



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Issue No. 1134, 26 September 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 resource 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. **All of our past journals are now available at http://cpc.au.af.mil/au_outreach.aspx.**

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: "U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues." Authored by Amy F. Woolf, Specialist in Nuclear Weapons Policy; published by the Congressional Research Service, September 5, 2014; 43 Pages. <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/231781.pdf>

Even though the United States plans to reduce the number of warheads deployed on its longrange missiles and bombers, consistent with the terms of the New START Treaty, it also plans to develop new delivery systems for deployment over the next 20-30 years. The 113th Congress will continue to review these programs during the annual authorization and appropriations process.

During the Cold War, the U.S. nuclear arsenal contained many types of delivery vehicles for nuclear weapons. The longer-range systems, which included long-range missiles based on U.S. territory, long-range missiles based on submarines, and heavy bombers that could threaten Soviet targets from their bases in the United States, are known as strategic nuclear delivery vehicles. At the end of the Cold War, in 1991, the United States deployed more than 10,000 warheads on these delivery vehicles. That number has declined to less than 2,000 warheads today, and is slated to decline to 1,550 warheads by 2018, after the New START Treaty completes implementation.

Outreach Journal Feedback or sign-up request: cpc.admin@maxwell.af.mil

[Return to Top](#)

U.S. NUCLEAR WEAPONS

1. [US Nuclear Arsenal in Europe is Likely to Stay](#)
2. [Projected US Nuclear Weapons Spending Hits \\$1 TRILLION – Just Five Years after Obama's Nobel Peace Prize](#)
3. [US Air Force Tests Intercontinental Ballistic Missile](#)

U.S. COUNTER-WMD

1. [US Navy Issues Warnings on Russia, China's Submarine Fleets](#)

U.S. ARMS CONTROL

1. [Kremlin Sees No Reasons to Withdraw from INF Treaty](#)
2. [US Official: Preserving Arms Control Cooperation with Russia Becomes More Difficult](#)

HOMELAND SECURITY/THE AMERICAS

1. [Top White House Official Confirmed as DOE Deputy Secretary](#)

ASIA/PACIFIC

1. [North Has Nuke Missiles: Source](#)

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

2. [North Korea Inching Toward Mobile Long-Range Missile](#)
3. [North Korea Admits to Kim Jong-un's Ill-Health for First Time](#)

EUROPE/RUSSIA

1. [Russia Fires Iskander-M Missiles during Large-Scale Drill in Far East](#)
2. [Russia to Fully Renew Nuclear Forces by 2020 – Official](#)
3. [‘Poland Needs Nuclear Arms to Thwart Russia’](#)
4. [Russia's Bulava Missile to be Test-Launched by Two Nuclear Subs in Autumn 2015](#)

MIDDLE EAST

1. [Diplomats: Iran Open to softened US Nuke Proposal](#)
2. [Iranian MPs Reject US Nuclear Proposal](#)
3. [Iran Used Military Base to Secretly Test Nuclear Detonation Technology, Israel says](#)
4. [Iranian Leader: US Should Focus on Terror, Not Nukes](#)
5. [Tehran Determined to Go Ahead with Nuclear Program, Including Uranium Enrichment — Rouhani](#)
6. [Araqchi: Iran Not to Cut Any Deal on Redlines](#)
7. [US Considers New Offer to Iran at Nuke Talks](#)

INDIA/PAKISTAN

1. [Pakistan Developing Sea-Based Nuclear-Arms](#)
2. [Pakistan Tests Nuclear-Capable Missile: Reports](#)

AFRICA

1. [U.S. Forecasts More Than 500,000 Ebola Cases in West Africa](#)
2. [Sources: Libya Asks Chemical Weapons Watchdog to Remove Stockpile](#)

COMMENTARY

1. [Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons: The Inevitability of Instability](#)
2. [Meet Kim Jong Un's New Nuclear Warriors](#)
3. [America's Nukes: A Timely Effort](#)
4. [China's Nuclear Threshold and No First-Use](#)
5. [The Unaffordable Arsenal](#)
6. [Time to Revive Debate about Space-Based Missile Defense](#)

Stars and Stripes – Washington, D.C.

US Nuclear Arsenal in Europe is Likely to Stay

By Ralph Vartabedian and W.J. Hennigan, Tribune Washington Bureau (MCT)
September 21, 2014

Last summer in Berlin, President Barack Obama called for "bold reductions" in U.S. and Russian tactical nuclear weapons to ease the risk of annihilation in Europe.

Obama was referring to the roughly 200 B61 nuclear bombs that the U.S. has deployed in five NATO nations stretching from the Netherlands to Turkey - and a Russian arsenal estimated at 2,000 tactical weapons.

But since last summer, that hopeful outlook has evaporated. Russia's incursions into Ukraine and nuclear threats made by Russian President Vladimir Putin have killed any chance that the U.S. would withdraw its tactical nuclear weapons anytime soon.

"Withdrawing our relatively few weapons would be the absolute wrong signal at this moment," said James Stavridis, the retired U.S. admiral who was NATO chief until 2013 and is now dean of the Fletcher School of international affairs at Tufts University.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

"Throughout my period of command as the NATO supreme allied commander, my personal view was that it was time to consider withdrawing the weapons from Europe," he said. "However, given Russian activities of the past months and the potential for a return to a period of significant friction between Russia and the alliance, I now believe we should keep the weapons in Europe, despite the costs and risks associated with doing so."

Support for nuclear deterrence has been echoing across Europe. Newer members of the NATO, including Poland and the Czech Republic, have advocated the continued deployment of U.S. nuclear weapons in Europe.

The maintenance of the B61 nuclear force on European soil involves trade-offs of cost, risk and deterrence.

The weapons spread over the continent are exposed to potential theft or accidents. But their presence is reassuring to some NATO allies, who believe the weapons show a strong U.S. commitment to their security.

And proposed modifications to the B61 under an \$8.1 billion Energy Department program should make them more accurate, enhancing their deterrence against Russia.

Sleek and streamlined, packing an explosive force of up to 700 million pounds of TNT, the B61 thermonuclear weapon is the last of its kind, the only tactical nuclear bomb in the U.S. arsenal.

Unlike strategic weapons, designed to destroy cities and hardened military targets, the tactical weapons are intended for use on a battlefield, delivered by aircraft at treetop level or from high altitudes.

The bomb was designed in the 1960s during the Johnson administration.

It was among the first compact nuclear weapons, just 13 inches in diameter. The B61 comes in five models, one able to reduce its explosive power to just 2 percent of the bomb used in World War II on Hiroshima, according to outside estimates.

The U.S. began sending battlefield nuclear weapons to Europe in the 1950s, when it was feared that the Soviet Union's conventional military superiority would allow it to overrun Western Europe.

All of those weapons, except the versatile B61, were long ago withdrawn.

Over the past 15 years, the U.S. nuclear umbrella has extended over an additional dozen Eastern European nations that joined NATO.

As the Ukrainian crisis has unfolded, Obama has asserted that the alliance needs to "make concrete commitments to help Ukraine modernize and strengthen its security forces."

Pressure has built in Washington for the Obama administration to do more than increase the economic sanctions on Russia that seem to have had little effect.

Air Force Gen. Philip M. Breedlove, NATO's current supreme allied commander, told National Public Radio this month that Russia's actions were contrary to a future that allows European nations to choose their own destiny. "What's happened recently in Ukraine is what we thought would never happen again," he said.

The situation is unfolding at a critical juncture for the U.S. nuclear weapons complex.

Philip Coyle, who recently served as a security advisor in the Obama administration, said he believed the B61s should be withdrawn from Europe under a program that would allow for rapid deployment in the case of a military emergency.

"The more places you have them, the more opportunity there is for things to go wrong," said Coyle, formerly the deputy director of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the nuclear weapons design center in the Bay Area.

Hans Kristensen, a nuclear weapons expert at the Federation of American Scientists, has argued in recent days that the Ukraine crisis should not be a rationale for continued B61 deployments in Europe.

Their presence has not deterred Putin so far, and their future presence is merely an "echo from the past," he said.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



But others say the B61's deployment in Europe is still a potent deterrent to the Cold War strategy that Putin has resurrected in the standoff with Ukraine.

Norton A. Schwartz, a retired four-star general and former Air Force chief of staff, said the aggressive Russian moves should reduce the uncertainty some NATO members have about the B61's relevance. "Does the NATO nuclear mission still provide some measure of deterrence, and with it, a degree of alliance cohesion?" he asked. "Experienced hands I know still think it does."

Linton Brooks, who negotiated the first strategic arms reduction treaty and later was the nuclear weapons chief in the Energy Department, said there would be wide support for a new treaty to eliminate the tactical weapons, but getting rid of them unilaterally would be a mistake.

"The danger is that it will be a signal to our Eastern European allies that we are lessening our support of them," he said. "Now is not the time."

But keeping the B61 in Europe will be part of an expensive nuclear modernization program. The bomb is the next major U.S. nuclear weapon to undergo a life extension program at an official cost of \$8.1 billion, though the Pentagon estimates it would cost about \$10 billion and outside groups say associated hardware would boost the total to \$12 billion. The program would include upgrades to higher-yield B61s based in the U.S. as part of the strategic stockpile.

Don Cook, chief of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex, said in a recent interview that the B61 is the oldest weapon in the U.S. inventory and that without a modernization program there would be some concerns about its future reliability.

Aging components, such as the conventional explosives that trigger the nuclear reactions and electronic arming systems, would be replaced. The bombs would get more formidable electronic and physical locks to thwart unauthorized use of a stolen weapon.

The modernization also would include a new tail fin assembly for greater accuracy and would allow a lower nuclear yield in attacking targets. "There would be less unintended collateral damage and less loss of life," Cook said.

Experts say the improvements would increase the weapon's deterrence value if the Russians believe the U.S. would be more likely to use the weapons because of their increased accuracy.

But such new capabilities are troubling to some experts who say the U.S. should not be thinking about how to make the weapons more useful.

"When the yield is lower and the system is more accurate, it makes them easier to use," Coyle said. "You don't want it to be tempting."

<http://www.stripes.com/news/europe/us-nuclear-arsenal-in-europe-is-likely-to-stay-1.304222>

[Return to Top](#)

Daily Mail OnLine.com – London, U.K.

Projected US Nuclear Weapons Spending Hits \$1 TRILLION – Just Five Years after Obama's Nobel Peace Prize

- *The US spent more in 2014 on nuclear weapons research, development, testing and production than ever, including during World War II*
- *Obama campaigned on shrinking America's nuclear arsenal*
- *2009 Nobel Peace Prize honored Obama for furthering a 'vision of a world free from nuclear arms'*
- *Plans call for modernizing US nuclear weapons to make it better leverage and force the world to shrink arsenals everywhere*
- *But replacing rusting hulks of radioactivity with modern, computerized weapons systems has become an end unto itself*

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

- *Under the Obama administration's current policies, the next 30 years will see \$1 trillion in new nuclear defense spending*

By DAVID MARTOSKO, US POLITICAL EDITOR FOR MAILONLINE
22 September 2014

Under Nobel Peace Prize-winning President Barack Obama, America's nuclear weapons spending will eclipse \$1 trillion over the next 30 years as the United States spent more in 2014 on its arsenal than at any time in its history – including during the Cold War and World War II.

The stunning news from The New York Times comes just five years after a newly minted Obama won the Prize for, in part, using international diplomacy to further a 'vision of a world free from nuclear arms.'

The Nobel committee wrote just nine months after Obama took office that his creation of a 'new climate in international politics' had already led to 'dialogue and negotiations' being 'preferred as instruments for resolving even the most difficult international conflicts.'

'The vision of a world free from nuclear arms has powerfully stimulated disarmament and arms control negotiations,' Obama's award citation read, describing his accomplishments.

But the *Times* reported Monday on its front page that a massive effort to revitalize and refurbish America's crumbling nuclear weapons resources has become a spending sprint, catapulting the U.S. past Cold War levels.

Obama campaigned in 2008 on a platform that included achieving 'a nuclear-free world,' and sought to nudge the country in that direction by modestly rebuilding America's nukes in order to make them more convincing leverage in discussions about global cuts in the number of warheads.

But as Congress sunk its teeth in new home-district spending opportunities and both Russia and China have seized opportunities to rattle sabers, the atomic reboot has taken on a life of its own.

As a result, the Department of Energy and the Atomic Energy Commission spent upwards of \$11 billion this year on nuclear weapons research, development, testing and production.

That number doesn't include any Defense Department spending on aircraft, missile silos or staffing to keep the nuclear button a viable option in the event of a first-strike by one of America's enemies.

The Brookings Institution estimated in 1998 that the entirety of the Manhattan Project and other spending on nuclear weapons research and production from 1940 to 1945 amounted to \$30.3 billion, in 2014 dollars.

That six-year figure is less than the projected U.S. nuclear spending for each of the next 30 years, according to a January 2014 research paper published by the Monterey Institute of International Studies, a graduate school of the far-left-leaning Middlebury College in Vermont.

The ramp-up of spending has left some of Obama's early supporters dumbfounded.

'A lot of it is hard to explain,' former Democratic U.S. Senator Sam Nunn told the *Times*. 'The president's vision was a significant change in direction. But the process has preserved the status quo.'

