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The Voice of Russia – Moscow, Russia
2 March 2014

**US to Upgrade its Nuclear Arsenal in Turkey - Media**

National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) of the US Department of Energy plans to replace the existing arsenal of nuclear weapons at the Turkish base of Incirlik with upgraded bombs. Incirlik holds about 60-70 items of this type of ammunition, the Haberturk agency reports.

This version is designated B61-12, which is being developed within the framework of the 2010 NNSA project to replace the outdated version of B61.

The main improvement is a modified tail section, which enables active targeting, the function the previous B61 lacks.

NNSA has conducted the first tests, which were evaluated as successful. Practical use of the new bombs would be possible in 2017.
At present, the European nuclear arsenals of the United States are located at bases in Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Italy and Turkey.

It is supposed, that there is a total of about 300 B61 nuclear bombs in these countries.

The US and the UK armies have been using the Turkish base of Incirlic for operational, strategic and logistical needs since 1955.

It is located a few kilometers to the east of the large Mediterranean city of Adana.

Voice of Russia, TASS


Obama Administration Asks for a Nuclear Weapons Budget Increase

By John Fleck, Journal Staff Writer
Tuesday, March 4, 2014

The Obama administration is asking Congress to fund a 7 percent increase in the National Nuclear Security Administration’s nuclear weapons activities account in 2015, which funds much of the core work at Sandia and Los Alamos national laboratories in New Mexico. The total budget request for the “weapons activities” line item is $8.31 billion, up from $7.78 billion in the current fiscal year.

Among the priorities, Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz told reporters in a briefing this afternoon, is money to keep refurbishment of the B61 nuclear bomb “essentially on schedule”, but defers work on the W78/88 missile warhead. The B61 is a critical program at Sandia. From the agency’s budget summary:

This revised strategy achieves the B61-12 LEP First Production Unit (FPU) by FY 2020 and completes production of the W76-1 warhead by FY 2019. The strategy defers the W78/88-1 Life Extension Program by five years.

The funding hike for nuclear weapons work is being partially offset by a major cut in nuclear non-proliferation spending – money funding work to halt the spread of nuclear weapons elsewhere in the world and dispose of surplus nuclear weapons materials here at home. Among the biggest programs there to be hit is a plant in South Carolina that was being built to dispose of surplus U.S. plutonium. The rising budget for that program simply proved too costly given current budget constraints, Moniz said.

The program, named “MOX” for the “mixed-oxide” nuclear power plant fuel it would manufacture with the old plutonium. The MOX project is part of an arms control deal with the Russians. Here’s the administration’s statement on the issue:

As part of an ongoing analysis of options to dispose of surplus plutonium, the Budget provides funding to place the Mixed Oxide (MOX) Fuel Fabrication Facility in cold standby, while NNSA evaluates alternative plutonium disposition options that will achieve a safe and secure solution more quickly and cost-effectively. The Administration remains committed to the U.S.-Russia Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement and will work with our Russian partners to achieve the goals of the agreement in a mutually beneficial manner.

Moniz said putting the troubled MOX project on “cold standby” would cost $221 million.

The administration request to Congress is the first step in the long and torturous path to a federal budget. The package now goes to Congress.

http://www.abqjournal.com/362612/abqnewsseeker/obama-administration-asks-for-a-nuclear-weapons-budget-increase.html
DOD Aims to Maintain ICBM Count: Lawmakers Seek Cut in Amount

Great Falls Tribune – Great Falls, MT

Written by Jenn Rowell, Tribune Staff Writer
March 5, 2014

The Department of Defense released its quadrennial defense review this week, and it includes mentions of intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The review states the DOD plans to continue investing in modernizing “essential nuclear delivery systems,” and the proposed DOD budget maintains the nuclear triad and funds the program to extend the Minuteman III intercontinental ballistic missile through 2030.

But the review also mentions that the U.S. will pursue further nuclear reductions with Russia and that the U.S. is prepared to reduce nuclear weapons by a third beyond the New START limitations.

The treaty, ratified by the Senate in 2010, limits the U.S. and Russia to no more than 1,550 deployed warheads; 800 deployed and nondeployed ICBM launchers, submarine-launched ballistic missile launchers and heavy bombers; and to reduce their deployed ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments to no more than 700.

In the review, the department breaks out its planned force structure and end strength by fiscal year 2019. In the breakout, the DOD lists that the U.S. will have up to 420 ICBMs, 240 SLBMs and up to 60 nuclear-capable heavy bombers.

Montana’s congressional delegation has pushed back on proposed cuts to the nuclear force, especially ICBMs, as 150 are maintained and operated by Malmstrom Air Force Base.

This week, two senators introduced the Smarter Approach to Nuclear Expenditures, or SANE, Act, which would cut $100 billion over the next decade from the nuclear weapons budget. A Democrat from Oregon introduced a companion bill in the House titled Reduce Expenditures in Nuclear Investments Now, or REIN-IN, Act.

Montana Sen. Jon Tester responded to the legislation this week and said, “The ICBMs at Malmstrom are our nation’s most cost-effective strategic assets, which is why I have pushed the Defense Department to ensure that ICBMs remain online to protect America through 2030. With threats from North Korea and elsewhere, we must remember the critical role our missiles play in keeping America safe. Now is not the time to lose sight of the need for a strong and modernized ICBM force.”

The SANE Act would, among other things, cut the warhead life extension programs and defer development of a new ICBM.

The Air Force’s budget proposal would maintain funding to continue the ICBM life extension program, keeping the weapon viable through 2030.

The bill would also cancel nuclear weapon making facilities and missile defense programs.

“Sen. Jeff Merkley’s proposal to weaken the nuclear triad is shortsighted and dangerous — especially considering current and emerging threats to our security,” Montana’s Republican Rep. Steve Daines said.

A recent Congressional Budget Office report estimated the cost over the next decade of operating, maintaining and modernizing nuclear weapons and the military systems capable of delivering those weapons.

That cost for 2014 is $23.1 billion and of that, $9.7 billion is for the DOD and $8.3 billion for the Department of Energy. Over 10 years, the total cost of all of those activities is estimated at $296 billion.

The estimate includes strategic and tactical weapons, as well as the DOE’s nuclear weapons activities, the laboratories that support those programs, nuclear reactors for ballistic submarines and the $5.1 billion for the
command, control, communications and early warning systems needed to be safely and effectively operated by
U.S. nuclear forces.

Of the total estimated cost for the next decade, $156 billion would be for strategic nuclear forces: $132 billion for
delivery systems and $25 billion for warheads and nuclear reactors; $7 billion tactical nuclear forces, $56 billion for
command, control, communications and early warning systems and $77 billion for DOE nuclear weapons
enterprise, though that excludes costs associated with sustainment and modernization activities unique to specific
warhead types.

“Our ICBM fleet is among the most cost-effective nuclear deterrent tools we have, and we should focus instead
on what does not work, like excessive procurement contracts and reducing the amount of work done by private
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http://www.greatfallstribune.com/article/20140305/NEWS01/303050022?nclick_check=1

National Journal
Gottemoeller: U.S. 'Will Be Patient' in Pursuing Test-Ban Treaty Approval
By Rachel Oswald, Global Security Newswire
March 4, 2014

A senior Obama administration official on Saturday signaled the United States was not in a rush to ratify a key arms
control treaty.
Rose Gottemoeller, acting undersecretary of State for arms control and international security, in remarks given in Marjuro, Marshall Islands, said the “United States will be patient in our pursuit of ratification” of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, “but we will also be persistent.”

The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty must still be ratified by eight advanced nuclear-energy countries, including the United States, for its prohibition against all nuclear tests to become the law of the land.

The Obama administration has long made public its desire to see Washington ratify the accord, but has acknowledged that securing two-thirds Senate approval in the currently polarized political climate would be difficult.

“It has been a long time since the CTBT was on the front pages of newspapers, so we will need time to make the case for this treaty,” Gottemoeller said in her speech. The address was timed for Nuclear Remembrance Day, a national holiday in the Marshall Islands that honors the victims of U.S. atomic testing in the region.

From 1946 to 1958, the United States carried out 67 atmospheric nuclear tests above the Marshall Islands’ Bikini and Enewetak atolls.

“I cannot emphasize strongly enough that it is precisely our deep understanding of the consequences of nuclear weapons -- including the dangerous health effects of nuclear explosive testing -- that has guided and motivated our efforts to reduce and ultimately eliminate these most dangerous and awe-inspiring weapons,” Gottemoeller said. “Entry into force of the CTBT is one such essential part of our pragmatic, step-by-step approach to eliminating nuclear dangers.”

A Senate confirmation vote for Gottmoeller -- to permanently take on the role of undersecretary of State for arms control and international security -- is expected to take place sometime this week.


Chicago Tribune – Chicago, IL

U.S. Puts South Carolina Plutonium Plant on Hold in 2015 Budget

Reuters
March 4, 2014

WASHINGTON, March 4 (Reuters) - The U.S. Department of Energy plans to halt work on a multibillion-dollar plant that would reprocess plutonium from nuclear weapons but faces spiraling construction costs, the Obama administration’s fiscal 2015 budget revealed on Tuesday.

The budget proposal showed that the DOE’s National Nuclear Security Administration will put the mixed-oxide, or MOX, Fuel Fabrication Facility, on the Savannah River near Aiken, South Carolina, on “cold standby” as it seeks other ways to dispose of or reprocess plutonium.

The MOX plant would convert plutonium from nuclear weapons programs into a fuel for nuclear power plants, but is expensive and has gone over budget. The plant could cost up to $30 billion over its lifetime, a recent DOE study found.

The DOE signed a contract to build the plant in 1999.

The federal budget plan for last year said the MOX plant had also undergone turnover among engineering and technical personnel involved in its construction as workers left for nuclear programs in surrounding states.

A science advocacy group welcomed the move, saying the DOE had already wasted billions of dollars on what it termed a risky project.
Converting plutonium to a form that is harder to steal or re-use in weapons is "an essential long-term goal," said Edwin Lyman, a scientist in the Union of Concerned Scientists Global Security Program.

"But the MOX strategy would have greatly increased near-term risks by making it easier for terrorists to steal plutonium during processing, transport or storage at reactors," Lyman said.

South Carolina Republican Senator Lindsey Graham was incensed at the move and vowed to keep the MOX plant on track.

"This cannot stand," Graham said in a release, adding the decision to freeze the program represented a "fundamental breach of trust" with the people of South Carolina.

He said he would work with the energy agency and members of the Senate Appropriations Committee to reduce costs at the plant.

Reporting by Timothy Gardner; Editing by Ros Krasny and Peter Cooney

http://my.chicagotribune.com/#section/-1/article/p2p.79519162/

Orlando Sentinel – Orlando, FL

Pentagon to Spend $1.9 Bln for Missile Defense Overhaul

By Andrea Shalal
March 5, 2014

WASHINGTON (Reuters) -- The U.S. Missile Defense Agency on Wednesday said it is requesting $1.9 billion over the next five years to overhaul the ground-based U.S. missile defense system managed by Boeing Co and improve its reliability.

Missile Defense Agency Director Vice Admiral James Syring told reporters Tuesday that the agency was asking for about $300 million in fiscal 2015 to redesign the Raytheon Co "kill vehicle" that hits and destroys an enemy missile on contact, add a new long-range radar and fund other measures to help the system better identify and track enemy missiles.

The agency on Wednesday provided its projected spending on the initiative over the five-year period through fiscal 2019.

