



# USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Issue No. 1126, 01 August 2014

Welcome to the CUWS Outreach Journal! As part of the CUWS' mission to develop Air Force, DoD, and other USG leaders to advance the state of knowledge, policy, and practices within strategic defense issues involving nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, we offer the government and civilian community a source of contemporary discussions on unconventional weapons. These discussions include news articles, papers, and other information sources that address issues pertinent to the U.S. national security community. It is our hope that this information resources will help enhance the overall awareness of these important national security issues and lead to the further discussion of options for dealing with the potential use of unconventional weapons.

The following news articles, papers, and other information sources do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the Air University, U.S. Air Force, or Department of Defense. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.

**Feature Item:** *"Chinese Concerns about U.S. Missile Defense"*. Authored by Gregory Kulacki; Union of Concerned Scientists. Published July 2014; 9 Pages.

<http://www.ucsusa.org/assets/documents/nwgs/china-missile-defense.pdf>

China perceives the U.S. pursuit of missile defense as a long-term strategic threat. As Chinese defense planners have become more familiar with existing missile defense technology and its limitations, Chinese assessments of the threat it poses in the near term are less alarming. Nevertheless, Chinese leaders continue to view U.S investments in missile defense, particularly those that involve cooperation with nations on China's periphery, as a cause for concern.

Outreach Journal Feedback or sign-up request: [cpc.admin@maxwell.af.mil](mailto:cpc.admin@maxwell.af.mil)

[Return to Top](#)

## **U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS**

1. [To Stop Cheating, Nuclear Officers Ditch the Grades](#)
2. [Obama Favoring Atomic-Arsenal Spending Over Nuclear Security: Report](#)
3. [Air Force Defends Shielding Nuclear Force from Service Cutbacks](#)

## **U.S. ARMS CONTROL**

1. [Russia-US Arms Reduction Treaty Should Not Depend on Political Situation - Diplomat](#)
2. [White House Accuses Russia of Violating Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty](#)
3. [Moscow May Walk out of Nuclear Treaty after US Accusations of Breach](#)
4. [US Statements that Russia Breaks INF Treaty Unfounded - FM](#)
5. [Top General Says Russia Committed to Nuclear Treaty](#)

## **HOMELAND SECURITY/THE AMERICAS**

1. [Ex-CIA Director Warns of 'EMP' Weapons Threats from N. Korea](#)
2. [Air Force Unveils 30-Year Strategy Document](#)
3. [Scientists Voice Support for Research on Dangerous Pathogens](#)

## **ASIA/PACIFIC**

1. [US Says China Tested Anti-Satellite Missile](#)
2. [N. Korea Yet to Develop 'EMP' Bombs: S. Korea](#)
3. [N.Korea Threatens to Nuke White House](#)
4. [North Korea May Be Closer to Full ICBM Test: U.S. Think Tank](#)
5. [North Fires Four Missiles, though Three Attempts Fail](#)
6. [China 'Confirms New Generation Long Range Missiles'](#)

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



### **EUROPE/RUSSIA**

1. [Marking Navy Day, Russia Starts Work on 3 Submarines](#)
2. [Scotland May Pay \\$1.7 Billion for Nuclear-Armed Subs over a Decade](#)
3. [Russia May be Deploying Missile Tied to Treaty Violation](#)

### **MIDDLE EAST**

1. [MP Rules out Closure of Iran's Nuclear Sites](#)
2. [Iranian Lawmakers Consider Plans to Boost Oversight of Nuclear Talks](#)
3. [US Negotiator Gives No Hard Deadline for Iran Deal](#)
4. [Iran's Ballistic Missile System Should Be Dealt with on Side of Nuclear Talks - Expert](#)
5. [Iran Denies Deal on Limiting Enrichment](#)

### **INDIA/PAKISTAN**

1. [Navy Gets New Facility to Communicate with Nuclear Submarines Prowling Underwater](#)

### **AFRICA**

1. [US Doctor Contracts Ebola as Virus Spreads](#)
2. [World Ebola Fears Grow with Europe and Asia on Alert](#)

### **COMMENTARY**

1. [Cold War Strategies Are Back in Russia's Playbook](#)
2. [Evolving Chinese Views on U.S. National Missile Defense](#)
3. [The Problem with Russia's Missiles](#)
4. [It is Time to Retire 'Weapons of Mass Destruction'](#)
5. [The Specter of North Korean ICBMs](#)

WAMC Northeast Public Radio - Albany, NY

## **To Stop Cheating, Nuclear Officers Ditch the Grades**

By Geoff Brumfiel

Monday, July 28, 2014

The young officers at F.E. Warren Air Force Base have an enormous job: to keep 150 nuclear-tipped missiles ready to launch at a moment's notice.

Understandably, they're expected to know exactly what they're doing.

Three times a month, they're tested on the weapons and the codes used to launch them. Anything less than 90 percent is a fail.

But until recently, even 90 percent wasn't really good enough. "I was told that if I got a 90 on a test, I was a D student — and I would be treated that way," says Lt. Daniel Sharp of his first year with the Air Force's 90th Missile Wing.

Now, in the wake of a major cheating scandal among missile officers, the Air Force is changing the way it grades. From here on out, all tests are pass-fail, and individual scores are not recorded.

It marks a huge shift from the ethos that's driven the missile forces. "There was a tag line that's been with missiles for 40 years that perfection is the standard," says Lt. Col. Barry Little, who heads up training. "That idea that you have to be perfect no longer applies."

The change comes because behind the perfection standard was another, unspoken rule: Be perfect, even if you have to cheat to do it. The cheating culture became public in January, when an investigation turned up evidence

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

that officers at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana were texting each other answers on tests. Nine officers were eventually relieved of duty, and dozens of others were reprimanded.

The Air Force does not publicly acknowledge that the cheating went on outside Malmstrom, but NPR has interviewed former Air Force officers who claim there was cheating at F.E. Warren. It came down to a choice, former missile officer Edward Warren told NPR in March: "Take your lumps and not have much of a career, or join in with your fellow launch officers and help each other out. And that is what most people did."

The new regime shifts the weight away from paper tests and toward practical skills. Inside a full mock-up of a nuclear launch control center, Andrew Beckner and Patrick Romenafski practice the launch of nuclear weapons with the turn of a key. How these two perform in this simulator will play a greater role in their future promotions, Little says. "Your crew proficiency, your reputation among your peers and your credibility ... all weigh in," he says.

The Air Force is trying to improve morale in other ways as well. They are giving more responsibility to officers in the field, replacing aging equipment and refurbishing old facilities.

Not everyone thinks these fixes will resolve the missile force's problems. Fundamentally, the mission is a holdover from Cold War days, says Bruce Blair, a former missile officer and head of Global Zero, a campaign to eliminate nuclear weapons. Missile crews often feel like "orphans of the Air Force," Blair says. "Out of the very accurate sense that their mission is no longer the priority it once was, [they] are just trying to do whatever it takes to get by."

Lt. Col. Little acknowledges more changes are needed to reinvigorate a sense of importance in the job, but he says that changing the perfection culture is an important first step. The pass-fail testing sends a message, he says: "As a team, they need to make the right decisions, but as individuals they're not required to be perfect."

<http://wamc.org/post/stop-cheating-nuclear-officers-ditch-grades>

[Return to Top](#)

National Journal – Washington, D.C.

## **Obama Favoring Atomic-Arsenal Spending Over Nuclear Security: Report**

By Global Security Newswire Staff

July 30, 2014

The White House last year rejected a proposal to speed up nuclear-security work, opting instead to spend more money on modernizing nuclear arms.

The Energy Department, in a secret May 2013 report, laid out a plan to ramp up efforts to finish securing and disposing of vulnerable stockpiles of nuclear material around the planet by December 2016. However, the White House in its fiscal 2015 budget plan ultimately decided to cut back its nuclear nonproliferation spending in order to make certain enough monies were available to update the U.S. nuclear stockpile, the Center for Public Integrity reported on Tuesday.

The 12-page report, obtained by the center, was produced by Global Threat Reduction Initiative staff in the National Nuclear Security Administration. The report said that in excess of two tons of movable, weapons-suitable uranium continues to be held in scores of atomic research reactors around the world. At the same time, global reactors are generating more plutonium, enough to fuel some 740 warheads annually, according to the proposal.

The NNSA report said that despite the Obama administration's high-profile, multi-year effort to secure vulnerable nuclear material, there were "still serious threats that require urgent attention."

During internal administration negotiations, Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz campaigned for more money for both nuclear security and arsenal modernization from the Defense Department's share of the budget, according to the CPI investigation. The Pentagon objected to this on the grounds that it had already given billions of dollars in the

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

last four years to Energy Department weapons activities, which were not progressing as quickly as the military wanted.

Ultimately, a deal was worked out in a Cabinet-level meeting to cut nonproliferation spending while protecting the weapons budget. An unidentified ex-White House official said there was internal agreement that it was okay to dial back nuclear-security efforts because of progress made in the last four years.

"They had basically achieved their goals. The stuff that was left was the stuff that was hard to do," the official said.

The budget that the Obama administration submitted to Congress earlier this year reduced spending on Energy Department nuclear nonproliferation efforts by \$399 million while increasing by \$534 million funding for atomic-arms programs, concludes a new study by Harvard University's Project on Managing the Atom.

Laura Holgate, National Security Council senior director for combating weapons-of-mass-destruction terrorism, said that cuts in nuclear security spending were appropriate because of how much progress had been made on that front.

"The president's nonproliferation and nuclear security priorities were protected," Holgate said in an email to the investigative news organization. "The decreased budget reflects natural and predictable declines based on project completion."

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/global-security-newswire/obama-favoring-atomic-arsenal-spending-over-nuclear-security-report-20140730>

[Return to Top](#)

Global Security Newswire – Washington, D.C.

## **Air Force Defends Shielding Nuclear Force from Service Cutbacks**

By Rachel Oswald, Global Security Newswire

July 31, 2014

Air Force brass on Wednesday defended their decision to spare nuclear-arms personnel from the force cutbacks happening in other parts of the service.

The Air Force announced in June that it had decided to retain 4,000 airmen working in the nuclear mission who would otherwise have faced possible involuntary separation from the service. In explaining the decision, Air Force Secretary Deborah Lee James said it was necessary to have "full manning in our nuclear positions" because of the "vital importance of this mission." Earlier this spring, the secretary told *Air Force Times* that due to budget constraints the service intended to reduce its active-duty force by 16,700 personnel in the next fiscal year.

At a Pentagon press conference, James said it was necessary for the Air Force to prioritize its missions. "Nuclear is number one. And people need to understand that," she was quoted as saying in an official transcript.

The Air Force this year has publicly shown more concern for its strategic deterrence mission, after a number of scandals highlighted low morale and a lack of professionalism by some airmen assigned to maintain, operate and protect the service's arsenal of strategic nuclear-tipped missiles.

Official investigations and independent analysis of the problem concluded that a number of missileers perceived that the nuclear arms mission had become a lower priority for service leaders, as evidenced, for example, by the lack of attention being given to their degrading support infrastructure.

"We're shifting resources and we're shifting personnel," James said on Wednesday. "The personnel aren't all there on station yet, but they'll be coming."

The Air Force in June said it was redirecting \$50 million in fiscal 2014 funds toward the immediate rehabilitation of the infrastructure that nuclear airmen rely on. The money also would help to address certain "people issues," according to the service.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



[Return to Top](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## Russia-US Arms Reduction Treaty Should Not Depend on Political Situation - Diplomat

28 July 2014

MOSCOW, July 28 (RIA Novosti) – Russia and the United States have no grounds to make the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) dependent on the current political environment, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov told Rossiya Segodnya International News Agency Monday.

“I think that we shouldn’t judge on any environment and current processes not related to the sphere of control over weapons. We should judge on the efficiency of this or that document, and mainly its resistance to foreign influence. Initially, we considered this document as mutually beneficial,” Ryabkov said.

The diplomat said the START treaty has been “weighed from the viewpoint of balance of interests,” and “there are no any unjustified concessions in it.”

“It is simply impossible to find anything in this document that would now demand a radically new opinion to preserve it. And if so, there are no grounds to question this tool that in general, is really aimed at strengthening our security, both of the United States and Russia, and contribute to supporting the strategic stability,” he said.

At the same time, he marked it is a completely another issue that “there are people in the United States or the US Congress who have been trying to find everything possible based on their anti-Russian rage to bite or pinch us and show that they dislike any Russian approaches to the issues, first of all, regional, and in fact geopolitical.”

The New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), which entered into force in February 2011, requires that the United States and Russia each reduce by 2018 to no more than 1,550 deployed strategic warheads on no more than 700 deployed intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs) and nuclear-capable bombers.

The treaty includes monitoring measures that provide confidence that each side could detect a militarily significant violation in a timely manner.

Under the treaty, the sides routinely exchange data on strategic offensive weapons on March 1 and September 1 every year.

<http://en.ria.ru/politics/20140728/191412762/Russia-US-Arms-Reduction-Treaty-Should-Not-Depend-on-Political.html>

[Return to Top](#)

RT (Russia Today) – Moscow, Russia

## White House Accuses Russia of Violating Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty

July 29, 2014

United States President Barack Obama has formally accused his Russian counterpart of violating a 1987 nuclear weapons treaty, the White House said on Tuesday.