But as geopolitics shift, the appetite for weakening America's offensive weaponry has all but disappeared.

'The most fundamental game changer is Putin's invasion of Ukraine,' Gary Samore, Obama's principal nuclear adviser during his first term added. 'That has made any measure to reduce the stockpile unilaterally politically impossible.'

The game changed earlier than that, however.

The 1.5 million-square-foot Kansas City National Security Campus opened last month after \$687 million of spending that was authorized in the waning months of the George W. Bush presidency.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 successful construction of the National Security Campus here in Kansas City is part of our broader effort to transform our Cold War era infrastructure into a 21st century nuclear security enterprise,' Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz said during a dedication ceremony.

And with that modernization, the U.S. is pot-committed in the never-ending high stakes poker game that is global nuclear diplomacy.

Former Deputy Energy Secretary Daniel Poneman told the Times that 'the whole design of the modernization enables us to make reductions' in spending in the future.

The new plant, officials say, will save \$150 million in energy costs each year. That number, however, may be part of an endless stream of pledges from the Obama administration that have yet to bear fruit.

A senior aide to a Republican senator who will be involved in budget negotiations for the 2016 fiscal year – a haggling process that will begin in January or February – told MailOnline that there will likely be opposition from both sides of the aisle if Obama proposes any kind of cuts.

'Democrats don't want their 2016 [presidential] candidate to have to run on a legacy of weakness,' he said. 'Plus, in the Senate they've never seen a spending bill they couldn't excuse.'

'And some Republicans,' he offered, 'are still pining for Reagan's "peace through strength" years from the Soviet days. With Putin going crazy, we might need that outlook again.'

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2765493/Projected-US-nuclear-weapons-spending-hits-1-TRILLION-just-five-years-Obama-s-Nobel-Peace-Prize.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Press TV – Tehran, Iran

US Air Force Tests Intercontinental Ballistic Missile

Wednesday, September 24, 2014

The US Air Force has test-launched an unarmed intercontinental ballistic missile, the Minuteman III Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM), from California.

The ICBM was launched off from Vandenberg Air Force Base Tuesday and travelled 4,200 miles over the Pacific to hit a target on the Kwajalein Atoll, the Associated Press reported.

The test was successful, according to the Air Force Global Strike Command.

Col. Keith Balts, 30th Space Wing commander, was the Launch Decision Authority, said a statement published on the website of Air Force base 30th Space Wing, Vandenberg.

"An outstanding display of teamwork ensured 100-percent mission success for the first Minuteman launch of the year here at Vandenberg," Col. Balts said.

"We constantly focus on flawless execution of our launch, range and expeditionary missions. I am extremely proud of the collaboration between the 30th SW and the 576th FLTS."

An intercontinental ballistic missile is a ballistic missile with a minimum range of more than 5,500 kilometers (3,400 miles) primarily designed for nuclear weapons delivery.

The US Department of Defense will use the data acquired from the test to further develop the project.

The test was met with criticism from activists for a non-nuclear world, including the Santa Barbara-based Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

The organization said the test was only two days after the International Day of Peace and three days before the official United Nations Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



"The officials at Vandenberg say the purpose of the test is to 'validate and verify the effectiveness, readiness and accuracy of the weapons system.' This means the effectiveness, readiness and accuracy of a weapons system capable of destroying civilization," said David Krieger, president of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation.

"The Air Force is only doing its job: practicing for the destruction of the human species. Instead of launching missiles, we should be leading negotiations to rid the world of weapons of mass annihilation."

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/09/24/379803/us-air-force-tests-new-ballistic-missile/>

[Return to Top](#)

Military.com – U.S.

US Navy Issues Warnings on Russia, China's Submarine Fleets

By Kris Osborn

September 20, 2014

The Navy's top Atlantic Submarine Force commander said Thursday that Russia and China's ballistic missile submarine development will impact how the U.S. deploys its fleet.

Navy Vice Adm. Michael Connor said global threats today are far more numerous and dispersed compared to the Cold War when the U.S. focused solely on Russia. Since the end of the Cold War, the U.S. has treated Russia more like a partner.

However, those goodwill feelings have changed since Russia has shown aggression in its recent conflict with Ukraine and instituted some tactics the U.S. hasn't seen since the Cold War. Considering Russia's significant nuclear arsenal, it has drawn the attention of the Navy's nuclear submarine leaders.

"The Soviet Union devolved into Russia but they kept their nuclear capabilities. They are now re-growing those capabilities and others. As they re-grow, we find that modern Russia appears to have some aspirations both territory-wise and influence-wise that are reminiscent of the way they behaved when we had the Soviet Union," Connor said.

Last week, Russia broadcast its intent to upgrade its submarine fleet when Russian officials released photos of two Akula II-class nuclear submarines being ferried to a shipyard to receive modernization upgrades.

Along with Russia, the U.S. Navy has taken a closer look at China's submarine fleet warning that its advancement means the Chinese have a global strike capability, Connor said.

"The world has become multi-polar and we have competition for global influence and power from a rising China -- which is also very much on our mind. The Chinese have had ballistic missile submarines in some form for a while. Their pace has accelerated and they have several nuclear ballistic missile submarines and are continuing to build more," Connor said.

In February, the Office of Naval Intelligence issued an assessment on the Chinese navy as part of testimony to the US-China Economic and Security Review. ONI leaders found that China's navy has evolved from a littoral force to one that is capable of meeting a wide range of missions to include being "increasingly capable of striking targets hundreds of miles from the Chinese mainland."

In particular, ONI raised concerns about China's fast-growing submarine force, to include the Jin-class ballistic nuclear submarines, which will likely commence deterrent patrols in 2014, according to the report. The expected operational deployment of the Jin SSBN "would mark China's first credible at-sea-second-strike nuclear capability," the report states.

The submarine would fire the JL-2 submarine-launched ballistic missile, which has a range of 4,000 nautical miles and would "enable the Jin to strike Hawaii, Alaska and possibly western portions of CONUS [continental United States] from East Asian waters," ONI assessed.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies
CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The report says the Chinese currently have five nuclear attack submarines, four nuclear ballistic missile submarines and 53 diesel attack submarines.

Overall, China's fleet of submarines has quickly increased in offensive weapons technology over the last 10 years. A decade ago, only a few Chinese submarines could fire modern anti-ship cruise missiles. Now, more than half of the conventional attack submarines are configured to fire anti-ship cruise missiles, or ASCMs, the report states.

"The type-095 guided missile attack submarine, which China will likely construct over the next decade, may be equipped with a land-attack capability," the assessment explains. This could enable Chinese submarines with an enhanced ability to strike U.S. bases throughout the region, the report adds.

Overall, Russia and China are firmly committed to have an undersea nuclear deterrent capability with a strong naval component, Connor added.

"We want to resolve minor conflict before they become major conflicts," he explained.

Connor made his remarks about Russian and China while commemorating the 4,000th strategic deterrence ballistic missile submarine patrol, explaining that undersea nuclear deterrence had its origins in the 1960s. Back then, the U.S. needed 41 submarines.

The U.S. Navy's fleet has since shrunk to 14 nuclear armed submarines based in Bangor, Washington, or Kings Bay, Georgia. The U.S. Navy plans to begin construction of a new-generation of Ohio-class, nuclear-armed ballistic missile submarines by 2021 called the Ohio Replacement program, Connor added.

<http://www.military.com/daily-news/2014/09/20/us-navy-issues-warnings-on-russia-chinas-submarine-fleets.html?comp=700001075741&rank=1>

[Return to Top](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Moscow, Russia

Kremlin Sees No Reasons to Withdraw from INF Treaty

But it is possible in exceptional circumstances, Sergei Ivanov, the chief of the Kremlin administration, said September 21, 2014

MOSCOW, September 21. /ITAR-TASS/. The Kremlin sees no reasons to unilaterally quit the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, but it is possible in exceptional circumstances, Sergei Ivanov, the chief of the Kremlin administration, said on Sunday.

"In principle, each of the parties may withdraw from the treaty in exceptional circumstances," he said in an interview with the Rossiiskaya Gazeta daily. "So far, and I would like to stress it, I see no such circumstance."

"As a matter of fact, we adherents of the principle of implementing international liabilities," he said. "Unless we see that our security interests are seriously threatened."

He said that prior to 2003 Russia and the United States had had regular consultations on the INF Treaty but later they had been stopped at the initiative of the U.S. side. "Now, the INF Treaty is in the focus of discussion, including in a regime of accusations and counteraccusation. The American side is loudly but groundlessly accusing us of actual violation of the treaty, but we have still more claims to the Americans," Ivanov said, citing among them target missiles the United States used during tests of its missile system, offensive operations drones and the ongoing implementation of missile defence plans providing for the deployment of MK-41 launch platforms in Europe.

Drawback of this treaty had become evident, he said, adding that the key one was its bilateral character. "It means that any other country of the world is free to do whatever it wants as concerns this type of weapons," Ivanov noted. As an example, he cited such countries as North Korea, Israel, Pakistan, India, Iran, which did have such type of weapons and which were located near Russia. "By the way, over the time of the Bush administration, the

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

American leaders were fully aware of that; different geographical location requires different approaches to defence,” he noted.

He said that the first round of new Russia-U.S. consultations had been held and the sides had told each other what they thought about it. “Let us wait for the continuation,” he added.

<http://en.itar-tass.com/russia/750593>

[Return to Top](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

US Official: Preserving Arms Control Cooperation with Russia Becomes More Difficult

26 September 2014

VIENNA, September 26 (RIA Novosti) – The United States will be working on preserving cooperation in nonproliferation and arms control with Russia even though new challenges have emerged, Tom Countryman, US Assistant Secretary of State for International Security and Nonproliferation has said.

“We seek to preserve cooperation in nonproliferation and arms control between the United States and Russia. Traditionally we have been able to do that despite all peaks and valleys in the relationship between Moscow and Washington. It is more difficult this year,” the official said on the sidelines of the IAEA's 58th General Conference in Vienna.

According to Countryman, “It becomes more difficult when Russia displays repeatedly defiance of both bilateral and multilateral treaties that it has signed.”

“Those kind of treaties are the lifeblood of disarmament and nonproliferation, and the casual way, with which Moscow treats compliance not only with the INF treaty, but with the UN Charter, the OSCE Final Act – all of them degrade the value of Russia’s commitments on specific issues such as disarmament and non-proliferation. It is a challenge that we are working through, and more specifically that we are working through during this conference,” the diplomat added.

Over the past few months, Moscow and Washington have been accusing each other of breaching the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. The 1987 treaty eliminated nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with intermediate ranges, defined as between 300-3,400 miles.

<http://en.ria.ru/politics/20140926/193292785/US-Official-Preserving-Arms-Control-Cooperation-With-Russia.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Oak Ridge Today - Oak Ridge, TN

Top White House Official Confirmed as DOE Deputy Secretary

By *Oak Ridge Today* Staff

September 21, 2014

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall was confirmed by the Senate on Thursday, September 18, as the U.S. Department of Energy’s deputy secretary.

“Liz’s confirmation comes at a historic time in our nation’s energy evolution,” Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz said. “She joins us with deep expertise in the department’s nuclear security mission, including both nuclear weapons and countering proliferation. Her extensive public service and recent responsibilities on the White House national security team position her to contribute to the department’s energy and security missions in a major way, both domestically and internationally. I thank the Senate for their attention to Liz’s nomination, and look forward to working closely with her as a key, trusted colleague.”

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

President Barack Obama nominated Sherwood-Randall in July.

As deputy secretary, Sherwood-Randall will support Moniz in the management and operation of the Department of Energy.

“She will have responsibility for enhancing DOE’s delivery of results for the American people, including strengthening project oversight and management; ensuring the safety, security and effectiveness of the nation’s nuclear weapons and advancing the Administration’s nonproliferation agenda; supporting the vital contributions of our unique national laboratory network; and promoting the administration’s “all-of-the-above” energy strategy for a low carbon future and a strong economy,” a press release said.

“I am deeply honored by President Obama’s nomination to this new role and by the trust the Senate has placed in me by confirming me today,” Sherwood-Randall said. “I am excited to have this opportunity to serve with Secretary Moniz and the multi-talented Energy Department staff, whose mission is vital to a strong economy and to our national security.”

Sherwood-Randall has been a top adviser to Obama for nearly six years, and she served as the White House Coordinator for Defense Policy, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction, and Arms Control for the National Security Council, from April 2013 until her Senate confirmation. From 2009 to 2013, she served as the president’s principal adviser on Europe, including 49 countries and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Prior to her service in the Obama administration, Sherwood-Randall was a senior research scholar at Stanford University from 2000 to 2008, and a founding principal in the Harvard-Stanford Preventive Defense Project from 1997-2008. She was also an adjunct senior fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations from 2004-2008.

Sherwood-Randall served in the Clinton Administration from 1994 through 1996 as the deputy assistant secretary of defense for Russia, Ukraine, and Eurasia. Previously, she co-founded and served as the associate director of Harvard University’s Strengthening Democratic Institutions Project. At the outset of her public service career, Sherwood-Randall was a chief foreign affairs and defense policy adviser to then-Senator Joseph Biden.

A native of California, she received her bachelor’s degree at Harvard University, and her doctorate as a Rhodes Scholar at Oxford University. She is married to Jeffrey B. Randall, and they have two sons.