Spokesman Rick Lehner said the agency planned to spend $738 million on the redesign of Raytheon's Exoatmospheric Kill Vehicle (EKV), with the bulk of the spending to come in fiscal 2016 and fiscal 2017.

A total of $939.5 million was budgeted for a new long-range discrimination radar through fiscal 2019, he said.

The agency also planned to spending $198 million on new algorithms and other measures aimed at improving the system's ability to discriminate potential enemy missiles, Lehner said.

Syring said the missile defense system needed a "bottoms-up design" review, as opposed to continued reliability improvements on the margins.

The agency aims to deploy a redesigned kill vehicle, new long-range radar and other measures by 2020.

Tom Collina, research director of the private Arms Control Association, a Washington-based advocacy group, welcomed the initiative to redesign the kill vehicle but said the new equipment would not be ready until 2020. That is three years after Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel says he wants to deploy 14 additional interceptors on the West Coast, bringing the total number of U.S. ground-based interceptors to 44.

"The Pentagon’s plan to spend almost $2 billion over five years to fix the broken national missile defense system underscores just how unreliable the system is and begs the question of why the Obama administration would want to expand this system before it gets fixed," Collina said.
"Rather than rush to deploy more bad interceptors by 2017, the administration should wait for improvements that all agree must get made," he said.

Riki Ellison, who heads the Missile Defense Advocacy Alliance, welcomed the planned overhaul but said the Missile Defense Agency’s budget request of $7.45 billion for 2015 was the lowest ever requested by President Barack Obama during his five years in office.

"Considering the growing instability around the world in North Korea, Iran, Syria and Ukraine, along with a real need to make our current U.S. homeland missile defense more reliable, this is not the time to have a record low investment in missile defense development, capability and capacity," he said.

The Pentagon’s budget requested about $8.5 billion for missile defense in total, including $7.45 billion for the Missile Defense Agency. Previous requests for the agency have ranged from $7.8 billion to $8.6 billion.

Reporting by Andrea Shalal; Editing by Cynthia Osterman
http://www.orlandosentinel.com/topic/sns-rt-usa-fiscal-missiledefense-20140305,0,458962,full.story
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NK’s Missiles Fall within Japan's Air Defense Zone
By Kang Seung-woo
March 3, 2014

North Korea fired two short-range missiles into the sea off its eastern coast Monday, both of which fell within Japan’s air defense identification zone, according to South Korea’s defense ministry.

One fell 400 kilometers northwest of Wajima, Ishikawa Prefecture, while the other landed 456 kilometers northwest of the same area.

“North Korea fired the missiles into an area used by civilian airlines and ships. Not proclaiming a no-sail, no-fly zone before the missile launch is a violation of international regulations,” said a senior government official.

The defense ministry said earlier in the day that the North launched two missiles in a northeasterly direction at 6:19 a.m.

“The projectiles are thought to be Scud (C-type) missiles given their range capability of 500 kilometers,” ministry spokesman Kim Min-seok said at a briefing.

The communist country has three types of Scud missiles — the Scud B with a range of 300 kilometers, the Scud C with a range of 500 and the Scud D with a range of 700.

The missile launch came four days after Pyongyang fired four Scuds Thursday that flew about 220 kilometers in the direction of Russia and fell into the sea — the first firing of a Scud missile since 2009.

The spokesman said that the North’s missile launches violated U.N. Security Council (UNSC) resolutions which ban the use of ballistic missile technology, even though the missiles were fired into its territorial waters.

“In light of the border trespassing and short-range missile launches, South Korean and U.S. forces have stepped up their surveillance status to closely watch the North Korean military’s latest moves,” Kim said. “We are ready to strike back if provoked.”

North Korean watchers say that the missile launch is part of boosting its military capability.

“This year, North Korea is setting its sights on developing weapons as well as strengthening its military readiness posture, and the missile firings on two occasions are seen as part of training,” said Chang Yong-seok, a senior researcher at the Institute for Peace and Unification Studies at Seoul National University.
“In addition, the missile launches are a response to the ongoing joint South Korean-U.S. military training.”

South Korean and U.S. forces last week began the two-week-long Key Resolve, a command-post exercise that ensures the ROK-U.S. alliance is prepared to defend South Korea, while the ongoing Foal Eagle field training exercise will run through April 18.

Last month, the two Koreas held reunions for families separated since the Korean War for the first time in three years prompting hopes of warming relations on the Korean peninsula. However, the North’s missilefirings will likely put a damper on those feelings.

Chang said that the Kim Jong-un regime will likely maintain a “peaceful” stance.

“Given that the North fired short-range missiles, it is a low-level provocation and it is not trying to heighten tensions on the peninsula,” he said.


China Fields New Intermediate-Range Nuclear Missile

*DF-26C deployment confirmed*

By Bill Gertz

March 3, 2014

U.S. intelligence agencies recently confirmed China’s development of a new intermediate-range nuclear missile (IRBM) called the Dongfeng-26C (DF-26C), U.S. officials said.

The new missile is estimated to have a range of at least 2,200 miles—enough for Chinese military forces to conduct attacks on U.S. military facilities in Guam, a major hub for the Pentagon’s shift of U.S. forces to Asia Pacific.

As part of the force posture changes, several thousand Marines now based in Okinawa will be moved to Guam as part of the Asia pivot.

In April, the Pentagon announced it is deploying one of its newest anti-missile systems, the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) to Guam because of growing missile threats to the U.S. island, located in the South Pacific some 1,600 miles southeast of Japan and 4,000 miles from Hawaii.

And on Feb. 10, the Navy announced the deployment of a fourth nuclear attack submarine to Guam, the USS Topeka.

Chinese military officials said the Topeka deployment is part of the Pentagon’s Air Sea Battle Concept and posed a threat to China.

Disclosure of the new Chinese IRBM follows the announcement this week by Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel that the U.S. military is sharply reducing its military forces.

“How can [U.S. policymakers] possibly justify such reductions in defense spending when American forces as far away as Guam, Korea, and Okinawa are targeted by these nuclear missiles,” said one official familiar with reports of the DF-26C.

It was the first official confirmation of China’s new IRBM, which officials believe is part of the People’s Liberation Army military buildup aimed at controlling the Asia Pacific waters and preventing the U.S. military entry to the two island chains along China’s coasts.

The first island chain extends from Japan’s southern Ryuku Islands southward and east of the Philippines and covers the entire South China Sea. The second island chain stretches more than a thousand miles into the Pacific in an arc from Japan westward and south to western New Guinea.
Few details could be learned about the new missile and a Pentagon spokesman declined to comment, citing a policy of not commenting on intelligence matters.

The missile is said to be on a road-mobile chassis and to use solid fuel. The fuel and mobility allow the missile to be hidden in underground facilities and fired on short notice, making it very difficult to counter in a conflict.

The DF-26C is expected to be mentioned in the Pentagon’s forthcoming annual report on China’s military power, which is due to Congress next month.

Adm. Cecil Haney, commander of the U.S. Strategic Command, told a congressional hearing this week that missile and other nuclear threats from China and Russia continue to grow.

“The current security environment is more complex, dynamic, and uncertain than at any time in recent history,” Haney said in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee. “Advances of significant nation state and non-state military capabilities continue across all air, sea, land, and space domains—as well as in cyberspace. This trend has the potential to adversely impact strategic stability.”

Russia and China in particular “are investing in long-term and wide-ranging military modernization programs to include extensive modernization of their strategic capabilities,” Haney said. “Nuclear weapons ambitions and the proliferation of weapon and nuclear technologies continue, increasing risk that countries will resort to nuclear coercion in regional crises or nuclear use in future conflicts.”

Richard Fisher, a China military affairs specialist, said Chinese reports have discussed a DF-26 missile as a medium-range or intermediate-range system. Medium-range is considered between 621 miles and 1,864 miles. Intermediate-range is between 1,864 and 3,418 miles.

Online reports of three new types of medium- and intermediate-range missiles have said the weapons could be multirole systems capable of firing nuclear or conventional warheads, along with maneuvering anti-ship and hypersonic warheads, Fisher said.

According to Fisher, two likely transporter erector launchers (TEL) for the new missiles were displayed last year on Chinese websites. They include two versions from missile TEL manufacturing companies called Sanjiang and Taian.

Three years ago, the state-run Global Times reported that the China Aerospace Science and Industry Corp. (CASIC) was working on a new 2,400-mile range missile that would be deployed by 2015.

That Chinese manufacturer also produced the DF-21 missile, prompting speculation that the DF-26C is a follow-up version of that system.

“China is developing and will soon deploy new longer-range theater missiles as part of its anti-access, area denial strategies, to be part of a combined force of new long-range bombers armed with supersonic anti-ship missiles, plus space weapons and larger numbers of submarines,” Fisher said in an email.

These forces are being deployed to push U.S. forces out of the first island chain and to have the capability to reach the second chain, including Guam, he said.

“China also consistently refuses to consider formal dialogue about its future nuclear forces or to consider any near term limits on them,” Fisher said. “China is giving Washington and its Asian allies no other choice but to pursue an ‘armed peace’ in Asia.”

According to Fisher, the Chinese missile buildup has forced the Navy to redesign its first aircraft carrier-based unmanned combat vehicle into a larger and longer aircraft.

The new Chinese long-range missiles also highlight the urgent need for a new U.S. long-range bomber to replace an aging fleet of strategic bombers.

To counter the Chinese threats, the United States should field its force of anti-ship ballistic missiles on submarines to match Chinese capabilities and deter China from using its naval power against U.S. allies such as Japan and the Philippines, Fisher said.
Russian officials have cited China’s intermediate-range missiles as one reason Moscow is seeking to jettison the U.S.-Russia Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), which bans medium and intermediate ballistic and cruise missiles.

U.S. officials have said Russia is violating the INF treaty with a new cruise missile and testing its long-range missiles to INF ranges.

“It is time to retire the INF treaty because the United States now requires this class of missiles in order to deter China,” Fisher said.

“The bottom line: We are in an arms race with China and if America falters, so will our strategic position in Asia, which will surely increase the chances of conflict, nuclear proliferation and even nuclear war.”

The Pentagon’s latest report on China’s military forces, published last year, said the PLA is investing in “a series of advanced short- and medium-range conventional ballistic missiles, land-attack and anti-ship cruise missiles, counter-space weapons, and military cyberspace capabilities.”

The weapons “appear designed to enable anti-access/area-denial (A2/AD) missions, what PLA strategists refer to as ‘counter-intervention operations,’” the report said.

The Washington Free Beacon first reported on March 7, 2012, that the Chinese military had revealed online photos of a new intermediate-range nuclear missile.

The new missile is believed by U.S. officials to be the DF-26C.

China’s military frequently uses the Internet to reveal the first photos of new weapons systems.

Analysts said the missile TEL shown in the photo is smaller in size than China’s DF-31 intercontinental missile and larger than the DF-21 missile.

http://freebeacon.com/china-fields-new-intermediate-range-nuclear-missile/
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N. Korea Fires More Missiles

By Kang Seung-woo

North Korea fired seven short-range projectiles into the sea off its eastern coast Tuesday from multiple rocket launchers in an apparent protest against the ongoing joint South Korean-U.S. military drills, according to the defense ministry.

“The North fired off three short-range projectiles using a 240 mm multiple rocket launcher at around 6 a.m. from Wonsan on its southeastern coast,” ministry spokesman Kim Min-seok said. They flew about 55 kilometers in a northeasterly direction.

