



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Commanders: Budget Cuts could Erode Nuke Arsenal](#)

1. [Iran Rejects Reports about Sending Message to US for Direct Talks](#)
2. [Ahmadinejad: Iran to Have some 17,000 Centrifuges](#)
3. [Iran's Rouhani to Nominate Forouzandeh as Chief Nuclear Negotiator: ISNA](#)
4. [Iran Seen Capable of Processing Weapons-Grade Uranium Next Year](#)
5. [UN Inspectors to Investigate Three Syrian Chemical Weapons Sites](#)
6. [Iran's Rohani Inherits Narrow Window to Avert Nuclear Showdown](#)
7. [North Korea Heralds Anniversary of War 'Victory' with Massive Parade](#)
8. [Backpack Bombers a Propaganda Tale](#)
9. [North Korea Prepared to Resume Talks with US and South Korea](#)
10. [China's Military Preparing for 'People's War' in Cyberspace, Space](#)
11. [USFK Chief Nominee Says OPCON Transfer Needed in 2015](#)
12. [More N. Korean Long-Range Rocket Launches Expected 'Soon'](#)
13. [China Reveals New Short-Range Missile](#)
14. [N-Powered Sub Arihant all set to Sail Out from Vizag](#)
15. [Putin Warns of Warship Building Delays](#)
16. [Conf of Young Russian Nuclear Researchers to Begin near Nizhny Novrogod](#)
17. [Russia Set to Create National Defense Center](#)
18. [U.S. Shows Nuclear Facilities to Reassure Japan, Allies on Deterrence](#)
19. [Armed Services Panel Forwards Cecil Haney's Nomination as StratCom Commander](#)
20. [Commanders: Budget Cuts could Erode Nuke Arsenal](#)
21. [Chambers Split on East Coast Missile Defense Site](#)
22. [STRATCOM Chief: More Missile Defense Tests Necessary](#)
23. [Pentagon Downplays Prospects of Cancelling F-35, Bomber](#)
24. [NNSA Defends B-61 Update Amid Possible New Price Hikes](#)
25. [Senate Confirms Adm. Cecil Haney as New StratCom Commander](#)
26. [John Prescott: It's Time to Sink Trident Now](#)
27. [How US, Russia Can Agree on Missile Defense](#)
28. [India's First Ballistic Missile Sub to Begin Sea Trials](#)
29. [What Went Wrong with Arms Control?](#)
30. [The Folly of Nuclear Disarmament](#)
31. [The INF Treaty and Regional Missile Threats](#)
32. [Snowden Asylum Could Blow Up Nuke Talks](#)

Welcome to the CPC Outreach Journal. As part of USAF Counterproliferation Center's mission to counter weapons of mass destruction through education and research, we're providing our government and civilian community a source for timely counterproliferation information. This information includes articles, papers and other documents addressing issues pertinent to US military response options for dealing with chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear (CBRN) threats and countermeasures. It's our hope this information resource will help enhance your counterproliferation issue awareness.

Established in 1998, the USAF/CPC provides education and research to present and future leaders of the Air Force, as well as to members of other branches of the armed services and Department of Defense. Our purpose is to help those agencies better prepare to counter the threat from weapons of mass destruction. Please feel free to visit our web site at <http://cpc.au.af.mil/> for in-depth information and specific points of contact. The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.

Issue No.1068, 02 August 2013

The following articles, papers or documents do not necessarily reflect official endorsement of the United States Air Force, Department of Defense, or other US government agencies. Reproduction for private use or commercial gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. All rights are reserved.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Press TV – Iran

Iran Rejects Reports about Sending Message to US for Direct Talks

Sunday, July 28, 2013

Iranian Foreign Ministry Spokesman Abbas Araqchi has rejected reports that Iran has sent a message to the US expressing its interest in engaging directly with Washington over the Islamic Republic's nuclear energy program.

"The Islamic Republic of Iran has not requested direct talks with the US," Araqchi said on Saturday.

The *New York Times* reported on July 26 that Iraqi Prime Minister Nouri al-Maliki had told US President Barack Obama's administration officials this month that Iran favored direct talks with the United States on its nuclear energy program.

The US daily's report claimed that al-Maliki had told the US ambassador in Baghdad in an early July meeting that he was relaying a message from Iranian officials and that Iran's President-elect Hassan Rohani would be serious about any discussions with the United States.

The US, Israel, and some of their allies have repeatedly charged that Iran may intend to acquire nuclear-weapons capability in the future.

Tehran has categorically rejected the accusation, arguing that as a signatory to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and a member of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), it is entitled to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.

Araqchi advised the US media to avoid creating tensions and media hype by publishing false reports ahead of the inauguration of Rohani.

Rohani's swearing-in is scheduled to be held on August 4, one day after his endorsement by Leader of the Islamic Revolution Ayatollah Seyyed Ali Khamenei.

Rohani, who won 50.7 percent of the June 14 presidential election in Iran to secure an outright victory, served as Iran's chief nuclear negotiator from October 2003 to August 2005.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/07/28/315954/no-message-sent-to-us-on-talks-iran/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Trend News Agency – Azerbaijan

Ahmadinejad: Iran to Have some 17,000 Centrifuges

Umid, S. Isayev

29 July 2013

Azerbaijan, Baku, July 29 -- Iran has some 12,000 active centrifuges, country's president Mahmoud Ahmadinejad said in a live interview with Iran's IRIB1 TV.

"We have nuclear technology. Aside from 12,000 active centrifuges, there are 5,000 more ready for inauguration," Ahmadinejad noted.

In June 2013, the International Atomic Energy Agency's director Yukiya Amano said Iran was violating the resolutions by increasing the number of centrifuges and volume of enriched uranium.

On Feb. 14, Iran announced that it has installed new, 5th generation centrifuges at Natanz nuclear research facility. Earlier, on Feb. 6 Iran announced that the country has successfully manufactured a tubular centrifuge, because of the imposed sanctions and restrictions.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Iran says it refines uranium to power a planned network of nuclear power stations. But the West fears that the material, if enriched much further to 90 percent, could be used for weapons. Iran says its nuclear program has only peaceful goals.

Ahmadinejad noted that Iran possesses the nuclear fuel cycle technology, however when the country announced it, it was "accused of bluffing".

Speaking elsewhere, Ahmadinejad noted that Iran has achieved laser technology, and is able to export this technology. He did not reveal any details regarding this.

Further on, he said that currently there are about 15 million cars in the world that run on gas, and 5 million of those cars are in Iran.

<http://en.trend.az/regions/iran/2174884.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Global Post – Boston, MA

Iran's Rouhani to Nominate Forouzandeh as Chief Nuclear Negotiator: ISNA

Reuters

July 29, 2013

DUBAI (Reuters) - Iranian President-elect Hassan Rouhani is to nominate Mohammad Forouzandeh as head of the Supreme National Security Council, a position which would automatically make him Iran's chief nuclear negotiator, Iran's ISNA news agency said on Monday, quoting sources inside Rouhani's office.

Forouzandeh is a former Revolutionary Guard and a current member of the Supreme National Security Council and head of a large and economically powerful state charitable foundation. There was no official confirmation of the report.

Reporting by Marcus George; Writing by Jon Hemming; Editing by Mark Trevelyan.

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/thomson-reuters/130729/irans-rouhani-nominate-forouzandeh-chief-nuclear-negotiator-isn>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Bloomberg Businessweek

Iran Seen Capable of Processing Weapons-Grade Uranium Next Year

By Terry Atlas

July 30, 2013

Iran may achieve the "critical capability" to process low-enriched uranium into material for a nuclear weapon without detection by international inspectors by mid-2014, according to a report by a research group.

Iran would reach this capability by acting on plans to install thousands of additional enrichment centrifuges at its Natanz and Fordow sites, according to David Albright, a former nuclear inspector, and Christina Walrond of the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security.

Preventing Iran from achieving the capability to break out from nuclear safeguards will require international efforts to limit the number and type of centrifuges built by the nation, according to the report issued yesterday.

"Although increasing the frequency and type of inspections at the enrichment plants is important, it is by no means sufficient to prevent Iran from achieving critical capability," according to the analysts.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

President Barack Obama has said the U.S. will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. America and other world powers are seeking an initial agreement halting Iran's production of 20 percent enriched uranium -- one processing step short of weapons-grade -- and removing the stockpile of such medium-enriched uranium so that it can't be diverted for weapons.

Enrichment Focus

The institute's report focuses instead on Iran's production of low-enriched uranium, usable as reactor fuel for power generators, which may be further enriched to bomb grade given time and sufficient centrifuges. Albright and Walrond cited scenarios in which current safeguard measures would be insufficient to detect quickly an Iranian decision to divert enough low-enriched uranium to make weapons-grade material for one or more nuclear weapons.