<http://oakridgetoday.com/2014/09/21/top-white-house-official-confirmed-doe-deputy-secretary/>

[Return to Top](#)

Korea JoongAng Daily – Seoul, South Korea

North Has Nuke Missiles: Source

By JEONG YONG-SOO and SER MYO-JA

September 23, 2014

North Korea is developing new missiles capable of carrying tactical nuclear warheads, South Korean intelligence authorities told the JoongAng Ilbo yesterday.

The North has performed a series of test-firings of new short-range missiles since Aug. 14. Designated as KN-10, the new ground-to-ground missiles are believed to be designed to carry nuclear payloads.

“We’ve come to the conclusion that the rockets test-fired three times since last month are new missiles based on their speeds and altitudes,” a senior South Korean government official told the JoongAng Ilbo.

“Based on our analysis and other intelligence, we concluded that they are intended to carry tactical nuclear weapons.”

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

As opposed to strategic nuclear weapons that are designed to be used to destroy large targets such as cities and factories, tactical nuclear weapons are intended to be used on a battlefield. They are developed by placing a relatively smaller nuclear payload on a short-range missile to destroy a military target.

It was the first time the government detected Pyongyang developing a tactical nuclear missile.

“The new missiles have a range of about 200 kilometers [124 miles], which is similar to their existing 300-milimeter-caliber multiple rocket launcher systems,” the source said. “They are developing the new missiles, although they already have artilleries with similar ranges, because they want a more powerful weapon.”

The 300-milimeter artillery rockets are already capable of hitting major military installations in the South, including Pyeongtaek, where the U.S. military’s main base will be relocated in 2016. The North, however, is going after a more powerful weapon.

Another source told the JoongAng Ilbo that the perennial economic crisis of the North, ironically, is the reason behind the new weapons system.

“Because the North has no possibility to win a conventional arms race due to its economic hardships, it is using all its resources to develop nuclear capability, which is an asymmetrical weapon,” the official said. “We believe the North is developing a tactical short-range missile because it has reached the final stage of miniaturization of a nuclear warhead.”

KN-10 missiles are modified versions of the Soviet Union’s SS-21 ground-to-ground missiles, and the South will fall into the nuclear range of the North if the Communist country manages to succeed in the miniaturization of nuclear weapons.

The new missiles are also fired from transporter erector launchers, or mobile launching pads, and use solid fuel. Those characteristics make it hard for the system to be detected in advance, posing a new threat to South Korea.

“Even without tactical nuclear warheads, the new missiles will have destructive power that is far stronger than the multiple rocket launcher systems,” said Yang Uk, a senior research fellow at the Korea Defence and Security Forum. “The South Korean military must change its strategy to counter them.”

The intelligence community believes the North has been developing the new tactical missiles since early 2010. The new system is believed to have a range of about 200 kilometers and is capable of carrying a warhead of up to 500 kilograms.

The 300-milimeter artillery rockets, developed in the late 2000s, have a similar range, but they are only capable of carrying up to 100 kilograms of payload. Nuclear warheads are far heavier.

While the 300-milimeter multiple rocket launcher system is guided by a Russian satellite, the method of guidance for the new tactical missile is unknown, the sources said.

The new missiles are built by using Russian technologies, sources said. In addition to their nuclear capabilities, the new missiles can carry a massive amount of explosives.

In contrast, the North built the multiple rocket launcher system based on Chinese technologies. It is capable of launching multiple rockets simultaneously, while it carries relatively lighter payloads of explosives.

The North unveiled its new multiple rocket launcher system in May 2013. The new tactical missile was made public last Aug. 14.

The key for the North to complete the new missile program is the miniaturization of nuclear weapons. The United States assessed that the North possesses plutonium warheads and has the technology capable of building uranium warheads.

Blue House National Security Office chief Kim Kwan-jin told the National Assembly last November that the North has the technology to build a nuclear weapon.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

“Through three nuclear tests since 2006, the North managed to take steps closer to miniaturization to a certain degree,” said Shin In-kyun, head of the Korea Defense Network. “We have to be prepared that they will be operationally deployed within a short period of time.”

Amid the North’s stepped-up efforts to develop the new missiles, signs were also seen that Pyongyang is trying to expand its production of weapons-grade plutonium and uranium.

<http://koreajoongangdaily.joins.com/news/article/article.aspx?aid=2995221>

[Return to Top](#)

Bloomberg News – New York, NY

North Korea Inching Toward Mobile Long-Range Missile

By Tony Capaccio and David Lerman

September 25, 2014

North Korea’s military is taking steps to field a road-mobile intercontinental ballistic missile that could threaten the U.S., the head of American forces in the Pacific said today.

While North Korean leader Kim Jong Un hasn’t yet deployed such a missile, “he’s showing us the signs that he’s trying to get there,” said Admiral Samuel Locklear, who offered new insight into the steps the isolated nation is taking to field its KN-08 missile.

Locklear discussed North Korean developments in a wide-ranging Bloomberg Government interview that included the shift of U.S. military assets toward the Asia-Pacific region, relations with Vietnam, the search for the missing Malaysian airliner and China’s military modernization.

The missile, which isn’t operational yet and is designed to be transported on roads, threatens to change relations between the U.S. and a nation once feared primarily for its conventional military and fixed long-range intercontinental missiles such as the Taepo-Dong-2, Locklear said.

Locating mobile missiles is more difficult than keeping an eye on fixed launching sites and requires constant surveillance and efforts to distinguish real weapons from mock-ups, he said.

Mobile Systems

“Road-mobile systems” decrease the “amount of time you have to deal with it, particularly if you want to deal with it before they launch it,” Locklear said, referring to the potential for a preemptive strike on a known missile site. Asked how close North Korea is to fielding an operational road-mobile missile, Locklear said it’s “hard for us to get an exact assessment of that.”

The U.S. has only seen what may be dummy versions of the missiles, along with increased activity around the sites where they would be housed, he said.

“So we watch it very, very carefully and it’s kind of just on an upward trajectory of the things that over time can give us concern,” he said.

North Korea’s conventional military is in decline, Locklear said. Locklear also said the nation’s increasing isolation and poverty are causes for concern.

‘Most Dangerous’

“It is, in my view -- among all the security challenges in the world -- it’s the most dangerous if it goes poorly,” he said.

In North Korea “you’ve got a country” that has put “pictures of mushroom clouds over New York City and Washington” Locklear said.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

Locklear said he's concerned that the world "is so tired and worn" out over North Korea's cycles of provoking the U.S. and its allies with missile launches and other military actions that it becomes "anesthetized."

North Korea's missile development, along with concern over Iranian weapons programs, is the principle rationale for the \$34 billion U.S. ground-based missile defense program managed by Chicago-based Boeing Co. (BA), which in June had its first successful interception test since December 2008.

Not Ready

Locklear said fielding the missile defense "against now-emerging road-mobile systems that can threaten our homeland will be a priority -- guaranteed."

Greg Thielmann, senior fellow at the Washington-based Arms Control Association and a former State Department intelligence official who follows North Korean missile developments, said "the only thing we can be reasonably confident of at the moment is that the KN-08 ICBM is not ready for deployment."

Evidence has emerged this year that North Korea has tested rocket engines for the KN-08's first and second stages, Thielmann said in an e-mail today. "Big questions remain" about the "nature and imminence of the threat" it poses and "are the North Koreans yet capable of miniaturizing a warhead" for the missile, which he said is doubtful.

Reaching Alaska

The Air Force's National Air and Space Intelligence Center said in its latest public report published last year that the missile, also known as the Hwasong-13, is estimated to have a maximum range of at least 5,500 kilometers (3,420 miles), far enough to reach Alaska but not the Pacific Northwest.

On other matters, Locklear said it may be time to consider partially lifting a ban on lethal aid to Vietnam, as U.S. relations gradually improve.

He described China's military modernization as natural, while expressing concern over its "transparency" and the potential for miscalculation among military forces in the East and South China Seas as Asia's largest economy increasingly exerts its influence.

Dropping Anchor

A Chinese nuclear-powered submarine anchored in Colombo, the capital of Sri Lanka, on Sept. 15, the first such vessel to visit the Indian Ocean nation, according to the state-run Sri Lanka News.

While the U.S. is focused on the threat posed by Islamic State extremists in the Middle East, Locklear said the military offensive in Iraq and Syria hasn't affected efforts to shift more military resources toward the Asia-Pacific region.

"I'm not seeing the huge impact on my capabilities in Asia-Pacific, based on where we are today," he said. "What we have said we were going to do in Asia-Pacific, we have done."

Locklear, whose geographic command includes the Indian Ocean, also said there's no progress in the hunt for the missing Malaysian airliner that disappeared in March with more than 200 passengers aboard.

"It was a needle in a haystack," he said. "We know a large part of where it's not."

<http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2014-09-26/north-korea-inching-toward-mobile-long-range-missile.html>

[Return to Top](#)

The London Guardian – London, U.K.

North Korea Admits to Kim Jong-un's Ill-Health for First Time

Leader suffering from 'discomfort', says documentary broadcast by state media amid speculation over 31-year-old's health

Reuters

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



Friday, 26 September 2014

North Korean leader Kim Jong-un is suffering from “discomfort”, a state media report has said in the first official acknowledgement of ill-health after a prolonged period out of the public eye.

Kim, 31, who is frequently the centrepiece of the isolated country’s propaganda, has not been photographed by state media since appearing at a concert alongside his wife on 3 September, fuelling speculation he is suffering from bad health.

“Based on his gait, it appears he has gout – something [due to] diet and genetic predisposition that has affected other members of the Kim family,” said Michael Madden, an expert on the North Korean leadership and contributor to the 38 North website.

Kim had been seen walking with a limp since an event with key officials in July and in a pre-recorded documentary broadcast by state media on Thursday appeared to have difficulty walking.

“The wealth and prosperity of our socialism is thanks to the painstaking efforts of our marshal, who keeps lighting the path for the people, like the flicker of a flame, despite suffering discomfort,” a voiceover for the hour-long documentary said.

The documentary was followed by a pre-recorded broadcast of a North Korean supreme people’s assembly meeting from which Kim Jong-un was notably absent.

Kim has rapidly gained weight since coming to power after his father died of a heart attack in 2011, photos released by state media show.

North Korea observers have speculated that Kim’s weight and family background may have contributed to his condition.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/26/north-korea-kim-jong-un-ill-health>

[Return to Top](#)

RT (Russia Today) – Moscow, Russia

Russia Fires Iskander-M Missiles during Large-Scale Drill in Far East

September 20, 2014

Russia has successfully fired Iskander-M missiles during Vostok-2014 maneuvers in the Far East. It was the first launch of its kind for the Eastern Military District.

Early on Saturday, the Iskander-M missile brigade was ordered to move to the firing pad in the remote woodlands of the Jewish Autonomous Region. The missile strike eliminated all training targets.

The aim of the exercise is to check the coordination between staff and commanders of different combat arms, as well as improve the command and control of troops while performing advanced tasks.

“Iskander is...one of our strongest weapons; the guarantor of our security,” Major General Mikhail Matvievsky, chief of Strategic Missile Forces and the Artillery of the Russian Ground Forces, remarked following the test.

The Iskander (also referred to as NATO's reporting name SS-26 Stone) is characterized by high mobility and maneuverability, as it takes just 20 minutes to place the system in operational readiness.

The system is capable of hitting targets at a distance of up to 400 kilometers, with a precision of around 30 centimeters. It can hit adversary troops or underground command centers, depending on the warheads placed on the rockets. If necessary, its missiles can also be armed with nuclear warheads.

The advanced missile system has been used by the Russian military since 2006.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies
CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The strategic command and staff exercise, code-named Vostok-2014, kicked off in the Eastern Military District on Friday and will continue until September 25.

"About 100,000 servicemen, up to 1,500 tanks, 120 aircraft, 5,000 pieces of weaponry, military and special hardware, and 70 ships will take part in the exercises," the Russian Defense ministry said.

Tactical and cruise land, sea, and air-launched missiles will be fired during the drill, which is taking place at more than 20 training ranges from Anadyr in the north to Vladivostok in the south.

Russian troops will train to defend the coastal area and the islands in Sakhalin, Kamchatka, Chukotka, and the southern part of Primorsky Kray.

<http://rt.com/news/189372-iskander-missile-russia-drill/>

[Return to Top](#)

RT (Russia Today) – Moscow, Russia

Russia to Fully Renew Nuclear Forces by 2020 – Official

September 22, 2014

Russia is set to renew the country's strategic nuclear forces by 100 percent, not 70 percent as previously announced, according to Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin.

"The formation of the technical basis for strategic nuclear forces is going at a faster rate, and in fact, we will renew not 70 percent of the SNF, but 100 percent," Rogozin told Rossiya TV channel.

The deputy premier, who's responsible for the Russian defense industry, also declared that in 2015 the army and the navy are to switch 30 percent of their weapons to *"cutting edge"* technology, and by 70 percent in 2020.

"Should we amaze our colleagues, and is it necessary to brandish all types of weaponry to surprise them? Something must be preserved as a quiet secret for yourself to reveal at the most critical moment," Rogozin said, as quoted by RIA Novosti.

He added that the Russian army needs to be compact to move to *"any threatening war theater"* if necessary.