“Around 4:17 p.m., the North fired four more projectiles from an area near Wonsan, again in a northeasterly direction, and they flew around 155 kilometers,” Kim said.

The ministry speculated that they could have been a new KN-09 launcher firing 300-milimeter rockets with a maximum range of about 180 kilometers.

As the KN-09 can fire several missiles in short succession, the launcher is seen as a serious threat to South Korean and U.S. troops, including U.S. bases in Pyeongtaek and Osan, located some 160 kilometers from the demilitarized zone.

According to a December report by the Institute for National Security Strategy (ISS), the North has increased its fleet of multiple rocket launchers near the inter-Korean maritime border in the west coast.
"The 300-milimeter multiple rocket launcher was developed to strike South Korea’s strategic facilities and hinder reinforcements by U.S. forces in a time of war,” a senior military official said.

It is the latest military action in a series of short-range missile launches in less than a week.

On Thursday, the North fired four Scud missiles that flew 220 kilometers in a northeast direction, followed by two other Scuds on Monday. They were evaluated to have flown over 500 kilometers.

The U.S. Defense Department said that the launches were in violation of U.N. Security Council resolutions. U.S. State Department Spokeswoman Jen Psaki said the U.S. wants Pyongyang to refrain from provocative actions and focus on fulfilling its international obligations.

The recent North Korean “provocations” are seen as a response to the ongoing joint South Korean-U.S. military drills.

"North Korea displayed a show of force against the Key Resolve exercise with weapons of varying ranges. The South Korean and U.S. forces are mobilizing intelligence assets to closely monitor possibilities of additional provocations,” ministry spokesman Kim said.

South Korean and U.S. forces last week began the two-week-long Key Resolve, a command-post exercise that ensures the ROK-U.S. alliance is prepared to defend South Korea, while the ongoing Foal Eagle field training exercise will run through April 18.

The North calls the military drill a rehearsal for an invasion of the Stalinist country.

Pyongyang had issued near-daily threats during last year’s joint drills that were held following its third nuclear test, prompting the U.S. to send high-profile nuclear bombers and stealth jets to the Korean Peninsula in a show of force.


Yonhap News Agency – Seoul, South Korea

In new QDR, Pentagon Highlights N. Korea's Threat under its Unpredictable Regime

March 5, 2014
By Lee Chi-dong

WASHINGTON, March 4 (Yonhap) -- In its updated global defense strategy, the Pentagon on Tuesday emphasized the need to counter a "significant" threat from North Korea's unpredictable regime.

"North Korea remains closed and authoritarian," it said in the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), which Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel characterized as defining the "historic transition" unfolding through the U.S. defense enterprise.

The QDR sets the direction of the U.S. military's overall operations at home and abroad in a period of budget austerity.

The Pentagon said the U.S. military will be reduced in size but will become "more modern and more ready to confront a broad range of future defense challenges."

It pointed out North Korea’s nuclear and long-range missile capabilities are a "growing and direct" threat to the U.S. and its allies.

"North Korea’s long-range missile and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) programs -- particularly its pursuit of nuclear weapons in contravention of its international obligations -- constitutes a significant threat to peace and
stability on the Korean Peninsula and in Northeast Asia and is a growing, direct threat to the United States," the review said.

The 88-page document, issued along with the U.S. military's fiscal year 2015 budget request, describes the communist nation and Iran as sources of "dynamic and unpredictable" challenges.

"Faced with this threat, the United States is committed to maintaining peace and security on the Korean Peninsula and closely monitors the situation through military and diplomatic channels in coordination with the ROK, Japan, China and Russia," it said. ROK is the acronym for South Korea's official name, the Republic of Korea.

The department said it would continue efforts to stay ahead of the North's ballistic missile threats.

The Pentagon plans to build out U.S. homeland defense with 44 Ground-Based Interceptors (GBIs) by 2017. It will also procure an additional Terminal High-Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) battery in 2015, bringing the total number of batteries to seven.

The Pentagon also said the Marine Corps is committed to remaining the country's "expeditionary force: a force capable of responding to crisis anywhere around the globe at a moment's notice."

On the Obama administration's broader policy of rebalancing toward Asia, it vowed to maintain a "robust footprint in Northeast Asia" while enhancing its presence in Oceania and Southeast Asia.

The QDR said what is also worrisome is the rapid pace and comprehensive scope of China's military modernization, combined with a relative lack of transparency and openness from China's leaders regarding both military capabilities and intentions.

"In the coming years, countries such as China will continue seeking to counter U.S. strengths using anti-access and area-denial approaches and by employing other new cyber and space control technologies," it said.

Meanwhile, Hagel said in a statement the QDR "outlines key missions of our strategy -- including the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific, sustaining our security commitments in the Middle East and Europe, and building partnership capacity throughout the world."

He emphasized that his department is doing its best to adapt itself to budget reductions but that there would be serious consequences should the sequester of automatic budget cuts persist.

"The QDR shows that continued sequestration requires dangerous reductions to readiness and modernization," he said.

http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2014/03/05/65/0301000000AEN2014030500551315F.html

CRIENGLISH.com – Beijing, China

China Urges Japan to Respond to Nuclear Concerns
CRIENGLISH.com
March 05, 2014

China’s Foreign Ministry has issued another statement, once-again calling on Japan to respond to the international community's concerns over its nuclear material stockpiles as soon as possible.

Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesperson Qin Gang.

"Avoiding answering questions does not help solve the problem and China is urging Japan to face up to these issues and hopes that Japan can give explanations as soon as possible. Japan should take measures to cope with doubts and concerns expressed by the international community."
The statement comes despite assurances by the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency that Japan's stockpile of nuclear materials is under full IAEA observation.

The United States has begun pressing Japan, once again, for the return of some 331-kilograms of weapons-grade plutonium it gave to Japan during the Cold War.

The US side began calling for the return of the nuclear materials in 2010.

Japan is officially a nuclear weapons-free country.

http://english.cri.cn/7146/2014/03/05/2361s815836.htm

China News net – Beijing, China

**China Focus: China Defense Budget to Increase 12.2 Pct in 2014**

March 5, 2014

BEIJING, March 5 (Xinhua) -- China plans to raise its defense budget by 12.2 percent to 808.2 billion yuan (about 132 billion U.S. dollars) in 2014, according to a draft budget report submitted to the national legislature for review on Wednesday.

This is the highest growth rate in China's defense budget since 2011.

According to Sun Huangtian, deputy head of the general logistics department of the People's Liberation Army (PLA), this year's defense budget will be spent mainly on modernizing the army's weapons and equipment, improving living and working conditions for service personnel, and updating the army's management system.

Sun said the increase in military expenditure is "moderate, and limited in scale."

"We will ensure that every cent of the money is spent wisely to boost the army's combativeness," he said.

Chen Zhou, a researcher with the Academy of Military Sciences and a deputy to the National People's Congress (NPC), also said China's military spending is at a "reasonable and balanced" level.

"Compared with major powers in the world, China's spending in national defense is considerably low either in terms of its share in GDP or in per capita terms," he said.

"In order to protect the country and safeguard regional peace and stability, China has to enhance its national defense," he said.

Chen acknowledged that China is under increasing strategic pressure, as the Asia-Pacific region has become a global geo-political and economic center, with some major powers "speeding up strategic adjustments and strengthening military alliance."

Highlighting rising maritime security risks, territorial and maritime disputes, as well as terrorist threats, Chen said, "The comparatively low level of input into national defense, coupled with a high-risk security environment, dictates that we must raise our defense budget on a moderate scale."

Chen's words were echoed by Yin Zhuo, director of the Expert Consultation Committee of the PLA Navy, who said China's military spending is still far from the level it needs to be as the country faces increasingly severe security challenges.

China's military budgets increased 10.7 percent in 2013, 11.2 percent in 2012 and 12.7 percent in 2011.

Although the rise in the defense budget in the past three years has surpassed GDP growth, the share of military spending in China's GDP stood at less than 1.5 percent last year, well below the world average of 3 percent, Yin said, citing statistics.
A report released by London's International Institute for Strategic Studies showed the United States remained the world's biggest defense spender in 2013, with a budget of 600.4 billion U.S. dollars.

Still, double-digit growth in China's defense budget in recent years has caused concerns from some western countries.

A spokeswoman of the national legislative body on Tuesday tried to play down such concerns, stressing that China's defense policy is purely defensive and that the country has never treated any nation as an enemy or a threat.

However, China will "respond effectively" to provocations by those ready to sabotage regional security and order, she said.

"Based on our history and experience, we believe that peace can only be maintained by strength," she told a press conference.

Chen Zhou, meanwhile, also attributed the defense budget rise partly to the increasing international responsibilities China is facing.

China is the largest personnel contributor to UN peace-keeping missions among the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. It also regularly sends naval task forces to conduct escort missions in the Gulf of Aden and off the coast of Somalia.

"Overseas missions cost several times more than those within the country," Chen said. "By moderately raising its defense budget and enhancing its military capabilities, China is also capable of making more contributions to world peace."

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/special/2014-03/05/c_133163507.htm

Channel NewsAsia.com – Singapore

N Korea Poses "Growing" Threat to US: Pentagon

North Korea poses a mounting threat to the United States due to its pursuit of long-range missiles and nuclear weapons, the Pentagon said Tuesday in its latest strategy document.

The Pentagon's latest strategy document said the United States will seek to stay ahead of the threat of ballistic missile arsenals in Iran and North Korea, noting plans to bolster the number of ground-based interceptors on US soil from 30 to 44 while investing in better sensors.
The US administration also is deploying a second powerful surveillance radar in Japan to provide early warning of any missile launched by North Korea, it said.

North Korea has pressed ahead with its missile program but experts have voiced skepticism over its claims to have a working inter-continental ballistic missile.

To promote "stability" in the region, US forces will keep up "a robust footprint in Northeast Asia while enhancing our presence in Oceania and Southeast Asia," the review said.

Although Washington's much-touted strategic "rebalance" to the Asia-Pacific region has been criticised as more hype than substance, senior Pentagon officials insisted the review and a new budget proposal released Tuesday showed a commitment to the shift.

US officials cited ship building plans, deployments of marines to Australia and an expansion of joint military training and drills.

"We will continue our contributions to the US rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region, seeking to preserve peace and stability in a region that is increasingly central to US political, economic, and security interests," the review said.

At the same time, the US military would retain an "enduring" presence in the Middle East and the Gulf, where some 35,000 troops are stationed, while also keeping up ties to "stalwart" allies in Europe.

The document was drafted before the current crisis erupted in Ukraine, with pro-Russian forces taking de facto control over the Crimean peninsula.


The Asahi Shimbun – Tokyo, Japan

**U.S. Defends Japan against China's Plutonium Criticism**

Reuters
March 6, 2014

VIENNA–The United States and China disagreed over Japan's plutonium stocks at a U.N. nuclear agency meeting on March 5, with Washington saying it did not share Beijing's concern about the sensitive issue, diplomats said.

China expressed concern about the size of Japan's plutonium holdings at a board session of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), diplomats who attended closed-door discussions at the U.N. body said. Russia voiced similar views, they said.

Like uranium, plutonium can be used to fuel nuclear power plants, but can also provide material for nuclear bombs.

The U.S. ambassador to the IAEA made clear his country was not worried about Japan's treatment of the material.