Pres. Obama wrote Russia’s Vladimir Putin, White House press secretary John Earnest said during a routine briefing Tuesday afternoon, informing him that the US has determined that Russia has violated the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, a pact signed by Presidents Ronald Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev nearly 30 years ago.

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Hours earlier on Monday evening, the New York Times reported that the Obama administration would accuse Russia of violating the agreement upon completion of a Department of State annual report on international compliance with arms control agreements.

*"The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the INF treaty not to possess, produce or flight test a ground-launched cruise missile with a range capability of 500 kilometers to 5,500 kilometers or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles,"* the Times said the report would read.

On Tuesday, press secretary Earnest confirmed that report and said Pres. Obama had written Putin to notify him of the allegations.

*"It is correct that the concerns that we've had about this have been raised with the Russian, it's correct that our concerns have been discussed inside the administration for some time and it's correct to assume that we've had conversations with our partners in the relevant committees in congress as well,"* Earnest said, adding that adherence to the INF treaty is in the national security interests of US and its allies alike.

But after voicing those concerns to the Kremlin, Earnest said, Russia's response has been *"wholly unsatisfactory."*

*"The United States is committed to the viability of the INF Treaty,"* a senior US official told AFP late Monday. *"We encourage Russia to return to compliance with its obligations under the treaty and to eliminate any prohibited items in a verifiable manner."*

According to the Times, US officials raised concerns about a potential treaty violation back in January, to which the State Dept. said the release of an eventual review would take into consideration. Three months later, Gen. Philip M. Breedlove, the top commander of NATO forces, told the paper that *"A weapon capability that violates the INF, that is introduced into the greater European land mass, is absolutely a tool that will have to be dealt with."*

The treaty, the Times reported this week, *"helped seal the end of the Cold War and has been regarded as a cornerstone of American-Russian arms control efforts."*

<http://rt.com/usa/176492-obama-accuses-russia-nuclear-treaty/>

[Return to Top](#)

The London Guardian – London, U.K.

## **Moscow May Walk out of Nuclear Treaty after US Accusations of Breach**

*Russia said to be on point of leaving 1987 treaty, after Obama administration said it violated the accord with tests of R-500*

By Alec Luhn in Moscow and Julian Borger

Tuesday, 29 July 2014

Russia may be on the point of walking out of a major cold war era arms-control treaty, Russian analysts have said, after President Obama accused Moscow of violating the accord by testing a cruise missile.

There has been evidence at least since 2011 of Russian missile tests in violation of the 1987 intermediate range nuclear forces (INF) treaty, which banned US or Russian ground-launched cruise missiles with a 500 to 5,500-mile (805 to 8,851km) range. But the Obama administration has been hesitant until now of accusing Moscow of a violation in the hope that it could persuade Vladimir Putin, the Russian president, to stop the tests or at least not deploy the weapon in question, known as the Iskander, or R-500.

Washington has also been reticent because of the technical differences in definition of what constitutes the range of a missile under the INF treaty. That ambiguity now seems to have dropped away. According to Pavel Felgenhauer, a defence analyst and columnist for the independent Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta, Russia has indeed broken the treaty by testing the R-500 which has a range of more than 1,000km.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"Of course, this is in gross violation of the 1987 treaty, but Russian officials including Putin have said this treaty is unfair and not suitable for Russia," Felgenhauer said. "The United States doesn't have [medium-range missiles] but other countries do have them, such as China, Pakistan and Israel, so they say this is unfair and wrong."

Russian press reports have suggested the missile may even be in deployment, with state news agency RIA Novosti reporting in June that the "Russian army currently uses its Iskander-M and Iskander-K variants." Felgenhauer said he doesn't believe the missile has been deployed, although he said it's entirely possible that Russia will leave the treaty amid tensions with the US.

"The present situation of a new cold war in Europe – and not even cold, at least not in Ukraine right now – it's a situation in which Russia can abrogate the 1987 treaty, and the possibilities are rather high," Felgenhauer said.

Russian officials have previously criticised the 1987 treaty, including former defence minister Sergei Ivanov. In 2013, Ivanov, then presidential chief of staff, said of the treaty: "We are fulfilling it, but it can't last forever."

According to Kremlin-linked analyst Sergei Markov, Russia has a far greater need for medium-range cruise missiles than the US, because military rivals including China are located near its borders and because Moscow lacks the Americans' long-range bombing capabilities.

"Russia would be happy to leave this agreement, and I think Russia is using the Ukraine crisis to leave the agreement," Markov said.

As for Russia's complaints about US aegis missiles, Felgenhauer said they reflect the genuine belief among Kremlin top brass that the US missile defence has a secret attack capability and poses a threat to Russia.

"This was a normal Soviet practice that missile interceptors had the in-built capability to be used as an attack missile," Felgenhauer said.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/jul/29/moscow-russia-violated-cold-war-nuclear-treaty-iskander-r500-missile-test-us>

[Return to Top](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Moscow, Russia

## **US Statements that Russia Breaks INF Treaty Unfounded - FM**

*Russia has repeatedly informed the United States of its concerns about the INF Treaty but Washington remained deaf to them, it said.*

July 30, 2014

MOSCOW, July 30, /ITAR-TASS/. U.S. government officials' statements that Russia has allegedly broken the INF (Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces) Treaty are groundless, the Russian Foreign Ministry said on Wednesday.

It said these allegations were "as baseless as all of Washington's claims that have lately been reaching Moscow. Absolutely no proof has been provided".

Diplomats say that INF-related problems are not new.

"They are well known to both sides and they have to be addressed on a daily basis without using 'loudspeaker diplomacy'," the ministry said.

This work was undertaken before.

"We have many complaints to make to the United States with regard to the Treaty. These include missile defence target missiles having characteristics similar to those of shorter- and intermediate-range missiles and the production by the Americans of armed drones which clearly fall under the land-based cruise missiles as defined in the Treaty," the ministry said.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

MK 41 Vertical Launching Systems have increasingly been in the focus of attention lately as the U.S. is planning to deploy them in Poland and Romania as part of its global missile defence plan, the ministry said.

“These systems can launch intermediate-range cruise missiles and their land-based version can be regarded as a direct violation of the INF Treaty,” the ministry said.

Russia has repeatedly informed the United States of its concerns about the INF Treaty but Washington remained deaf to them, it said.

“Washington does not want to listen to us. As on other disputable issues, they listen to themselves only,” it added.

However, Moscow hopes to receive Washington’s explanations regarding its questions about the INF Treaty and assurances of its readiness to work together to ensure its enforcement and make it more effective, the ministry said.

In a letter to President Vladimir Putin, U.S. President Barack Obama accused Russia of being in breach of the treaty’s obligation not to have, manufacture and test a ground-launched cruise missile with a range of 500 to 5,500 km or not have and manufacture launching systems for such missile.

The INF Treaty was signed in 1987 by and between the United States and the Soviet Union. It eliminated nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with intermediate ranges, defined as between 500-5,500 km (300-3,400 miles).

It was the first time the two superpowers had agreed to reduce their nuclear arsenals, eliminate an entire category of nuclear weapons, and conduct extensive on-site verification inspections. As a result, the United States and the Soviet Union destroyed a total of 2,692 short-, medium-, and intermediate-range missiles.

<http://en.itar-tass.com/russia/742972>

[Return to Top](#)

The Moscow Times – Moscow, Russia

## **Top General Says Russia Committed to Nuclear Treaty**

Reuters

August 01, 2014

Russia's top general, Valery Gerasimov, has told the chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff that Moscow is committed to adhering to the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Treaty after Washington accused Russia of violating the agreement.

The accusations from Washington have heightened tension between Russia and the U.S. at a time when ties between the two former Cold War foes have plunged relations to their lowest level since the 1991 fall of the Soviet Union.

"Gerasimov reaffirmed Russia's commitment to fulfilling the provisions of the treaty on intermediate-range rockets," Russian state news agency RIA Novosti quoted Gerasimov as telling U.S. General Martin Dempsey in a telephone call on Thursday.

Washington says Russia has violated the treaty, ratified in 1988, which was designed to eliminate ground-launched cruise missiles with ranges of 500 to 5,500 km (310 to 3,400 miles). The U.S. has called for senior-level talks to discuss Russia's compliance.

It was unclear whether Gerasimov's conversation with Dempsey was part of those talks.

Russia's Foreign Ministry denied the U.S. accusations as "unfounded" and said it had its own complaints against the U.S. over the treaty.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226





Washington has given no details over how in its view Russia violated the treaty, but the New York Times had reported in January that Washington informed its NATO partners that Russia had tested a ground-launched cruise missile.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/news/article/top-general-says-russia-committed-to-nuclear-treaty/504412.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Yonhap News Agency – Seoul, South Korea

## Ex-CIA Director Warns of 'EMP' Weapons Threats from N. Korea

July 26, 2014

WASHINGTON, July 25 (Yonhap) -- North Korea is expected to become capable soon of launching electromagnetic pulse (EMP) weapons attacks, a former director of the Central Intelligence Agency has warned, stressing the need for upgrading the country's missile defense systems.

An EMP bomb refers to a nuclear weapon designed to be detonated at a high altitude so as to generate powerful electromagnetic pulses that can destroy electronic and electrical devices on the ground. North Korea has long been believed to be developing EMP weapons.

"There is now an increasing likelihood that rogue nations such as North Korea (and before long, most likely, Iran) will soon match Russia and China in that they will have the primary ingredients for an EMP attack," former CIA Director James Woolsey said in a statement submitted Thursday to the House Armed Services Committee.

The primary ingredients are simple ballistic missiles, such as SCUDs, that could be launched from a freighter offshore, space launch vehicles able to launch low-earth-orbit satellites, and simple low-yield nuclear weapons that can generate gamma rays and fireballs, he said.

Woolsey also said Russia told the U.S. in 2004 that its "brain drain" had been helping the North develop EMP weapons.

He made a similar remark last year, saying a delegation of Russian generals warned in 2004 that design information for a Super-EMP nuclear warhead had leaked from Russia to North Korea and the North might be able to develop such a weapon "in a few years."

"We must change our policy to assess these threats and deploy defenses against them," he said. "The EMP Commission estimates that within 12 months of an EMP event, two-thirds of the U.S. population would likely perish from starvation, disease, and societal breakdown."

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/full/2014/07/26/65/1200000000AEN20140726000500315F.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Air Force Times.com – Washington, D.C.

## Air Force Unveils 30-Year Strategy Document

By Aaron Mehta, Staff writer

July 30, 2014

WASHINGTON — The Air Force is calling for closer ties to industry, better relations with Congress, and increased flexibility for both airmen and acquisitions — all part of a 30-year strategy document unveiled Wednesday.

Titled "America's Air Force: A Call to the Future," the document is part of a broader strategic overview ordered by Chief of Staff Gen. Mark Welsh this year. Welsh announced his goal of taking a longer look into the future during February's Air Force Association conference in Orlando, Florida.



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The 22-page document is largely broad in its goals. Service officials indicated a 20-year “Strategic Master Plan” document, planned for completion before the end of 2014, will feature more concrete goals and targets.

Still, the 30-year document provides a roadmap of sorts for how Welsh and Air Force Secretary Deborah Lee James see the future of the service. The review is largely based on four trends:

- “[R]apidly emerging technological breakthroughs,” such as the leap in technology for portable devices over the past decade, will continue to occur, which requires the service to stay flexible to maintain a technological edge;
- Geopolitical instability will continue, meaning that “preparing for a threat based solely on current geopolitical realities will be insufficient;”
- A “wide range of operating environments” that the Air Force will have to contend with, requiring equipment that can operate in contested and uncontested environments, as well as heavily degraded environments for humanitarian missions;
- The need to ensure protection for the “global commons” of the air, cyber and space domains.

Handling these four trends relies on “strategic agility,” or making sure the service can be flexible and adaptable to deal with whatever threats could emerge.

“Embracing strategic agility will enable us to ‘jump the rails’ from our current path of 20th-century, industrial-era processes and paradigms,” the report reads.

That agility comes in a couple different ways. For airmen, it involves creating a way for them to leave the service, gather real-world experience, and then bring that back into the Air Force without being punished for it.

“Breaks in service — or transitions between full-time and part-time — need not be punitive in the advancement of our future airmen. Rather, the experience they gain during their time out of uniform should be recognized for the broader perspective it delivers,” the report reads. “Similarly, we must commit to a career development model that provides those in specialized career fields with incentives and promotion opportunities on par with those in more mainstream disciplines.”

The report also emphasizes “a character-based, diverse culture” inside the service, with the goal of blending the lines between the active, Guard and reserve components.

Technologically, that agility means working more closely with the science and technology (S&T) side to nurture and develop new technologies.

“A commitment to capitalize on the most promising S&T breakthroughs will expand the aperture when we consider future capabilities,” the authors wrote. “We must couple this commitment with a requirements process and acquisition system that accommodates more frequent ‘pivot points’ — opportunities to modify or abandon a program during its life cycle — and harnesses rapid prototyping to reduce resources required to bring a design idea into service.”