"Breakout times at critical capability would be so short that there simply would not be enough time to organize an international diplomatic or military response," the analysts said.

Iran's leaders have said its nuclear program is for civilian purposes. U.S. intelligence agencies have assessed that Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei hasn't made a decision to produce a bomb, though the nation is developing its capability to do so.

Enrichment facilities in Fordow, near the holy city of Qom, and Natanz, 130 miles southeast of Tehran, are run by Iran and monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Iran says the 20 percent enriched uranium, which has been of the most immediate global concern, is being processed to provide fuel for a research reactor used to produce medical isotopes.

The institute's report says monitoring alone isn't enough and that international negotiations should press for a halt to installation of additional centrifuges and set a cap on the total number and capabilities of those production devices.

The report also raises the possibility that Iran may be building another enrichment facility that it hasn't declared to international monitors and that would provide an alternative route to a breakout nuclear-weapons capability.

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-07-30/iran-may-achieve-nuclear-breakout-capability-by-middle-of-2014>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Australian – Australia

UN Inspectors to Investigate Three Syrian Chemical Weapons Sites

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

August 01, 2013

UN inspectors will go to Syria soon to investigate three sites where chemical weapons attacks have been reported, the United Nations has said.

President Bashar al-Assad's government had blocked the inspectors since calling for a UN inquiry into the use of the banned arms in March.

"The mission will travel to Syria as soon as possible to contemporaneously investigate three of the reported incidents," said UN spokesman Martin Nesirky.

The announcement followed an accord reached with the Syrian government when two UN envoys went to Damascus last week.

The inspectors, who are led by Swedish expert Ake Sellstrom, are being assembled in Europe and could go to Syria as soon as next week, diplomats said.

The announcement that inspectors will get into Syria is seen as a major breakthrough in one of the most frightening aspects of the 28-month-old war.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



The United Nations says reports on 13 different chemical attacks have been made. Syria, Britain, France, Russia and the United States have all handed over evidence to Mr Sellstrom's team.

But experts say most of the reported attacks are now months old and there is a risk that evidence has been cleared up or has degraded.

Khan al-Assal, which is one of three sites on the initial investigation list, is now the scene of major fighting between government and rebel forces.

Syria has hundreds of tonnes of various chemical arms, according to experts, and has never joined international conventions banning their use.

The major powers all agree that chemical weapons have been used in the conflict. Russia sides with its government ally in blaming the opposition. Western nations say all the evidence points to Mr Assad's forces using the arms in "limited" quantities.

While the initial inquiry will focus on three sites, Mr Nesirky said UN leader Ban Ki-moon "remains mindful of other reported incidents and the mission will also continue to seek clarification from the member states concerned."

The spokesman said the first sites on the UN list includes Khan al-Assal, near Aleppo, where the government reported a chemical weapons attack on March 19. It said at least 26 people, including 16 soldiers, were killed.

Mr Assad's government and Russia blame Syrian rebels for the attack. The Syrian opposition says Mr Assad's forces carried it out.

The other two sites on the initial list are Ataybah near Damascus, where a suspected attack was staged in March, and Homs, where chemical weapons are alleged to have been used on December 23, diplomats said.

Britain and France have submitted evidence smuggled out of Syria to the United Nations on the Ataybah and Homs attacks, which they say were carried out by the government.

The Syrian government called for the UN inquiry in March. But it then blocked the UN inspectors, insisting that they be limited to Khan al-Assal. Ban had demanded "unfettered" access for the investigation.

Mr Sellstrom and UN High Representative for Disarmament Affairs Angela Kane went to Damascus last week to negotiate the access accord.

Paul Walker, director of environmental security at Green Cross International, an international lobbying group, said: "It is a big step forward just to get the inspectors into Syria at all."

"Without on-site inspections there are just estimates and wide speculation and no final proof," Mr Walker, who has monitored Syria's chemical weapons program for several years, told AFP.

He added however that the chemical residue degrades very quickly and there is a danger the attack sites have been sanitised.

"The actual on-site evidence is probably cleaned up if there was good evidence to begin with. But it will likely give the inspectors access to autopsy reports and also living victims' firsthand accounts and that could very well be helpful," he said.

Mr Walker said Syria is believed to have up to 1000 tonnes of chemical arms in at least a dozen stockpiles around the country.

"We assume that they are pretty secure - there have been no reports of any weapons stolen, no reports of any rebel groups having taken over a weapons depot," he said.

He said the reported protection of the weapons has led to Western skepticism that rebel forces had used any chemical agents in the war.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/in-depth/middle-east-in-turmoil/un-inspectors-to-investigate-three-syrian-chemical-weapons-sites/story-fn7ycml4-1226689314802>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Bloomberg Businessweek

Iran's Rohani Inherits Narrow Window to Avert Nuclear Showdown

By Terry Atlas, Bloomberg News

August 01, 2013

The inauguration of Iran's President Hassan Rohani in two days restarts the countdown toward a confrontation over the Islamic Republic's nuclear program as it approaches Israel's "red line" for military action.

After a decade of fruitless negotiations and tightening economic sanctions, the next 12 months may make or break the international effort to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Such weapons would pose an existential threat to Israel, endanger the U.S. and Europe, and trigger a nuclear arms race in the Persian Gulf region.

Rohani, who takes office Aug. 4 and was considered a relative moderate among the candidates permitted to run by the country's Guardian Council, has spurred hopes in some quarters that Iran may be willing to curb its nuclear efforts. That view isn't shared by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who calls Rohani a "wolf in sheep's clothing," and Iran's nuclear advances are narrowing the window of time to avoid a conflict.

"There is a 75 percent to 80 percent chance that issue will have come to a head" by this time next year, said John McLaughlin, a former deputy director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

As negotiations stalled during the wait for the election to choose President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad's successor, Iran increased its stockpile of medium-enriched uranium and added centrifuges capable of shortening the "breakout" time to produce enough highly enriched fuel for a nuclear device.

The country could have a nuclear weapon within a year if Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei chooses to do so, according to former U.S. Marine General James Mattis, who retired in March as commander of the U.S. Central Command.

Mideast Challenges

Iran joins Syria and Egypt on a mushrooming list of Mideast challenges for President Barack Obama. During a March visit to Israel, he said the U.S. "will do what is necessary" to keep Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Netanyahu has renewed his warnings of Israeli military action amid Iran's nuclear advances and talk in the West of Rohani's moderation.

"I'm convinced that last year Prime Minister Netanyahu wanted to attack Iran and was looking for some kind of green light, or at least a yellow light from Washington -- and he didn't get it," said Gary Samore, who at the time was White House coordinator for arms control and weapons of mass destruction, proliferation and terrorism.

Obama has said there's still time for talks and assured Netanyahu -- as well as declaring publicly -- that "all options are on the table" to thwart Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Agreement Sought

By pressuring Iran with sanctions, the U.S. and other world powers are seeking an initial agreement that halts its production of 20 percent enriched uranium -- a step short of weapons grade -- and removes its stockpile of medium-enriched uranium so it can't be diverted for weapons.

Iran says its enrichment program is intended solely for electric power generation and medical research. Netanyahu in June said Iran needs to stop all uranium enrichment activities so that the Islamic Republic won't get nuclear weapons.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



The negotiating window will shut if Iran moves to avoid International Atomic Energy Agency monitoring, such as kicking out global inspectors. In that case, "I think it would be impossible to hold back the Israelis," Samore told a security conference in Aspen, Colorado, last month. "In fact, it would probably be impossible to hold back the United States."

U.S. intelligence agencies have assessed that Khamenei, who has ultimate authority over the nuclear program, hasn't decided to produce a weapon, though Iran is developing the ability to do so quickly.

Three Paths

The situation is complicated because Iran is advancing along three paths, each with weapons implications.

One is the production of 20 percent enriched uranium, which is the initial focus of Western concerns because it can quickly be purified to weapons grade. Netanyahu's "red line" for a military strike is tied to the amount of medium-enriched uranium needed for a warhead, about 240 kilograms (529 pounds).

In May, the Vienna-based IAEA reported that Iran's stockpile totaled 182 kilograms (401 pounds), up from 167 kilograms (368 pounds) three months earlier, after removing some for use in a reactor making medical isotopes. At that rate, Iran by mid-2014 would have enough to make one weapon, an amount the U.S. says is far more than needed to fuel its one existing medical research reactor and four others being planned.