"We are not at all concerned that the plutonium is either being handled improperly or that there isn't a plan for disposition," Ambassador Joseph Macmanus told reporters.

He later told the board, according to one diplomat, that "we do not share the concerns expressed" by China in February.

On Feb. 17, Beijing said it was "extremely concerned" by a report that Japan has resisted returning to the United States more than 300 kg (660 lb) of mostly weapons-grade plutonium.

Japan's news agency said the United States had pressed Japan to give back the nuclear material, which could be used to make up to 50 nuclear bombs. Japan had balked, but finally given in to U.S. demands, the media said.
The material was bought for research purposes during the 1960s and the two governments will probably reach an official agreement on its return at the Nuclear Security Summit in The Hague in March, an official at Japan's education ministry said.

Nuclear-armed China is involved in a bitter territorial dispute with Japan. It denies Japanese accusations that it is a threat to peace and in turn has accused Japan of trying to rearm and failing to learn the lessons of its brutal behavior during World War Two, when Japanese forces occupied China.

**NO IAEA CONCERN EITHER**

Japan, the world's only target of atomic bombs, in the final stages of World War II, does not have nuclear weapons, and says it will not seek to obtain them.

Japan has plutonium contained in spent nuclear fuel at civil reactor and reprocessing sites, totaling 159 tons at the end of 2012, according to Japanese data posted on the IAEA website.

Macmanus said "plutonium and the disposition of plutonium stocks" was a central element of what he called a very successful diplomatic and energy partnership with Japan.

"We are satisfied that Japan understands what the conditions are for the use and the maintenance of those stocks and we are not concerned," he told reporters.

In his statement to the board, he was quoted as saying that one goal of a U.S.-Japan nuclear security working group was to reduce quantities of weapons usable nuclear material in Japan, and that this cooperation has been "successfully ongoing for decades". He said Japan had been "consistently" transparent about its plutonium inventory.

IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano earlier this week also said there was no reason for concern that plutonium held by Japan could be diverted for nuclear arms purposes.

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind_news/politics/AJ201403060015

**Korea Times – Seoul, South Korea**

March 6, 2014

**Pentagon: N. Korea has at least 6 Road-Mobile ICBM Launchers**

The Pentagon said Wednesday North Korea has at least six Hwasong-13 road-mobile long-range missile launchers, as the U.S. updated the assessment of the secretive nation's military power.

It said the Hwasong-13 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) have a range of more than 3,400 miles, but its capability has yet to be tested.

The Hwasong-13 has not been flight-tested and "their current reliability as weapon systems would be low," the Pentagon said in its annual report, titled "Military and Security Developments involving the Democratic People's Republic of Korea 2013."

In the previous version, the U.S. Department of Defense did not mention the Hwasong-13, but said the launchers of the Taepodong-2 long-range missiles have "not yet deployed."

In this year's document, the department noted launches of the Taepodong-2 have been observed from both east and west coast launch facilities.

The Pentagon stressed the communist country remains "one of the United States' most critical security challenges for many reasons."

These include North Korea's willingness to undertake provocative and destabilizing behavior, including attacks on South Korea, it said.
The report also carried the U.S. military’s formal view on the recent purge and execution of Jang Song-thaek, who was once the No. 2 leader in the North.

Jang's death is unlikely to lead to major changes in defense policy or internal stability in the near term, the Pentagon said.

"His absence will most likely be felt in the economy," as Jang was in charge of several high-profile initiatives, particularly with China, to attract foreign currency and investment to the North, it added.

Jang, the leader Kim Jong-un's uncle, was believed to be a relatively pragmatic advisor to Kim, but his influence probably waned in 2013, the Pentagon said. It cited a significant drop in the number of his public appearances with his nephew.

Meanwhile, the department maintained its view that North Korea has around 950,000-strong ground forces. The number of tanks and armed vehicles increased by 100 each to 4,200 and 2,200 over the past year, it said.

(Yonhap)

http://koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2014/03/113_152815.html
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RIANovosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia Test-Fires ICBM to Target in Kazakhstan

4 March 2014

MOSCOW, March 4 (RIA Novosti) – Russia test-fired an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) from a test site in southern Russia on Tuesday evening, a Russian defense ministry spokesman said.

Kapustin Yar is about 450 km (280 miles) east of the Ukrainian border. The launch coincided with reports of large deployments of apparently Russia-commanded troops in Crimea, which President Vladimir Putin denied on Tuesday.

Spokesman Igor Yegorov said the launch took place at 22:10 Moscow time (6:10 p.m. GMT) from the Kapustin Yar testing range in southern Russia’s Astrakhan Region.

The test was successful as the simulated warhead hit a designated target at a test range in Kazakhstan.

Yegorov said the aim of the test was to test suggested improvements of the ICBM, which entered service in 1985.

A Defense Ministry spokesman said in early January that the Russian military plans to test around 70 types of rocket and missile weaponry at Kapustin Yar this year.

The testing program at the Kapustin Yar range in southern Russia will include about 300 launches of rockets, missiles, and aerial drones as part of more than 180 R&D projects, said Colonel Igor Yegorov.

The range is located in the Astrakhan region between the cities of Volgograd and Astrakhan. It is known for tests of Iskander-M tactical ballistic missiles, S-300 and S-400 air defense systems and Smerch multiple-launch rocket systems.

The RS-12M Topol (NATO reporting name SS-25 Sickle) is a single-warhead intercontinental ballistic missile that has a maximum range of 10,000 kilometers (6,125 miles) and can carry a nuclear warhead with a yield of up to 550 kilotons.


Return to Top

The Washington Examiner – Washington, D.C.
Report: 'New' Russian Nuclear Programs Alarm Neighbors
By Paul Bedard
March 4, 2014

Russia is expanding and modernizing its nuclear arsenal, raising questions from surrounding nations about what Moscow and President Vladimir Putin are up to, according to a new report from the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists.

In the March/April issue provided to Secrets, the report reveals that the former Soviet capital is working on new missiles, nuclear submarines and bombers capable of carrying heavy nuclear-tipped bombs and missiles.

“Since our last Russian Notebook in early 2013, Russia has taken several important steps in modernizing its strategic and nonstrategic nuclear forces. These include continued development and deployment of new intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), construction of ballistic missile submarines, development of a new strategic bomber, and deployment of tactical ballistic and cruise missiles and fighter-bombers,” said the authors.

“While much of this development continues well-known programs that have been under way for many years, other developments are new. Combined, the steps contribute to growing concern in other countries about Russian intentions and help justify nuclear modernization programs and political opposition to reductions in other nuclear weapon states,” they added.

When added to Russia’s surprising moves over the last week in Ukraine, the information revealed in the new nuclear report raises the stakes in the diplomatic standoff between Putin and President Obama.

On the nuclear side, the authors also said that Russia has some 3,500 warheads slated for dismantlement under an international deal, but still intact.

“Russia had a military stockpile of approximately 4,300 nuclear warheads, of which roughly 1,600 strategic warheads were deployed on missiles and at bomber bases. Another 700 strategic warheads are in storage along with roughly 2,000 nonstrategic warheads. A large number — perhaps 3,500 — of retired but still largely intact warheads await dismantlement,” said the report.

The report also raised a new issue: Russia has not dismantled the nonnuclear weapons it promised to. “Despite Russia’s declaration in 1991 and 1992 that it would eliminate all ground-launched nonstrategic nuclear warheads, it has not done so. We estimate that approximately 170 warheads are assigned to SS-21 Scarab (Tochka) and SS-26 Stone (Iskander) short-range ballistic missiles. The SS-26 will replace the SS-21 completely over the next decade, eventually arming 10 tactical missile brigades,” said the Bulletin.


Russia Plans 2 More Ballistic Missile Tests in March
5 March 2014

ASTANA, March 5 (RIA Novosti) – Russia is planning to carry out two tests of intercontinental ballistic missiles this month in addition to Tuesday’s successful launch, the Kazakh military said.

“On February 19, the Kazakh Defense Ministry received a request [from Russia] for permission to carry out three test launches in March. The request was approved on February 28,” the Central Asian nation’s Defense Ministry said Wednesday.

In line with a 1992 bilateral agreement on the use of test ranges, Russia periodically launches ballistic missiles with dummy warheads from its territory toward simulated targets at the Sary-Shagan range, which Moscow leases in Kazakhstan.
The Russian Defense Ministry said earlier that a RS-12M Topol ICBM, carrying a payload simulating “an advanced warhead,” was launched from the Kapustin Yar testing range in southern Russia’s Astrakhan Region on Tuesday.

Spokesman Igor Yegorov said the launch’s purpose was to test improvements of the ballistic missile, which entered service with the Russian Strategic Missile Forces in 1985.

The RS-12M Topol (SS-25 Sickle) is a single-warhead intercontinental ballistic missile, about the same size and shape as the US Minuteman ICBM.

The missile has a maximum range of 10,000 kilometers (6,000 miles) and can carry a nuclear warhead with a yield of up to 550 kilotons.


Al Arabiya – Dubai, U.A.E.

Rowhani to Iran Generals: Cut Hostile Rhetoric
By Staff writer, Al Arabiya News
Saturday, 1 March 2014

President Hassan Rowhani urged Iran’s military leaders on Saturday to let diplomacy prevail in dealing with potential foreign threats, in a clear reference to efforts to end the nuclear dispute and decades of hostile relations with the West, Reuters reported.

“It is very important to formulate one’s sentences and speeches in a way that is not construed as threat, intention to strike a blow,” Reuters quoted Rowhani as saying in a meeting with Iran’s top military echelon.

“We must be very careful in our calculations. Launching missiles and staging military exercises to scare off the other side is not good deterrence, although a necessity in its proper place,” the official IRNA news agency quoted him as saying.

He added: “A misfire could burst into flames and wreak havoc to everything.”

Moderate Rowhani

A moderate elected by landslide last June, Rowhani has broken with tradition and pursued compromise with the United States and its allies on uranium enrichment, a sensitive issue that resulted in global economic sanctions against Iran.

The Associated Press reported Rowhani as telling defense ministry officials that the Islamic Republic has decided not to develop nuclear weapons out of principle, not only because it is prevented so by treaties.

“We are not after weapons of mass destruction. That’s our red line,” he said.

He added: “If Iran was after weapons of mass destruction, it would build chemical weapons. Those are easier to make. It would build biological arms, which are even easier than making chemical weapons.”

He reiterated a policy set by Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, who issued a religious decree banning the production and use of nuclear weapons.

He has said holding such arms is a sin as well as “useless, harmful and dangerous.”

Iran is a signatory to the NPT and says it will remain committed to its obligations not to build nuclear weapons under the treaty but will not compromise on its right to enrich uranium and produce nuclear fuel.

“We signed these treaties to show the world we are not after such weapons,” he told military commanders.

“Even if there were no NPT or other treaties, our belief, our faith, our religion and principles tell us not to seek weapons of mass destruction.”
Rowhani’s efforts

Rowhani’s efforts run counter to belligerent slogans from Islamic hardliners who dominate the elite Revolutionary Guards and the regular army to a lesser extent.

While Iranian nuclear negotiators were haggling with world powers in Vienna last month, many generals were beating war drums at home and flexing their military muscles.

“Our forefathers primed us for the final epic battle,” said the chief commander of the Revolutionary Guards, Mohammad-Ali Jafari last month.

Such belligerence was absent from Rowhani’s speech on Saturday.

“Our foreign policy is based on detente and trust-building with the world. This is not just a slogan,” he said.