Looking to modular systems will help get technology into the field sooner and provide more options for forces operating around the globe, the report notes.

The rapid pace of development on new concepts and ideas also means making acquisitions easier and less cumbersome — and will require working more closely with industry.

“As we increasingly elevate affordability as a key attribute of future acquisitions, we should look to the commercial industry for insights. The profit motive that drives the private sector forces increased competition — along with innovative acquisition and development processes — into business models as a matter of survival.”

James previewed the strategic agility idea during a speech to American industry at the Farnborough International Airshow July 15.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

We're still too rigid in our processes and procedures ... we still take too long too frequently to get things done," James told the audience. "We have got to learn to talk to each other freely."

Also important in the report is an emphasis on "partnerships" — strengthening ties with think tanks, industry and, notably, Congress.

Relations between the Hill and the Air Force have been rocky for years, something the report acknowledges and pledges to improve upon. Given the service's goal of retiring platforms such as the A-10, which have been largely blocked by congressional action, those improved relations can't come soon enough.

### **New Technologies**

One area that goes into greater details than others is a focus on what "game-changing" technologies being developed now could be relevant for the future of the service.

The five areas highlighted are hypersonic weapons, nanotechnology, directed energy, unmanned systems and autonomous systems.

Those are all areas in development, and the report notes this is not an exhaustive list. However, the emphasis on these technologies provides a roadmap not just for Air Force researchers, but for industry leaders who want to get a jump on new investments.

Speaking on Tuesday, Gen. Mike Hostage, head of Air Force Air Combat Command, made it clear directed energy was one technology he would like to see focused on, particularly given magazine size challenges on newer jets such as the F-22 and F-35.

"I spent a lot of time over the past couple of weeks talking to the different labs that are working on directed energy," Hostage said. "There are some amazing developments in that arena."

Hostage also expanded on how he would like to see industry and the Air Force work more closely together to develop new technologies, noting that Air Combat Command hosts "innovation conferences" to bring research labs, operators and industry together.

"The idea is to spark interest on the part of our industry partners to grab a lab and say 'hey, we would like to partner with you on that technology,'" Hostage said.

"Our industry partners have IRAD money that is their lifeblood," Hostage continued, referring to internal research and development. "That's how they produce things that will eventually produce profit. It's IRAD that produces the stuff I actually need to go to war. So it's really important to me that we spend the S&T to keep the labs producing technology, but also that industry takes that technology and produces real things with it."

### **Modern Deterrence**

The report also lays out the need for a modern deterrence strategy.

"In the 21st century, a credible nuclear deterrent is still absolutely necessary, but not always sufficient," the report reads. "The future deterrence landscape is exceedingly more difficult."

A dispersed threat, such as a terrorist group like al-Qaida, is not deterred by the threat of a nuclear strike — and realistically, nations such as Iran that would act against the United States would do so with a cyber attack, not a military intervention that could open the possibility of a nuclear response.

Instead, new deterrent methods are needed, ones that are based on technologies that are cheaper and more responsive. Cyber will play a role here, as will having highly capable ISR platforms.

"Instead of committing vast amounts of national treasure to overwhelm any and all potential adversaries, we will develop innovative, lower-cost options that demand high-cost responses," the report concludes. "If it costs markedly less for us to defeat a missile than it does for the adversary to build and launch it, the strategic calculus changes significantly."

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy News – University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

## Scientists Voice Support for Research on Dangerous Pathogens

By Robert Roos, News Editor, *CIDRAP News*

July 30, 2014

Amid new concerns about lab safety lapses and in a counterpoint to recent calls for restrictions on research that may render pathogens more dangerous, 36 scientists from several countries have issued a formal statement asserting that research on potentially dangerous pathogens can be done safely and is necessary for a full understanding of infectious diseases.

The group, which calls itself "Scientists for Science," includes the two scientists who have been most prominently associated with "gain-of-function" (GOF) research: Ron Fouchier, PhD, of Erasmus Medical Centre in the Netherlands and Yoshihiro Kawaoka, DVM, PhD, of the University of Wisconsin.

GOF research refers to experiments that involve increasing the virulence, transmissibility, or host range of microbes. The statement does not refer specifically to GOF studies but clearly relates to them, though not exclusively.

### Confidence in safety

"Scientists for Science are confident that biomedical research on potentially dangerous pathogens can be performed safely and is essential for a comprehensive understanding of microbial disease pathogenesis, prevention and treatment," the statement reads. "The results of such research are often unanticipated and accrue over time; therefore, risk-benefit analyses are difficult to assess accurately."

The Scientists for Science statement comes in the wake of lab safety lapses involving *Bacillus anthracis* and H5N1 avian flu at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the discovery of smallpox virus samples in a Food and Drug Administration facility. The incidents have increased concern about lab safety in general and the risks of GOF research in particular.

On Jul 14 another group of scientists, who call themselves the Cambridge Working Group, called for a halt to research involving the creation of "potential pandemic pathogens," especially flu viruses, pending a full assessment of the risks and benefits and of whether the same information could be gained by safer methods. Two days later, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC) said the safety of studies that involve the generation of potential pandemic pathogens deserves more public discussion.

Signers of the Scientists for Science statement include researchers from universities and other research centers in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, the Netherlands, and Australia. Besides Fouchier and Kawaoka, the list includes such names as Christian Drosten of the University of Bonn, Peter Doherty of the University of Melbourne, Peter Palese of the Icahn School of Medicine at Mt. Sinai in New York City, Vincent Racaniello of Columbia University, and Andrew Pekosz of Johns Hopkins University.

### More names added

Since the statement was posted 2 days ago, 13 more individuals have added their names as "supporting scientists." They include several US government scientists who signed on as private individuals. Among the latest signers are Ian Lipkin of Columbia and David Morens, Jeffery Taubenberger, and John Yewdell of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases.



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Paul Duprex, PhD, associate professor of microbiology at Boston University, said in an interview that the statement grew out of conversations and e-mail exchanges he had with Racaniello of Columbia and Sean Whelan of Harvard University.

He said the trio talked about "the need to be proactive in explaining what we do and deal with the fact that there are a number of people who can make things worse by scare-mongering in the public. . . . We came to the conclusion that we had two options: either keep our heads down or explain the importance of basic microbiological research and what it has achieved."

"That is why Scientists for Science was established and we worked on the statement iteratively with input from Yoshi Kawaoka, for example," Duprex said.

**Research already regulated**

The statement says that significant resources have been invested in building biosafety level 3 and 4 labs globally and in limiting risks through regulations, engineering features, and training. "Ensuring that these facilities operate safely and are staffed effectively so that risk is minimized is our most important line of defense, as opposed to limiting the types of experiments that are done," it adds.

It goes on to say that studies on dangerous pathogens are already extensively regulated, unlike recombinant DNA research at the time of the Asilomar conference in 1975. Studies involving "select agents" are subject to federal regulations, and research plans for other organisms are reviewed by scientists and funding agencies, while safety committees review risk assessments and mitigation plans.

"If there is going to be further discussion about these issues, we must have input from outside experts with the background and skills to conduct actual risk assessments based on specific experiments and existing laboratories," the statement says.

"Such conversations are best facilitated under the auspices of a neutral party, such as the International Union of Microbiological Societies or the American Society for Microbiology [ASM], or national academies, such as the National Academy of Sciences [NAS], USA. We suggest they should organize a meeting to discuss these issues."

The statement closes with a pledge that the group will provide scientists and the public with accurate information and will work to promote "open and unbiased discourse."

**Recent events moved group to act**

Duprex said he and his partners had been discussing doing something for a long time but started writing the statement about 2 weeks ago. He acknowledged that the Cambridge Working Group's statement was a factor in moving them to act, but said it wasn't the only one.

"That in addition to many other things crystallized why it's important for scientists to speak up," he said. However, "This is not about people fighting with each other, it's about instructive, proactive, reasonable debate."

He commented further by e-mail: "Even though much of the focus and criticism is directed at so called 'gain of function' studies, as scientists we see this in a much broader perspective. We expect that [www.scientistsforscience.org](http://www.scientistsforscience.org) will be a forum for deliberation among Sfs members, to discuss how to carry out experiments with dangerous pathogens safely and to share good practice."

He added that the group plans to provide facts and commentary and engage in open discourse with other scientists and the public. "We are convinced that using rhetoric or posturing to make points is counterproductive and does not serve science well. When necessary we will proactively respond to statements which are either damaging or simply erroneous."

Duprex said the group plans to approach the ASM and NAS about organizing a meeting to discuss biosecurity.

<http://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2014/07/scientists-voice-support-research-dangerous-pathogens>

[Return to Top](#)

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



Asian Correspondent.com – Bristol, U.K.

## US Says China Tested Anti-Satellite Missile

By AP News  
July 26, 2014

WASHINGTON (AP) — The U.S. says China has tested a missile designed to destroy satellites and is urging Beijing to refrain from destabilizing actions.

State Department spokeswoman Marie Harf said the “non-destructive” test occurred Wednesday. She said a previous destructive test of the system in 2007 created thousands of pieces of dangerous debris in space.

Harf said Friday that the continued development and testing of destructive anti-satellite systems threaten the long-term security and sustainability of the outer-space environment that all nations depend upon.

China’s state-run Xinhua news agency, citing a Defense Ministry statement, reported a successful missile interception test conducted from land within Chinese territory late Wednesday.

Xinhua did not refer to it as an anti-satellite system. It said such tests could strengthen Chinese air defense against ballistic missiles.

<http://asiancorrespondent.com/125163/us-says-china-tested-anti-satellite-missile/>

[Return to Top](#)

Yonhap News Agency – Seoul, South Korea

## N. Korea Yet to Develop 'EMP' Bombs: S. Korea

July 28, 2014

SEOUL, July 28 (Yonhap) -- North Korea appears to have not yet developed electromagnetic pulse (EMP) bombs despite its push to secure related technology, South Korea's defense ministry said Monday.

An EMP bomb refers to a nuclear weapon designed to be detonated at a high altitude so as to generate powerful electromagnetic pulses that can destroy electronic and electrical devices on the ground. The communist North has long been believed to be developing EMP weapons.

Reponding to the speculation, James Woolsey, a former director of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), said last week that Pyongyang "will soon match Russia and China in that they will have the primary ingredients for an EMP attack."

He made the comments in a statement submitted last Tuesday to the House Armed Services Committee.

"It is yet to be confirmed if the North has secured the technology related to the EMP. But it is our analysis that it has yet to have success in making EMP bombs," defense ministry spokesman Kim Min-seok told a regular briefing.

"We see that North Korea has yet to reach a technological level high enough to develop the bombs, as building (the bombs) requires advanced skills," he added, while declining to confirm the intelligence the former CIA chief put forth.

EMP bombs are considered critical in new types of warfare for their ability to neutralize or damage radar, airplanes, naval fleets and aerial defense systems.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2014/07/28/59/0401000000AEN20140728004300315F.html>

[Return to Top](#)

The Chosun Ilbo – Seoul, South Korea

July 29, 2014

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



## N.Korea Threatens to Nuke White House

North Korea threatened to launch a nuclear strike on the U.S. on Sunday marking the 61st anniversary of the armistice that halted the Korean War.

Hwang Pyong-so, chief of the North Korean military's politburo, was speaking at a meeting of representatives from the Army, Navy, Air Force and Strategic Force at the Kumsusan Palace of the Sun in Pyongyang.

If the U.S. threatens the North's "sovereignty and survival with nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and means of nuclear strike," the North will "fire our nuclear-armed rockets at the White House and the Pentagon, the sources of evil," as well as at U.S. "military bases across the Pacific and large U.S. cities," the official Rodong Sinmun quoted him on Monday as saying.

The North is not believed to have the means to make nuclear warheads for missiles.

Meanwhile, the North pointedly snubbed China, its traditional ally and another signatory to the armistice. At previous annual events marking the anniversary, the North habitually hailed its "blood ties" to China while thanking it for joining the Korean War.

Last year, Chinese Vice President Li Yuanchao visited the North and leader Kim Jong-un paid respects at a cemetery for Chinese soldiers in the North.

But this year, neither senior officials nor the media mentioned China at all. Kim visited only a cemetery for North Korean soldiers this year.

The North is clearly peeved at China, not least over an oil embargo that has gone on for most of this year and forced some army officers to cycle to work.

[http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html\\_dir/2014/07/29/2014072901579.html](http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2014/07/29/2014072901579.html)

[Return to Top](#)

The Japan Times – Tokyo, Japan

## North Korea May Be Closer to Full ICBM Test: U.S. Think Tank

*Leading U.S. think tank says North Korea may conduct flight test soon*

Agence France-Presse (AFP)-JIJI, Associated Press (AP)

July 30, 2014

SEOUL/WASHINGTON – Fresh satellite images suggest North Korea might be wrapping up engine trials on an intercontinental ballistic missile, fueling speculation of a full-scale flight test to come, a U.S. think tank said Wednesday.

Development of a working ICBM would be a game-changing step, bringing the continental United States into range and adding a whole new threat level to the North's regular nuclear-strike warnings.