Iran's second effort involves thousands of new centrifuges at facilities at Natanz, 209 kilometers (130 miles) southeast of Tehran, and Fordow, near the holy city Qom, that cut the time needed to convert power-reactor grade uranium to weapons material. Iran has 5,000 centrifuges ready to join 12,000 in operation, Ahmadinejad said July 28, according to the state-run Mehr news agency.

Elude Safeguards

The growing number of centrifuges will give Iran the ability by mid-2014 to dash to a bomb while evading IAEA safeguards, according to a report this week by David Albright and Christina Walrond of the Washington-based Institute for Science and International Security. With enough centrifuges, "there simply would not be enough time to organize an international diplomatic or military response," according to Albright, a former nuclear inspector, and Walrond, who urge talks on capping the number of Iranian centrifuges.

Iran's third path is a heavy-water reactor at Arak, 241 kilometers (150 miles) south of Tehran, that's to enter operation in mid-2014 to produce isotopes for medical and agricultural use, officials say. This type of reactor could yield about 10 kilograms (22 pounds) of plutonium a year -- enough for about two nuclear weapons -- if the weapons-grade material is separated from irradiated fuel, according to ISIS.

Iraq Attack

Israel in 1981 bombed a similar facility that was nearing completion in Iraq, and in 2007 it destroyed what allegedly was a similar heavy-water reactor secretly being built in Syria with North Korean assistance. Any attack on Arak would have to come in the next six to nine months -- before fuel is loaded -- to avoid spreading radioactive material.

To stop Iran's programs, the U.S. has led an international effort to impose an array of sanctions that have hit Iran's economy by sharply reducing Iran's oil revenue, trade and international financial transactions.

In December, Economy Minister Shamseddin Hosseini said oil revenue had dropped 50 percent due to sanctions, according to the Tehran-based Khabar Online website. The national currency, the rial, lost more than half its value in the past year before Rohani's June 14 election, and the International Monetary Fund forecasts a decline in gross domestic product of 1.3 percent this year, following a 1.9 percent contraction in 2012.

New Talks

Rohani, 64, who was Iran's chief nuclear negotiator from 2003 to 2005, owes his election in part to public discontent over economic conditions, and he won't be able to improve conditions without sanctions relief.



The six world powers negotiating with Iran -- the U.S., U.K., France, Russia, China and Germany -- are prepared for new talks and think Rohani's election may provide an opportunity for progress, a Western diplomat told reporters in Brussels on July 19, speaking on condition of anonymity.

"The atmospherics and the mood have really changed," Ray Takeyh, a Mideast analyst at the Council on Foreign Relations in Washington, said in a phone interview. "Given that change of atmosphere, I suspect that the prospects of confrontation, which I always thought were low, are likely to be even lower."

That may depend on what Rohani does in the next few months. An initial test will be Iran's response to the outstanding proposal from the Western nations, which call themselves the P5+1 because all but Germany are permanent members of the United Nations Security Council.

Western Proposal

They've offered to ease trade sanctions on petrochemicals, precious metals and civilian aircraft parts and to provide technical cooperation on nuclear energy if Iran halts production of 20 percent-enriched uranium and ships much of its stockpile out of the country, according to diplomats involved.

That would only be a first step, and wouldn't give Iran relief from the main sanctions on the oil and financial sectors.

"The Iranians will be in for some sticker shock," Samore said. "They're going to have to pay a very high price in terms of limiting their nuclear program."

Kenneth Katzman, a Mideast analyst at the Congressional Research Service, said he doesn't expect the U.S. to alter its negotiating strategy following Rohani's election.

"There's a very deep hesitancy in the United States to make any advance concessions to Iran until the U.S. sees what Rohani wants to do and what he can do," said Katzman, speaking at the Heritage Foundation, a Washington policy group.

Samore said an early test of whether Rohani can take a different path is whether Iran accepts Obama's longstanding offer of a bilateral channel for talks. He called the P5+1 negotiations a relatively ineffective route toward a deal.

"I've sat through those meetings, and it's really kind of staged event," he said. To hammer out an agreement, he said, "you really have to get the two critical parties -- the U.S. and Iran -- in a room together and do some give and take."

<http://www.businessweek.com/news/2013-08-01/iran-s-rohani-inherits-narrow-window-to-avert-nuclear-showdown#p1>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

North Korea Heralds Anniversary of War 'Victory' with Massive Parade

July 27, 2013

Reuters

PYONGYANG--North Korea celebrated the 60th anniversary of the Korean War truce on July 27 with a massive military parade trumpeting the revolutionary genius of three generations of leaders that gave it "Victory in the Great Fatherland Liberation War."

Leader Kim Jong Un was joined by Chinese Vice President Li Yuanchao on the podium overlooking Pyongyang's main Kim Il Sung square to inspect a massive throng of soldiers in goosestep and a display of weapons including its mid-range missiles.

Kim clad in black exchanged words with Li through an interpreter but did not make public remarks at the parade, which appeared to be one of the largest ever put on by the North.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Choe Ryong Hae, Kim's main military aide and the chief political operative of the North's 1.2-million-strong army, said the reclusive state sees peace as a top national priority and its military was aimed at safeguarding North Korea from invasion.

"Reality shows if peace is sought, there must be preparations for war," Choe said in a speech. "For us with our utmost task of building an economy and improving the lives of the people, a peaceful environment is greater than ever."

The remarks were moderate in tone without the bellicose rhetoric that routinely fills the North's public commentary, and Choe did not mention the country's nuclear arms program or name the United States as its chief enemy.

Kim and Li, along with the North's top military officials and the youthful leader's uncle Jang Song Thaek, seen as North Korea's second most powerful man, watched as a missile arsenal paraded past, including the newly developed mid-range Musudan.

Fighter jets and large military helicopters flew over the square packed with tens of thousands of soldiers, North Korean and foreign veterans of the Korean War and diplomats.

On July 25, Kim met Li in what was the highest-level talks between the two countries after their ties seemed to fray following Pyongyang's missile and nuclear tests in the past year, that led to tougher U.N. sanctions backed by Beijing.

Li told Kim that Beijing will push for talks on removing nuclear weapons from the Korean peninsula, according to China's Foreign Ministry.

China's official Xinhua news agency, in a commentary on July 27, said the time was right to for all sides to seek a permanent end to the state of hostilities on the peninsula, but added North Korea had to live up to its responsibilities.

"For Pyongyang's part, its security concerns are understandable and should be addressed properly, but violating U.N. Security Council resolutions is not helpful. It has to keep its end of the bargain," Xinhua said.

In the South Korean capital Seoul, veterans of some of the 16 countries that fought under the United Nations command during the Korean War marked the truce at a more intimate event.

"For the past sixty years, an uncertain peace that can be broken at any moment has been maintained," South Korean President Park Geun-hye said. "The war has been suspended and we are in the midst of the longest truce."

In 1950 the United States rallied the United Nations to send troops to counter the North's invasion of the South, which was backed by Soviet forces. The allies nearly destroyed Kim Il Sung's army when China intervened.

On July 27, 1953, the commanders of North Korea, China and the United States signed the armistice, setting up a 240 km (150 mile) border across the peninsula that is the world's most heavily guarded frontier.

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/asia/korean_peninsula/AJ201307270050

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Daily NK – Seoul, South Korea

Backpack Bombers a Propaganda Tale

By Lee Sang Yong
July 29, 2013

A unit of North Korean soldiers carrying what appeared to be representations of "nuclear backpacks" (a variation on the "briefcase bomb" concept) appeared during a military parade held on Saturday as part of North Korea's commemoration of its "victory" in the Korean War.

However, it is thought unlikely that North Korea has the technical capacity to produce such a high-tech nuclear device.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

A spokesperson for the South Korean Ministry of National Defense, Kim Min Seok told a regular briefing on the morning of the 29th, "Nuclear backpacks are an extremely small type of nuclear weapon; you need very advanced skills in order to miniaturize like that," before noting, "Experts do not believe that North Korea has reached the ability to manufacture these backpacks."

The military parade, held on the morning of the 27th in Kim Il Sung Square, saw the appearance of a unit wearing backpacks marked with a radioactive warning symbol (see picture). Experts see this as North Korea publicizing the claimed ability to miniaturize nuclear weapons, but they doubt the veracity of the claim.

In 2011, Daily NK reported that the Chosun People's Army had established a "backpack bomb unit" under the 8th Corps in North Pyongan Province. The unit, which is brigade-level, is said to operate under the auspices of a logging camp. However, there is no evidence that the unit is equipped with functioning weaponry even if it exists.