“Iran is sincere in saying it is not out to attack anyone. Aggression is our red line. Weapons of mass destruction are our red line.”

With Reuters and Associated Press

http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/2014/03/01/Rowhani-to-Iran-generals-cut-hostile-rhetoric.html

Why Have You Assassinated Iranian Scientists, Rouhani Asks West

TEHRAN (FNA) - Iran’s President Hassan Rouhani blasted the western states for their desire and attempts to monopolize scientific progress, and asked them the reason why they have assassinated Iran’s top nuclear scientists.

“Owing to their ability to create power and development, the industrial states assume it (the scientific progress) as their exclusive right in a way that their spy agencies embark on assassinating our scientists and intellectuals to prevent the country’s development and progress,” Rouhani said, addressing the 27th Khwarizmi scientific festival in Tehran on Sunday.

“You were informed of the peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear program, then why did you assassinate our nuclear scientists and killed our missile specialists while we have and will make use of our missiles just for defending our country,” he asked the western states.

Rouhani underlined that the world is aware of the peaceful nature of Iran’s nuclear program and the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has carried out thousands of man/hours of inspection of Iran’s nuclear installations and found no sign of Iran’s diversion towards the military use of the nuclear technology.

Western and Israeli spy agencies, collaborated by the terrorist Mojahedin-e Khalq Organization (MKO), have assassinated several Iranian scientists in the last several years.

In the fifth attack of its kind in two years, terrorists killed a 32-year-old Iranian scientist, Mostafa Ahmadi Roshan, and his driver on January 11, 2012.

The blast took place on the second anniversary of the martyrdom of Iranian university professor and nuclear scientist, Massoud Ali Mohammadi, who was also assassinated in a terrorist bomb attack in Tehran in January 2010.

The assassination method used in the bombing was similar to the 2010 terrorist bomb attacks against the then university professor, Fereidoun Abbasi Davani - the former head of Iran’s Atomic Energy Organization - and his colleague Majid Shahriari. While Abbasi Davani survived the attack, Shahriari was martyred.
Another Iranian scientist, Dariush Rezaeinejad, was also assassinated through the same method on 23 July 2011.


The Washington Examiner – Washington, D.C.

**Obama Offers 'Absolute Commitment' to Prevent Nuclear-Armed Iran**

By Meghashyam Mali  
MARCH 3, 2014

President Obama on Monday assured Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of his “absolute commitment” to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

“My absolute commitment is that Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon,” Obama told reporters ahead of his meeting with the Israeli leader at the White House.

Netanyahu is meeting with Obama as the administration makes a push to finalize the framework for a new round of peace talks between Israel and the Palestinians. But that task is complicated by longstanding divisions between Obama and Netanyahu on a number of other issues, in particular over Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Netanyahu has been a public skeptic of Obama’s talks with Tehran on its nuclear program.

In January, the administration and other world powers finalized an interim deal with Iran that would see it freeze some aspects of its nuclear program in exchange for limited sanctions relief. The deal also launches a 6-month timetable for the two sides to reach a permanent accord.

Israel and a number of other key U.S. allies, along with lawmakers from both parties, though, have criticized the deal, saying it undermines the international sanctions regime and does little to prevent Iran from continuing weapons development.

Netanyahu earlier had criticized those terms, saying that Iran had received the “deal of the century.”

On Monday, Netanyahu said that “no country will be happier than ours if we reach a peaceful solution” over Iran. President Obama has insisted that all options remain on the table to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons capability.


FARS News Agency – Tehran, Iran  
Tuesday, March 04, 2014

**Russian Official: Attainment of Final Iran-G5+1 Nuclear Deal Possible in Six Months**

TEHRAN (FNA) - A senior Russian diplomat said that a final deal with the six major world powers on Tehran's nuclear program can be obtained in six months.

“favorable groundwork has been laid for a final agreement between Iran and the P5+1 group over the Islamic Republic's nuclear energy program,” Head of the Russian Federation Council's International Affairs Committee Mikhail Margelov.

The Russian diplomat underlined that favorable conditions have been created for a comprehensive agreement to be drafted, which would lift the sanctions against Iran completely.
Iran and the six world powers (the US, Russia, China, France, Britain and Germany) wrapped up their latest round of nuclear negotiations in Vienna on February 20. The two sides are slated to meet again in Vienna, Austria, on March 17 to continue their discussions.

Iran and the Group 5+1 (the five permanent UN Security Council members plus Germany) inked an interim deal on the Islamic Republic’s nuclear energy program in Geneva, Switzerland, on November 24, 2013. The Geneva deal took effect on January 20.

Tehran and its negotiating sides aim to continue their talks to hammer out a long-term deal aimed at fully resolving the decade-old dispute over Iran’s nuclear energy program.


IRNA (Islamic Republic News Agency) – Tehran, Iran

Araqchi: Technical Talks in Vienna will Cover Arak Heavy Water Reactor, Uranium Enrichment Tomorrow

4 March 2014

Tehran, March 4, IRNA - Deputy Foreign Minister and senior member of Iran nuclear negotiating team Abbas Araqchi said on Tuesday that the technical talks in Vienna will cover Arak heavy water reactor and uranium enrichment tomorrow.

Speaking to reporters, he said that the agenda of the technical meeting by experts of Iran and Group 5+1 in Vienna will cover enrichment of uranium as well as removing ambiguities on Arak heavy water reactor.

The expert meeting in Vienna will take about three to four days and it might take longer if sounds necessary, he said.

He said that Iran never lets other issues except the country’s nuclear programs to be raised in the technical meeting in Vienna.

On the upcoming visit to Tehran of EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton, he said the visit is to take place as scheduled on Saturday night.

She is to confer with President Hassan Rouhani, Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif as well as several senior officials on issues of mutual interests, Araqchi said.

Araqchi said that Iran hopes to reach a comprehensive agreement with the western governments to end decade-long nuclear dispute.

He made it clear that Iran is not optimistic about the good faith of the western governments.

Iran believes that the western governments are aware of civilian nature of the Iranian nuclear program and have used it as a pretext to strike a blow to Iran.

The US Administration has orchestrated arbitrary sanctions on Iran over the past three years which inflicted several hundred billion dollars damages on Iranian economy.

The Iranian government reserves the right to take legal action with the International Court of Justice in The Hague against the US Administration to seek compensation for the heavy damages the sanctions incurred on Iranian economy.

http://www.irna.ir/en/News/2649732/Politic/Araqchi__Technical_talks_in_Vienna_will_cover_Arak_heavy_water_reactor__uranium_enrichment_tomorrow
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The Daily Star – Beirut, Lebanon

Syria Surrenders a Third of Chemical Arsenal: Watchdog
Agence France-Presse (AFP)
March 04, 2014

THE HAGUE: Syria has surrendered or destroyed nearly a third of its chemical arsenal but remains behind on its international obligations, the head of the disarmament mission told the world’s chemical watchdog Tuesday.

Syria has already missed several target dates to hand over or destroy its arsenal before a June 30 deadline and the United Nations-Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) mission called on Damascus to move faster.

"Nearly one third of Syria's chemical weapons material has now been removed or destroyed," UN-OPCW coordinator Sigrid Kaag told a meeting of the watchdog at its Hague headquarters.

"This is good progress and I expect further acceleration and intensification of effort."

OPCW head Ahmet Uzumcu told the Executive Council meeting that Syria had submitted a revised proposal to complete the removal of all chemicals from Syria before the end of April, after previously saying it could only complete the job by June.

An OPCW meeting two weeks ago heard that just 11 percent of Syria’s dangerous chemicals had left the country.

But with two shipments last week and one more expected this week, the country will have handed over more than 35 percent of its arsenal, Uzumcu said.

"Given delays since the lapse of the two target dates for removal, it will be important to maintain this newly created momentum," Uzumcu said.

Syria was to have shipped out most dangerous Category 1 chemicals by December 31 and Category 2 chemicals by February 5.

"For its part, the Syrian Government has reaffirmed its commitment to implement the removal operations in a timely manner," Uzumcu.

Syria has also destroyed 93 percent of its stocks of isopropanol, used to make sarin nerve gas, a task that was supposed to have been completed by March 1.

The remainder is currently inaccessible for security reasons in the war-ravaged country, diplomats said.

Syria has claimed two "attempted attacks" on convoys taking chemicals to Latakia port on their way out of the country, but Western diplomats dismissed the unverifiable claim.

Once Syria has delivered its chemicals to main port Latakia, they are to be taken by Western warships to a US vessel, the MV Cape Ray, aboard which they will be broken down at sea using hydrolysis, a process expected to take 90 days.

That means the entire disarmament and destruction process may well overrun the June 30 deadline, agreed by Russia and the US last year as part of a plan to avert US-backed military strikes in the wake of deadly chemical attacks outside Damascus blamed by the West on President Bashar al-Assad’s regime.

Most countries at the OPCW’s Executive Council are frustrated with the delays, although Russia, China and Iran are reluctant to put more pressure on Damascus.

So-called Priority 1 chemicals were supposed to be destroyed by March 31, but they will not even be delivered to Latakia by that date.
Syria is also supposed to have destroyed its 12 chemical weapon production facilities by March 15, and the OPCW Executive Council remains divided on how to pressure Syria to meet that date.

UN Security Council resolution 2118 was passed after a massive chemical weapon attack that killed hundreds in several opposition areas around Damascus in August.

Rebels and the regime exchanged blame for that attack.


Kerry: US Won’t Let Iran Obtain Nuclear Weapon, Period

Despite clear promises in AIPAC talk, secretary of state acknowledges disagreements between Jerusalem and Washington

By Rebecca Shimoni Stoil and Haviv Rettig Gur

March 4, 2014

WASHINGTON — The United States will “not permit Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon,” US Secretary of State John Kerry reiterated during his keynote address to AIPAC’s 2014 policy conference. Kerry’s statement, however, highlighted the distance between Israel and the United States’ positions on a final deal, as he failed to specify whether and how it would restrict Iran’s nuclear program.

“Let me sum up President Obama’s policy,” Kerry told an audience that responded with polite applause.

“Unequivocal: We will not permit Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. Period.”

Kerry used a popular administration catch-phrase when he reiterated that “our diplomacy is guided by a simple bottom line: No deal is better than a bad deal, and we absolutely will not accept a bad deal.”

The secretary of state said that the United States will only sign a comprehensive agreement with Iran that fulfills three criteria: ensures that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon, guarantees that the program is for peaceful purposes only; and increases visibility and expands breakout time so that if Iran were “to go for a bomb, we would have enough time to act.”

“If those standards aren’t met, there won’t be an agreement,” Kerry assured the audience.

Kerry’s conditions did not, however, directly address some of the largest looming questions regarding the final deal. His talk did not go into details on whether Iran has a right to enrich uranium, the status of centrifuge production – and which centrifuges would be permissible – or the status of Iran’s ballistic missile program under a comprehensive deal.

Although AIPAC members are set to lobby senators on Tuesday to sign on to the Nuclear Weapons Free Iran Act, which the administration vehemently opposes, Kerry spoke out against passing any new sanctions legislation while negotiations are underway.

“We need to make sure that if this opportunity is to elude us it is not because we are the ones who closed the window,” Kerry warned.