"The rocket engine test program may wind down by the end of this year," The U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins University said on its closely followed 38 North website. "If the engine tests are concluded, the next stage in development of the KN-08 road-mobile ICBM may be full-scale flight tests of the missile."

It stressed, however, that it was unclear just how successful the tests had been. Regular satellite analysis has shown a major construction program under way at North Korea's Sohae Satellite Launching Station since mid-2013, focused on upgrading facilities to handle larger, longer-range rockets with heavier payloads.

Although there is no doubt that North Korea has an extremely active ballistic missile development program, expert opinion is split on just how much progress it has made. Images taken this month showed the gantry height on the main launchpad had increased to more than 50 meters, while a wider access road and rail spur capable of transporting larger rockets to the pad were either finished or nearing completion.

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"These modifications could be completed by 2015," the 38 North website said.

The images also showed evidence of new engine tests, including the presence of first stage rocket motors and distressed vegetation along the edges of the flame path.

The KN08 was first unveiled at a military parade in April 2012, but many analysts dismissed the models on show as mock-ups. In December the same year, Pyongyang demonstrated its rocket capabilities by sending a satellite in orbit on a multistage launch vehicle. But it has yet to conduct a test that would show it had mastered the re-entry technology required for an effective ICBM.

Over the past month or so, North Korea has conducted a series of short and medium range missile tests, which were largely seen as a muscle-flexing exercise in response to South Korea-U.S. joint military drills.

In January, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper told a congressional hearing that North Korea had taken initial steps toward fielding the KN-08 although it remains untested.

Assessing the intentions of North Korea's secretive government and the nation's technical capabilities is notoriously difficult. A mobile missile is potentially more threatening as it could be deployed more quickly and discreetly.

Experts say North Korea has probably not yet managed to miniaturize a nuclear device that it could mount on a long-range missile capable of hitting mainland America. Pyongyang has not conducted a nuclear test explosion since February 2013 despite speculation it was preparing to do so this spring. Such a test could help hone its capabilities.

Adm. Samuel Locklear told a Pentagon news conference Tuesday that he is concerned by North Korea's frequent testing of ballistic missiles. Locklear heads U.S. Pacific Command, and his responsibilities include military relations with longtime U.S. ally South Korea.

North Korea often test-fires missiles, artillery and rockets, but the number of weapons tests it has conducted this year is much higher than previous years.

"Every time they do something that the international community has told them not to do, particularly as it relates to missile technology or nuclear technology, you have to assume that it's a step forward in technology," Locklear said. "Otherwise, they probably wouldn't be doing it."

Locklear said he worries that "you become somewhat numb" to reports of another North Korean missile test, adding, "you start to say, well, it's not such a big deal."

Locklear said he believes North Korea has continued to make "steady progress" in both its missile technology and nuclear capability, adding that he has to "plan for the worst" of what North Korea says it has or demonstrates it might have.

Secretary of State John Kerry said last week that North Korea has been "quieter" than in the past, which he attributed to U.S. efforts to engage with Pyongyang's only ally, China.

But in a sign of concern, the House on Monday passed a bill to toughen sanctions and restrict North Korea's access to hard currency. The bill would empower President Barack Obama to target foreign banks that facilitate the North's development and proliferation of weapons technology by barring them from the U.S. financial system.

Prospects for the legislation's passage through the Senate are uncertain.

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2014/07/30/asia-pacific/north-korea-may-be-closer-to-full-icbm-test-u-s-think-tank/#.U9mBfSzhDw>

[Return to Top](#)

Korea JoongAng Daily – Seoul, South Korea

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226





## North Fires Four Missiles, though Three Attempts Fail

BY JEONG YONG-SOO, KIM HEE-JIN  
August 01, 2014

North Korea fired four short-range projectiles with a cutting-edge, precision-guided rocket launcher, though three of them fell to the ground, failing to reach the sea, a Seoul official told the JoongAng Ilbo on Wednesday.

A senior official from South Korea's Ministry of National Defense said North Korea appeared to use its KN-09 multiple-rocket launcher, with a Russian GLONASS GPS system, for the launch of the four rockets on Wednesday.

The South's Joint Chiefs of Staff confirmed Pyongyang test-fired four 300-mm projectiles at 7:30 a.m., 7:40 a.m., 5:50 p.m. and 6 p.m. on Wednesday at a launch site near Mount Mohyang, in North Pyongan, a central region, toward the East Sea.

However, the two rockets fired in the morning disappeared from the South Korean military's radar just a few seconds after blast off, the Defense Ministry official said.

One of the two projectiles launched in the afternoon also flew just 130 kilometers (80 miles) and then fell to the ground, the official added.

The other splashed into North Korean waters in the East Sea off Pukchong County, South Hamgyong. It flew 210 kilometers.

The official said the South Korean military assumed the two botched rockets appeared to have landed near Mount Myohyang, with the other near Hamhung, South Hamgyong.

The KN-09 launcher is one of the regime's more ambitious weapons. Sources say North Korea allegedly imported relevant technologies from China in the early 2000s and has been developing it for the past decade in an aim to precisely strike South Korea's Gyeryongdae military headquarters in South Chungcheong and the U.S. military base under the construction in Pyeongtaek, Gyeonggi.

However, the Seoul official said the failed launch of the three projectiles actually proved that there were defects in the regime's KN-09 launcher.

"Technically, if a rocket is fired with a KN-09 launcher toward the East Sea from Mount Myohyang, it should fly at least 160 kilometers," the official said. "If it just flew for a few seconds or just 130 kilometers, we can say it is actually a botched launch."

Since this year, North Korea is known to have used the KN-09 launcher five times, test-firing three or four projectiles each time, according to Seoul officials. They allegedly flew between 150 kilometers and 210 kilometers and splashed around similar spots in international waters off the regime's east coast. Previous launches with the KN-09 raised concerns in South Korea that the North seemed to have succeeded in developing a cutting-edge multiple-rocket launcher on its own.

That confidence, however, appeared to lead the botched launches on Wednesday, said Shin In-kyun, the head of the Korea Defense Net, a military think tank in Seoul.

"North Korea showed confidence in launching rockets with the KN-09 launcher since its first test-firing last year, gradually extending the range of the projectiles so far," Shin said. "But that confidence apparently triggered the botched rockets launches.

"In general, it is common to fire a missile or rocket in a coastal region, because the projectile could fall to the ground if it is fired from inland," Shin said. "However, since this year, North Korea has fired rockets from the west coast or from a central region toward the East Sea, a dangerous act for those in the country."

<http://koreajoongangdaily.joins.com/news/article/Article.aspx?aid=2992862>

[Return to Top](#)



The London Daily Telegraph – London, U.K.

## China 'Confirms New Generation Long Range Missiles'

*China's ownership of a new intercontinental ballistic missile said to be capable of carrying multiple nuclear warheads as far as the United States is confirmed by state-run media*

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

01 August 2014

China has acknowledged the existence of a new intercontinental ballistic missile said to be capable of carrying multiple nuclear warheads as far as the United States, state-run media reported.

A government environmental monitoring centre in Shaanxi said on its website a military facility in the province was developing Dongfeng-41 (DF-41) missiles, the Global Times reported.

The DF-41 is designed to have a range of 12,000 kilometres (7,500 miles), according to a report by Jane's Strategic Weapon Systems, putting it among the world's longest-range missiles.

It is "possibly capable of carrying multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles", the US Defence Department said in a report in June, referring to a payload of several nuclear warheads.

China's military is highly secretive, and the Global Times said it had not previously acknowledged the existence of the DF-41.

The original government web post appeared to have been deleted on Friday, but the newspaper posted a screengrab.

It also quoted a Chinese military analyst as saying: "As the US continues to strengthen its missile defence system, developing third generation nuclear weapons capable of carrying multiple warheads is the trend."

China's defence ministry in January responded to reports it had tested a hypersonic missile delivery vehicle by saying any military experiments were "not targeted at any country and at any specific goals".

It made the same response last December when asked about reports that it had tested the DF-41.

Tensions between Washington and Beijing have risen in recent months over territorial disputes with US allies in the East and South China Seas, and cyber-hacking.

Beijing has boosted its military spending by double digit amounts for several years as it seeks to modernise its armed forces, and now has the world's second biggest military outlays after the US.

Chinese President Xi Jinping said in July any confrontation between the two powers "will surely spell disaster for both countries and for the world".

China's previous longest range missile was the DF-5A, which can carry a single warhead as far as 12,000 km, according to Jane's.

The DF-5A had its first test flight in 1971, and has to be fuelled for around two hours prior to firing, limiting its effectiveness as a weapon, according to analysts.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/11005061/China-confirms-new-generation-long-range-missiles.html>

[Return to Top](#)

The Moscow Times – Moscow, Russia

## Marking Navy Day, Russia Starts Work on 3 Submarines

By Matthew Bodner

July 27, 2014

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Russia started building its three newest submarines on Sunday in the White Sea port of Severodvinsk, marking the halfway point in the country's drive to re-establish its place as a modern naval power.

Speaking aboard the Admiral Kuznetsov aircraft carrier during Russia's Navy Day celebrations in Severomorsk near Murmask, President Vladimir Putin stressed the importance of the navy to Russia's security and identity.

"The navy, for our country, is her pride, strength and dignity," Putin said, RIA Novosti reported. Putin also pledged that "the power and strength of the Russian navy will only grow."

The building of the submarines — the Borei-class Knyaz Oleg, the Yasen-class Krasnoyarsk and the Khabarovsk, which appears to be an updated Yasen — is part of a naval modernization program initiated by Putin.

Overall, Russia is engaged in a \$700 billion military rearmament program through 2020.

Also in Severodvinsk, Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin, who oversees Russia's defense industry, said the vessels were important tools in the struggle against NATO encroachment on Russian sovereignty.

"Today, when the U.S. and NATO countries are trying to impose their political agenda, when they are trying to push other countries to their knees ... the factors of power become crucial," Rogozin was quoted as saying by Interfax.

"At this moment, Russia is a nation that represents the axis of good, but good can only be defended by force," he added.

The two submarine classes differ in terms of their capabilities. Borei-class nuclear missile submarines are designed to strike cities, while the Yasen submarines are suited to hunting other submarines and surface vessels.

Russia has already deployed two Borei submarines, the Yury Dolgoruky and the Alexander Nevsky. The third Borei, the Vladimir Monomakh, finished its sea trials on Sunday and is awaiting its official commission into the Russian navy, while the Knyaz Vladimir, the fourth vessel, is still under construction.

Eight of the Borei-class submarines will join the fleet by 2020, replacing the aging Typhoon-class submarines and the Delta-III and Delta-IV submarines, which had been the mainstay of Soviet sea-based nuclear deterrence since the 1970s.

The Boreis are five meters shorter than the 175-meter Typhoons — the largest submarines ever constructed — and will carry intercontinental ballistic missiles.

As for the Yasen-class submarines, the lead boat — called the Severodvinsk — joined the Russian navy in June. The next two Yasen-class vessels, the Kazan and the Novorossiisk, are being built.

Russian authorities hope that the two new submarines will revive the Russian navy as a player on the high seas, after it lost much of its naval might to neglect and decay during the turbulent 1990s.

There are currently 60 submarines serving in the Russian navy, RIA Novosti reported. Ten of them are strategic nuclear missile submarines, while the rest are nuclear-powered attack submarines and diesel-electric submarines, such as the Kilo.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/business/article/marking-navy-day-russia-starts-work-on-3-submarines/504118.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Global Security Newswire – Washington, D.C.

## **Scotland May Pay \$1.7 Billion for Nuclear-Armed Subs over a Decade**

July 28, 2014

Scotland may pay \$1.7 billion over the next decade to care for the United Kingdom's fleet of nuclear-armed submarines, the Scottish *Herald* reports.

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The locally governing Scottish National Party floated the figure weeks before a planned vote on whether Scotland will secede from the United Kingdom. The party has pledged to have all British nuclear warheads, ballistic missiles and strategic submarines withdrawn from Scotland by 2020 following a potential "pro-independence" vote in September.

"Scots pay a whopping [\$1.7 billion] just to keep Trident ticking over -- weapons of mass destruction which the vast majority of Scots do not want," party defense spokesman Angus Robertson said.

"It is ludicrous that we are paying billions of pounds of taxpayers' money when it could and should be used to build a fairer society and stronger economy, with more opportunities for all," he added.

Robertson's party based the amount on a \$22.1 billion cost estimate for sustaining the country's submarine-based nuclear deterrent over 10 years. Former British defense minister Philip Hammond informed British lawmakers of the projection.

Hammond said the amount would include expenses from "maintaining the Trident strategic weapons system, including costs associated with the nuclear warhead." The country would pay an additional \$2.7 billion for "nuclear propulsion" systems, including those used by the country's four Vanguard-class ballistic missile submarines, he added.

The figures, though, did not account for a potential \$170 billion price tag for modernizing the country's strategic nuclear force.

The British defense ministry attempted to deflect criticism of the country's nuclear-weapons spending.

"Our first duty is to defend the interests and citizens of the United Kingdom and our submarine-based continuous at-sea deterrent is the ultimate safeguard of our national security," a spokeswoman said.

"No alternative would be as effective at deterring threats, which is why we are committed to maintaining a minimum credible nuclear deterrent at the best possible value for the taxpayer," the official added.