Rogozin also stated that Russia can do without the French Mistral helicopter carriers, the delivery of which was suspended over the situation in Ukraine. Moreover, the official described the statements from France that the contract could be disrupted as *"unlawful"* because one third of the ship was manufactured in Russia.

"For the same reason, it is impossible to transfer this half-of-the-ship to anybody else," he added.

"Secondly, the money has been paid and it must be returned with penalties. Thirdly, it is not even money that France is risking, but its status of a reliable supplier in the World Trade Organization," Rogozin said.

Mistrals aren't entirely convenient for the Russian climate, as they were initially designed for the Mediterranean and wouldn't be able to sail in northern seas, the deputy premier underlined.

Last but not the least, Russia can now make state-of-the-art ships that can easily match up to the Mistrals, the official said.

"Last year, on November 16 we transferred the Vikramaditya light aircraft carrier, which was formerly our Admiral Gorshkov missile cruiser, to our Indian colleagues. Thus, having implemented that contract and earning big money, we proved inside Russia and showed to the country's leadership that Russia can now assemble ships of that kind," Rogozin stressed, as quoted by ITAR-TASS.

The deputy PM also said that Russia would invite the world's best specialists to work in the country's manufacturing.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 principle, we would be glad to hire French shipbuilders. I'm not joking. We'll be employing the best specialists from all over the globe now," Rogozin stated, adding that Ukrainian workers are welcome too, and for them the procedure of getting Russian citizenship would be simplified.

Among other developments, the Russian military-industrial complex will replace all the Ukrainian supplies in two-and-a-half years.

<http://rt.com/politics/189604-russia-nuclear-2020-mistral/>

[Return to Top](#)

Times of Oman – Muscat, Oman

'Poland Needs Nuclear Arms to Thwart Russia'

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

September 24, 2014

Warsaw: Polish anti-communist icon Lech Walesa said Poland should procure nuclear weapons as a safeguard against Russia, which it blames for stoking the crisis in neighbouring Ukraine.

"Poland needs to stand up to Russia," the Nobel Peace laureate, who spearheaded Poland's democracy movement and became its first post-communist president, said in an interview published on Wednesday.

EU and Nato member Poland has been rattled by Russia's actions in Ukraine, including its March annexation of the Crimean peninsula and suspected backing of rebels in the east.

Russian President Vladimir "Putin has been trying to intimidate us with his nuclear weapons, so why shouldn't we have our own arsenal?" Walesa told the Rzeczpospolita daily.

"We should borrow, lease nuclear weapons and show Putin that if a Russian soldier poses one foot on our land uninvited, we will attack. Just to be clear," the 70-year-old said.

Several countries including Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands and Turkey currently host shared nuclear weapons on their territory under Nato.

But there is no tradition at the moment of borrowing or leasing the weapons.

Poland should speak up and say: "Mister Putin, we won't let you make one step forward. Try it and you'll perish, and so will we," added Walesa, who as leader of the Solidarity trade union negotiated a peaceful end to Communism at home in 1989.

It is under his presidency in 1993 that the last Soviet troops left Poland. Six years later the country joined the Nato defence alliance.

On Wednesday, Poland began major military exercises involving 12,500 troops, including 750 from other Nato countries, which will continue through October 3.

Poland stages the Anakonda manoeuvres every two years but this time they "take on a special significance given the events in Ukraine," Defence Minister Tomasz Siemoniak said at the opening ceremony.

"It is important for Nato to show that we stick together," added Torben Moller, a brigadier general from the alliance's command centre at Brunssum in the Netherlands.

<http://www.timesofoman.com/News/40454/Article-%E2%80%98Poland-needs-nuclear-arms-to-thwart-Russia%E2%80%99>

[Return to Top](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Moscow, Russia

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



Russia's Bulava Missile to be Test-Launched by Two Nuclear Subs in Autumn 2015

Test-launches planned for next autumn will be fourth and fifth after an abortive test-firing in September 2013
September 26, 2014

MOSCOW, September 26. /ITAR-TASS/. First and second Borei-class strategic nuclear-powered submarines Alexander Nevsky and Vladimir Monomakh will test-launch the Bulava intercontinental ballistic missile at a firing range in northern Russia after arrival at a permanent base in the city of Vilyuchinsk, Russia's far eastern Kamchatka peninsula, an informed source in Russia's Navy General Staff told ITAR-TASS on Friday.

"According to the plan, Alexander Nevsky and Vladimir Monomakh should test-launch an ICBM Bulava each from underwater position in the area east of the Kuril Islands in the Pacific at firing range Chizha on Kanin Nos Cape in Arkhangelsk region [northern Russia]," he said.

Test-launches should be made several days after submarines arrive to Kamchatka.

"These test-launches at the northern firing range are planned to check whether the route is suitable for Bulava's flight trajectory in both directions - from the north to the east and back," the source said. "After Bulava ICBMs are test-fired both submarines will go on combat duty and will start performing combat patrolling missions in planned areas of the world ocean," the source added.

<http://en.itar-tass.com/russia/751426>

[Return to Top](#)

The Times of Israel – Jerusalem, Israel

Diplomats: Iran Open to softened US Nuke Proposal

Initiative would forgo demand Tehran scale back its enrichment capacity, instead focus on cutting off the flow of uranium

By George Jahn
September 21, 2014

UNITED NATIONS (AP) — With Iran refusing US demands that it gut its uranium enrichment program, the two sides are now discussing a new proposal that would leave much of Tehran's enriching machines in place but disconnected from feeds of uranium, diplomats told The Associated Press Saturday.

The talks have been stalled for months over Iran's opposition to sharply reducing the size and output of centrifuges that can enrich uranium to levels needed for reactor fuel or weapons-grade material used in the core of nuclear warheads. Iran says its enrichment program is only for peaceful purposes, but Washington fears it could be used to make a bomb.

Time is running out before a Nov. 24 deadline and both sides are eager to break the impasse.

Ahead of the resumption of talks Friday, The New York Times reported that Washington was considering putting a new plan on the table that would focus on removing piping connecting the centrifuges.

That would allow the US leeway on modifying demands that Iran cut the number of centrifuge machines from 19,000 to no more than 1,500.

Two diplomats told the AP that Tehran, which would gain an end to crippling nuclear-related sanctions as part of any deal, was initially non-committal at a bilateral meeting in August. But they say the proposal has now moved to being discussed at the talks Tehran is holding with the US and five other powers, and that the Islamic Republic was listening closely.

Both diplomats demanded anonymity because their information is confidential.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

While only a proposal, the plan would allow the Iranians to claim that they did not compromise on vows that they would never emasculate their enrichment capabilities, while keeping intact American demands that the program be downgraded to a point where it could not be quickly turned to making bombs.

But any plan could founder due to opposition to major compromises at the negotiating table from Iranian hardliners as well as US congressional critics, and a group of 31 Republican senators quickly criticized the proposal.

Warning of "troubling nuclear concessions to Iran," the Republican senators expressed grave concerns about the new initiative and the possible softening of Washington's stance on other issues, in a letter dated Sept. 19 and sent to US Secretary of State John Kerry.

Among the signatories was Republican Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois, who was behind many of the sanctions slapped on Iran over its nuclear defiance.

The talks bring Iran to the negotiating table with the United States, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly. That means US Secretary of State John Kerry and his counterparts will likely join in, adding their diplomatic muscle to the meeting.

Ahead of the talks, chief US negotiator Wendy Sherman acknowledged that the sides "remain far apart" on the size and scope of Iran's uranium enrichment capacity.

Iran's demands that it be allowed to keep its program at its present size and output are not acceptable and will not give Iran what it wants — an end to the nuclear-related sanctions choking its economy, she told reporters.

"We must be confident that any effort by Tehran to break out of its obligations will be so visible and time-consuming that the attempt would have no chance of success," she said of Washington's push for deep, long-lasting cuts.

Other contentious issues are what to do with an underground enrichment plant near the village of Fordo and with a reactor under construction near the city of Arak.

The US wants the Fordo facility converted to non-enrichment use because it's heavily fortified against underground attack. And it wants the reactor converted to reduce to a minimum its production of plutonium, an alternate pathway to nuclear arms.

The deadline was extended to Nov. 24 after the sides failed to reach agreement by the end of July.

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/diplomats-iran-receptive-to-softened-uke-proposal/>

[Return to Top](#)

FARS News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Monday, September 22, 2014

Iranian MPs Reject US Nuclear Proposal

TEHRAN (FNA) - Several members of the Iranian parliament rejected a proposal reportedly raised by the US negotiators during the nuclear talks underway in New York for the disconnection of Iran's centrifuge machines instead of dismantling them.

"During the negotiations, especially after the Geneva agreement, the Americans tried to push the negotiations towards a deadlock through presenting deviator proposals," Rapporteur of the parliament's National Security and Foreign Policy Commission Seyed Hossein Naqavi Hosseini told FNA on Monday, describing the latest offer as another push by Washington to dismantle the core of Iran's civilian nuclear capability.

He warned that the US wants to deprive Iran of its nuclear rights.

Also, Vice-Chairman of the Commission Mansour Haqiqatpour underlined that the US proposal for decoupling the centrifuges would make Iran's nuclear industry nothing more than a decor.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

He called the proposal as "a ridiculous plan".

Another member of the Commission, Ebrahim Aqamohammadi, said removing the piping connecting the centrifuges means shutting down uranium enrichment in Iran.

"Our understanding is that when we divert the industry and technology from its circuit and prevent the natural trend of its work, it will have no efficiency," he added.

Unnamed Diplomats told The Associated Press on Saturday that a new US proposal on the table focuses on removing piping connecting the centrifuges. That would allow the US leeway on modifying demands that Iran cut the number of centrifuge machines from 19,000 to no more than 1,500.

The 7th round of talks between Iran and the Group 5+1 (the US, Russia, China, Britain and France plus Germany) started in New York on Friday.

The two sides held six rounds of negotiations in Vienna to reach a comprehensive deal after they inked an interim agreement in Geneva on November 24.

The Geneva agreement took effect on January 20 and expired six months later on July 20. In July, Tehran and the six countries agreed to extend negotiations until November 24 after they failed to reach an agreement on a number of key issues.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13930631001284>

[Return to Top](#)

Ha'aretz Daily News – Tel Aviv, Israel

Iran Used Military Base to Secretly Test Nuclear Detonation Technology, Israel says

Israel gave no specific dates for such testing, saying only that it occurred during what it called the 2000-2001 construction of a nuclear weaponization test site in Iran's Parchin military base.

By Jeffrey Heller

September 24, 2014

REUTERS – Israel said on Wednesday that Iran has used its Parchin military base as the site for secret tests of technology that could be used only for detonating a nuclear weapon.

The Jewish state has been a severe critic of six big powers' negotiations with Iran on restraining its nuclear program, suspecting Tehran is only trying to buy time to master sensitive nuclear know-how and would evade the terms of any final deal.

The Islamic Republic says allegations that it is seeking a nuclear weapons capability are false and baseless. Tehran says it is Israel's assumed atomic arsenal that is a destabilizing threat to the Middle East.

A statement from Intelligence Minister Yuval Steinitz, issued a day before Iranian President Hassan Rohani – the architect of Tehran's diplomacy with the big powers - was to address the UN General Assembly, said internal neutron sources such as uranium were used in nuclear implosion tests at Parchin.

Israel, his statement said, based its information on "highly reliable information", without elaborating.

It gave no specific dates for such testing, saying only that it occurred during what it called the 2000-2001 construction of a nuclear weaponization test site in Parchin.

An annex to an International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) report in 2011, which included information received from member states, indicated that Iran may have conducted such alleged experiments but did not specify where they had taken place.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

"It is important to emphasize that these kinds of tests can have no 'dual use' explanation, since the only possible purpose of such internal neutron sources is to ignite the nuclear chain reaction in nuclear weapons," the Israeli statement said.

"Dual use" technology, materials or know-how can be applied to producing either civilian nuclear energy or nuclear bombs.

Iran has long denied UN nuclear inspectors access to the Parchin base outside Tehran where the IAEA has said it has observed, via satellite imagery, ongoing construction and revamping activity.

Western officials believe Iran once conducted explosive tests at Parchin of relevance in developing a nuclear weapon and has sought to "cleanse" the compound of evidence since then.

Iran says Parchin is a conventional military facility, and that the country's nuclear program is for peaceful energy purposes only.

The landslide election of the relatively moderate Rohani last year raised hopes of a solution to Iran's nuclear stand-off with the world powers after years of rising tension and fears of a new Middle East war.

Israel critical of dialogue with Iran

An interim accord was reached between Iran and the United States, Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany in Geneva last November. But the two sides did not meet a self-imposed July target date for a long-term agreement and now face a new deadline of November 24.

Steinitz's intervention on the alleged Parchin tests issue came against a backdrop of sharp Israeli criticism of the powers' strategy of seeking to remove the risks posed by Iran's nuclear program through negotiations.

In an interview published on Wednesday in the Israel Hayom newspaper, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said he was "worried ... (by) signs that the powers will agree to accept Iran as a nuclear threshold state".

Israel has said it would better to tighten isolating international sanctions against Iran, rather than loosen some of them as has been done as part of the interim deal. The Jewish state has also threatened to bomb the nuclear installations of its arch-enemy if it deems the negotiations ultimately futile.