“It is crucial that we seize what might be the last best chance to have diplomacy work, and maybe the last chance for quite some time,” Kerry continued. “The reality is that only strong diplomacy can firmly and permanently achieve the goal. Those who say strike and hit need to go check what happens after that.”

http://www.timesofisrael.com/kerry-us-wont-let-iran-obtain-nuclear-weapon-period/
Iran Will Never Give Up Nuclear Enrichment Right: Zarif

Wednesday, March 05, 2014

Iran’s Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif says Tehran will never give up its right to nuclear enrichment for peaceful purposes.

“I want to say that the West should also share an objective with us and I hope that they have started to share that objective and that is you cannot wish Iran’s nuclear program away. You cannot entertain illusions of a zero enrichment option,” Zarif told reporters at the foreign correspondents’ club of Japan in Tokyo on Wednesday.

The top Iranian diplomat said that Iran has the nuclear know-how, scientists and workshops for enrichment and the production of centrifuges, adding that it is impossible to dismantle science or technology.

He also noted that Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei has issued a decree which prohibits nuclear weapons.

In the fatwa (religious decree), Ayatollah Khamenei said the Islamic Republic considers the pursuit and possession of nuclear weapons “a grave sin” from every logical, religious and theoretical standpoint.

Zarif further said Iran believes that nuclear weapons have no place in the world and called for pressure on Israel to get rid of its nukes.

Israel, which is widely believed to be the only possessor of nuclear arms in the Middle East, reportedly maintains between 200 and 400 atomic warheads.

The Iranian foreign minister’s remarks came as Iran and the P5+1 group are set to start a new round of expert-level talks on Tehran’s nuclear energy program in the Austrian capital, Vienna, later on Wednesday.

Iran and the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council -- Russia, China, France, Britain and the US -- plus Germany inked an interim deal on Tehran’s nuclear energy program in Geneva, Switzerland, on November 24, 2013. The Geneva accord, dubbed the Joint Plan of Action, took effect on January 20.

US Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman, who leads the US negotiating team to the nuclear talks between Iran and the P5 + 1 group, told reporters in al-Quds (Jerusalem) on February 22 that in a comprehensive agreement, Iran would be able to maintain a domestic enrichment program that answers its practical needs.

It is an “unlikely” expectation to ask Iran for zero enrichment, she added.

http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2014/03/05/353331/zarif-rules-out-zero-enrichment-illusion/

West Presses Iran to Address Suspected Atomic Bomb Research

By Fredrik Dahl, Reuters
March 05, 2014

VIENNA: Western powers pressed Iran on Wednesday to tackle suspicions that it may have worked on designing an atomic bomb and the United States said the issue would be central to the success of talks on a final settlement over Tehran’s nuclear program.

At a board meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Washington and the European Union underlined their support for the U.N. watchdog’s efforts to investigate long-running allegations of possible nuclear arms research by Iran.
The IAEA inquiry is separate from but complementary to higher-level political talks between Iran and six world powers aimed at a deal on the overall scope of Tehran's nuclear energy program to ensure it cannot be diverted into bombmaking.

In potentially a significant advance for the IAEA’s inquiry into Iran’s nuclear research, Tehran agreed last month to address one of many topics the U.N. agency wants answers on - fast-acting detonators that can be used for nuclear explosions.

But while this was welcomed by Western officials at the closed-door session of the IAEA’s 35-nation governing board in Vienna, they made clear the Islamic Republic must do much more.

The U.S. ambassador to the IAEA, Joseph Macmanus, said it remained critical for Iran to address substantively all international concerns about the so-called possible military dimensions (PMD) of the country's nuclear program.

A "satisfactory resolution of PMD issues will be critical to any long-term comprehensive solution to the Iranian nuclear issue," Macmanus said, according to a copy of his statement.

He later told reporters: "I don't think there is a question that it is being raised and will continue to be central to a comprehensive solution."

The 28-nation European Union voiced a similar line in its statement: "We urge Iran to cooperate fully with the agency regarding PMD issues, and to provide the agency with access to all people, documents and sites requested."

Iran denies Western allegations that it is seeking to develop the capability to make atomic arms, saying its nuclear program is a peaceful project to produce electricity.

Also in Vienna on Wednesday, experts from Iran and the powers - the United States, Russia, France, Britain, Germany and Britain - began a meeting to prepare for the next round of political-level talks on March 17 in the Austrian capital. Diplomats said Russia would take part in the meeting, suggesting no apparent immediate fallout in the Iran negotiations because of the crisis over Ukraine.

"The overriding commitment is one of working together to resolve the Iran nuclear program and there are many other issues in the world that will continue to cause us to have disagreements and debates and sometimes to find ourselves in opposition to one another," Macmanus said when asked whether tensions over Ukraine could disrupt the Iran talks.

Iran and the powers are aiming to build on a breakthrough deal reached late last year in Geneva under which Tehran agreed to curb parts of its nuclear program in exchange for some easing of sanctions that are battering its economy.

The six-month agreement focused mainly on preventing Tehran obtaining nuclear fissile material to assemble a future bomb, rather than on whether Iran sought to develop nuclear weapons technology in the past, which the IAEA is investigating.

Western diplomats and nuclear experts say the IAEA needs to carry out its inquiry to establish what happened and to be able to provide assurances that any "weaponisation" work - expertise to turn fissile material into a functioning bomb - has ceased.

But it is unclear to what extent it will form part of any final settlement between Iran and the powers - which unlike the IAEA can lift crippling sanctions on the major oil producer and therefore have more leverage in dealing with Tehran.

In Brussels, officials said EU foreign policy chief Catherine Ashton - who is coordinating the nuclear negotiations with Iran on behalf of the six powers - would travel to Tehran on Saturday for a two-day visit.

Topics would include Syria's civil war, human rights in Iran and the nuclear dispute. She is due to meet several senior officials, including Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif.
Trend News - Baku, Azerbaijan

Iran Builds First Hypersonic Wind Tunnel to Test Missiles and Spacecraft
By Umid Niayesh, Trend
5 March 2014

Baku, Azerbaijan -- Iran's Islamic Revolution Guards Corps (IRGC) has built the country's first hypersonic wind tunnel for testing missiles and spacecraft, Iranian Tasnim news agency reported on March 5.

The device which operates at the speed of Mach 8 has been made by experts of the IRGC Imam Hussein University in Tehran.

A wind tunnel is a tool used in aerodynamic research to study the effects of air moving past solid objects. A wind tunnel consists of a closed tubular passage with the object under test mounted in the middle.

Full-scale aircraft or vehicles are sometimes tested in large wind tunnels. In addition to vehicles, wind tunnels are used to study the airflow around large structures such as bridges or office buildings.

Last year, IRGC Commander Major General Mohammad Ali Jafari announced that Iran has designed a hypersonic wind tunnel operating at the speed of Mach 8.

Iran's previous wind tunnels operated at the speed of lower than Mach 3 and the country had to send its missile abroad for testing.

The new hypersonic tunnel enables Iran to protect sensitive information of the indigenously-designed and built missiles and spacecraft as well as reducing expenses.

Iranian media outlets report that Iran has made great achievements in its defense sector and has attained self-sufficiency in producing essential military equipment and systems, in recent years. Tehran established an arms development program during the Iran-Iraq war in the 1980s to counter the weapons embargo imposed on it by the U.S. and its Western allies.

Since 1992, Iran has manufactured its own tanks, armored personnel carriers, missiles, radars, boats, submarines and fighter planes. Iran also unveiled its first domestically-manufactured long-range Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in 2010.

Tehran has repeatedly assured other nations that its military strength poses no threat to other countries since the Islamic Republic's defense doctrine is based entirely on deterrence.


The Jerusalem Post – Jerusalem, Israel

US Says 'Still Appropriate' to Pursue Nuclear Deal Despite Iran Arms Shipment

White House spokesman says talks to continue, but US "will continue to stand up to Iran's support for destabilizing activities in the region."

By JPOST.COM STAFF
06 March 2014
It is entirely appropriate to continue to pursue the possibility of reaching a resolution on the nuclear program, White House Spokesman Jay Carney told reporters on Wednesday, despite confirmation that Israel had intercepted a ship containing weapons heading from Tehran to Gaza.

Carney said that talks will go on, but acknowledged that there were struggles within the US to accept Tehran’s stance on many issues.

"We continue to have enormous issues with Iran, its sponsorship of terrorist organizations, its bad behavior in the region that manifests itself in many ways. And we continue to take all the necessary steps to address those challenges," he said.

"Even as we continue efforts to resolve our concerns over Iran’s nuclear program through diplomacy, we will continue to stand up to Iran’s support for destabilizing activities in the region, in coordination with our partners and allies, and made clear that these illicit actions are unacceptable to the international community and in gross violation of Iran’s UN Security Council obligations."

The spokesman also echoed the State Department’s comments, confirming that after becoming aware of the suspected vessel, the White House directed the Department of Defense to monitor the vessel and was prepared to take necessary steps.

"This is part of the robust presence that the president has directed that we continue to maintain in and around the Gulf," he said.

"Throughout this time, our intelligence and military activities were closely coordinated with our Israeli counterparts who ultimately chose to take the lead in interdicting the shipment of illicit arms."

US State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki confirmed on Wednesday that "the Israeli government interdicted a shipment of illicit Iranian arms," adding that the US was ready to act before Israel made its move.

"The White House directed the Department of Defense to monitor the vessel," Psaki said, adding that the US prepared to take "unilateral steps" to stop the shipment. Israel volunteered to handle the ship itself, she added.

The transfer of arms would amount to a violation of UN Security Council resolutions, Psaki noted.
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**Iran Says Nuclear Talks with Powers ‘Substantive and Useful’**

*The next round of political negotiations will take place later this month*

Reuters
March 7, 2014

Vienna/Akara: A senior Iranian official said on Friday that expert-level talks between Iran and six world powers on Tehran’s nuclear programme were “substantive and useful”.

The March 5-7 meeting at the United Nations complex in Vienna is to prepare for the next round of political negotiations on the issue later this month, also in the Austrian capital.

Seeking to build on an interim agreement reached late last year in Geneva, Iran and the major powers aim to hammer out a final settlement of the decade-old dispute over Tehran’s atomic activities by late July.

Both sides have made clear their political will to reach a long-term accord and have scheduled a series of meetings in coming months. But they also acknowledge that there are still big differences over the future scope of Iran’s nuclear programme and that success is far from guaranteed.
Officials said experts from Russia were taking part in this week’s meeting in Vienna, suggesting there was no immediate fallout on the nuclear negotiations from the crisis in Ukraine.

“The talks are very serious and substantive and useful,” the head of the Iranian delegation at the expert-level talks, senior Foreign Ministry official Hamid Baidinejad told Iran’s Fars News Agency.

Western officials want Iran to significantly scale back its uranium enrichment activities to ensure that it would be unable to build an atomic bomb quickly if it ever decided to do so.

Iran denies allegations that it is seeking the technical know-how and means to assemble nuclear weapons and says it will not shut any of its nuclear sites, which include the uranium enrichment plants at Natanz and Fordow and a planned heavy water reactor at Arak.

Iran wants Western and UN sanctions that are severely hurting its oil-dependent economy lifted, having won limited relief in exchange for curbing its most sensitive nuclear work under the six-month Geneva agreement, which took effect on January 20.

Uranium can be used to fuel a planned network of nuclear power plants, which is Iran’s stated goal, but also provide fuel for bombs if processed to a high fissile concentration, which the West fears may be Iran’s ultimate aim.

A senior diplomat from one of the big powers said there had been “no suggestion by anyone” that the crisis would impede discussions on Iran or other issues such as Syria where the US and Europe are trying to cooperate with Russia.