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/scotland-may-pay-17b-nuclear-armed-subs-over-next-decade/>

[Return to Top](#)

National Journal – Washington, D.C.

## **Russia May be Deploying Missile Tied to Treaty Violation**

By Diane Barnes

July 31, 2014

A U.S. analyst says Russia may be putting a new type of missile into launch-ready position, despite its link to an intensifying nuclear feud with Washington.

The country's defense ministry last week published a photograph that appears to show soldiers handling an Iskander-K cruise missile canister at a base near Luga, about 75 miles from Estonia, nuclear-arms expert Hans Kristensen said in a Wednesday assessment. The Russian image went public just days before the United States formally accused Moscow of breaking a Cold War arms-control treaty by test-firing a ground-launched cruise missile with comparable capabilities.

The U.S. State Department has not publicly named which missile it believes Russia launched in violation of the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty, and Moscow has denied committing any breach of the pact.

"News media reports and other information indicate that the violation possibly concerns the Iskander-K," wrote Kristensen, who heads the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists. Russia already has deployed a shorter-range, ballistic-missile variant of the weapon, called the Iskander-M.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Asked recently whether Russia is now also fielding the Iskander-K, one senior government official "did not want to say," Kristensen wrote. The FAS analyst added, though, that Moscow's top defense official last year said the military had begun deploying Iskander weapons in complete packages, rather than in "piecemeal" form.

The vague comment by Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu "could indicate that the Iskander units are being equipped with both the Iskander-M ballistic missile and Iskander-K cruise missile, and that Luga is the first western missile brigade to receive them," he wrote.

In his analysis, Kristensen joined other arms-control advocates who cautioned Washington against pulling out of the missile regime in response to the possible violation.

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/global-security-newswire/russia-may-be-deploying-missile-tied-to-treaty-violation-20140731>

[Return to Top](#)

Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran

## **MP Rules out Closure of Iran's Nuclear Sites**

July 26, 2014

TEHRAN (Tasnim) – An Iranian lawmaker underscored that the closures of Fordow and Arak nuclear sites are not on the agenda with Tehran's peaceful nuclear activities, including uranium enrichment, remaining firmly in place.

Iran's Fordow nuclear site will keep operating, Avaz Heidarpour told the Tasnim News Agency.

The legislator also noted that country's Arak heavy-water reactor complies with the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty) regulations, and stressed that Iran will vigorously press ahead with its nuclear activities.

Iran's entitlement to uranium enrichment has been "stabilized" following a 2010 conferences of the parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and under the Geneva deal between Tehran and six world powers, Heidarpour explained.

The US and some of its allies, Israel in particular, argue that Iran's nuclear program might include a military component, urging Iran to suspend its nuclear activities, including the closure of Arak heavy-water reactor.

Iran, however, rejects the allegation, insisting that as a signatory to the nuclear non-proliferation treaty there is no law against its use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Tehran also says numerous inspections of its nuclear sites by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) have invariably failed to find any diversion towards developing a military capability.

Iran and the sextet of world powers (the five permanent UN Security Council members plus Germany) on November 24, 2013, signed an interim nuclear deal in the Swiss city of Geneva.

The breakthrough agreement (the Joint Plan of Action) stipulates that Iran will carry out its enrichment activities under a final, comprehensive nuclear deal in the future.

<http://www.tasnimnews.com/English/Home/Single/442967>

[Return to Top](#)

Asharq Al-Awsat – London, U.K.

## **Iranian Lawmakers Consider Plans to Boost Oversight of Nuclear Talks**

*Development likely to raise fears of new obstacles to final settlement of nuclear issue*

Monday, 28 July 2014

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

London, *Asharq Al-Awsat*—Iran’s parliament is pushing forward with plans to boost its role in the international talks on the country’s nuclear program, say reports, in a development that may herald a more hardline Iranian position in negotiations.

Iranian media said on Sunday that the speaker of the Iranian parliament, Ali Larijani, had proposed an initiative to expand parliamentary oversight of Iran’s nuclear program, including the ongoing talks with the P5+1, a group of states which includes the US, France, Germany and the UK.

The chairman of the parliament’s National Security and Foreign Policy Committee, Mansour Haqiqat-Pour told the Iranian ISNA news agency: “Larijani proposed this initiative during his meeting with the National Security Committee, and the idea stipulates the drafting of a comprehensive project for nuclear activities and ratifying it by parliament.”

The legislator did not go into the details of the initiative, but he said: “Nuclear activities need a series of specific laws related to their use and their effect on the environment, where we can draft a comprehensive project for nuclear activities by revising laws related to this issue.”

After Larijani’s meeting with the Committee, Ismail Kowsari, one of its members, told journalists: “Larijani announced during this meeting that by drafting this project, we can use it whenever it is needed. The National Security Committee must make every effort to prepare this project.”

A number of Iranian MPs, including Larijani, have repeatedly called for Iran’s parliament to play a greater role in supervising the course of nuclear negotiations between Iran and the P5+1.

In April, Larijani said in a statement that “parliament will carefully supervise the forthcoming nuclear negotiations and will only consider as legitimate the negotiations which are held under parliamentary legislation.”

In the same statement, he criticized calls from the P5+1 for stricter safeguards on the Iranian nuclear program, which he said “have no legitimacy and lack legal standards.”

Under the terms of an interim agreement reached in November last year, Iran has agreed to impose some restrictions on its nuclear activities in return for limited relief on the crippling international sanctions that have been imposed on its energy and financial sectors.

A deadline for reaching a comprehensive agreement on Iran’s nuclear program expired on July 20, leading both sides to agree a four-month extension. While the US and its allies have expressed fears that Iran is covertly seeking the capability to build nuclear weapons, Tehran insists that its nuclear program is entirely peaceful.

Calls from Larijani and his parliamentary allies parallel those in the US Congress, where legislators have periodically called on the Obama administration to take a tougher line in the talks with Iran and push for more stringent restrictions on the Iranian nuclear program.

In the latest example, a number of Republican senators introduced a bill on July 23 that would require President Obama to notify Congress of any agreement reached between Iran and the P5+1, and give legislators the opportunity to reject the deal and impose additional sanctions.

Both developments are likely to raise fears that hardliners in both the Iranian parliament and the US Congress will complicate efforts by negotiators to reach a final, comprehensive agreement by imposing conditions the other side finds unacceptable, or refusing to ratify a deal reached by negotiators from the two sides.

Larijani’s calls follow previous expressions of unease among hardliners that the Rouhani administration was taking too soft a line in the nuclear talks.

A number of Iranian news agencies published reports in January which said a team was formed to supervise the Iranian nuclear negotiators, but government officials and the Foreign Ministry denied any knowledge of the existence of such a team.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



## USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

### CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

A number of hardline MPs at the Iranian parliament, who are opposed to the interim nuclear agreement signed last November, have expressed anger at the make-up of the current team of Iranian nuclear negotiators.

They said all members of the nuclear negotiation team were supporters of President Hassan Rouhani and Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif, and demanded that a number of MPs be added to the team. The legislators' calls were not implemented, however, because of President Rouhani's objections to the idea.

<http://www.aawsat.net/2014/07/article55334752>

[Return to Top](#)

The News & Observer.com – Raleigh, NC

## US Negotiator Gives No Hard Deadline for Iran Deal

By BRADLEY KLAPPER, Associated Press (AP)

July 29, 2014

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration's chief nuclear negotiator refused Tuesday to provide a hard deadline for a deal with Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. She vowed to consult with Congress before suspending more economic sanctions on Tehran, but said the administration won't necessarily seek lawmakers' approval.

The testimony by the State Department's Wendy Sherman immediately prompted objections in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, whose Democratic and Republican members pushed for clear markers as part of the diplomatic effort. World powers and Iran recently committed to a four-month negotiating extension through Nov. 24, an agreement that allows the Islamic republic to recoup \$2.8 billion in Iranian assets frozen in overseas bank accounts.

"The next four months will allow us to determine whether a diplomatic solution is possible," Sherman told the panel. "A comprehensive resolution, if we are able to arrive at one, will benefit people everywhere. It will ease anxiety and enhance security throughout the Middle East. It will reduce the likelihood of a nuclear arms race in the region. It will eliminate the potential threat of nuclear blackmail. It will contribute to the security of Israel, the Gulf states and our partners throughout the region."

But pressed by senators to outline how long the administration would continue talking and how far it would consider bending to coax Tehran into an accord, Sherman refused to be pinned down. She wouldn't promise the current extension would be the last. She said the administration would consult lawmakers before waiving more sanctions, but doesn't need their approval.

Sen. Bob Corker of Tennessee, the top Republican on the committee, described Sherman's pledge as a "zero commitment."

Sen. Marco Rubio, R-Fla., was blunter.

"This entire thing is a disaster," he said.

Iran says its program is solely designed for peaceful nuclear energy generation and medical research. The United States and its partners believe Iran's uranium enrichment activity, a potential heavy water facility that can produce plutonium and ballistic missile research, all point to a covert weapons program.

An interim deal reached last November and put into place earlier this year provided Tehran up to \$7 billion in economic relief for a series of measures to freeze its nuclear advancement. The goal was to reach a final agreement by July 20 but Secretary of State John Kerry and other top diplomats said that while tangible progress had been made, the gaps were still too wide.

Sen. Bob Menendez, D-N.J., called Iran's concessions to date "underwhelming."

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"I've been skeptical of the Iranians' sincerity from Day 1 and I cannot say that I am any less skeptical today," said Menendez, the committee chairman. He said he'd oppose any further extension of negotiations.

Sherman said the administration strongly believes the talks merit additional time.

"We wouldn't have agreed to an extension if we did not have an honest expectation that we have a credible path forward," she said. "We still have work to do. We still have time to determine whether we can close the gap between what Iran has said it intends and what it is willing to do."

Congress would enjoy its greatest leverage if a comprehensive accord is reached.

Lawmakers would essentially enjoy a veto over any final deal because they could place strict limits on Iranian activity in exchange for the revocation of U.S. nuclear-related sanctions.

Permanently scrapping sanctions that are codified in U.S. law would require both chambers of Congress to act. That task would only get harder for the administration if Republicans, who already control the House, seize a majority in the Senate in November's midterm elections.

<http://www.newsobserver.com/2014/07/29/4036967/us-negotiator-gives-no-hard-deadline.html>

[Return to Top](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Iran's Ballistic Missile System Should Be Dealt with on Side of Nuclear Talks - Expert**

30 July 2014

WASHINGTON, July 30 (RIA Novosti) - In a Wednesday discussion with the Israel Policy Forum, former State Department assistant secretary for non-proliferation, and current non-proliferation expert at the Brookings Institute, Robert Einhorn, told RIA Novosti that he believes that the issue of Iran's ballistic missiles should be dealt with on the side of the ongoing P5+1 nuclear negotiations.

"The Iranian position is that this negotiation is about the nuclear issue, not about the missile issue," said Einhorn. "I think this could be very difficult to get the Iranians to include a provision regarding their missile capabilities in the comprehensive nuclear deal. But I do think it makes sense, perhaps as a side deal, to press the Iranians to adopt certain restraints regarding their missile program."

Asked by RIA Novosti whether he believes the two issues should be dealt with separately, Einhorn stated bluntly, "It [the Iranian ballistic missiles] will not be part of the nuclear agreement, but perhaps they can be pursued on the side." Einhorn worked at the State Department as assistant secretary for non-proliferation during the Clinton administration and as the Secretary of State Special Advisor for non-proliferation and arms control during the Obama administration.

Einhorn was asked to respond to the statement made on Tuesday by Undersecretary of State Wendy Sherman, when she told members of Congress that the Iranian ballistic missile system, capable of delivering a nuclear warhead, "has to be addressed in some way" in the P5+1 Iranian nuclear negotiations. The international negotiations to ensure Iran does not develop nuclear weapons, was recently extended from its original July 20 deadline and the talks are expected to conclude in November of 2014.

The United States attempt to put Iran's ballistic missile program on the agenda of the nuclear agreements, prompted disapproval from Russia's Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov. Lavrov accused the Americans of trying to "load" the talks "with new demands," as the issues arising from the ballistic missile program were not a part of the original program agreed to in Geneva in November 2013.

According to Einhorn, the ballistic missile system is a legitimate concern that should be addressed as a violation of UN Security Council resolution 1929.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226





**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

However, it is the Iranian position “that it pursues its missile program for conventional military reasons. In other words, there is no intent to arm these missiles with nuclear weapons, only conventional munitions. So therefore, this nuclear negotiation shouldn’t deal with the missile issue.”

Einhorn suggested that as a confidence building measure, to take place on the sidelines of the nuclear negotiations, Iran could commit for five years not to test missile systems that are more capable than those it has previously tested. “In other words, not to improve that capability for some period of time.”

“I think this could be very difficult to get the Iranians to include provisions regarding their missile capabilities in the comprehensive nuclear deal,” concluded Einhorn. “But I do think it makes sense, perhaps separately, perhaps as a side deal, to press the Iranians to adopt certain restraints regarding their missile program.”