The IAEA report in 2011 cited intelligence indicating Iran had a nuclear weapons research program that was halted in 2003 when it came under increased international pressure. The intelligence suggested some activities may have resumed later.

The report identified about 12 specific areas that it said needed clarification, including alleged work on a neutron initiator that could be used to trigger an atomic explosion, and explosive tests at Parchin.

The information was in part based on information received from IAEA member states. The Vienna-based UN agency did not name them but experts and diplomats say much of it is believed to come from Israel and Western powers.

Iran has dismissed the allegations as fabricated.

While the six powers seek to limit the size of Iran's future nuclear program - and thereby extend the time it would need for any bid to amass fissile material for a weapon - the IAEA is investigating alleged research and experiments in the past that could have been applied to constructing the bomb itself.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/israel-s-eye-on-iran/1.617664>

[Return to Top](#)

The Times of Israel – Jerusalem, Israel

Iranian Leader: US Should Focus on Terror, Not Nukes

Ahead of UN address, Rouhani says Tehran and Washington can work together to curb Islamic extremism

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

By George Jahn

September 25, 2014

NEW YORK (AP) — Iranian President Hasan Rouhani urged the United States on Wednesday to move beyond “insignificant” fears that his country seeks nuclear arms and challenged it to join his country in battling what he described as the global threat of Islamic extremism.

During a speech and question-and-answer session hosted by the New America think tank, Rouhani urged the US government to “let go of pressure politics toward Iran” — a reference to Iranian complaints that Washington’s demands at the nuclear talks are unrealistic. Repeating that Iran is not interested in nuclear arms, he urged the US to “leave behind (this) insignificant issue.”

Instead, he said, the two countries must focus on the fight against the Islamic State group and other extremist groups, the “real and serious common challenges which ... threaten the entirety of the world.”

At the same time, he was critical of the US bombing campaign of Islamic State strongholds in Iraq and Syria and the growing coalition of countries seeking to stop the terrorists by military means. “Bombing and airstrikes are not the appropriate way,” he said, warning that “extraterritorial interference...in fact only feeds and strengthens terrorism.”

Blaming “the misunderstandings of the realities of the region by...outsiders,” Rouhani said wrong US policies, including the invasions of Afghanistan in 2001 and Iraq in 2003, likely led to the birth of the Islamic State group by creating power vacuums exploited by extremists.

Rouhani also suggested it was in the West’s interest to reach a nuclear agreement with Iran, freeing Tehran to play a more active role in creating and maintaining stability in the Islamic world.

The nuclear talks appear stuck two months before their extended November 24 deadline. While the US is formally joined by five other powers at the negotiating table with Iran, it is clear that the Americans are the lead negotiators, and Rouhani directed most of his comments at Washington.

Even if a nuclear deal is sealed, it could face harsh opposition by Iranian hardliners and US congressional critics united in one fear — that their side has given away too much. But Rouhani shrugged off opposition from inside his country and said it was up to US President Barack Obama to deal with Congress.

Iran-US tensions have eased since the election last year of the moderate Rouhani. A year ago, he and Obama spoke by telephone for 15 minutes, the first time the presidents of the United States and Iran had talked directly since the 1979 Iranian revolution and siege of the American embassy. The conversation was hailed as an historic breakthrough.

Tensions have risen recently, with American officials furious over the arrest of Jason Rezarian, an American-Iranian journalist for the Washington Post detained on unspecified charges in Iran.

But Rouhani made clear he was not prepared to interfere in the case of Rezarian, whose wife was also arrested.

Iranian officials have not specifically said why the couple is being held, and Rouhani has dodged questions about their fate. Asked Wednesday about Rezarian, he said he would be freed if he is innocent of any crime.

“We must not prematurely express opinions about a case that hasn’t reached the court yet,” he said.

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/iranian-leader-us-should-focus-on-terror-not-nukes/>

[Return to Top](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Moscow, Russia

Tehran Determined to Go Ahead with Nuclear Program, Including Uranium Enrichment — Rouhani

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

According to Iranian president, dragging feet at negotiations on Iran's nuclear program will have a negative impact on regional economy, security and development
September 25, 2014

UNITED NATIONS, September 25 /ITAR-TASS/. An agreement on Iran's nuclear program will signal that the West no longer interferes in development of the rest of the world, Iranian President Hassan Rouhani said Thursday.

According to Iranian president, dragging feet at negotiations on Iran's nuclear program will have a negative impact on regional economy, security and development.

Rouhani also said Tehran is determined to go ahead with its peaceful nuclear program, including uranium enrichment, within the framework of international law.

Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif said earlier this month he was hopeful that the decision on the Iranian nuclear issue would be reached by November 24.

Talks on Iran's nuclear program

Speaking after a meeting with Ashton, Zarif expressed hope that given the readiness and political will demonstrated by the sides the solution could be reached within three months.

The talks between Iran and the P5+1 (five permanent members of the UN Security Council and Germany) group, which were supposed to be concluded on July 20, will continue until November 24, a day before the end of a year since the adoption of the Geneva Agreement.

The interim nuclear deal made on November 24, 2013, called for taking the first step of reciprocal actions to prove good faith in a six-month period to be followed by negotiations for a comprehensive agreement, according to which the Western governments will acknowledge the Iranian nuclear programme as civilian.

The deal was called the first step to be followed by a comprehensive agreement, which, on the one hand, should resolve the international community's concerns about the Iranian nuclear programme and, on the other hand, remove economic sanctions that slow down Iran's economic development.

The agreement reached by and between Iran and the P5+1 (five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and Germany) in Geneva last year became effective on January 20, 2014.

<http://en.itar-tass.com/world/751290>

[Return to Top](#)

FARS News Agency – Tehran, Iran
Friday, September 26, 2014

Araqchi: Iran Not to Cut Any Deal on Redlines

TEHRAN (FNA) - Senior Iranian nuclear negotiator Seyed Abbas Araqchi underlined that Tehran will never accept to make a deal through crossing or ignoring its redlines in the talks with the Group 5+1 (the US, Russia, China, France and Britain plus Germany).

Araqchi underscored that Iran is ready to accept solutions that would allay concerns over the country's nuclear energy program provided that they take into consideration the Islamic Republic's rights and redlines.

Araqchi, who is also the deputy foreign minister for legal and international affairs, said the Iranian negotiating team will continue to insist on Iran's rights and will not overstep the country's "redlines" in the talks.

Acknowledging that the two sides are still divided over "key issues", the Iranian negotiator said, "We will by no means leave the negotiating table, but will not retreat an iota from Iran's rights either."

"The nuclear negotiations have reached a breathtaking point and both sides have entered into many details," Araqchi pointed out.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 7th round of talks between Iran and the Group 5+1 started in New York last Friday.

The two sides held six rounds of negotiations in Vienna to reach a comprehensive deal after they inked an interim agreement in Geneva on November 24.

The Geneva agreement took effect on January 20 and expired six months later on July 20. In July, Tehran and the six countries agreed to extend negotiations until November 24 after they failed to reach an agreement on a number of key issues.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13930704000649>

[Return to Top](#)

San Francisco Chronicle – San Francisco, CA

US Considers New Offer to Iran at Nuke Talks

By GEORGE JAHN, Associated Press (AP)

Friday, September 26, 2014

UNITED NATIONS (AP) — The U.S. is considering softening present demands that Iran gut its uranium enrichment program in favor of a new proposal that would allow Tehran to keep nearly half of the project intact while placing other constraints on its possible use as a path to nuclear weapons, diplomats told The Associated Press.

The initiative, revealed late Thursday, comes after months of nuclear negotiations between Iran and six world powers that have failed to substantially narrow differences over the future size and capacity of Tehran's uranium enrichment program. Iran insists it does not want atomic arms but the West is only willing to lift nuclear-related sanctions if Tehran agrees to substantially shrink enrichment and other activities that Iran could turn toward making such weapons.

The U.S., which fears Tehran may enrich to weapons-grade level used to arm nuclear warheads, ideally wants no more than 1,500 centrifuges left operating. Iran insists it wants to use the technology only to make reactor fuel and for other peaceful purposes and insists it be allowed to run at least the present 9,400 machines.

The tentative new U.S. offer attempts to meet the Iranians close to half way on numbers, said two diplomats who demanded anonymity because their information is confidential. They said it envisages letting Iran keep up to 4,500 centrifuges but would reduce the stock of uranium gas fed into the machines to the point where it would take more than a year of enriching to create enough material for a nuclear warhead.

That, they said, would give the international community enough lead time to react to any such attempt.

The diplomats emphasized that the proposal is only one of several being discussed by the six powers — the U.S., Russia, China, Britain, France and Germany — and has not yet been formally submitted to the Iranians.

Other ideas also include letting Iran have more than 1,500 machines but removing or destroying much of the infrastructure needed to make them run — wiring, pipes used to feed uranium gas and other auxiliary equipment.

Both ideas would allow the Iranians to claim that they did not compromise on vows that they would never emasculate their enrichment capabilities, while keeping intact American demands that the program be downgraded to a point where it could not be quickly turned to making bombs.

The new proposals reflect Washington's desire to advance the talks ahead of a Nov. 24 deadline that was extended from July. The current round began a week ago on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly, leading to speculation that foreign ministers of the negotiating nations would join in the talks. But the diplomats said that was no longer planned because of the lack of substantial progress.

The fates of a reactor under construction near the city of Arak and of an underground enrichment facility at Fordo are also contentious issues. The U.S. and its Western allies want the reactor converted to reduce to a minimum its

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

production of plutonium, an alternate pathway to nuclear arms. And they insist that the Fordo plant be shuttered or used for something other than enrichment because it is fortified and thought to be impervious to air attacks.

The U.S. proposal drew opposition from Israel. The country's intelligence minister, Yuval Steinitz, said in a statement that "Israel strongly objects" because it believes Iran is conducting experiments meant to "ignite the nuclear chain reaction in nuclear weapons."

<http://www.sfgate.com/news/world/article/US-considers-new-offer-to-Iran-at-nuke-talks-5781974.php>

[Return to Top](#)

The Times of India – New Delhi, India

Pakistan Developing Sea-Based Nuclear-Arms

Press Trust of India (PTI)

September 22, 2014

ISLAMABAD/WASHINGTON: Pakistan is developing sea-based missiles and expanding its interest in tactical nuclear warheads to give it a "second-strike" capability if a catastrophic nuclear attack destroyed all its land-based weapons, according to a media report on Sunday.

The next step of Pakistan's strategy includes an effort to develop nuclear warheads suitable for deployment from the Indian Ocean, either from warships or from one of the country's five diesel-powered navy submarines, The Washington Post reported quoting Pakistani and Western analysts.

In a sign of that ambition, Pakistan in 2012 created the Naval Strategic Force command, which is similar to the air force and army commands that oversee nuclear weapons. "We are on our way, and my own hunch is within a year or so, we should be developing our second-strike capability," the paper quoted Shireen M Mazari, a nuclear expert and the former director of the Institute of Strategic Studies Islamabad, a Pakistani government-funded thinktank.

Instead of working to enhance the range of its missiles, Pakistan is developing shorter-range cruise missiles that fly lower to the ground and can evade ballistic missile defences, analysts said. Pakistan has repeatedly tested its indigenously produced, nuclear-capable, Babur cruise missile, which has a range of 640km and can strike targets at land and sea, military officials said.

In 2011 and last year, Pakistan also tested a new tactical, nuclear-capable, battlefield missile that has a range of just 60km. "This is the miniaturization of warheads," said Mansoor Ahmed, a strategic studies and nuclear expert at Quaid-i-Azam University in Islamabad.

Pakistan's nuclear push comes amid heightened tension with US intelligence and congressional officials over the security of the country's nuclear weapons and materials, the Post said. The paper reported in September 2013 that US intelligence officials had increased surveillance of Pakistan in part because of concerns that nuclear materials could fall into the hands of terrorists.

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/pakistan/Pakistan-developing-sea-based-nuclear-arms/articleshow/43115566.cms>

[Return to Top](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Pakistan Tests Nuclear-Capable Missile: Reports

26 September 2014

MOSCOW, September 26 (RIA Novosti) - Pakistan has successfully tested the Hatf IX (NASR) short range surface-to-surface missile capable of carrying nuclear warheads, Pakistani Inter Services Public Relations (ISPR) service announced Friday.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 test fire was conducted with successive launches of 4 x Missiles from a state of the art Multi Tube Launcher with Salvo Mode. NASR, with a range of 60 km [37 miles] and in-flight maneuver capability is a quick response system, with shoot and scoot attributes. It contributes to the full spectrum deterrence against the prevailing threat spectrum," ISPR stated in a press release published on its official website.

The tests were perceived as "yet another milestone towards Pakistan's deterrence capability," according to the press release.

The test launch was hailed by the President of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan Mamnoon Hussain and the country's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. They congratulated everyone who had participated in the launch, including military and scientists, on the successful test.

Pakistan became a declared nuclear power in 1998 after an underground nuclear test that followed those made by India. Pakistan and India have been competing in nuclear missile testing for more than 20 years.

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20140926/193323663/Pakistan-Tests-Nuclear-Capable-Missile-Reports.html

[Return to Top](#)

Reuters.com – U.S.