<http://www.dailynk.com/english/read.php?cataId=nk00100&num=10788>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Russia

29 July 2013

North Korea Prepared to Resume Talks with US and South Korea

PYONGYANG, July 29 (Itar-Tass) - North Korea is prepared to resume talks with the United States and South Korea, Head of Institute of the Far East of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Academician Mikhail Titarenko told Itar-Tass on Monday. He was participating in a conference organized in Pyongyang by the Institute of International Relations and the Institute of Peace and Disarmament under North Korean Foreign Ministry.

"Participants of the conference noted that if the United States stops its hostile policy towards North Korea, Pyongyang will agree to discuss the creation of a nuclear-free zone on the Korean Peninsula," the Russian academician said. In his words, North Korea has put forth several important initiatives, including meetings at high level, but the U.S. and South Korea "left these initiatives unanswered." North Korean security experts believe that the U.S. "is fanning up tensions deliberately on the peninsula to keep its military presence in Japan and South Korea," Mikhail Titarenko said. "North Korea finds the nuclear weapons as a force of deterrence and a guarantee of independent development under the conditions when the U.S. does not want to recognize that country," he said.

As for South Korea, North Korean security experts say that inter-Korean relations "dropped to their lowest level" during Lee Myung-bak's presidency. Incumbent South Korean President Park Geun-hye, according to the experts, "calls just in words for the normalization of the relations between South Korea and North Korea, but in fact she continues Lee Myun-bak's political course," Titarenko noted. However, he noted that North Korea, judging by the debates, also intends to take steps for the invigoration of the situation on the Korean Peninsula in the future.

The conference also discussed the problems of East Asia, including "the measures to improve the situation on the Korean Peninsula." North Korean representatives said the country is interested in the creation of a nuclear-free zone on the peninsula. North Korean Eternal President Kim Il Sung has voiced this idea for the first time, Titarenko recalled.

<http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c32/822849.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Washington Free Beacon

China's Military Preparing for 'People's War' in Cyberspace, Space

Translated report reveals high-tech plans for cyber attacks, anti-satellite strikes

By Bill Gertz

July 30, 2013

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



China's military is preparing for war in cyberspace involving space attacks on satellites and the use of both military and civilian personnel for a digital "people's war," according to an internal Chinese defense report.

"As cyber technology continues to develop, cyber warfare has quietly begun," the report concludes, noting that the ability to wage cyber war in space is vital for China's military modernization.

According to the report, strategic warfare in the past was built on nuclear weapons. "But strategic warfare in the information age is cyber warfare," the report said.

"With the reliance of information warfare on space, cyberspace will surely become a hot spot in the struggle for cyberspace control," the report said.

The new details of Chinese plans for cyber and space warfare were revealed in a report "Study on Space Cyber Warfare" by four engineers working at a Chinese defense research center in Shanghai.

The report presents a rare inside look of one of Beijing's most secret military programs: Cyber warfare plans against the United States in a future conflict.

"Cyber warfare is not limited to military personnel. All personnel with special knowledge and skills on information system may participate in the execution of cyber warfare. Cyber warfare may truly be called a people's warfare," the report says.

People's War was first developed by China's Communist founder Mao Zedong as a Marxist-Leninist insurgency and guerrilla warfare concept. The article provides evidence that Chinese military theorists are adapting Mao's peasant uprising stratagem for a future conflict with the United States.

A defense official said the report was recently circulated in military and intelligence circles. Its publication came as a surprise to many in the Pentagon because in the past, U.S. translations of Chinese military documents on similar warfighting capabilities were not translated under a directive from policy officials seeking to prevent disclosure of Chinese military writings the officials feared could upset U.S.-China relations.

A Chinese government spokesman could not be reached for comment. However, Chinese spokesmen in the past have denied reports that China engages in cyber attacks.

The study links China's space warfare development programs with its extensive cyber warfare capabilities. Both programs are considered "trump card" weapons that would allow a weaker China to defeat a militarily stronger United States in a conflict.

"Cyber warfare is an act of war that utilizes space technology; it combines space technology and cyber technology and maintains and seizes the control of cyberspace," the study says.

Because cyberspace relies on satellites, "space will surely be the main battlefield of cyber warfare," the report said.

Satellites and space vehicles are considered the "outer nodes" of cyber space and "are clear targets for attack and may be approached directly," the report said, adding that ground-based cyberspace nodes are more concealed and thus more difficult to attack.

Additionally, satellites have limited defenses and anti-jamming capabilities, leaving them very vulnerable to attack.

The report reveals that China's military, which controls the country's rapidly growing space program, is preparing to conduct space-based cyber warfare—"cyber reconnaissance, jamming, and attack"—from space vehicles.

Space-based cyber warfare will include three categories: space cyber attack, space cyber defense, and space cyber support. The space cyber support involves reconnaissance, targeting, and intelligence gathering.

"A space cyber-attack is carried out using space technology and methods of hard kill and soft kill," the report said. "It ensures its own control at will while at the same time uses cyberspace to disable, weaken, disrupt, and destroy the enemy's cyber actions or cyber installations."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Soft-kill methods are designed to disrupt or damage cyberspace links using jamming, network cyber attacks, and “deceit” in the electromagnetic domain.

The cyber attacks include launching computer viruses, theft and tampering of data, denial of service attacks, and “detonation of [a] network bomb that can instantaneously paralyze or destroy enemy’s information network.”

“Soft kill measures are well concealed, fast in action, and the attack can be accomplished before the enemy even has time to discover it,” the report said. “Soft kill measures are deceptive and well hidden; they are difficult to detect and monitor.”

Hard-kill cyber attack weapons include missiles and other “kinetic” weapons along with directed energy, including lasers, radio frequency weapons, and particle beam weapons.

Chinese cyber warfare capabilities are one of the People’s Liberation Army’s (PLA) most closely guarded secrets, along with its anti-satellite missile and jamming program.

The topic of military cyber warfare was recently discussed by U.S. and Chinese military and defense officials at a meeting earlier this month of the U.S.-China Strategic and Economic Dialogue in Washington.

The *Washington Free Beacon* obtained a copy of the recently translated report, dated December 2012 and published in the journal *Aerospace Electronic Warfare*.

The journal is a bimonthly publication of the Institute 8511, part of the China Aerospace Science and Industry Corp. (CASIC), a state-run missile manufacturer and high-technology aerospace research center.

Institute 8511 develops electronic warfare offense and defense weapons, countermeasure technologies, and command and control systems for aircraft and missiles.

The institute in the past also developed China’s DF-21D anti-ship ballistic missile, a unique weapon that uses precision guidance to attack U.S. aircraft carriers at sea.

The defense official said Institute 8511 is located close to the PLA’s premier cyber warfare headquarters in Shanghai, known as Unit 61398. That unit was identified in a report last February by the security firm Mandiant as the main origin of widespread military cyber attacks on the West.

According to the report, China’s goal for cyber war calls for using high-technology weapons in cyberspace to achieve military objectives.

“Since cyberspace is boundless and transcends land, sea, air, and space, cyber warfare is not constrained by territorial land or territorial sea, and there is no difference between the front and the rear of the battlefield,” the report said. “The advantage of cyber warfare is its global nature; it has global alert, global resources, and global access.”

Additionally, war in cyberspace is not constrained by nighttime, weather, or geography and can be conducted at any time, key factors that have limited conventional warfighting in the past.

In line with Chinese military doctrine that calls for sudden attacks and the element of surprise, the report said cyberwarfare is ideal for rapid attacks that are difficult for an enemy to identify.

“This suddenness can often leave cyber warfare without a trace and without damaging the physical installation or personnel, and yet it can change the trend and outcome of war by affecting the operational effectiveness in an instance.”

A second recently translated military report by two PLA colonels calls for China to adopt a new military doctrine called “trump card and data link-centric warfare” that is based on the U.S. war fighting doctrine called “network-centric warfare.”

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



The two colonels, Sr. Col. Du Wenlong and Sr. Col. Xie Zhaohui, call for a new strategic concept designed to attack and defeat the United States using advanced command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, what the military calls C4ISR and the key to conducting combined arms warfare.

The colonels call for new weapons and other military capabilities “to penetrate and to strike as quickly as possible ... and ensure that our military will win the warfare under the informatized conditions.”

“Should the United States military’s transformation model of ‘network-centric warfare’ become a success, it will undoubtedly and completely change the mode and means of warfare, making warfare even more sudden and its outcome even quicker to come, generating unmatched asymmetrical advantages,” the colonels said. “This will inevitably greatly strengthen its arrogance, enabling it to have its own way to an even bigger extent and to promote its politics of hegemony.”

Publication of the new cyber warfare report provides a more recent example of the contradiction between internal Chinese military writings and public statements. A 1999 book produced for the Pentagon’s Office of Net Assessment and edited by China specialist Michael Pillsbury first reveals the contradiction.