Chief negotiators from Iran and the powers — the US, France, Russia, Britain, Germany and China — are to begin their next round of negotiations on March 18 in Vienna.

The meeting is expected to last two to three days.
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**Pak set to Get Chinese Submarines amid Sub Crisis in India**

By Saibal Dasgupta, Tamil News Network (TNN)

March 1, 2014

BEIJING: India’s submarine crisis comes just around the time China has begun arming two other neighbors, Pakistan and Bangladesh, with submarines. China has also introduced new nuclear submarines that have caused a flutter in Washington.

Jane’s weekly quoting a senior Pakistani official says China is set to sell up to six submarines to Pakistan by end of 2014. China has also signed an agreement with Pakistan to sell two Type 035G Ming-class diesel-electric submarines to Bangladesh, reports from Dhaka said recently. The New Age newspaper said the deal was valued $206 million. China has promised to deliver the submarines to Bangladesh Navy by 2019.

"Technical details are almost done. The present discussions are mainly about the financing details," a senior Pakistan official told Jane’s. The journal said a second Pakistani government official confirmed that “the contract is at an advanced stage and discussions won’t linger on for too long. Realistically, we should have a deal by end 2014.”

Islamabad is expected to buy China's S20 or Yuan-class diesel-electric submarine (SSK). At present, the Pakistani Navy operates five French submarines; three Agosta 90B (Khalid-class) submarines purchased in the 1990s and two ageing Agosta 70 (Hashmat-class) boats dating from the late 1970s.
Pakistan’s ambitious defence planners are also pushing China for selling submarine-launched nuclear ballistic missiles. But western diplomats say China may be reluctant to hand over such sophisticated equipment fearing harsh reactions from Washington.

Another of India’s neighbours, Myanmar is using Chinese experts to train its submarine personnel. It also sent a contingent of navy personnel for submarine warfare training in Pakistan in mid-2013. Myanmar has announced plans to build its own fleet of submarines, and is expected to look towards Russia for supplies.
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**Test of Sub-Launched Missile Soon**

By Hemant Kumar Rout
02nd March 2014

BALASORE -- The DRDO is getting set to conduct a crucial trial of sub-marin launched ballistic missile (SLBM) B-05, earlier known as K-15, from an underwater platform off the Visakhapatnam coast soon. The test would pave the way for its first ever test from a nuclear powered submarine later this year.

A reliable source at the Chandipur test range told this paper that the nuke-capable missile is likely to be test-fired from a pontoon (replica of a submarine) nearly 20 metre under sea off the Vizag coast on March 10.

Though earlier it was scheduled to be test-fired from the indigenously built nuclear powered submarine INS Arihant, the latter is yet to be readied for live trials. Sea trials of the submarine have not been started yet even though it went critical on August 10 last year.

This submarine is a part of the country’s Advanced Technology Vessel (ATV) programme. India is the fifth country to have this technology after the US, Russia, France and China. It has to complete at least two to three trials before the deployment. Four more submarines of this class have been planned.

B-05 is the world’s best weapon in this class. Flying at hypersonic speed, the missile cannot be spotted until it is virtually upon the target. It engages in a series of terminal manoeuvres designed to defeat enemy missiles.

SLBM is a part of India’s ‘nuclear triad’ (air, ground and submarine-launched weapons) and invulnerable second-strike weapon as projected in the nuclear doctrine. The missile can be compared with the Tomahawk missile of the US.

DRDO scientists in presence of the Navy officials will conduct the test from a submerged pontoon as the Arihant submarine has not been fully ‘operational’. Radars, telemetry systems and other tracking equipment have been dispatched to various locations to track the missile properly.

The indigenously developed B-05 missile having a strike range of around 750 km is 10 metres in length and one metre in diameter. Its launch weight is about 10 tonnes.

http://www.newindianexpress.com/states/odisha/Test-of-Sub-Launched-Missile-Soon/2014/03/02/article2086077.ece

**Ukraine Crisis' Impact on Nuclear Weapons**

By Steven Pifer
Tuesday, March 4, 2014

Editor’s note: Steven Pifer, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, is a former U.S. ambassador to Ukraine and helped negotiate the Budapest Memorandum.

(CNN) -- Russia’s military occupation of Ukrainian territory on the Crimean peninsula constitutes a blatant violation of the commitments that Moscow undertook in the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances for Ukraine. The United States and United Kingdom, the other two signatories, now have an obligation to support Ukraine and penalize Russia.

When the Soviet Union collapsed in 1991, Ukraine found itself holding the world’s third largest nuclear arsenal, including some 1,900 strategic nuclear warheads that had been designed to attack the United States. Working in a trilateral dialogue with Ukrainian and Russian negotiators, American diplomats helped to broker a deal — the January 1994 Trilateral Statement — under which Ukraine agreed to transfer all of the strategic nuclear warheads to Russia for elimination and to dismantle all of the strategic delivery systems on its territory.

Kiev did this on the condition that it receive security guarantees or assurances. The Budapest Memorandum, signed on December 5, 1994, by the leaders of Ukraine, Russia, the United States and the United Kingdom (the latter three being the depositary states of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, that is, the states that receive the accession documents of other countries that join the treaty) laid out a set of assurances for Ukraine. These included commitments to respect Ukraine’s independence, sovereignty and existing borders; to refrain from the threat or use of force against Ukraine’s territorial integrity and independence; and to refrain from economic coercion against Ukraine.

The memorandum bundled together a set of assurances that Ukraine already held from the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) Final Act, United Nations Charter and Non-Proliferation Treaty. The Ukrainian government nevertheless found it politically valuable to have these assurances in a Ukraine-specific document.

Words matter, and a big question at the time arose over whether to use the term "guarantees" or "assurances" in the memorandum. The United States provides guarantees to allies, such as NATO member states; the term implies a military commitment. In the early 1990s, neither the George H. W. Bush administration nor the Clinton administration was prepared to extend a military commitment to Ukraine—and both felt that, even if they wanted to, the Senate would not produce the needed two-thirds vote for consent to ratification of such a treaty.

The Budapest Memorandum thus was negotiated as a political agreement. It refers to assurances, not defined, but less than a military guarantee. U.S. negotiators — myself among them — discussed this point in detail with Ukrainian counterparts so that there would be no misunderstanding.

What is taking place today in Crimea can only be described as a Russian military occupation. The Russian Black Sea Fleet and its associated units have had bases in Crimea since 1991, by agreement with Ukraine. But the agreement does not allow for the Russian military, which has poured thousands of additional troops onto the peninsula over the past several days, to take control of Crimea.

These Russian actions are in blatant violation of the Budapest Memorandum, as well as Russia’s commitments under the CSCE Final Act and a 1997 bilateral Ukraine-Russia treaty. As signatories, the United States and United Kingdom have an obligation to respond, even if they are not obligated to respond with military force.

Washington and London should act in two ways. First, they should work with other European Union member states to support Ukraine. That means political engagement, such as Secretary of State John Kerry’s visit today to Kiev. They should also assemble a financial package with the International Monetary Fund to extend credits to Ukraine. That can give the country some breathing room as it undertakes critical reforms to put its economic house in order.

Second, Washington and London should work with the European Union and others to impose political, diplomatic and economic sanctions on Moscow unless and until Russia ceases its violation of Ukraine’s sovereignty and
terrestrial integrity. This has begun. On Sunday, the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Italy, Canada and Japan announced they were suspending preparations to take part in the G8 summit to be hosted in June in Sochi by Russian President Vladimir Putin. Other steps have been taken, and still others are being planned.

The West should aim to impose significant costs on Russia that will lead Putin to rethink his actions. That likely will prove difficult, but there can be no business as usual with Moscow.

A strong response is important for settling Ukraine’s current crisis. It also matters for the cause of nuclear nonproliferation. Security assurances were key to bringing Kiev to agree to get rid of its nuclear arms. If Washington and London do not stand by the Budapest Memorandum now, it would discredit the idea of such assurances. That would be unfortunate, as security assurances could play a role in defusing nuclear proliferation cases, such as Iran.

http://www.cnn.com/2014/03/04/opinion/pifer-ukraine-budapest-memorandum/

OPINION/World Report

The Disarmament Fallacy
Eliminating all nuclear weapons is a fool’s errand.
By Peter Huessy
March 4, 2014

The campaign to reach “global zero” — the elimination of all nuclear weapons worldwide — has become a cause celebre among an array of retired statesmen, as well as an important policy priority of President Obama himself. But this effort is handicapped by its adoption of several seriously wrong-headed assumptions, positions and ideas that U.S. media outlets have tended to swallow without careful scrutiny.

The first and more egregious problem is the campaign’s radical proposal to eliminate the nearly 500 existing U.S. land-based missiles and their associated launch control facilities. Doing so would reduce American nuclear assets by upward of 98 percent. It would also give adversaries of the United States added incentive to try challenging American nuclear primacy.

Then there is the assumption that further nuclear reductions by the United States (even unilateral ones) will induce other aspiring or existing nuclear powers to do the same. However, the historical record supports no such conclusion. Since the Reagan administration, four successive arms control agreements — the INF treaty, START I, the Moscow treaty and New START — have reduced our nuclear arsenal by close to 90 percent. Yet, over that same period, China has multiplied its nuclear force, Pakistan and India have produced hundreds of nuclear weapons, North Korea has amassed a stockpile of roughly a dozen nuclear devices, while Iran continues to seek nuclear weapons (despite its protestations to the contrary). And the fond hope that our allies would help us push back on such proliferation has turned out to be more dream than reality.

There is no reason to believe, then, that further strategic cuts in Washington will precipitate the same in Beijing, Pyongyang or elsewhere. To the contrary, they are very likely to prompt the opposite.

Wrong, too, is the assumption, relied on by many, that because nuclear weapons did not deter the attacks of 9/11 they are not useful tools for protecting the United States in the security environment that has emerged thereafter. This reasoning contains a core fallacy. While our nuclear deterrent can stop conventional and other military conflicts from getting out of hand, it is not designed to stop all attacks, especially those of a surreptitious nature not tied to a nation state (like the attacks on New York and Washington perpetrated by al-Qaida). But that does not in the least invalidate the importance of possessing a robust nuclear arsenal when confronting strategic competitors like Russia and China and hostile states such as Iran and North Korea, which rely on their own strategic capabilities in times of warfare.
Most crucially, advocates of “global zero” assume that the security of our allies won’t be affected if the U.S. nuclear deterrent is significantly curtailed. In reality, as former Senate Majority Leader Robert Dole explained last year in a Capitol Hill speech, some 31 countries now depend upon our nuclear umbrella for their security. If that shield appears flimsy or dented, these states will seek their own nuclear weapons. In fact, recent debates in places like Japan and Saudi Arabia underscore that, absent a credible U.S. strategic guarantee — one backed up by a robust nuclear arsenal — emerging nuclear threats could well precipitate a run on the atom, with disastrous consequences for global security.

It stands to reason, then, that for all of its lofty goals “global zero” could very well exacerbate the very problems that it aims to curtail. A logical corollary is that America, in pursuit of the perceived security of fewer nuclear weapons, is actually making both itself and its allies a great deal less secure.

Peter Huessy is senior fellow for national security affairs at the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington, D.C.