U.S. Forecasts More Than 500,000 Ebola Cases in West Africa

By Sharon Begley and Tom Miles
Tuesday, September 23, 2014

NEW YORK/GENEVA (Reuters) - Global experts issued stark new warnings of the scale of West Africa's Ebola outbreak on Tuesday, with the U.S. government estimating between 550,000 and 1.4 million people might be infected in the region by January.

The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) said its projection was based on data from late August and did not take into account a planned U.S. mission to fight the disease, so the upper end of the forecast was unlikely.

However, it followed research by experts from the World Health Organization (WHO) and Imperial College, which estimated that 20,000 people risked infection within six weeks -- months earlier than previous forecasts. It warned that the disease might become a permanent feature of life in West Africa.

The worst Ebola outbreak on record has already killed over 2,800 people - more than the combined total of all previous outbreaks. The disease has marched across much of Guinea, Liberia and Sierra Leone, killing dozens of health workers and crippling economies recovering from years of conflict.

Outbreaks in Nigeria and Senegal appear for now to have been contained. But nations across the region fear contagion and, against expert advice, have shuttered borders and restricted travel, complicating international efforts to fight the disease.

"I am confident the most dire projections will not come to pass," CDC director Dr. Thomas Frieden told reporters.

The worst-case scenario assumes that there are 2.5 times the number of recorded cases, currently at 5,864.

"A surge now can break the back of the epidemic," Frieden said. "If you get enough people effectively isolated, the epidemic can be stopped."

Amid complaints from aid workers and regional leaders that the world was doing too little, U.S. President Barack Obama last week announced plans to send 3,000 troops to build 17 treatment centers and train thousands of healthcare workers.

The U.S. move has been welcomed, but it was accompanied by calls for other nations to follow suit, since the disease was still spreading faster than the moves being made to contain it.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

Underscoring this gap, a senior U.N. official in Liberia, the worst-hit nation, said on Tuesday that 150 foreign experts were in the country but another 600 to 700 were needed.

Antonio Vigilante, head of the U.N. Development Programme in Liberia, said Liberia now had 350 to 400 beds for Ebola patients, but that fell far short of the 2,000 needed.

"Even if we are at 2,000 beds two or three weeks from now, the cases we'll have in any single day may be more than that," he said.

HORRENDOUS, SCARY

Much of the international medical assistance has been provided by French medical charity Medecins Sans Frontieres (MSF). However, the group says it is overwhelmed and has called for states to send their medics to the region. The response so far has been muted.

"We have announcements that more will come but very small numbers," Vigilante added. "The American military are bringing in a camp hospital, but it is for 25 beds with medical staff. And so there are still very few."

In a bid to fill the void, Liberia is now planning to train some 40,000 community workers.

Liberian President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf called the CDC predictions "horrendous" and "scary." But now that structures had been put in place, he said, the U.S. effort would help ensure the outbreak would decline as fast as it spread.

"I believe that, given another couple of weeks, we shall see that this major effort begins to show results," she said, via Skype to an audience at Georgetown University in Washington, DC.

Experts from the WHO and Imperial College were less optimistic. In an article published in the New England Journal of Medicine, they warned that infections could reach 20,000 by November if strict controls were not put in place.

"With exponential growth, you'll see that the case numbers per week go up, so that by the second of November, over these three countries our best estimate is over 20,000 cases, confirmed and suspected cases," said Dr. Christopher Dye, WHO director of strategy and co-author of the article.

The WHO forecast last month it would take nine months to reach this level of infections. Dye said nearly 10,000 of those would be in Liberia, 5,000 in Sierra Leone and nearly 6,000 in Guinea.

EBOLA PERMANENT

A spokesman for Sierra Leone's army said it had sealed off its borders with Liberia and Guinea, joining similar actions by countries in the region. The move went against a pledge by Africa's leaders at the African Union to lift restrictions.

"Our troops are on the borders to stop the movement, especially of vehicles," said army spokesman Col. Michael Samura. Witnesses in Kambia, a town bordering Guinea, said dozens of vehicles were turned back on both sides of the frontier.

With the United States taking the lead in Liberia, a nation established by freed American slaves, the British government said on Tuesday it was stepping up its military and humanitarian mission in Sierra Leone, a former colony whose civil war it helped end just over a decade ago.

About 40 military personnel are on the ground helping install a planned 700 new beds, and 164 staff from Britain's National Health Service have volunteered to work in West Africa. They join nations like Cuba, China, Uganda and France who have already promised or sent medics to the region.

Underscoring the economic impact of the crisis, Malaysian palm oil firm Sime Darby (SIME.KL) has delayed construction of a mill for its Liberia plantation and has frozen talks to expand its planted acreage there because of the outbreak.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

Meanwhile, the Wellcome Trust said experimental drugs, including compounds from Mapp Biopharmaceutical, Sarepta (SRPT.O) and Tekmira (TKM.TO), will be tested in affected states for the first time in a bid to fast-track trials.

Dye, the WHO expert, said that if current efforts are fully successful, Ebola will disappear from the human population and return to its animal reservoir, as it has done in other outbreaks in Central Africa where it is relatively common.

But he warned that if control efforts are only partly successful, Ebola viral disease in the human population could become "a permanent feature of life in West Africa".

"Quite honestly if you ask 'can we stamp Ebola out of Liberia?' I'm not sure. In principle we know how to do it, but can we do it on the ground? It remains to be seen."

Additional reporting by Stephanie Nebehay in Geneva, Kate Kelland in London, David Morgan in Washington, Umaru Fofana in Freetown; Writing by David Lewis; Editing by Daniel Flynn, Larry King

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/09/23/us-health-ebola-idUSKCN0HI2A120140923>

[Return to Top](#)

Al Arabiya – Dubai, U.A.E.

Sources: Libya Asks Chemical Weapons Watchdog to Remove Stockpile

Anthony Deutsch, Reuters

Wednesday, 24 September 2014

Libya has asked the global chemical weapons watchdog to draw up plans to ship a stockpile of 850 tonnes of chemicals overseas due to deteriorating security, sources have told Reuters.

Diplomats and officials said that transporting the toxins abroad for destruction, as was recently done in Syria, is the most viable option to keep them out of the hands of battling militant groups.

Since the removal of Muammar Qaddafi three years ago, the country has descended into anarchy, with rival militias and hardline Islamic groups battling for political control and vast oil reserves.

Facilities to destroy the chemical weapons were set up and Libyans were trained to use the equipment, but fighting threatens stability and has made it impossible to safely conduct their work.

Experts at the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), which won the Nobel Peace prize this year, are "working on something right now," one source told Reuters.

The technical details still need to be worked out and the OPCW on Tuesday declined to comment.

The OPCW said Tripoli has already destroyed weapons that were ready for use including armed munitions and the most deadly, or "category 1," toxins with the help of Western countries, but still has around 850 tonnes of industrial chemicals that could be used to produce weapons.

An armed group from the western city of Misrata seized Tripoli in August, forcing the elected parliament and senior officials to move to the east.

This week, soldiers and police clashed near Libya's biggest El Sharara oilfield in the south, while separate fighting erupted in the west not far from the Zawiya refinery.

The Misrata-group has set up its own government, which is not recognized by the international community backing the largely powerless prime minister, Abdullah al-Thinni.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 Libyan government has said the security situation is untenable and to guarantee the safety of the remaining stockpile they have asked the OPCW to look at this,” one diplomatic source told Reuters on condition of anonymity.

Deadline threatened

Since joining the OPCW in 2004, Libya has declared 26 metric tonnes of sulphur mustard, 1,390 tonnes of raw, precursor chemicals, 3,563 unloaded aerial bombs and three former chemical weapons production facilities.

Some of those weapons have already been destroyed and OPCW head Ahmet Uzumcu said in February he was confident the remaining chemicals would be destroyed next year, but given the worsening situation, Libya is likely to miss a planned completion date of December 2016.

The industrial chemicals could be shipped from the remote storage site, Ruwagha, in southeastern Libya, were they were initially supposed to be destroyed.

Under the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, all declared chemical weapons must be destroyed in the country of origin. An exception was made in the case of Syria due to the civil war, which has killed around 200,000 people.

Syria has a smaller amount of industrial chemicals, which were loaded onto cargo ships and taken to commercial destruction facilities across Western Europe.

The OPCW and the United Nations led a massive international, logistical operation to remove chemical weapons from Syria with the help of more than a dozen countries.

The OPCW, based in the Hague, Netherlands, was set up to enforce the Chemical Weapons Convention. It’s founding treaty has been ratified by all countries but Israel, Egypt, Myanmar, South Sudan, Angola and North Korea.

The largest known chemical weapons program had been in Syria, which joined the convention in 2013 under the threat of U.S.-led military intervention after more than 1,000 people were killed in a sarin gas attack outside Damascus last August.

<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/africa/2014/09/24/Sources-Libya-asks-chemical-weapons-watchdog-to-remove-stockpile.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies (IPCS) – New Delhi, India

OPINION/Article

#4670, 22 September 2014

Pakistan’s Tactical Nuclear Weapons: The Inevitability of Instability

By Varun Sahni

Hatf IX (Nasr) is a Pakistani ballistic missile which can deliver a sub-kiloton nuclear warhead over a range of 60 km, or 37.3 miles. It is supposed to have entered service in 2013 and is believed to be fully integrated into Pakistan’s C3I (command, control, communications and intelligence). Its purported role is as a low-yield battlefield deterrent against mechanised columns. Should India – and the world – take *Nasr* seriously?

The development and deployment of *Nasr* by Pakistan was inevitable and the impact of this tactical nuclear weapon (tac nuke) on the emerging India-Pakistan deterrence relationship is inherently destabilising.

Defining Tactical Nuclear Weapons: The Pakistani Context

There are four different yardsticks by which tac nukes could be defined and classified. The first is the range of the missile: it must be short range, that is less than 80-100 km. The second is yield of warhead, conventionally benchmarked at less than 5 kilotons (kT) with reference to a 1994 US Congressional definition prohibiting R&D in US nuclear weapons laboratories below this yield. The third is function – Pakistan would use its tactical nuclear

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



weapons in an anti-armour role; bunker busting is the primary role envisaged by US proponents of research into low yield nuclear weapons. The fourth yardstick is impact, which in the case of tac nukes is limited to the immediate battlefield, or in other words, the sub-theatre.

Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Problem than a Solution?

Why are tac nukes usually seen as a problem rather than as a solution? In the first place, they lower the nuclear threshold by blurring the distinction between conventional and nuclear war. Secondly, tac nukes accentuate the 'always-never dilemma' inherent in all nuclear weapons: they must *always* work when you want them to, yet *never* be used when you do not want them to be used. The possibility of unauthorised or accidental use increases significantly with tac nukes: unlike ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs), whose commanders have delegative control, in the case of tac nukes delegative control may go down to subaltern/NCO levels under battlefield conditions. Thirdly, battlefield deployment of tac nukes, especially in situations of rapid armour movement, creates an enormous pressure to 'use them or lose them'. Finally, there is a much greater possibility for tac nukes to fall into 'wrong hands' due to theft, pilferage or sabotage.

Given these problems, all of them well known for decades, why has Pakistan gone down the tac nuke route? In order to understand why, it is important to underline that Pakistan has, from even before South Asia's overt nuclearisation, signalled a nuclear doctrine of not only first use but also *early* use. This doctrine has created problems for Pakistan, whose nuclear planners have had to grapple with the issue of nuclear thresholds, that is the point beyond which Pakistan would have no option but to use its nuclear weapons. As far back as 2002, the Landau Network-Centro Volta team (Cotta-Ramusino and Martellini) had identified four Pakistani thresholds: geographic (space threshold), military, political (domestic destabilisation) and even economic. Tac nukes are Pakistan's solution to the military threshold.

Pakistan's Tactical Nuclear Weapons: Here to Stay

There are three essential features of Pakistan that suggest that its tac nukes are here to stay. Firstly, as the weaker power in the India-Pakistan dyad, Pakistan faces significant conventional asymmetries. Only nuclear weapons provide Pakistan with a sense of strategic parity with India. Faced with the possibility of an Indian armoured thrust in the plains or desert sectors, Pakistan is signalling that it will use its tactical nuclear weapons despite their escalatory potential.

Secondly, Pakistan is a quintessential 'homeland state' with deep existential anxieties. Its entire national identity has been constructed as a homeland for an endangered people facing a historically implacable foe. No matter how many internal security challenges it faces, Pakistan will not drop its guard vis-à-vis India and will always give the external threat primacy. In such an identity construction, nuclear weapons give Pakistan and its people the assurance of national survival and civilizational certitude that they are second to none. Furthermore, they encapsulate the sense of 'we will all go together when we go' – akin to the Samson Option of that other nuclearised homeland state, Israel.

Finally, Pakistan is a revisionist power that has systematically pursued asymmetric strategies to overturn the territorial status quo. In this context, the nature of the 'Kashmir issue' comes into sharp focus. As a wise person once said of the Kashmir issue, 'Kashmir is with India, the issue is with Pakistan.' While admittedly a neat play on words, this observation identifies two core elements in the 'shadow of the future': (1) The Kashmir issue will be resolved only when Pakistan considers it resolved; (2) any change in the territorial status quo would be inimical to India. Pakistan's dilemma is the nuclear weapons give it strategic parity but also buttress the territorial status quo. This explains why Pakistan has no compunction in deliberately shortening its nuclear fuse vis-à-vis India by deploying tac nukes.