The book, “Chinese Views of Future Warfare,” influenced many senior Pentagon and military leaders’ views of China by showing that internal Chinese military writings discussed plans for war with the United States, considered China’s main enemy. The writings contrasted sharply with frequent public statements by China that its arms buildup is purely defensive and not directed at any country.

Richard Fisher, a Chinese military affairs expert, said the Chinese report reveals China’s merger of cyber warfare and space warfare efforts.

Fisher said the Chinese military understands that U.S. satellites are critical to relaying computer data traffic and are vulnerable to direct attack.

“China has already demonstrated two anti-satellite weapons: ground based lasers in 2006 and then the SC-19 [anti-satellite] missile in 2007. A higher Medium Earth Orbit (MEO) capable ASAT called DN02 may have been tested recently,” Fisher said.

China also is pressing for a space arms agreement at the same time it is building up its space forces, Fisher said.

“The bottom line today is that China’s first priority is building the means to win wars in space while using space diplomacy to disarm its potential enemies,” he said.

U.S. cyber warfare strategy was recently disclosed in a top-secret Presidential Policy Directive-20 that was made public by former National Security Agency contractor Edward Snowden.

The directive outlines the use of military cyber attacks that “can offer unique and unconventional capabilities to advance U.S. national objectives around the world with little or no warning to the adversary or target and with potential effects ranging from subtle to severely damaging.”

A third Chinese document from 2005 that was translated recently by the U.S. government reveals that Chinese military planners are preparing to destroy or disable up to eight Global Positioning System satellites. The satellites are critical for U.S. military precision guided missiles and bombs.

“Eliminating two groups of GPS satellites can prevent GPS satellites from providing navigation service around the clock,” the study stated. “The effect of dropping these GPS satellites on the navigation accuracy of GPS satellites is quite obvious,” the study, “Research on Voidness of GPS,” said.

<http://freebeacon.com/china-military-preparing-for-peoples-war-in-cyberspace-space/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Korea Herald – South Korea



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

USFK Chief Nominee Says OPCON Transfer Needed in 2015

July 31, 2013

The nominee to become the top commander of American troops in South Korea said Tuesday he supports the transition of wartime operational control (OPCON) as scheduled in 2015, despite Seoul's call for some flexibility on the timeline.

The stance by Army Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti reflects a gap between the allies on the appropriate timing for the OPCON transfer in the face of growing threats from nuclear-armed North Korea.

"I do agree with the timetable. It is a bilateral agreement, Strategic Alliance 2015, to turn over operational control by December of 2015," he said in a Senate confirmation hearing.

In May, President Barack Obama nominated Scaparrotti, formerly deputy commander of U.S. forces in Afghanistan, to head U.S. Forces Korea. If confirmed, he will get promoted to the rank of four-star general and succeed Gen. James Thurman.

"I think it's a good plan ... And I think we should move forward with it," Scaparrotti said, adding it is expected to pave the way for enhanced combat readiness.

But he emphasized that South Korea's military will have to meet "a detailed set of certification requirements" by the agreed-upon date.

"Although these requirements are based on meeting milestones leading to December 2015, it is important to note that the transition is conditions-driven," he said.

The Pentagon said earlier the requirements include South Korea's acquisition of weapon systems, command and control systems, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance gear and an adequate supply of munitions.

Whether South Korea should take over the OPCON of its troops in the event of war is still politically and ideologically controversial in the country.

Some emphasize the rights and responsibility as a sovereign nation, while others are concerned that an early OPCON transition may trigger miscalculation by North Korea.

South Korea handed over its operational control to the U.S.-led U.N. troops during the 1950-53 Korean War. Seoul regained peacetime OPCON in 1994.

South Korea originally agreed to take back its wartime OPCON as of April 17, 2012. Shortly after North Korea's deadly torpedo attack on a South Korean warship in 2010, however, Seoul asked for a delay in the schedule. Washington accepted it.

Earlier this month, Yonhap News Agency learned that South Korea's Defense Ministry has proposed more discussions with the Pentagon on the feasibility of the OPCON transfer in 2015.

South Korean military officials apparently hope for a further postponement in the schedule as they believe it would be difficult to be fully ready for the transition by the target date.

A diplomatic source said it is a matter to be resolved by the two governments again on the basis of a political determination, not a military one. (Yonhap News)

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20130731000239>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Voice of America (VOA)

More N. Korean Long-Range Rocket Launches Expected 'Soon'

By Steve Herman

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



July 31, 2013

TOKYO — Specialists following North Korea's nuclear and ballistic missile development concur the reclusive state is nearly certain to continue launching long-range rockets which may be intended to improve its capability to fire weapons of mass destruction.

A North Korean official in Pyongyang last week told VOA News that another launch of the Unha series vehicle will occur "soon" as part of the country's "peaceful use of space." He did not elaborate.

The latest in the series, the Unha-3, carried the apparently non-functioning Kwangmyongsong-3 (Shining Star) satellite into a low Earth orbit on December 12, 2012.

A floral exhibition, which closed Tuesday in Pyongyang, included several small-scale models of larger "Unha-9" rockets among the flowers, reinforcing the message that North Korea wants its people and the outside world to believe there will be additional launches.

The first mention of the Unha-9 was at a reception for rocket scientists December 21, 2012.

The January 3, 2013 internet edition of the Rodong Sinmun, the Workers' Party official newspaper, quoted a scientist saying there would be six more satellite launch vehicles. Reports say the Unha 4 and 5 are intended to launch earth observation satellites, Unha 6, 7 and 8 would presumably place into orbit communications satellites and Unha 9 would carry a lunar orbiter.

However, during Saturday's massive "Victory Day" parade in Kim Il Sung Square there were no such representations of launch vehicles beyond the Unha 3.

"I expect regular launches for the foreseeable future," says Jeffrey Lewis, Director of the East Asia Nonproliferation Program at the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies at the Monterey Institute of International Studies.

At a previous encounter where North Korean officials spoke with academics and others on related topics, Lewis notes he asked "how many launches North Korea planned and what type of satellites they intended to place in orbit, but the officials did not respond to a fairly direct question."

A recent report issued by the Federation of American scientists concluded that "according to available data, the Unha-3 looks like a typical, slow paced satellite launcher program, producing single prototypes every now and then. A serious missile program would look different."

There have been indications the North was preparing for rockets larger than the Unha with major construction at the Tonghae Satellite Launching Ground (the Unha-3 blasted off from the more modern Sohae Satellite Launching Station).

"I haven't seen a clear explanation of what they plan to do with a larger launcher," says a consultant on the topic to the U.S. Government who asked not to be identified when discussing the subject. He notes North Korea already has a mobile ICBM program and questions why it would really need the capability to boost bigger satellite into higher orbits. "Are they just insisting on a space program as cover for missile technology development?"

New commercial satellite imagery confirms work at Tonghae Satellite Launching Ground remains on hiatus, according to the U.S.-Korea Institute at the Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies.

"These projects - the building of a new launch pad, missile assembly building and launch control center - are designed to handle larger rockets than the Unha-3 space launch vehicle (SLV), able to handle heavier payloads and to fly greater distances," according to an analysis released by the institute on July 23. "Work slowed and stopped at the end of 2012. While it was expected that construction would continue this spring, new imagery indicates that work had not resumed as of late May 2013, almost eight months later."

It is unknown why construction has remained halted. Some officials in Seoul and Tokyo point to behind-the-scenes diplomacy involving Beijing for applying pressure on Pyongyang.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The December 2012 launch came in defiance of United Nations' sanctions. The following month the world body expanded its sanctions against the impoverished country, targeting new individuals and North Korea's space agency.

On February 12 of this year, Pyongyang announced its third underground nuclear weapons test.

The U.N. also imposed further sanctions for that action, targeting North Korea's economy and leadership. Significantly China, the main benefactor of Pyongyang, voted in favor of the unanimous Security Council resolution which had been drafted by the United States.

That prompted the most bellicose rhetoric in years from North Korea vowing all-out nuclear war.

The strident threats have virtually evaporated in recent months although there have been no indications from Pyongyang that it will abide by the sanctions and halt its nuclear and missile programs.

"The space launches are part and parcel of the campaign effort to demonstrate that North Korea has become a modern industrial power under the Kim family," asserts Lewis.

During nine days of interaction in July with the Korean People's Army, officers made repeated references to their country's Juche (self-reliance) ideology, asserting they have been left with no choice but to develop nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles because of the persistent military threat they face from the United States.