Commentary: Misplaced Concerns about China's Military Spending

March 5, 2014

BEIJING, March 5 (Xinhua) -- The Chinese government on Wednesday revealed plans to raise its defense budget by 12.2 percent to 808.2 billion yuan (about 132 billion U.S. dollars) in 2014.

No sooner had the news gone public than some foreign officials and analysts jumped out to cast a false color on the rise of Chinese military spending and hype the "China threat" theory.

Japan's Chief Cabinet Secretary Yoshihide Suga, whose country has been a recidivous troublemaker in the region, picked up the musty tone of accusing China of lacking transparency on defense expenditures.

Rory Medcalf, an analyst at the Lowy Institute for International Policy in Sydney, was quoted by Reuters as describing the increase as "worrying news for China's neighbors, particularly for Japan."

Such "concerns" are unfounded and misplaced. First of all, it is a history-proven basic international norm that every country needs a military budget that can meet its defense needs.

For China, the size of the country and its roles as a key cornerstone of regional and global peace, as well as the largest personnel contributor to UN peace-keeping missions demand that its defense outlays be relatively high.

As a matter of fact, China's military expenses are still much lower than those of major foreign powers both in proportion to GDP and in per capita terms. Thus the latest uptick is nothing unusual.

What is of more fundamental importance is China's peace-oriented defense posture. Beijing has steadfastly committed itself to peaceful development and its defense policy is defensive in nature.

To portray China as a threat because of its relatively big military budget is as nonsensical as to depict it as a pillar of peace if it spends nothing at all on defense.

Furthermore, a militarily stronger China will be a more robust ballast of peace in a region where the security situation is increasingly complicated and volatile.

As a responsible, major stakeholder in regional peace and stability, China needs sufficient strength to prevent hot-headed players from misjudgment and thus forestall conflict and war, so as to maintain a favorable environment for the socioeconomic development of all in the neighborhood.
The real menaces to regional security are, among others, the mounting assertiveness of some South China Sea claimants emboldened by the United States' so-called re-balancing to the Asia-Pacific and the resurgence of Japanese radical nationalism.

It is those factors that sober minds should be concerned about, and it is Washington and Tokyo, instead of Beijing, that should explain to the world their military postures and intentions.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/special/2014-03/05/c_133163228.htm
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OPINION/Commentary
Peace Can Only Be Preserved by Strength: NPC
Xinhua, March 5, 2014
By Xinhua

A spokesperson for China's top legislature on Tuesday defended the country's defense policies, saying that peace can only be preserved through strength.

Responding to a question concerning China’s growing military power, Fu Ying, spokesperson for the second session of the 12th National People’s Congress (NPC), said China, as a major power, is responsible for regional peace and security.

But "based on our history and experience, we believe that peace can only be maintained by strength," she told a press conference.

China's military spending has long been cited as a cause for concern in Western countries.

"We have heard such concerns ... Indeed, certain countries have been selling the idea of China as a major threat," Fu told the press conference, "But we Chinese might ask, can a prosperous country such as China really achieve peace without strong national defense?"

The spokeswoman had made similar comments on various occasions. "It's not good news for the world that a country as large as China is unable to protect itself," earlier reports quoted Fu as saying last year.

At Tuesday's press conference, Fu said China, whose defense policy is entirely defensive in nature, has never treated any country as an enemy or a threat.

Cooperation is the main theme of China's relations with its neighboring countries, she said, adding that China has always advocated peaceful solutions to territorial and maritime disputes with other countries.

"For disputes which cannot be settled in the short term, we could always set them aside, or negotiate joint development plans," said Fu, who added that a country's military power should be viewed in terms of its future policy.

However, China will "respond effectively" to provocations by those ready to sabotage regional security and order "for the sake of China’s own territorial sovereignty, as well as for the protection of regional order and peace," she said.

Commenting on the US pivot to Asia, Fu said although the US had repeatedly stressed that it does not have a specific strategy to contain China and that it does not target China, "we still have to see whether its words match its deeds."

http://www.globaltimes.cn/content/846279.shtml#.Uxegdyyx5Dw
US Strategy in the Second Nuclear Age

*America’s nuclear triad shouldn’t be held sacrosanct just to please advocates in the U.S. Navy and Air Force.*

By James R. Holmes for The Diplomat

March 06, 2014

As submarines, bombers, and ballistic missiles age, and as the U.S. armed forces flourish the long knives over budgetary matters, the future of the nuclear triad has come under scrutiny. The Obama administration released a new Nuclear Posture Review in 2010 and revised its Nuclear Employment Strategy last June. Think-tank analyses abound. While vowing to seek additional cutbacks to the U.S. and Russian arsenals and reduce the part nuclear weapons play in U.S. national security strategy, the administration also affirms that it will retain the triad of nuclear-powered ballistic-missile submarines (SSBNs), manned bombers, and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).

Fixing its strategic gaze on Russia, however, risks anchoring Washington in the Cold War past. The triad aimed at deterring the Soviet Union, a peer opponent boasting a massive atomic arsenal. But the world has entered a second nuclear age typified less by deterrence between nuclear-armed alliances than by competition among states at very different places in their nuclear lives. Multiple nuclear trajectories translates into a more complex strategic setting. Concentrating exclusively on Russia distracts from a comprehensive survey of that setting, and potentially leaves U.S. nuclear strategy out of phase with changing times.

Making strategy, then, promises to be a more intricate enterprise in the second nuclear age than the first. Think about it. The United States and Russia remain the biggest nuclear-weapon states by a sizable margin, but their inventories are on the downslope owing to arms-control accords bearing names like START and New START. Washington intends to seek further reductions, further narrowing the Russian and American margins of supremacy over lesser nuclear powers. Great Britain and France, meanwhile, are struggling to remain nuclear-weapon states. Replacing the Royal Navy’s Trident SSBN force has proved such a pricey undertaking that the rest of the navy is shrinking to boutique proportions to pay for it.

So much for the nuclear old timers. China has embarked on a sweeping overhaul to its nuclear deterrent, for instance by putting to sea its first viable SSBN fleet — that is, its first invulnerable second-strike force. That makes Beijing a de facto newcomer to the nuclear-weapons club. India and Pakistan fielded modest arsenals after the 1998 nuclear tests. North Korea staged a small-scale nuclear breakout, while Iran entertains atomic aspirations — as yet unfulfilled — of its own. And so on. Variety rules.

It’s imperative, consequently, to think ahead about how nuclear old timers on the decline will make and execute strategy. Equally critical is to envision the strategies new entrants to the nuclear club — entrants with smaller, more vulnerable forces than those maintained by established powers — will deploy to safeguard their interests in a bareknuckles world. Coping with asymmetry and the new, shifting geometry of deterrence is the challenge before the U.S. military.

That imperative should shape the nation’s nuclear forces. Does America need all three legs of the triad to protect itself in the second nuclear age? Covert SSBNs remain the mainstay of deterrence vis-à-vis peer competitors. Is an undersea monad enough? Partisans of air power maintain that manned bombers can signal resolve in a crisis in a way SSBNs, which cruise the depths unseen, never can. This makes sense. Does the aerial component supply enough value in the second nuclear age to repay the investment? And what about ICBMs? The missile force looks like the most expendable leg of the triad. ICBMs duplicate the SSBN fleet’s second-strike capacity, except they’re more vulnerable to enemy counterstrikes. Nor are they particularly useful for telegraphing steadfastness.

Such matters are worth mulling over. The triad — which after all is nothing more than a set of policy implements — shouldn’t be held sacrosanct just to please advocates in the U.S. Navy and Air Force. If all three legs are critical in the second nuclear age, let’s keep them. If not, let’s dispose of excess capacity. Assembling the right toolkit is the trick to executing strategy in all ages. So is discarding worn-out tools.
False Alarms on Iranian ICBMs

By Travis C. Stalcup
March 06, 2014

The Pentagon’s announcement last month of the proposed expansion of its missile defense shield is evidence that the hype over the Iranian threat continues to spread unabated.

According to Sen. Kelly Ayotte, a New Hampshire Republican, the impetus for the five-year project is Iran’s development of intercontinental missiles, which may reach operational capability as early as next year. The International Institute for Strategic Studies, a British think tank known for its staid analysis of military developments around the world, disagrees. Decrying alarmism over the alleged Iranian threat, IISS argues that such capability will not exist for some time, if ever. The argument over when and if Iran can hold American cities at risk misses the point. Even if Tehran acquired nuclear weapons, the United States already has the posture and capabilities sufficient to safeguard its territory.

Since the Soviet Union achieved ICBM capability in the mid-1950s, the United States has proven remarkably capable of deterring nuclear attacks on its territory and possessions. At its peak in the mid-1980s, the Soviet nuclear arsenal numbered somewhere around 40,000 warheads. Addressing Western diplomats, Soviet premier Nikita Khrushchev famously declared: “We will bury you!” With so much destructive power aimed at New York and Chicago as well as Omaha, Colorado Springs, and elsewhere, Americans were right to be nervous about their future. Despite this anxiety, the concept of deterrence held against an arguably more capable and advanced adversary. After decades of mutually assured destruction, what have we to fear from a country that may, at some point in the distant future, have a questionable capability to attack some place in the United States?

It is true that Iran is developing ballistic missiles with a range of up to 6,000 kilometers, capable of holding parts of the American homeland at risk. However, according to the Center for Nonproliferation Studies, such capability is still only theoretical because as scientist David Wright points out, building ICBMs is tricky. In fact, it is unlikely that Iran would be capable of fielding an ICBM until 2020 at the earliest and even then its missiles would be “too large and cumbersome to be placed on a mobile platform.”

That immobility is a problem. Without the ability to shift or conceal nuclear assets in a crisis, Iran’s arsenal would be sitting ducks for a conventional or nuclear attack and thus more prone to protect their weapons with a first strike. The principle of second strike survivability is an article of faith in deterrence circles and without it a country’s nuclear stockpiles provide tempting targets. This fact brings to light what the debate over Iran’s nuclear weapon and ballistic missile program has missed: so what? Even if Iran were to acquire nuclear warheads and the means of delivering them – an assumption that overlooks the challenge of balancing missile throw weight, achieving miniaturization, and incorporating systems for a reasonable error probability – the United States possesses a range of nuclear options sufficient to deter a strike on the homeland.

When it comes to deterring small arsenals from regional adversaries, the old admonition against re-inventing the wheel still applies: deterrence works. The American nuclear arsenal can hold the Iranian regime at risk and thus, deter attacks on the continental United States and Middle Eastern allies. The same holds true for North Korea and American allies in the Pacific. Missile defense, which is an attempt to nullify an adversary’s capability to hold American targets hostage, weakens deterrence by opening windows of opportunity – or at least the perception of
such – for a disarming first strike. To restore strategic stability, Iran would intensify warhead and missile production in hopes of overwhelming interceptors. In its terrifying logic, mutual vulnerability maximizes safety.

The real fear of a nuclear-armed Iran is not a bolt-from-the-blue attack on the East Coast but rather the immunity such weapons impart against American coercion. Iran is indeed dangerous and its continued pursuit of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile technology is troubling, but such circumstances do not pose an impossible problem. In fact, American policymakers have been here before and would do well to take their cue from Khrushchev: “Tehran, attack us or our allies and we will bury you.”

Stalcup is a Center for Strategic and International Studies Nuclear Scholars Initiative fellow and a defense policy analyst in Arlington, VA. His work has appeared in The New York Times, the Honolulu Star-Advertiser, the Dallas Morning News, and The Diplomat current affairs web magazine.


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 School, 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.