<http://en.ria.ru/politics/20140730/191496024/Irans-Ballistic-Missile-System-Should-Be-Dealt-With-On-Side-of.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Press TV – Tehran, Iran

## **Iran Denies Deal on Limiting Enrichment**

Thursday, July 31, 2014

A senior Iranian nuclear negotiator has dismissed allegations of Iran’s consent to scale down its uranium enrichment program.

“Any agreement about Arak or Fordow [nuclear facilities] is denied. No agreement has so far been reached about the issues under discussion [with six world powers], including these two sites, and the differences still remain,” ISNA quoted Abbas Araqchi, who is also a deputy to the Iranian foreign minister, as saying.

He was reacting to July 29 remarks by the US lead nuclear negotiator Wendy Sherman to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee about “tangible progress in key areas, including Fordow, Arak and IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) access.”

“It [Iran] promised not to fuel or install remaining components at the research reactor in Arak.... It allowed inspectors to have daily access at the Natanz enrichment facility and the underground plant at Fordow,” said Sherman who is the deputy US secretary of state.

Araqchi said, “The only criterion for the Islamic Republic of Iran has been the country’s needs and throughout negotiations [with the world powers], decisions will be made only based on the country’s needs.”

Iran and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council – the United States, France, Britain, Russia and China – plus Germany are to resume their negotiations to discuss ways to reach a final agreement over Tehran’s nuclear energy program in September.

The right to enrich uranium, the Arak heavy water reactor and sanctions against Tehran are among the bones of contention between Iran and the six countries.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/07/31/373515/iran-denies-deal-on-limiting-enrichment/>

[Return to Top](#)

The Times of India – Mumbai, India

## **Navy Gets New Facility to Communicate with Nuclear Submarines Prowling Underwater**

By Rajat Pandit, Tamil News Network (TNN)

July 31, 2014

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

NEW DELHI: With India planning a larger fleet of nuclear-powered submarines, which can prowl underwater for several months at a time and let loose their nuclear-tipped missiles as and when required, the Navy has acquired a new advanced facility to communicate with the silent predators.

The state-of-the-art very low frequency (VLF) transmitting station was commissioned at INS Kattabomman in Tirunelveli (Tamil Nadu) by Navy chief Admiral RK Dhowan on Thursday.

"The new facility will boost our ability to communicate with submarines, which have trailing wire antenna to pick up the coded VLF radio waves, on an uninterrupted basis throughout the year," said an officer.

Only a handful of nations have such a VLF capability, which is critical to pass coded orders to nuclear submarines on long-range deterrent patrols. Diesel-electric submarines have to surface every few days to get oxygen to recharge their batteries and have limited endurance due to fuel requirements.

Nuclear-powered submarines, armed with nuclear-tipped missiles, in turn, are considered the most effective and difficult-to-detect nuke platform since they can operate underwater at long ranges for months at end.

India is down to just 13 old diesel-electric submarines, barely half of which are operational at any given time, and a single nuclear-propelled submarine INS Chakra on lease from Russia without any long-range missiles.

But India's first three SSBNs (nuclear-powered submarines with nuclear ballistic missiles) are already being built at the secretive Ship-Building Centre at Vizag to complete the country's nuclear weapons triad - the capability to fire nukes from land, air and underwater.

The first, the 6,000-tonne INS Arihant, is slated to go for extensive sea trials soon after its miniature 83MW pressurized light-water reactor, which went "critical" in August last year, attains "full power" in the next couple of months. Moreover, there is an ongoing proposal to build six SSNs (nuclear-powered attack submarines, usually without ballistic missiles), as reported by TOI earlier.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Navy-gets-new-facility-to-communicate-with-nuclear-submarines-prowling-underwater/articleshow/39371121.cms>

[Return to Top](#)

Sydney Morning Herald – Sydney, Australia

## **US Doctor Contracts Ebola as Virus Spreads**

July 28, 2014

Washington: Two Americans involved in the treatment of Ebola victims in Liberia have become infected with the West African epidemic.

As of July 20, the number of Ebola cases recorded in the months-long epidemic was 1093, including more than 660 deaths in the worst outbreak of the haemorrhagic fever on record, according to the WHO.

Dr Kent Brantly, a former GP in Fort Worth, Texas, became the third senior doctor in less than a week to fall ill with the virus he was trying to treat in others. Dr Samuel Brisbane, from Liberia, died on Saturday at a clinic in the country's capital, Monrovia.

Sierra Leone's leading Ebola specialist, Dr Sheikh Umar Khan, also tested positive last week, and is being treated at a Medecins Sans Frontieres clinic. He is expected to survive.

Dr Brantly was in a stable condition and has been isolated at the group's Ebola treatment centre at a hospital in the Liberian capital Monrovia, charity Samaritan's Purse said. He is the medical director of the charity's Ebola case management centre in Liberia.

Nancy Writebol, a missionary with the SIM Christian charity that runs the hospital, had contracted the disease and was also stable as of Sunday morning, according to the Christian charity. Ms Writebol had been working as a hygienist responsible for detoxifying protective suits worn by those entering and exiting an Ebola isolation centre.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"They're both receiving intensive early treatment, but certainly it's a dangerous situation and a frightening situation," spokeswoman Melissa Strickland said.

The Ebola outbreak shows no signs of abating, with authorities across West Africa now on higher alert after a Liberian man carrying the illness flew unchecked from Monrovia to Lagos, Africa's most populous city, and died there. He was vomiting during the flight, raising concerns other passengers could have caught the illness.

Any surge in infections in Lagos, Nigeria, could be impossible to contain. Travellers leaving airports in the main affected countries - Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia - were undergoing extra checks, but doctors have warned that symptoms can take time to show.

Relations of virus victims in Sierra Leone, where more than 450 have died from the virus, are increasingly mistrustful of Western doctors' attempts to save their family members, and are resorting to traditional healers. But that means that they are forcibly carrying their sick relations from isolation wards back to their villages, significantly raising chances of further contagion.

In recent days crowds gathered outside clinics and hospitals to protest against what they see as a conspiracy, in some cases clashing with police as they threatened to burn down the buildings and remove the patients.

A Sierra Leone patient who sparked a nationwide hunt when her family forcefully removed her from a treatment centre and took her to a traditional healer. She died in an ambulance on the way to another hospital, a health official said on the weekend.

More people have died now in Sierra Leone than in Guinea, where this outbreak of the virus was first identified in February.

Ebola is believed to be carried by animals hunted for meat, notably bats. It spreads among humans via bodily fluids including sweat, meaning you can get sick from touching an infected person.

The virus can kill victims within days, causing severe fever and muscle pain, vomiting, diarrhoea and, in some cases, organ failure and unstoppable bleeding.

With no vaccine, patients believed to have caught the virus must be isolated to prevent further contagion.

*AFP, Telegraph, London, Reuters*

<http://www.smh.com.au/world/us-doctor-contracts-ebola-as-virus-spreads-20140728-zxhvf.html>

[Return to Top](#)

The Global Post – Boston, MA

## **World Ebola Fears Grow with Europe and Asia on Alert**

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

July 30, 2014

Fears that the west African Ebola outbreak could spread to other continents grew on Wednesday with European and Asian countries on alert and a leading medical charity warning the epidemic was out of control.

Doctors Without Borders (MSF) said the crisis gripping Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone would only get worse and warned there was no overarching strategy to handle the world's worst-ever outbreak of the disease.

Hong Kong announced quarantine measures for suspected cases, although one woman arriving from Africa with possible symptoms tested negative, while the EU said it was ready to deal with the threat.

The International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) has held talks with global health officials on potential measures to halt the spread of the disease.

In Britain, Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond chaired the government's COBRA crisis management committee to assess the situation, although only one person has tested negative for the disease.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies  
CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"The prime minister does regard it as a very serious threat," Hammond said. "We are very much focused on it as a new and emerging threat which we need to deal with."

He said the emergency meeting had decided that the best approach was to provide "additional resources to deal with the disease at source" in west Africa.

Ebola can kill victims within days, causing severe fever and muscle pain, vomiting, diarrhoea and, in some cases, organ failure and unstoppable bleeding.

Since March, there have been 1,201 cases of Ebola and 672 deaths in Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, according to the World Health Organization (WHO).

The European Union is equipped and ready to treat victims should the deadly virus be found in its 28 member states, an EU source said in Brussels.

"We cannot rule out the possibility that an infected person arrives in Europe but the EU has the means to track and contain any outbreak rapidly," the source said.

The isolation and negative testing of a suspected case in Valencia in Spain showed that the "system worked", added the source.

"The level of contamination on the ground is extremely worrying and we need to scale up our action before many more lives are lost," said EU Humanitarian Aid Commissioner Kristalina Georgieva.

- Hong Kong quarantine -

In Hong Kong, a densely populated city previously scarred by disease outbreaks such as the 2003 SARS epidemic, health officials confirmed they would quarantine as a precautionary measure any visitors from Guinea, Sierra Leone and Liberia who showed fever symptoms.

One woman arriving in the southern Chinese city from Africa, who showed symptoms including fever and vomiting, has tested negative for Ebola.

Bart Janssens, MSF's director of operations, warned that governments and global bodies had no "overarching view" vision of how to tackle the outbreak.

"This epidemic is unprecedented, absolutely out of control and the situation can only get worse, because it is still spreading, above all in Liberia and Sierra Leone, in some very important hotspots," he said.

"If the situation does not improve fairly quickly, there is a real risk of new countries being affected," he told La Libre Belgique newspaper.

In Canada, local media reported that a Canadian doctor had put himself in quarantine as a precaution after spending weeks in west Africa treating patients with the virus alongside an American doctor, who is now infected.

Meanwhile in Sierra Leone, a doctor in charge of an Ebola treatment centre became another victim of the virus.

A spokesman for the French foreign ministry said they were offering technical support and expertise on the ground in west Africa.

Togo-based pan-African airline ASKY, which serves 20 destinations, said it halted all flights to and from Liberia and Sierra Leone following the death of a passenger from the virus.

The 40-year-old man, who travelled from Liberia, died in Lagos on Friday in Nigeria's first confirmed death from Ebola.

The virus crossing borders for the first time by plane could lead to new flight restrictions aimed at containing outbreaks, the world aviation agency said.

"Until now (the virus) had not impacted commercial aviation, but now we're affected," ICAO secretary general Raymond Benjamin said.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

"We will have to act quickly."

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/140730/world-ebola-fears-grow-europe-and-asia-alert>

[Return to Top](#)

The Moscow Times – Moscow, Russia

OPINION/Columnist

## Cold War Strategies Are Back in Russia's Playbook

By Alexander Golts

July 28, 2014

The theory that history unfolds first as a tragedy and then repeats itself as a farce is not always true. Sometimes, history repeats its tragedy all over again, and with the same terrible consequences.

Thirty years ago, a Soviet fighter jet shot down a South Korean airliner that had strayed into Soviet airspace. U.S. intelligence presented incontrovertible evidence to then-President Ronald Reagan: a recording of the conversation between the pilots.

Reagan called the act a massacre. The world shuddered in horror. Prior to that, the international community considered Reagan's description of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire" a bit of a rhetorical exaggeration. After the deaths of hundreds of civilians, that assessment seemed all too accurate.

Nobody bothered listening to the head of the Russian General Staff who, jabbing his pointer at explanatory graphics, attempted to prove that Soviet intelligence had mistaken the Boeing for a U.S. spy plane that had cleverly hidden behind the exterior of a passenger plane. Overnight, the Soviet superpower turned into an international pariah.

Now the situation is repeating with extraordinary precision, right up to the press briefing with Russian military officials zealously putting forward two mutually exclusive theories. According to one, Ukrainian storm troopers shot down the airplane, and according to the other, Ukrainian anti-aircraft missiles are to blame. The Russian Foreign Ministry has demanded that the international community discuss the cacophony of unending and presumptuous "questions" put forward by the Defense Ministry, insisting that Moscow receive information on all air-launched and surface-to-air missiles in the Ukrainian Army's possession.

But the world simply ignores those demands. The leading Western states have already reached their conclusions. U.S. White House spokesman Josh Earnest expressed their logic very clearly. "What we know is that the Malaysia Airlines jet was brought down by a missile that was fired from the ground," he said. "It was fired from the ground in an area that was controlled by separatists and in an area where the Ukrainians themselves were not actually operating anti-aircraft weapons at that time. So that is why we have concluded that Vladimir Putin and the Russians are culpable in this tragedy."

Russia has become a rogue state in the eyes of the West. The European Union and the United States see no reason to build a relationship with it and even feel they must restrain the country by all possible means, much like the Soviet Union before it. The U.S. chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Martin Dempsey, has said that NATO member states must take major steps to ensure their national security.

In practice, that probably means that the United States will have to be ready to quickly deploy troops to Europe to respond to potential crises. So, even if U.S. troops do not appear at Russia's doorstep, U.S. military bases for the storage and deployment of heavy weaponry will likely begin dotting the map. The U.S. administration is discussing the possibility of providing Kiev with intelligence on the exact location of the separatists' anti-aircraft installations and of supplying Ukraine with U.S. weapons.