North Korea and the United States have no diplomatic ties. Both countries signed an armistice on July 27, 1953 halting three years of combat which devastated the Korean peninsula.

Since then, South Korea, which fully democratized in the late 1980's, has recovered to become the 15th richest country in the world in terms of nominal gross domestic product (GDP).

Meanwhile in the North, a single-party state, absolute leadership has passed to Kim Jong Un, the grandson of the country's founder and eternal President, Kim Il Sung.

Despite having half the population of the South, the North's economy is 1/30th of the size of its neighbor at an estimated 125th place for nominal GDP, between Papua New Guinea and Mauritius, with trade dominated by primary partner China.

VOA correspondent Steve Herman this week concluded a nine-day trip to North Korea

<http://www.voanews.com/content/nkorea-claim-of-more-long-range-rocket-launches-seen-as-credible/1713495.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Washington Free Beacon

China Reveals New Short-Range Missile

DF-12 among more than 5 new short-range missiles

By Bill Gertz

August 2, 2013

The Chinese military has deployed a new advanced short-range missile known as the DF-12 that was revealed for the first time in photos posted on the Internet this week.

Disclosure of the missile follows publication of an Air Force National Space and Missile Intelligence Center (NASIC) report describing China as having the most aggressive ballistic missile development program in the world.

"China has the most active and diverse ballistic missile development program in the world," the report said, highlighting 13 variants of short-range ballistic missiles, including five new short-range missiles systems.

Beijing currently has deployed between 1,000 and 1,200 missiles opposite Taiwan, the island nation set up after China's civil war that Beijing has vowed to use force to reunite with the mainland.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The DF-12 missile was disclosed in a post on a Chinese website Tuesday.

The posting on official state-run media described what had previously been called the M-20 for the first time as the Dong Feng-12.

The shift in designation from M-20 to DF-12 indicates the missile is being deployed with China's Second Artillery Corps, the service in charge of missile and nuclear weapons. It is not known whether the DF-12 will be armed with conventional or nuclear warheads or whether it is dual-capable.

The DF-12 is a solid-fueled advanced short-range missile that China's claims is comparable to Russia's new short-range missile known as the Iskander, a short-range ballistic missile that Moscow recently said would be deployed in areas close to Europe, raising fears of new Russian military assertiveness.

According to the online posting, the missile was discovered by visitors to the Chinese Space Museum in Beijing.

The posting said the missile's official range is between 62 and 173 miles but that its actual range could be as long as 260 miles.

The missile has inertial navigation and Global Positioning System guidance.

A model of the road-mobile missile with two-launch tubes was first shown at an arms show in 2011.

Sen. Joseph Donnelly (D., Ind.) quoted from the NASIC report on China's missile buildup during a recent Senate Armed Services Committee meeting, noting that the Chinese are "developing and testing offensive missiles, forming additional missile units, qualitatively upgrading missile systems and developing methods to counter ballistic missile defenses."

The Chinese posting about the DF-12 stated that the missile would be difficult to intercept by missile defenses because of its range and speed.

The DF-12 is believed to be the missile described in the NASIC report as the CSS-X-15, which has an estimated range of 178 miles, according to a Chinese military affairs expert.

"PLA movement to deploy this new class of shorter range ballistic missiles stresses Taiwan by presenting a much shorter flight time, which can limit the ability of Taiwan's missile defenses to react," said Rick Fisher, an analyst with the International Assessment and Strategy Center.

"Information from Chinese sales representatives and promotional materials also indicates these new short-range ballistic missile are maneuverable, which further complicates the task of missile defenses and can be armed with different types of warheads," Fisher said.

"In PLA service it can be expected that some DF-12 class SRBMs will be armed with tactical nuclear warheads."

China's development of a new class of short-range missile is that it will add a new layer of threat to Taiwan.

"These new short-range missiles are likely to be much cheaper to acquire than the 1,200 or so DF-15 and DF-11 SRBMs currently aimed at Taiwan," Fisher said. "The prospect for new growth in SRBMs aimed at Taiwan would significantly reduce the utility of Taiwan's current missile defenses and make it financially prohibitive to match China's increasing number of offensive missiles with defensive missiles."

Taiwan currently has a limited number of Patriot anti-missile interceptors to protect the capital and some military bases.

Fisher said the new Chinese short-range missiles are likely to spur Taiwan to invest scarce defense resources in developing offensive missiles to deter China.

Reports from Taiwan indicate the island nation is developing a long-range cruise missile capable of reaching Shanghai.

The Obama administration has begun to drop its longstanding opposition to Taiwan's development of offensive ballistic and cruise missiles, according to U.S. officials.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“But if the United States wants to continue to enable its allies to stress a ‘defensive’ response to China’s missile buildup potential, then there should be far higher investments in energy weapons, like lasers and railguns,” Fisher said.

“These systems have the potential to allow a country like Taiwan to pursue a largely ‘defensive’ strategy that need not include high numbers of new ‘offensive’ missiles,” he added, noting that U.S. defense spending cuts have meant fewer research dollars for energy weapons.

The NASIC report said that the Chinese recently began deploying a new short-range missile called the DF-16, which has a range of about 124 miles.

“China is producing technologically advanced ballistic missiles and has sold ballistic missile technology to other countries,” the report said. “China has an extensive theater missile program and has deployed a large force of ballistic missiles in the vicinity of Taiwan.”

<http://freebeacon.com/china-reveals-new-short-range-missile/>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Tribune – India

N-Powered Sub Arihant all set to Sail Out from Vizag

Ajay Banerjee, Tamil News Service (TNS)

July 28, 2013

New Delhi, July 28 -- Indigenously built nuclear-powered submarine, INS Arihant, is finally set to sail out from its base at Vishakhapatnam. The 6,000-tonne submarine, armed with nuclear missiles, is ready after years of efforts interspersed with sanctions in 1998 and impediments due to non-availability of cutting-edge technology.

“The nuclear reactor that will power the submarine can be formally declared ‘critical’ anytime now, while the nuclear-tipped missiles to be launched from underwater are in place,” sources said.

“Everything is ready,” a functionary said. “The wait is for the monsoon to subside before Arihant (slayer of enemies) dives into sea. A certain amount of calm is needed at sea when the vessel goes out the first time. The monsoon on the East Coast starts weakening by the middle of August, meaning the submarine will slither out in a couple of weeks from now,” he added.

“Around 95 per cent of harbour trials are over,” sources said. Once the submarine is out at sea, it will run on nuclear-powered 80MW pressurised water reactor (PWR). The PWR was developed by the Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC) with assistance from a Russian designing team. It uses enriched uranium as fuel and light water as coolant and moderator.

Once at sea, the vessel will be gradually loaded with weapons and missiles. All parameters will be tested after each addition. “Each test will be conducted underwater for two months or more. This will include the Submarine Launched Ballistic Missile (SLBM)”, sources said.

New Delhi has done 10 underwater launches of SLBMs code named ‘B05’ using a submerged pontoon to mimic a submarine. It can travel 700 km, while the bigger variant, so far known as the ‘K-4’, can hit targets 3,500 km away and will finally be installed on Arihant and also the next two follow-on submarines of the same class.

The submarine will provide second-strike capability in case of a nuclear attack. It is the easiest to launch a nuclear strike from a submarine as it remains submerged, hence the enemy cannot detect it.

In December 2010, the then Navy Chief Admiral Nirmal Verma had announced: “When Arihant goes to sea, it will be on a deterrent patrol (armed with nuclear-tipped missiles).” Being nuclear-powered, the submarine will not have to surface for two months to breathe, like the conventional vessels have to.

India will join the US, the UK, France, and China by having such technology and prowess.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Arihant has cost Rs 15,000 crore. It has been jointly developed by the Navy, BARC and the Defence Research and Development Organisation (DRDO) at the Visakhapatnam naval dockyard. Russian designers assisted in building the vessel. Other companies involved in the development of the submarine are Tata Power and Larsen & Toubro (L&T). The project, earlier known as the advanced technology vessel (ATV), has been under development since 1998.

<http://www.tribuneindia.com/2013/20130729/main5.htm>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Putin Warns of Warship Building Delays

29 July 2013

NOVO-OGARYOVO, July 29 (RIA Novosti) - Delivery of some new ships to the Russian Navy due after 2015 under the current procurement program, could be delayed until 2025, President Vladimir Putin said Monday.

"I know you have voiced the idea of introducing amendments into the existing state armaments program for financing ships which are due to be handed over by 2015," he told a conference on the Navy's development. "And for ships due after 2015 - ascertain the amount of money already in the new state program for the period to 2025. This is all possible, let's see, but only so there are not setbacks," in order to "synchronize manufacturing capabilities with the volume of funding provided," he added.