An arms control agreement between India and Pakistan over tac nukes is unlikely: there is no incentive for Pakistan to remove a redline that begins at the international border (IB) itself. The strategic challenges that Pakistan's tac nukes pose for India will be explored in a future column.

Varun Sahni is a Professor and Chairperson, CIPOD, SIS, JNU & Member, IPCS Executive Committee



[Return to Top](#)

Foreign Policy.com – Washington, D.C.

OPINION/Argument

Meet Kim Jong Un's New Nuclear Warriors

What a rising generation of scientists and apparatchiks means for North Korea's nuclear program.

By Michael Madden

September 22, 2014

You probably missed the obituary. But on July 7, when North Korean media announced the death of the 88-year-old senior North Korean official Jon Pyong Ho, it highlighted an important but largely ignored development in Pyongyang's effort to build weapons of mass destruction (WMD). While most observers focus on Pyongyang's nuclear and missile tests, they ignore the shift happening in North Korea's WMD community: a newer generation is replacing the North Korean scientists who played a key role in developing Pyongyang's WMDs. This new generation will play a central role in determining whether North Korea will become a (small) nuclear power.

Generational change is natural as older scientists fade from the scene, but there are other factors driving this process. North Korean munitions production formerly focused on enhancing conventional military capabilities, developing short and medium-range ballistic missiles, and filling orders from foreign countries. But by the mid-1990s, resources had already begun to shift to the development of long-range missiles -- like the Taepodong rocket, which first launched in 1998.

The emphasis on nuclear weapons and missile delivery systems as the bedrock of security policy accelerated after the 2002 collapse of the 1994 denuclearization agreement between the United States and North Korea. From 2006 to 2013, North Korea tested both nuclear weapons and the long-range missile technology that could be used to deliver them. In March 2013, North Korea codified these priorities by adopting "a new strategic line on carrying out economic construction and building nuclear armed forces simultaneously" during an important party meeting.

This emphasis resulted in a reorganization intended to reinforce the ruling Workers' Party of Korea's control of all WMD and space-related activities, previously spread across a number of organizations and now probably consolidated under one group, known as the Machine Building Industry Department (MBID). This restructuring and generational shift first became evident in September 2010 when Jon, who had served as the party official in charge of the munitions industries for 23 years, was promoted to a more general government post. At the same time, his old job was split between the 70-year-old Pak To Chun and the octogenarian Ju Kyu Chang, who became department director and subsequently entered semi-retirement. That may not seem like a big change, but in the world of top North Korean officials, many hang on to their posts until their 80s.

While generational change began during Kim Jong Il's last years as ruler, his son and successor Kim Jong Un, who took power in December 2011 following the death of his father, may have further encouraged this process. Unlike his father -- who appeared to prefer small working groups of top officials and middle managers to deal with WMD issues -- Kim Jong Un convenes meetings with experts at both the executive and working levels. The process -- more open and involving a higher number of participants -- gives him direct contact with working-level personnel and allows them to develop personal links to the supreme leadership that would not have been possible before. Kim's style probably creates new avenues of advancement for younger scientists and technicians although it's unclear whether this new method will give the WMD community more clout.

North Korea's plans to develop new nuclear weapons designs, produce more fissile materials for a larger stockpile, and launch bigger and better rockets will depend largely on the capabilities of its next generation of WMD scientists and technicians.

Three key appointments in the shift to a younger generation of scientists are:

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

Jo Chun Ryong: A former factory manager and party official in the arms production industry in his 50s, Jo has worked on developing the North's new multiple launch rocket systems and intermediate-range ballistic missiles. In early 2014, he was appointed department director of the MBID as well as chairman of the Second Economic Committee, which manages the North's network of munitions factories and production sites. He appears to be responsible for the daily operational management of the North's military industrial complex. Around the same time, he was elected to the National Defense Commission, the state's most important decision-making body. Despite being probably the second-most powerful official in the WMD community, Jo has made few public appearances.

Hong Sung Mu: The party's key manager of WMD and space programs, Hong is a deputy director of the MBID in his early 60s who has served as Pak's No. 2 man since 2010. Hong probably played a key role in supervising the February 2013 nuclear test, and he has appeared in North Korean state media attending events related to a successful December 2012 rocket launch, as well as the 2013 nuclear test.

Hong Yong Chil: Another MBID deputy director, Hong appears to be a close advisor to Kim Jong Un on machine-building technologies and arms production -- he routinely appears at missile tests and machine factories alongside Kim. In June 2013, he reportedly attended Kim's tour of the Kanggye Tractor Plant in the northwestern Jagang Province -- which may house equipment involved in the production of uranium enrichment centrifuges. Hong appears regularly in North Korean state media, and is one of the public faces of the WMD community.

While these officials are the more visible face of generational change in North Korea's WMD establishment, that change is also taking place among the hundreds if not thousands of scientists, technicians, and workers who work for them. Because patronage is prevalent in North Korean politics, the rise of new senior officials has brought with it a network of younger scientists and technicians. Moreover, graduate or doctoral students who assisted in research for North Korea's first nuclear test in 2006 have since then most likely enjoyed career advancement. Similarly, a low-level technician or graduate student who participated in the 1998 launch of the Taepodong-1 rocket may now be a mid-level manager in the ballistic missile or space programs.

Pyongyang has been careful not to expose individuals to public scrutiny, but observers can glimpse the new generation through North Korean media. Kim Jong Il posed for photographs with scientists and technicians involved in the 2009 Unha space launch vehicle test. They appear to be closer in age to members of Kim Jong Un's generation, or roughly half as old as the department heads in the front row.

In 2012, after another space launch vehicle test, North Korean media announced a list of recipients of titles and awards. The largest number of those recipients mentioned by name were the 27 winners of the Kim Jong Il Youth Honor Prize, awarded to individuals under 30. As for the nuclear weapons program, a commemorative photo with personnel involved in the February 2013 nuclear test shows technicians and experts who appear to range in age from their 20s to 40s.

Generation change also extends to North Korea's nuclear reactor program. According to the North Koreans, experts in their 40s designed the country's new experimental light water reactor, probably intended to produce energy for the civilian sector. Individuals who worked on a similar reactor program established under the 1994 agreement but never finished appear not to be involved; older engineers at the Yongbyon nuclear installation, where North Korea builds its nuclear weapons, appear not to be involved either.

It's difficult to say how the new generation's capabilities compare to those of their predecessors. North Korean scientists in the 1970s and 1980s benefitted from decades of exchange agreements with the Soviet Union, Warsaw Pact countries, and China. While those agreements have since ended, the new generation enjoys both the intellectual capital the older generation accumulated, as well as the Internet. It is probably no accident that Pyongyang established one of its first e-libraries in Jagang, a region which hosts the National Defense Science Academy, an institution that trains personnel involved in the development and manufacturing of weapons, and several industrial sites involved in the production of missiles and missile components. (The e-libraries are facilities where authorized individuals access research and scholarship via CD-ROMs and North Korea's intranet.)

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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

But the new generation will play a large role in determining whether North Korea possesses the capability to launch rockets that can reach the United States.

A version of this article also appeared in 38 North.

Michael Madden studies North Korean political culture and leadership dynamics and is a contributor to 38 North.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/09/22/north_korea_kim_jong_un_weapons_of_mass_destruction_younger_generation

[Return to Top](#)

The Pittsburgh Tribune-Review – Pittsburgh, PA

OPINION/Editorial

America's Nukes: A Timely Effort

By *The Tribune-Review*

Tuesday, September 23, 2014

The Obama administration's foolhardy drive to cut America's nuclear deterrent ironically is giving way to a welcome, large-scale effort to modernize and revitalize U.S. warheads, missiles, bombers and submarines.

A gleaming new \$700 million warhead plant near Kansas City, Mo., opened early and under budget, The New York Times reports. It's one of eight major sites slated for upgrades along with "12 new missile submarines, up to 100 new bombers and 400 land-based missiles" over the next three decades.

Much of this upgrading is a price paid by the administration to secure GOP votes for Senate ratification of its New START treaty (a treaty of appeasement, by any other name) with Russia. And some of it, such as the Kansas City plant, was begun by the Bush administration.

Yet, this White House still frames these upgrades as creating a smaller arsenal to ease further reductions. But with Vladimir Putin's adventurism chilling U.S.-Russia relations, China's continuing territorial provocations and other factors, even it realizes this is no time to weaken national defense.

Citing troubles with other upgrade projects, critics say the estimated \$1 trillion overall cost of modernizing nuclear weapons and delivery systems is unaffordable. But what America cannot afford is to let its nuclear deterrent's credibility and reliability slip. And if that's the result of circumstances forced on a reluctant administration, so be it.

<http://triblive.com/opinion/editorials/6839750-74/america-administration-nuclear#axzz3EHf1GrOH>

[Return to Top](#)

All Things Nuclear.org – Cambridge, MA

OPINION/Insight on Science and Security

China's Nuclear Threshold and No First-Use

Gregory Kulacki, *China project manager and senior analyst*

September 24th, 2014

Next month, on 16 October, China will commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of its first successful nuclear weapons test. That same day in 1964 the Chinese government released an official statement declaring, "China will never at any time or under any circumstances be the first to use nuclear weapons." The Chinese government reconfirmed its commitment to that declaration many times over the past five decades, most recently in April 2013.

The original statement also contains an explanation of why China decided to develop nuclear weapons. It notes that it was not because China plans to use them, but rather to oppose the "nuclear blackmail and nuclear threats" made by others. Although China's declaration may appear to be a moral or symbolic act, it also reflects the hard-

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



nosed strategic calculation that there is no imaginable scenario in which using nuclear weapons would end well for China. Taken as a whole, the language expresses the view that self-assurance of immunity to nuclear blackmail is the sole purpose of China's nuclear arsenal.

Most U.S. analysts of China's nuclear program never took this statement seriously, especially the no first use pledge. The relatively recent disclosure of a discussion of nuclear weapons policy in a highly classified Chinese military textbook raised new U.S. suspicions about China's threshold for nuclear use.

A Secret "Adjustment" to Chinese Nuclear Policy?

The focus of U.S. suspicion centers on the textbook's consideration of an exceptional situation in which China is suffering large and sustained conventional attacks from a militarily superior and nuclear-armed enemy. The section of the textbook where this situation is examined suggests the Chinese military may try to stop such attacks by threatening to use its nuclear weapons—announcing targets, conducting launch exercises—as a way of getting the attacker's attention and trying to coerce the attacker into stopping its attack. The Chinese military calls this "lowering the threshold for nuclear coercion."

I believe it is clear from a careful reading of this section, in the context of the rest of the book, that the proposed "adjustment" in China's nuclear policy is intended as a bluff. Unlike U.S. and Russian nuclear threats, which are made publicly and during peacetime, the Chinese military intended its nuclear threat to remain a secret. It was conceived as a surprise China would only spring at a desperate moment in the midst of a war. Unfortunately for the Chinese military planners who devised this stratagem, the classified text detailing their preparations to employ it was leaked to foreign sources and is now available in several U.S. university libraries.

Persistent U.S. Misunderstanding of China's Nuclear Doctrine

Initial U.S. and Japanese reports about the stratagem mistakenly claimed it called for China to launch a pre-emptive nuclear strike, and unfortunately, many U.S. governmental and non-governmental experts still believe the initial reports. The textbook describes the stratagem as a lowering of China's threshold for threatening to use its nuclear weapons, not for actually using them. There continues to be a great deal of confusion about the language the Chinese military used to describe the stratagem, perhaps because there is no publicly available English translation of the original Chinese source. So I provide a translation of the relevant section [here](#).

The directions for implementing the "lowering the threshold" stratagem are in the final section of a chapter called "Deterrence Operations" in a military textbook U.S. analysts generally refer to as *The Science of Second Artillery Campaigns*, but which I prefer to translate as *The Science of Second Artillery Operations*. The word "campaigns" suggests a discussion of military strategy, but the book is actually a training manual for the officers and soldiers who operate China's missile forces. It was written by a committee of professional military educators supervised by the General Command of China's People's Liberation Army. It was classified "extremely secret" and initially distributed to authorized readers in 2004.

Some U.S. observers think the text is ambiguous on the question of whether or not China would launch a pre-emptive nuclear attack. The relevant section of the text only discusses preparations to carry out a threat gesture, not an attack. What might happen if the bluff fails, however, is difficult to discern if a reader relies only on these final few pages of one chapter in a 405-page book. Reading the rest of the book makes it easier to answer that question with greater confidence.

Throughout *The Science of Second Artillery Operations* the soldiers and officers who operate China's nuclear-armed missiles are reminded that China's no first use doctrine is a fundamental concept of Chinese nuclear planning. An important reminder appears just two pages after the discussion of the bluff in the introduction to the subsequent chapter on "Second Artillery Nuclear Retaliatory Attack Operations,"

"According to our country's principle, its stand of no first use of nuclear weapons, the Second Artillery will carry out a nuclear missile attack against the enemy's important strategic targets, according to the combat orders of the Supreme Command, only after the enemy has carried out a nuclear attack against our country."