In this way, we see a scenario unfolding on the territory of a European country that is strikingly similar to numerous guerilla wars of the second half of the last century in which the Soviet Union and the U.S. took turns supporting insurgents and propping up puppet governments. But at that time, the leaders in Washington

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

and Moscow had enough prudence and intelligence to make sure those wars did not spread to Europe. General Dempsey, however, declares that the strategic landscape in Europe has already changed dramatically, and not only in Ukraine.

In short, the world is quickly spiraling into a new Cold War. The Soviet Union lost the last Cold War. What chances does Russia have in this one?

The Soviet Union had almost 5 million troops, but Russia, with its current demographic problems, can muster no more than 800,000. Soviet industry produced the full gamut of goods, whereas Russia is wholly dependent on imports in many areas.

The Soviet Union created the Warsaw Pact, a fairly powerful political and military alliance.

But as President Vladimir Putin recently admitted, "Russia is fortunately not a member of any alliance," thereby indicating the true value he places on the Collective Security Treaty Organization that only recently he had tried to present as a counterweight to NATO.

This list of comparisons could go on indefinitely, with each point only further underscoring that Russia cannot serve as a military counterweight to the United States.

However, that fact does not worry Russia's commander-in-chief in the least. President Putin opened a recent Security Council meeting on defending the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Russia with this sensational statement: "Obviously, there is no direct military threat to the sovereignty and territorial integrity of this country." According to Putin, "the strategic balance of powers in the world guarantees this." However, the factors listed above indicate that no such balance even exists: Militarily, Russia is far inferior to the West.

Russia's only strong point is its nuclear weapons, so Vladimir Putin relies primarily on those. But of course, according to former Defense Ministry Anatoly Serdyukov, the United States also has superiority in that area. Serdyukov explained that it would take until 2028 for Russia to increase its arsenal of nuclear delivery vehicles to the limits permitted by the New START Treaty.

However, unlike the last Cold War, the question of quantitative parity will have little fundamental importance this time. In the current situation, it is obvious that the West will base its policy on the possibility that even a single Russian warhead might penetrate its defenses and reach U.S. territory.

Until recently, the fact that Russia has the world's second-largest nuclear arsenal did not seriously influence international politics. That is because the world relied on the intelligence and sanity of Kremlin leaders, and believed that no circumstances could ever arise in which Putin would push the button.

Now the situation has changed. Russia is becoming a lonely pariah without alliances or military might, other than its nuclear weapons. And without any other easy means of achieving its objectives, I am afraid that the Kremlin will constantly try to prove it is just crazy enough to use its nuclear weapons. In short, Russia is turning into a second North Korea, only much, much larger, and far more dangerous.

*Alexander Golts is deputy editor of the online newspaper Yezhednevny Zhurnal.*

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/cold-war-strategies-are-back-in-russias-playbook/504195.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Union of Concerned Scientist - Cambridge, MA

OPINION/All Things Nuclear

## **Evolving Chinese Views on U.S. National Missile Defense**

By Gregory Kulacki, China project manager and senior analyst

July 28, 2014

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

Chinese perceptions of the U.S. national missile defense program are changing. Initial concerns about a technological arms race China could not win are gradually giving way to less alarming Chinese assessments. Most Chinese observers do not view the capabilities of existing U.S. missile defense technology as an immediate military challenge. But Chinese observers do see continued U.S. investments in missile defense, particularly those that involve cooperation with nations on China's periphery, as a cause for concern over the long term.

China's evolving views on missile defense are presented in a new UCS white paper.

### **Sensors vs. Interceptors**

The current focus of Chinese concern appears to be on the ancillary intelligence gathering and surveillance capabilities the United States is putting in place during peacetime rather than the ability of U.S. defenses to intercept a Chinese missile fired during an actual conflict. Chinese military planners worry—justifiably or not—that the radars the United States is deploying in the region, including those that support missile defense, could be used to observe the testing or track the deployments of Chinese missiles. Combined with intensive U.S. monitoring of Chinese missile forces with satellites, and the U.S. refusal to take any military option including a nuclear first strike “off the table,” Chinese military planners confront what some perceive as an uncomfortably high risk of a disarming U.S. preemptive strike, either against the missiles themselves or against their command and control systems.

From China's perspective, continued U.S. investments in a national missile defense present a serious challenge to the efforts of both sides to maintain strategic stability between China and the United States over the long term. The U.S. pursuit of a shield against nuclear attacks undermines Chinese confidence in U.S. assurances that greater Chinese transparency about its comparatively small nuclear arsenal would not undermine Chinese security. And China's refusal to discuss the size and capabilities of its nuclear forces undermines U.S. confidence in Chinese assurances that China will not build up its nuclear forces as the United States and Russia scale down, or threaten to use its nuclear weapons during a future conflict with the United States.

### **Technological vs. Negotiated Solutions**

Despite three decades of research and development, the United States has yet to produce an effective reliable defense against long-range ballistic missiles. But President Reagan's 1983 decision to invest in this defense, which he promised would make nuclear-armed missiles “obsolete,” did spur the Chinese leadership to launch its own large scale, long-term investment in advanced military technologies, including kinetic energy interceptors like those being developed for the U.S. national missile defense program.

China has tested its own kinetic energy interceptors using missiles and a satellite as targets. In January 2007 the Chinese used the interceptor to obliterate an aging Chinese weather satellite, creating a large field of potentially dangerous debris that will remain in space for decades. China described its most recent test of this exoatmospheric hit-to-kill technology, conducted just last week, as a missile defense test. Chinese press reports compared the test to an 11 January 2010 test, which is described in detail in a U.S. cable issued the following day.

President Reagan's technological utopianism, which, ironically, is also defining feature of Chinese Marxism, lives on among U.S. defense analysts who continue to believe national missile defense is a solution to the danger of nuclear-armed missiles. Common sense, as well as experience, suggests that a new defense merely begets a new offense, and in the case of national missile defense, countermeasures that can be easily added to missiles to defeat missile defenses are a lot simpler and much less expensive to successfully develop and deploy, even for technology-starved nations like Iran and North Korea.

The women and men who work in China's defense science community understand the limiting technical realities of the U.S. national missile defense program. Throughout the history of the People's Republic, China's senior political leaders looked to their scientists and engineers for definitive guidance on Chinese nuclear weapons policy. These technically trained professionals see the continued U.S. pursuit of a national missile defense as antithetical to international efforts to reduce and eventually eliminate nuclear weapons. For them, missile defense is a security problem, not a solution, even though they now possess the same basic technology themselves.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

In the words of one of China's most influential arms control experts, who works in a center affiliated with the Chinese Academy of Engineering Physics,

*"Historically, limitations on the development of strategic missile defense systems were a cornerstone of nuclear arms control. The development of strategic missile defense not only easily facilitates nuclear arms racing; it poisons relations between the nuclear nations, destroys strategic stability and makes deep nuclear reductions difficult to realize."*

*Gregory has lived and worked in China for the better part of the last twenty-five years facilitating exchanges between academic, governmental, and professional organizations in both countries. Since joining the Union of Concerned Scientists in 2002, he has focused on promoting and conducting dialog between Chinese and American experts on nuclear arms control and space security.*

<http://allthingsnuclear.org/evolving-chinese-views-on-u-s-national-missile-defense/>

[Return to Top](#)

Foreign Policy – Washington, D.C.  
OPINION/The Voice

## **The Problem with Russia's Missiles**

*Why is the United States taking Moscow to task over noncompliance with the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty?*

By Jeffrey Lewis  
July 29, 2014

The State Department's annual "Compliance Report" is about to drop. According to Michael Gordon at the *New York Times*, the State Department will accuse the Russians of cheating on the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF). Gordon even has the money sentence:

"The United States has determined that the Russian Federation is in violation of its obligations under the I.N.F. treaty not to possess, produce or flight test a ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM) with a range capability of 500 kilometers to 5,500 kilometers or to possess or produce launchers of such missiles."

Gordon's story is part of a formal rollout. Secretary of State John Kerry gave Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov a courtesy call on Sunday, and the U.S. Embassy delivered a letter from President Barack Obama to Vladimir Putin.

Let's get this out of the way first: The decision to accuse Russia in print of violating the 1987 INF Treaty is not about Ukraine. Putin certainly hasn't done himself any favors in recent months, of course, but American concerns about Russia's compliance have been building for a long time. Rose Gottemoeller, the U.S. undersecretary of state for arms control and international security, began raising the issue of INF compliance with the Russians more than a year ago, in May 2013. After failing to get satisfaction from Moscow, she briefed the NATO Arms Control, Disarmament, and Non-Proliferation Committee on the compliance issues in January 2014. As early as this spring, it was clear that there was a possibility of using State's annual Compliance Report to make public the concerns that U.S. diplomats had expressed in private. I argued in April that, given the mounting evidence, it was time to let the Russians have it.

And now it is that time of year. The Compliance Report is due every year on April 15, but congressionally mandated reports are always late. August is actually pretty early. Recall that the Bush administration didn't even bother to submit a compliance report during six of the eight years it was in office.

The decision to focus on the R-500 cruise missile is interesting. Russia is actually testing two different systems that raise compliance questions -- the R-500 cruise missile and the RS-26 ballistic missile. The Obama administration, according to Gordon, has decided to make an issue of Russia's R-500 cruise missile, developed for the Iskander tactical missile system. Although this cruise missile has a stated range of 500 kilometers, Russian officials have been clear that they could easily extend the range beyond the 500 km limit imposed by the INF treaty. According

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226





to Gordon's January 2014 story, Gottemoeller told NATO allies that Russia had tested the R-500 to ranges beyond 500 km. (Gordon doesn't report what the U.S. intelligence community believes the actual range is in either story.)

The Obama administration appears to have focused on the R-500 for two reasons: It is easier to prove and may be easier to solve. First, of the two issues, the R-500 is apparently the more blatant violation. The RS-26, on the other hand, has been referred to as a "circumvention" of the INF in deference to the ambiguity of its status. (Russia asserts that the RS-26 is an intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM, to be counted under the New START treaty.) So the Obama administration is probably right to start with the more blatant case of cheating.

Second, the White House may believe that Russia is on the verge of moving from testing the prohibited cruise missile to deploying it. Douglas Barrie and Henry Boyd of the International Institute for Strategic Studies recently noted a Russian article that appears to show an R-500 canister on a deployed Iskander. If Russia is indeed on the verge of deploying large numbers of R-500 cruise missiles, now is the time to start talking about it. It's much easier to prevent something with arms control than to roll it back. The Obama administration apparently hopes that pressure now will persuade Russia to forego deployment of the new cruise missile. I wouldn't hold my breath.

But even if the administration is right to start with the R-500, over the long-term the RS-26 might be a bigger threat. A two-stage ballistic missile with multiple nuclear warheads, the RS-26 looks a lot like the SS-20 that prompted the INF discussion in the first place. The R-500 is a serious compliance issue, but it is also probably a conventionally armed missile that may only slightly exceed the range limits set by the INF treaty. The RS-26, on the other hand, is designed to hold Western European capitals at risk of attack with nuclear weapons. While Russia might hint that the RS-26 is intended for China, the reality is that it also seems to be designed to threaten NATO forces in Western Europe to deter them from coming to the aid of the alliance's newer members closer to Russia's tender embraces.

Even if the R-500 and RS-26 pose a challenge for NATO, it does not make sense for the United States to withdraw from the INF Treaty. It isn't often that I agree with former Bush administration official Stephen Rademaker, but he was exactly right when he testified: "I do not believe the appropriate remedy in this case is for the United States to withdraw from the treaty. Rather, since Russia so clearly wants out, we should make sure that they alone pay the political and diplomatic price of terminating the treaty. But it is also clear that we cannot and should not ignore the violations."

Putting public pressure on Russia is the right strategy, but sometimes the right strategy still falls short. The Russians would like to have intermediate-range nuclear forces, but without taking the political hit for withdrawing from the treaty. Keeping things quiet lets Russia violate the treaty, but without paying any political or diplomatic costs. The Russians hate having to talk about this in public. When Ivo Daalder raised the issue at the Munich Security Conference, Lavrov fumed. Making an issue of Russia's R-500 forces Moscow to choose between its new cruise missile and its propaganda line about the threat from NATO. Russia might ultimately withdraw from the INF treaty anyway, but at least it will be clear who's undermining stability and security in Europe.

*Jeffrey Lewis is director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies.*

[http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/07/29/the\\_problem\\_with\\_russia\\_s\\_missiles\\_r500\\_rs26\\_inf\\_treaty?utm\\_content=buffer4da4&utm\\_medium=social&utm\\_source=facebook.com&utm\\_campaign=buffer](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/07/29/the_problem_with_russia_s_missiles_r500_rs26_inf_treaty?utm_content=buffer4da4&utm_medium=social&utm_source=facebook.com&utm_campaign=buffer)

[Return to Top](#)

Cicero Magazine – Berlin, Germany

## **It is Time to Retire 'Weapons of Mass Destruction'**

OPINION/Article

By Dan Kaszeta

July 29, 2014

Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The West has been using the terms WMD and “weapons of mass destruction” to describe an expanding list of weapons and materials for the past 20 years. It was not a term used when I began working in the field. When I first entered the U.S. Army, we used the term NBC—nuclear, biological, and chemical. Some of the old manuals in the library at the U.S. Army Chemical School used CBR (chemical, bacteriological, radiological) or ABC (atomic, biological, chemical). Today the U.S. military has adopted the acronym CBRN—chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear. Early in my career, the only references to WMD I came across were in translations of Soviet military writing. It wasn’t until 1995 when I was working in the Pentagon that I actually heard active use of the term. By 1997, it was thoroughly entrenched. Following the build up to the 2003 Iraq War, it became a household word across America. WMD started as a Soviet-era Russian-ism that crept into the American vocabulary. This misguided, unclear, undefined, and unhelpful term needs to be retired from our active lexicon.