Putin said last year that the procurement of new warships and submarines for the Navy would be a priority over the next decade. The Russian government has allocated five trillion rubles (\$166 billion) or a quarter of the entire armament procurement budget until 2020 for the fleet. Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu said in March the Navy would receive 24 submarines and 54 surface warships by 2020.

About 750 warships were modernized or repaired last year, Putin said Monday, adding that development and testing of some new surface ships and submarines has been marking time.

He attributed the delays in the delivery of new warships and weapon systems for the Navy to irregular supplies of components to subcontractors, a lack of effective collaboration between design organizations and manufacturing enterprises, and the low quality of equipment.

No less than 132 equipment failures were found during construction of one warship, he said, urging industry and defense related agencies to submit proposals on ways of improving the situation.

Putin gave them six months to resolve these issues, Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin said after the meeting.

Putin has already criticized the naval shipbuilding industry this year for its poor performance. In May, he sacked the head of United Shipbuilding Corporation, Andrei Dyachkov, after just 10 months in the job, and warned the new management he expected a major shakeup in the sector.

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130729/182476073/Putin-Warns-of-Warship-Building-Delays.html

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

ITAR-TASS News Agency

30 July 2013

Conf of Young Russian Nuclear Researchers to Begin near Nizhny Novgorod

NIZHNY NOVGOROD, July 30 (Itar-Tass) - Sarov, a town in Nizhny Novgorod region that is broadly known under the codename of Arzamas-16 is hosting the first-ever conference titled 'Russia's Nuclear Shield and Sword.'

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

It will bring together more than 300 young researchers and experts from eighteen enterprises and research centers reporting to the State Atomic Energy Corporation /Rosatom/ and to the Defense Ministry, the press service of Russia's Federal Nuclear Research Center said.

The latter center has been the main organizing force as regards the convocation of the conference.

The gathering is dedicated to the 60th anniversary since the testing of Russian hydrogen bomb /RDS-6s/. The people who designed, assembled and tested that super-weapon, which became the Soviet Union's durable and reliable shield in the years of the Cold War, have been invited to attend the conference as guests of honor.

The list of the invitees includes Academician Yuri Trutnev, the veteran of the Sarov center, Nikolai Balandin, and Academician Radiy Ilkayev who heads the Sarov research center.

Sarov officials note a sharp increase in the number of young researchers and workers who come to the center upon graduation from colleges and universities.

The RDS-6s hydrogen bomb that was tested August 12, 1953 near Semipalatinsk in Kazakhstan was also designed by young people the majority of whom - physicists and mathematicians many of whom were 25 to 27 years old at the time.

Dr Andrei Sakharov, who came up with the idea of a sandwich-like structure of the bomb, in which the two layers of lithium would squeeze the heavier uranium. This proposal laid the groundwork for getting a thermonuclear reaction.

The thermonuclear 'beauty' that had the power or 400 tons in the TNT equivalent is the largest and the most scaring of the bombs of different calibers that one can see in Sarov's Museum of Nuclear Armaments.

<http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c32/823712.html>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia Set to Create National Defense Center

31 July 2013

RZHEVKA (Leningrad region), July 31 (RIA Novosti) – The Russian military has started work on the creation of the National Defense Center, which will enhance the operational management of the armed forces and ensure prompt response to strategic threats, Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu said Wednesday.

"We have begun the creation of such a center. It is a lot of work. We have already outlined the main criteria for the center," Shoigu said.

According to the minister, the center will consolidate command over the country's armed forces, especially the nuclear triad and rapid reaction forces. It will also allow real-time monitoring of day-to-day activities of military units around the country.

Col. Gen. Pavel Popov, who has been deputy emergencies minister since 2008, will be reassigned to the Defense Ministry and oversee the creation of the center, Shoigu said.

The Russian Armed Forces are in the midst of a major program of reform, including a gradual transition to an all-volunteer makeup, organizational changes and re-equipment with advanced weapons.

The current strength of the Russian military is estimated at 1,040,000 personnel in active service and 2,035,000 in reserve.

http://en.ria.ru/military_news/20130731/182512075/Russia-Set-to-Create-National-Defense-Center.html

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Asahi Shimbun – Japan

U.S. Shows Nuclear Facilities to Reassure Japan, Allies on Deterrence

July 30, 2013

By YOSHIHIRO MAKINO, Correspondent

WASHINGTON--The United States has allowed Japanese officials to see confidential nuclear-related facilities to allay concerns that the Obama administration's disarmament initiative could weaken its nuclear umbrella.

The move was also intended to prevent Japan from developing nuclear weapons using its massive stockpile of plutonium to counter potential threats from its neighbors in East Asia, sources said.

Senior officials of Japan's foreign and defense ministries were granted access to three U.S. military installations, according to Japanese and U.S. government sources.

In May last year, they were briefed in the center for the Headquarters of the U.S. Strategic Command at Offutt Air Force Base in Nebraska, and they also took a look at the control center for intercontinental ballistic missiles at Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana.

A missile cannot be launched at Malmstrom Air Force Base unless two soldiers press two buttons, located at a distance from each other, simultaneously.

"The Japan-U.S. alliance is in a fit state," one Japanese visitor, apparently impressed by the arrangement, said at the time.

In April this year, Japanese officials boarded an Ohio-class nuclear submarine that can launch nuclear-capable Trident ballistic missiles at Naval Base Kitsap in the state of Washington. They saw giant cylindrical columns--tubes for launching the Trident missiles--in a long, steel room.

During the tours, nuclear weapons were not shown, and access was limited to operational systems and delivery vehicles.

Still, a Japanese government source said the U.S. move is "a landmark step to reinforce the (bilateral) alliance."

The United States did not disclose details of its nuclear weapons, related facilities or nuclear strategy although it did promise to provide a nuclear umbrella to Japan under the bilateral security alliance.

However, the sources said that Japanese and U.S. officials have started simulating military and foreign policy responses in the event of a nuclear attack from a third country as part of a bilateral dialogue on extended deterrence that started in February 2010.

In one table-top exercise session, more than 10 officials each from the two countries took part and discussed options under a wide range of scenarios, according to one participant.

Japan has called on the United States to disclose details of the nuclear umbrella since the crisis over North Korea's nuclear development program started in the 1990s.

Japan is not the only U.S. ally to see nuclear-related facilities. Officials from South Korea and members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have also been granted access.

A U.S. source said the move is designed to enhance transparency so that U.S. allies will not be upset by the Obama administration's nuclear disarmament policy.

James Acton, senior associate in the nuclear policy program at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, said Washington is trying to reassure Tokyo and Seoul that the U.S. nuclear umbrella will continue to protect them from threats by China and North Korea.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

One source said the United States is also aiming to prevent Japan and South Korea from going nuclear to counter North Korea's nuclear ambitions.

Last September, Washington expressed concerns about the previous Democratic Party of Japan government's policy to continue to reprocess spent nuclear fuel despite a stated goal of eventually phasing out nuclear power operations.

The policy raised suspicions that Japan may move to produce nuclear weapons. The reprocessing of spent nuclear fuel has already left Japan with enough plutonium to create thousands of nuclear bombs.

The United States also sent nuclear-capable bombers to South Korea during a joint military exercise in March.

A U.S. expert said the dispatch was aimed at keeping in check growing calls for nuclear armament in South Korea, in addition to countering North Korea's military provocations.

The United States, which is reducing its defense outlays, also appears to be embracing Japan and South Korea into its nuclear strategy to call on the two allies to shoulder a greater financial burden.

Some U.S. government officials welcome plans being considered by the Abe administration to lift Japan's self-imposed ban on exercising the right to collective self-defense or acquire capabilities to attack enemy bases.

Some in the Japanese government are wary that the U.S. move may lead to an increased financial burden, but others hail it as strengthening the bilateral security alliance.

http://ajw.asahi.com/article/behind_news/politics/AJ201307300096

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Omaha World-Herald
Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Armed Services Panel Forwards Cecil Haney's Nomination as StratCom Commander

By Joseph Morton, World-Herald bureau

WASHINGTON — Adm. Cecil Haney took an important step Tuesday toward becoming the next commander of U.S. Strategic Command.

The Senate Armed Services Committee forwarded his nomination to the full Senate, and he could be confirmed before the week is over.

Located at Offutt Air Force Base south of Omaha, StratCom has a diverse mission that includes overseeing the nation's nuclear arsenal.

Committee members on Tuesday questioned Haney about his views on U.S. missile defense, potential reductions in the country's stockpile of nuclear warheads, the need to ramp up cyber defenses and other areas.