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies
CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

U.S. decision-makers who look with skepticism on China's initial statement fifty years ago may still not find this credible. But my reading of the recently disclosed Chinese text reveals nothing in the language that throws additional doubt on China's no first use policy.

Moreover, during interviews conducted in Beijing two years ago, officials from China's nuclear weapons laboratory who advise the senior political leadership on nuclear weapons policy told me the bluff discussed in *The Science of Second Artillery Operations* is unlikely to be approved by China's senior political leaders, even in the most desperate of situations. Given the uncertainties surrounding the stratagem, which are discussed in the translated text—including the risk it could cause an adversary to launch a preemptive nuclear strike—this is not surprising.

For the time being, at least, it appears that China's nuclear threshold has not changed.

<http://allthingsnuclear.org/chinas-nuclear-threshold-and-no-first-use/>

[Return to Top](#)

Foreign Policy.com – Washington, D.C.
OPINION/Argument

The Unaffordable Arsenal

The Obama administration is embarking on a multibillion-dollar nuclear spending spree. Problem is, none of it is necessary.

By Tom Z. Collina
September 24, 2014

The U.S. missile strikes against the Islamic State jihadists in Syria and Iraq underscore a growing problem for the Defense Department. New threats are demanding the military's attention around the globe: from the rise of shadowy new terrorist groups in the Middle East to Russia's invasion of Ukraine to the rampant Ebola virus in West Africa. At the same time, the 2011 Budget Control Act caps the defense budget, which must be significantly reduced from projected levels.

What to do? Defense heavyweights are calling to lift the caps and increase spending. But given that a dysfunctional Congress would have to agree to such a major change -- an unlikely prospect -- it is a safe bet that there will be fewer defense dollars, at least over the next 10 years.

So where will new money for high-priority military missions come from? Simple. The Pentagon will take it from less important activities. It's a zero-sum game.

Fortunately, there is a sizable chunk of the Pentagon budget where we can safely cut back: the U.S. nuclear arsenal.

As the *New York Times* reported on Sept. 22, the United States plans to spend about \$355 billion on nuclear weapons over the next 10 years, and up to \$1 trillion over 30 years. As they say in Washington, that's real money. Yet these weapons play essentially no role in responding to today's highest-priority threats. U.S. nuclear weapons did not keep Russia from taking Crimea. They did not stop the Islamic State from rampaging through Iraq and Syria. And Ebola? Yeah, right.

A quarter-century after the Cold War, spending this much money on nuclear weapons is simply not justified. But even if it was, the harsh reality is that the country does not have the cash to pay the tab.

This summer, an independent, bipartisan federal commission co-chaired by former Secretary of Defense William Perry and retired Gen. John Abizaid called the Obama administration's plans for the arsenal "unaffordable" and a threat to "needed improvements in conventional forces."

But, of course, the Pentagon already knows this. The Navy wants 12 new ballistic missile submarines that would cost about \$100 billion to build. The Air Force is seeking up to 100 new, nuclear-capable strategic bombers for at least \$80 billion, as well as land-based ballistic missiles and air-launched cruise missiles. Both services know that

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



planned spending will not cover these costs, so they are seeking additional funds -- outside of their own budgets. The Senate Armed Services Committee has already approved a "National Sea-Based Deterrence Fund" to finance the construction of new submarines from another source, yet to be determined.

In the services' view, the nuclear programs are so important that someone else should pay for them.

Responding to this game of nuclear pass-the-buck, Undersecretary of Defense Frank Kendall said on Sept. 17, "at the end of the day we have to find money to pay for these things one way or another, right? So changing the accounting system doesn't really change that fundamental requirement. We still need the money and it has to come from somewhere."

Rather than hoping for a handout or creative accounting, a more pragmatic approach would be for the Obama administration to accept that the nuclear weapons enterprise is just too big and should be scaled back. Can it really be that the nation needs to rebuild essentially every missile, bomber, submarine, and warhead it's built over the last 50 years? No. It is time to get real.

"This is Obama's legacy budget," a senior administration official told the *New York Times*. "It's his last chance to make the hard choices and prioritize." But that doesn't mean it's an all-or-nothing proposition. We don't have to get rid of all the weapons to save a boatload of money. In fact, the United States can save billions of dollars and still keep the "triad" of delivery systems armed with the same number of nuclear warheads planned under the 2010 New START Treaty. We just need to do it in a more cost-effective way.

Here are five ideas the United States could use to save roughly \$70 billion over the next decade across all three legs of the triad:

1. Build eight new nuclear-armed submarines instead of 12.

Savings: \$16 billion over 10 years.

Under New START, the Pentagon plans to deploy approximately 1,000 nuclear warheads on strategic submarines. Eight fully armed submarines can meet this requirement, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO). So why buy 12? The "need" for 12 subs has more to do with how promptly they could strike their targets. More subs means you can station them closer to their targets in China and Russia for quick launch.

But the White House could relax those requirements, which are based on Cold War assumptions. Instead of forward-deploying subs, they should be kept out of harm's way, as an assured retaliatory force if ever needed. If prompt launch is required, land-based missiles can serve that mission.

2. Delay new nuclear-capable bombers.

Savings: \$32 billion over 10 years.

Given the decades of service left in the current Air Force bomber fleet (B-52s and B-2s), the new bomber program can be delayed until the mid-2020s, according to CBO. Even with a 10-year delay, a new bomber would still be ready by about the time the current bomber fleet will reach the end of its service life. Moreover, the delay would allow the new bomber to incorporate technological advances made during that time. "Taking advantage of future technological developments can be particularly valuable for weapon systems that are expected to be in use for several decades," CBO states.

3. Cancel the air-launched cruise missile.

Savings: \$3 billion over 10 years.

The new Air Force bomber would carry two types of nuclear weapons: a rebuilt gravity bomb (the B61) and an Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM). The current ALCM, carried by B-52 bombers, is scheduled for retirement in 2030.

The new Air Force bomber -- unlike the B-52 -- will be designed to penetrate enemy air defenses, so it needs bombs that can be dropped from above, like the B61. It does not need a standoff missile, like the ALCM, which



would be shot from outside enemy airspace. If we ever do need that capability, submarine-launched ballistic missiles can do it just as well.

4. Scale back the B61 bomb life extension.

Savings: \$4 billion over 10 years.

The administration plans to extend the service life of about 400 B61 gravity bombs at the cost of about \$10 billion, or \$25 million each, starting in 2020. This is the only U.S. nuclear weapon based in Europe, with about 180 tactical (short-range) versions stored in five NATO countries. A strategic version is stored in the United States for use on B-2 bombers.

Despite the crisis in Ukraine, the Cold War has not resumed. There is no military justification for keeping B61 tactical bombs in NATO countries. The United States can continue to reassure NATO allies and deter any nuclear weapons threat with nuclear weapons based in the United States and on submarines at sea. If B61 bombs must stay in Europe for political reasons, then they should be allowed to age out over the next decade and then retired. Let's not spend billions on a weapon that is on its way out.

5. Maintain existing land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

Savings: \$16 billion over 10 years.

The Air Force is expected to decide in 2016 whether to continue to extend the life of the Minuteman III missile after 2030 or to replace it with a new one. A detailed 2014 RAND study supports extending the life of the current Minuteman III, which it found to be "a relatively inexpensive way to retain current ICBM capabilities."

The RAND report found that keeping the Minuteman IIIs in current silos is the cheapest option, a program that would still cost up to \$90 billion over 39 years. In comparison, building a new silo-based ICBM would cost up to \$125 billion and a mobile version (rail or road) would cost up to \$219 billion.

It is hard to imagine what would justify a military requirement for a new ICBM capability beyond that offered by a life-extended Minuteman III. As the RAND report points out, only Russia is capable of attacking all U.S. ICBMs. Such an attack is highly unlikely, as Moscow could not expect to escape a nuclear response, either from ICBMs or other U.S. nuclear forces in the strategic triad. Silo-based Minuteman IIIs are survivable against all other potential nuclear adversaries, including China, and will likely remain so for the foreseeable future.

* * *

Proponents of nuclear weapons say that spending large sums of money to rebuild the arsenal is worth it, since the United States still faces nuclear threats from Russia and China that must be addressed. And since Moscow and Beijing are modernizing their arsenals, so should we. After all, with an annual \$500 billion defense budget, spending \$30 billion (or just 6 percent) on nuclear weapons is not so much, the thinking goes.

But the threats we face are changing, and so too must our responses to them.

Nuclear weapons are the dinosaurs of military hardware. This plump piggy bank should be raided to address the real high-priority emerging threats. The United States does not have to break the congressional budget deal and increase defense spending to do so. We've got the world's most expensive, most sophisticated nuclear deterrent -- and the irony is that it has no deterrent effect on the most pressing conflicts we face. Surely we don't need to go out and buy new, shiny version.

Tom Z. Collina is the director of policy at the Ploughshares Fund in Washington, D.C.

http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/09/24/the_unaffordable_arsenal_defense_spending_nuclear_weapons

[Return to Top](#)

National Defense Magazine.org – Arlington, VA

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226



Time to Revive Debate about Space-Based Missile Defense

October 2014

By Marvin Baker Schaffer

Boost phase missile defense is necessary to reliably and cost-effectively defeat the most advanced intercontinental ballistic missile threats, those of the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China.

Current intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) defenses do not have the necessary ability to engage the most sophisticated configurations that have been and can be deployed by the Russians and to a lesser extent by the Chinese.

Specifically, U.S. defenses cannot successfully engage ICBMs containing multiply independent reentry vehicles (MIRVs), extensive sophisticated decoys or maneuvering reentry vehicle capability.

Russian missile forces include several thousand ICBMs, and China has 50 to 75. Both countries are in the process of modernizing their forces, and, ominously, by 2020 many of the systems are expected to carry nuclear-tipped MIRVs and sophisticated decoys.

The Russians also have hundreds of submarine-launched ballistic missiles and the Chinese may have dozens.

Although Iranian and North Korean forces are presently not as threatening as Russian and Chinese forces, both may also stockpile sophisticated nuclear ICBMs within a decade. Their missiles currently are non-nuclear and have only intermediate range capability threatening nearby U.S. allies. Other entities or non-state groups could acquire nuclear-tipped ballistic missile weapons as well if unimpeded. Hezbollah in Lebanon, a client of Iran, fits this category.

One configuration to redress this threat is called "brilliant pebbles." It requires putting 300 to 1,000 spacecraft into low-Earth orbit at an overall cost of roughly \$1 billion. That will enable defense in the boost phase to preempt use of MIRVs and other sophisticated countermeasure techniques.

Another defensive technique is the use of standoff remotely piloted aircraft such as the Air Force's MQ-9 Reaper. They could fire air-to-air missiles at ICBMs that are still in the boost phase. The initial procurement costs would be at least 17 times that of brilliant pebbles, but it would not require placing objects into space and the drones would be recoverable.

A third technique could employ high-energy solid-state lasers deployed in large numbers and placed in low-Earth orbit. This would cost at least 100 times more than brilliant pebbles.

Both the brilliant pebbles and RPV approaches warrant further research and development.

A raging political controversy began in 1972 when the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was adopted by the Nixon administration. The underlying rationale for the treaty was two-fold. First, the ability to achieve reliable defense against sophisticated attacks — MIRVs plus decoys — was considered either excessively expensive or impossible. The second was that the mutually assured destruction policy provided a stable alternative for survivability.

The ABM Treaty prohibited the deployment of new defenses by both the United States and the Soviet Union. It was not challenged for more than a decade.

The June 2002 annulment of the treaty by the George W. Bush administration paved the way for space-based missile defense. Neither the Bush nor the Obama administrations have revived the brilliant pebbles program.

Significantly, nothing in the current land- and sea-based U.S. program has global reach and nothing has the range for reliable boost-phase engagement.

Experts contend that space-based missile defense has the potential for reliable boost-phase engagements at the least cost. The savings are significant, a factor of at least 17 compared to the Reaper approach, and a factor of more than 100 compared to the solid-state laser concept.

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ 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 main drawback of the space option is the large number of objects placed permanently into low-Earth orbit. That disadvantage is also suffered by the laser defense, but not by the remotely piloted aircraft defense.

Whether or not a large number of objects should be placed into low-Earth orbit is a political judgment that must be balanced against cost considerations and/or the drawback of only partially negating the ICBM threat.

Both the Reagan and George H.W. Bush administrations favored the use of space for missile defense. The Clinton administration canceled all space-based defensive programs. The George W. Bush administration then canceled the ABM Treaty, but did nothing to revive space-based defensive weaponry. The Obama administration instituted an expanded sea-based defense but did not revive the space-based system to engage in the boost phase.

Apparently, the need to provide reliable boost-phase defense against a sophisticated nuclear-armed enemy did not persuade either President Bush or Obama. Since ICBM and submarine-launched ballistic missiles with sophisticated capabilities appear inevitable in coming decades, boost-phase missile defense research should be revived.

Marvin Schaffer is a member of the adjunct research staff at RAND Corp.

<http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/archive/2014/October/Pages/TimeToReviveDebateAboutSpaceBasedMissileDefense.aspx>

[Return to Top](#)

ABOUT THE USAF CUWS

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

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

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

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

[Return to Top](#)

Issue No.1134, 26 September 2014

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

<http://cpc.au.af.mil> \ https://twitter.com/USAF_CUWS

Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7226