The general assumption is that WMD means the same thing as CBRN—chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons. But this is by no means the case. Earlier uses of the term are documented, with one of the earliest being by Cosmo Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury, in reference to the 1937 bombing of Guernica during the Spanish Civil War, although this was a conventional attack and not CBRN in nature. There has since been permutations and gyrations in the definition and usage, as covered by William Safire in the New York Times. The recent capture by ISIS forces of Saddam’s former chemical weapons facility at Muthanna has prompted more variation in the definition of the term to the effect that chemical weapons are not WMD.

WMD is vague and over-broad as a term. What does it actually mean? What are WMDs? The general “street definition” as NBC/CBRN materials is certainly not the only definition. It means different things in different places. US scholar Seth Carus found over 40 meanings in 2006, and more have doubtless emerged since. Examples abound. The old Soviet term covered weapons used to inflict heavy casualties, including nuclear, chemical, and bacteriological agents. But smallpox, for example, can be used as biological weapon and is a virus, not bacteria. Is a dirty bomb spreading radioactive material part of this definition? The definitional problems become clear.

The UN also took a stab at defining WMD as, “Atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above.” (S/C.3/32/Rev.1)

The current prevailing—but by no means only—U.S. military definition is from Joint Publication 1-02, but many other U.S. military publications do not bother to define it in detail. JP 1-02 defines WMD as: “Chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear weapons capable of a high order of destruction or causing mass casualties and exclude the means of transporting or propelling the weapon where such means is a separable and divisible part from the weapon”.

But even the U.S. government cannot agree on the definition. There is a definition, enshrined in law, which has much broader scope than the Joint Publication. It creates the absurd position of people using pipe bombs being convicted of using a WMD because of the very broad legal definition enacted into US law (18 USC 2332a). This law states that the following are WMDs:

- Any weapon that is designed or intended to cause death or serious bodily injury through the release, dissemination, or impact of toxic or poisonous chemicals, or their precursors
- any weapon involving a biological agent, toxin, or vector
- Any weapon that is designed to release radiation or radioactivity at a level dangerous to human life
- Any destructive device under 18 USC 921

This particular law is so overly broad as to be ridiculous. Although the authors mean well, this law is problematic. The precursor clause is troublesome. Sulfur is a direct precursor of the binary form of the nerve agent VX. If I spill a bag of sulfur in the parking lot of a US Post Office, have I just become a WMD terrorist who attacked the U.S. government? Isopropyl alcohol is a precursor to Sarin. So, if you make a Molotov cocktail using isopropyl alcohol, is it a WMD? A zealous prosecutor could argue that such an act would be within the scope of the law. The Boston Marathon bombers were charged with the use of WMD. Though their crime was indeed heinous, it certainly stretches credulity to call their pressure cooker device a WMD.

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The “dangerous device” clause broadens WMD to include a whole host of devices already illegal under US law:

- Bombs
- Grenades
- Rockets with propellant charge of four ounces
- Missiles having an explosive charge of one quarter ounce
- Mines
- “Similar Devices”
- Any weapon that has a bore over half an inch in diameter (.50 cal), except for shotguns.

By this U.S. legal definition, every military in the world has WMD. People should not be running around with these kinds of things, but what public policy end is served by making 20mm cannons and 40mm grenade launchers into WMD? Perhaps it is a binary outlook on the subject, but something is either legal or illegal. What end is served by passing more laws to make something that is already illegal even more illegal? Even more troubling is the “similar devices” clause. This clause is enough to enable a keen prosecutor to make anything into a WMD. Fireworks, smoke grenades, and flare pistols, usually with a bore over half an inch, could all come within the definition.

Various people have argued, both seriously and fatuously, that the term WMD does not really extend to chemical weapons. Professor James Holmes, at the US Naval War College, argues as much in an article in *The Diplomat* in 2013. I think that his points are technically quite correct. More fatuously, when you examine social media over the last year there is some sophistry and, indeed, squirming going on about whether chemical weapons are WMD. The fact that Saddam Hussein really did have Sarin and Mustard is laid bare by the fact that rather a lot of chemical warfare agent—mostly in form of useless residue and detritus—is at a place called Muthanna. The recent loss of this facility to ISIS has forced some people into an ideologically uncomfortable position – If Saddam Hussein never had WMDs, then what’s this stuff at Muthanna everyone is now worried about? At least a few commentators have resorted to the flexibility of the WMD term by claiming “chemical weapons are not WMD”. Simply enter the phrase in the search box on Twitter and hold on to your hat. It is a silly argument to make, but the fact that it can occur at all is due to the fact that the phrase WMD is so flexible it has become useless.

The second problem with the term “Weapons of Mass Destruction” is that it is actually linguistically incorrect. Even if we stick to the narrow definition of NBC/CBRN weapons, there is not actually much destruction with the B and the C (biological and chemical). If a weapon does not actually destroy anything, then why call it a weapon of destruction? Nuclear weapons clearly destroy things, and in a well-understood way. But the other categories of NBC/CBRN weapons usually do not. Biological weapons kill people, make them sick, or are injurious to agriculture, but they do not actually destroy anything. Smallpox and plague are quite deadly, but they do not destroy things. Anthrax spores might contaminate something for a long time, but there is a fundamental difference between contamination and destruction.

A lot of chemical or biological weapons do not contaminate anything at all. Chemical warfare agents are not known for destroying anything either. Some toxic industrial chemicals might cause widespread destruction, but these are generally substances with flammable, explosive, reactive, and/or corrosive properties that actually make them unsuitable for use as chemical weapons in a military setting because they are as dangerous to their user as to their target. Much of Professor Holmes’ critique of the term falls under this broad heading, arguing on practical grounds that chemical weapons are not actually a huge problem in naval settings.

Use of WMD as a phrase gives us a third problem—conflation. When we use the phrase WMD as some kind of collective noun, it causes conflation of different materials problems. Even if we are sticking to the narrow definition CBRN materials and weapons, there are fundamental difference between the C, B, R and N. These differences cover practically every aspect of operations: protection, medical countermeasures, detection, decontamination, and emergency response. There is no point in saying that chemical weapons are at all similar to biological weapons, as they are very different. So, why should we conflate them underneath an umbrella term? We can also approach the conflation issue in matters of scale. A single nuclear weapon, even a small one, has quite a potent effect whose use would be dramatic event in human history. A single chemical artillery round,

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



on the other hand, will not have much individual impact. So why would we use intellectual constructs that make the two nominally equal?

I believe that these various points – vagueness, linguistic inaccuracy, and conflation—are sufficient grounds for retiring this contrived and stilted phrase. Many others already have. The Carnegie Endowment, in its publication “Deadly Arsenal”, minimizes its use of the term as problematic. I am proud to join the ranks of WMD refuseniks.

If we retire WMD as a term, what do we replace it with? Why do we need to replace it with anything? If we mean chemical weapons, let us say chemical weapons. If we mean biological weapons, let us say so. We use specific language in many ways in modern discourse. Modern media is capable of differentiating between a bacteria and a virus, and between a diesel or gasoline engine. These are distinctions far more subtle than the difference between a nuclear weapon and an anthrax spore or a pressure cooker with gunpowder in it. So why do we need some stilted euphemistic phrase like WMD? We do not need it and we should retire it.

*Dan Kaszeta has over twenty years of diverse experience in the defense and security sectors and field of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) issues. He was a member of the U.S. Secret Service as a Senior Physical Security Specialist in the Technical Security Division and in the Chemical/Biological Countermeasures Branch. He is an independent consultant at Strongpoint Security and author of CBRN and Hazmat Incidents at Major Public Events: Planning and Response.*

<http://ciceromagazine.com/opinion/it-is-time-to-retire-weapons-of-mass-destruction/>

[Return to Top](#)

The Diplomat – Tokyo, Japan  
OPINION/Flashpoints

## The Specter of North Korean ICBMs

*With sanctions unable to stop Pyongyang’s weapons program, the U.S. needs a new policy.*

By Clint Richards for *The Diplomat*

July 31, 2014

Despite North Korea’s increasing isolation from its only strategic ally and benefactor, China, it has remained resolute in its antagonistic stance against the U.S. in recent weeks, especially as South Korea and the U.S. conduct regular military drills in the region. North Korea has responded by increasing its tempo of missile launches, and on Wednesday it was revealed that Pyongyang could be preparing for a full intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) test. The U.S. has responded with new and proposed sanctions on several fronts as it seeks to constrain the Hermit Kingdom’s behavior.

However, any actual U.S. levers over North Korea’s behavior are limited, and many in the West, including some top American officials, are becoming sensitized to Pyongyang’s repeated nuclear and ballistic missile tests. As North Korea shows that it is not only unresponsive to sanctions, despite the cost to its economy and population, but that it can make steady progress in its missile and nuclear research, the U.S. and its allies will have to find more creative ways to check its progress before it manages to miniaturize a nuclear device and successfully mount it to a fully operational ICBM.

Following a rather audacious threat on Sunday from Pyongyang to strike the U.S. with nuclear weapons, on the 61st anniversary of the Korean War Armistice, it does appear that the military regime is taking steps to be able to do just that. Satellite imagery from the U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins University’s *38 North* blog suggests that ICBM engine trials may be coming to a close. If those trials are successfully concluded by the end of this year, “the next stage in development of the KN-08 road-mobile ICBM may be a full-scale flight test of the missile.” Modifications to the Sohae Satellite Launching Station in order to accommodate such a large missile could be ready by 2015, although there is considerable speculation in the intelligence community as to whether North Korea is making enough progress in its ballistic missile program to be ready by such an early date.



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

On Wednesday, the same day *38 North* published its findings, the U.S. special representative for North Korea policy, Glyn Davies, said North Korea would not give up its nuclear and missile programs unless the international community maintained its sanctions regime. He said the U.S. would continue to cooperate with the U.N. and on its own to "strengthen and bolster the existing sanctions regime." In that vein, the U.S. Treasury Department on Wednesday sanctioned two North Korean shipping firms involved in transporting missiles and aircraft between Pyongyang and Cuba last year.

On Tuesday U.S. Admiral Samuel Locklear told reporters at the Pentagon he was concerned that the frequency of North Korean missile tests was increasing this year, and that the international community was becoming "somewhat numb" to them. He also said he believes Pyongyang's missile program is making "steady progress," and that if North Korea is willing to go through with its tests despite being warned not to, the international community has to assume the North is making progress with its technology.

The U.S. House of Representatives has also passed another round of sanctions that it says will be as effective as the banking restrictions imposed in 2005 that effectively shut North Korea out of the international banking community. The new sanctions are intended to target "institutions controlled by Kim Jong-un." The authors of the House bill expect it to pass when it reaches the Senate, further ratcheting up economic pressure on the Kim regime.

Despite the effectiveness of the 2005 sanctions in dramatically limiting the North Korean regime's access to hard currency, it did not force Pyongyang to abandon its weapons programs. North Korea's leadership has repeatedly displayed its willingness to allow the country to undergo deep economic pain in order to maintain its grip on power. China, which has the most leverage over North Korea, has not managed to bring the new regime under Kim Jong-un in line, despite reports that it has vastly curtailed economic support and energy exports.

Despite North Korea's penchant to go overboard in its threats to destroy both the U.S. and South Korea, it is usually very calculated in how and when it displays its military capabilities. It has yet to go beyond espionage and limited tactical engagements with South Korea. However, it has also shown no signs of giving up on its nuclear and ballistic weapons programs, and while their threat to the continental U.S. is not imminent, the U.S. has also not found a policy that can induce North Korea to give them up. Given the current trajectory of events, the U.S. must increasingly plan for a day when that threat is real. What its policy will be at that point remains up for debate.

*Clint Richards is an Associate Editor of The Diplomat. He has worked as an open-source intelligence analyst with Stratfor Global Intelligence and as a geopolitical risk management consultant where he writes his own blog, Asia to Africa Intel.*

<http://thediplomat.com/2014/07/the-specter-of-north-korean-icbms/>

[Return to Top](#)

## **ABOUT THE USAF CUWS**

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

The Secretary of Defense's Task Force on Nuclear Weapons Management released a report in 2008 that recommended "Air Force personnel connected to the nuclear mission be required to take a professional military education (PME) course on national, defense, and Air Force concepts for deterrence and defense." As a result, the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, in coordination with the AF/A10 and Air Force Global Strike Command,

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



**USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies**  
**CUWS Outreach Journal**

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

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.

[Return to Top](#)

**Issue No.1126, 01 August 2014**

United States Air Force Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies | Maxwell AFB, Alabama

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ [https://twitter.com/USAF\\_CUWS](https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS)

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226