in ways that global powers stereotypically acted the last time there were two of them — which was the Cold War. In this sense, China really is consciously trying to conjure up the era of bomb shelters and cocktails that American pop culture treats as pure nostalgia.
China doesn’t want to waste money in a pointless arms race, as the Soviet Union did. But it has been growing its military budget at 9.5 percent annually over the last decade, according to the Pentagon. At first, the budgetary growth was keeping pace with China’s extraordinary economic output. But the military budget has continued to rise even as China’s economic growth has slowed.

Why should China, which until quite recently liked to herald its “peaceful rise,” be taking steps that it fully intends to be understood as assertions of military power? The answer is based both in strategic logic and in the domestic policy of the Chinese Communist Party.

China’s foreign policy elites increasingly recognize that the nation’s tremendous economic growth makes it a rising power that will inevitably threaten U.S. global hegemony. Under the logic of strategy, it doesn’t matter to the U.S. whether China actually intends to be a great power. The capacity to become one is sufficient to trigger a counterstrategy of containment. As a result, from the Chinese perspective, it makes no sense to try to project a purely peaceful rise — because the strategists on the other side won’t believe it, anyway.

The zero-sum logic of strategic confrontation is taken straight from the Cold War textbook. What mitigates it — to a degree — is the different reality of the current cool war. During the Cold War, the U.S. and Russia barely traded with each other. Yet China and the U.S. are economically interdependent.

That’s what makes the cool war different from the Cold War: Geostategic conflict between the two powers is occurring simultaneously with deep economic cooperation. That’s why Japan can be simultaneously arming itself against China and deepening its trade ties. Indeed, even Taiwan, existentially threatened by Chinese power, is deepening its economic relationship with the mainland.

Domestically, China’s interests also point in the direction of some rhetorical confrontation with the U.S. For several decades, the Chinese Communist Party has achieved legitimacy by delivering economic growth. As that growth slows, as it inevitably must, new sources of legitimacy are needed.

Xi’s Chinese dream is a bold effort that goes beyond mere economic growth. The dream is not only of greater wealth, but also of international recognition of China’s historic significance. Put bluntly, the Chinese dream is a dream of national greatness. The Chinese Communist Party under Xi is turning to nationalism as a source of legitimacy — and it’s a source that will become more important as Chinese growth slows.

Nationalist legitimation requires headlines that give the public the experience that their nation-state matters. Deploying multiple warheads, an act that will be noticed worldwide and that will then come to the attention of the Chinese public through the dynamics of global response, is a fantastic example of brilliant nationalism. We can expect more of it in the future. The message to the U.S. is simple: Don’t throw out your bar cart — or your bombs. Noah Feldman, a Bloomberg View columnist, teaches international law at Harvard University.

http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2015/05/22/commentary/world-commentary/chinas-cold-war-nostalgia/

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/ASXP) 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.