Sen. Deb Fischer, R-Neb., a committee member, brought up the new headquarters that is being constructed at Offutt to replace the aging facility StratCom currently uses.

Haney described the new command-and-control complex as key for all of StratCom's missions, particularly strategic deterrence.

"Without the command and control that connects the relevant information to our leadership, the decisions cannot be made in a prompt time, and that's such an important part of our infrastructure and capability going forward," Haney said.

Haney was deputy commander of StratCom before taking over the Navy's Pacific Fleet Command about three years ago. If confirmed, he would replace Air Force Gen. C. Robert Kehler, who has been StratCom commander since January 2011.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich., the committee chairman, is hoping to get Haney and other pending nominees through the confirmation process before the Senate leaves for its August recess at the end of this week. The Senate does not return until mid-September.

Haney, 57, weighed in on a range of issues during Tuesday's hearing.

For example, he said, the United States needs to continue delivering the message to Russia that U.S. missile defense systems are not intended to undermine that country's deterrence options.

He also was asked several times about his position on potential reductions to U.S. nuclear warheads.

President Barack Obama has called for a one-third reduction of U.S.- and Russian- deployed nuclear weapons.

Sen. Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H., asked Haney what his advice would be if the president sought to accomplish such a stockpile reduction unilaterally, without negotiating with Russia.

Haney said he opposes unilateral reduction.

"My advice would be that we negotiate a bilateral agreement that also has verifiable components to it," he said.

<http://www.omaha.com/article/20130730/NEWS/130739881/1694>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Seattle Times
Tuesday, July 30, 2013

Commanders: Budget Cuts could Erode Nuke Arsenal

Impending budget cuts could hamper efforts to deter North Korea from taking hostile action and stymie plans to upgrade America's nuclear arsenal, top U.S. military officers told senators Tuesday.

By LOLITA C. BALDOR, Associated Press (AP)

WASHINGTON — Impending budget cuts could hamper efforts to deter North Korea from taking hostile action and stymie plans to upgrade America's nuclear arsenal, top U.S. military officers told senators Tuesday.

Army Lt. Gen. Curtis Scaparrotti told the Senate Armed Services Committee that reducing the number of aircraft carriers in the Pacific could undercut deterrence and increase the possibility of miscalculation in the tense Korean peninsula. Scaparrotti, who has been nominated to command U.S. forces in South Korea, added that cuts in training will also erode combat readiness there.

He said Pyongyang is putting more money into development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, special operations forces and cyberthreat capabilities. And he added that if U.S. forces had to be deployed to Korea as a result of a provocation there, "we would probably take some time here in the States to train that unit to the readiness level that we believe they need to be at to do the job before they deploy. So arriving forces might be delayed as a result."

During the same hearing, Navy Adm. Cecil Haney said that the U.S. must continue plans to upgrade the nation's primary nuclear bomb and replace the aging fleet of nuclear-capable submarines to counter threats from other nations and non-state actors. Haney, who has been nominated to take over U.S. Strategic Command, said that cost savings have contributed to the delay in development of the new Ohio Class ballistic missile submarine, adding that additional delays would be unacceptable.

The Pentagon faces the prospect of a \$52 billion, across-the-board budget cut in 2014 unless Congress and the White House come up with a deficit-cutting plan.

Haney also said that budget cuts are a factor as the Pentagon considers whether to make U.S. Cyber Command a separate military command. Currently it is part of U.S. Strategic Command, but military officials have been vocal in their warnings about the growing threat of cyberattacks from enemy nations and terrorists.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Right now, Haney said that creating a new command will trigger more overhead costs, so leaving the cyber responsibilities under Strategic Command works for now.

Senators quizzed Scaparrotti on the planned transfer of wartime control to South Korea, giving Seoul the primary responsibility for defending itself in a conflict.

"Sovereign nations should be responsible for their own national defense in time of war, particularly after the length of time that they have been gaining in capability," said Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich.

He said he would do all he could to stick to the December 2015 deadline for the transfer of control.

Others expressed concerns that Haney has said he supports further analysis before a decision is made to develop a missile defense site on the East Coast.

"What further analysis do we need to conduct?" asked Sen. Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H. "You know, we missed it when it came to the North Korean nuclear threat. And I'd hate to see us in that position with regard to Iran." She said having a site on the East Coast would provide greater capability for the U.S. to respond if Iran launches an intercontinental ballistic missile.

Haney said he believes that an environmental impact study should go forward on possible East Coast sites. But he said he'd like to see further study on the need for an East Coast location, but that that a key priority is to invest in sensor technologies that are able to accurately determine what type of missile has been launched at the U.S. - whether it's a decoy or a warhead.

Haney also offered support for the beleaguered new Littoral Combat Ship - a small combat vessel now being deployed in the Pacific. There have been nagging questions about the cost and viability of the roughly \$34 billion program and whether the Pentagon's plan to buy up to 52 of the ships should be chopped by as much as half due to budget constraints.

Haney said the USS Freedom, which Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel toured in a recent trip to Singapore, is working out well and that the Navy is making improvements as it learns more about how the vessel operates.

http://seattletimes.com/html/politics/2021503056_apusdefensecuts.html

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Roll Call

Chambers Split on East Coast Missile Defense Site

By Frank Oliveri, Roll Call Staff

July 30, 2013

Democrats and Republicans agree that the nation's missile defenses — designed to blunt missile threats from North Korea and Iran — need improvement.

But while the House wants to buy a new missile that has failed a recent test and commit to building an East Coast missile defense site, which would use an incomplete upgraded version of the missile, some key Senate leaders are far more skeptical.

Top defense policy and spending Democrats in the Senate said last week they would oppose efforts to go beyond what the administration has sought for upgrades to the ground-based interceptor, a missile used by the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system, and an East Coast missile site, despite provisions in the House defense authorization and spending bills seeking to do just that.

The conflict is one in a long line of missile defense disagreements between the two parties over the years. But it comes as the Defense Department tries to identify its priorities in an unstable fiscal environment and Congress grapples with a

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



long series of purchases that went awry because the military, with congressional support, bought weapons that had not completed sufficient testing.

“Before we go forward on missile defense we need a successful test, period,” said Richard J. Durbin, D-Ill., chairman of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. “Before we expand the missile defense layout to include the East Coast, we need a pretty fulsome debate after a successful test.”

The discussion foreshadows tough debates on the Senate floor when the chamber takes up its version of the fiscal 2014 Defense policy (S 1197) and appropriations bills later this year.

The Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee marked up its spending bill Tuesday, with the full committee scheduled to take up the bill Thursday.

Self-Fulfilling Prophecies

Several Republicans, including Rep. Trent Franks, R-Ariz., made the case on the House floor last week that budget cuts to the Missile Defense Agency may have actually contributed to the test failures, the latest of which occurred July 5, when the missile didn’t separate from its booster and failed to engage its target in what is already a highly controlled testing environment.

“One nuclear armed missile coming into the United States could ruin our whole day,” Franks said. The president and Democrats “criticize these programs when there are test failures or delays that have been made worse by their slashing and burning of the program. ... While the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system did miss its target on a July 5 test, it was one test.”

The House last week passed a spending bill (HR 2397) that would add about \$107 million to the president’s spending request for 14 upgraded missiles, after defeating an amendment that would have stripped out the money. The president recently outlined plans to add 14 more missiles to a launch site in Alaska after a recent missile test by North Korea.

Rep. Jared Polis, D-Colo., noted that the ground-based missile defense program, writ large, has not had a successful intercept since December 2008.

“These repeated failures unfortunately have not stopped us from continuing to authorize” funds for “14 additional missiles on top of the 30 we already have in the” fiscal 2013 defense policy law (PL 113-239), Polis said.

Despite Government Accountability Office findings that there has been insufficient testing to verify whether the system will work as intended, the military’s top missile defense officer, Vice Adm. James D. Syring, told Durbin during a July 17 hearing, “We stand by the results we have obtained” from the new missile interceptor tests to date.

But Syring, the director of the Missile Defense Agency, acknowledged the problems of the missile defense program overall, suggesting it was rushed in the face of growing signs of missile threats from North Korea and Iran, with the intent of developing and fixing system shortfalls on the fly. He also said he thought it would be best to see successful tests before committing to the purchase of 14 new interceptors.

Syring acknowledged that the system has never been tested against an intercontinental ballistic missile of the kind that would reach U.S. shores, but he assured Durbin he believed the United States was well defended.

When Durbin expressed doubts about this conclusion, Syring said, “We have extensive model and simulation capability that projects the results of our conducted intercept testing in the longer range environment.”

The military won’t, however, have a test target to verify these simulations until 2015, he said.

http://www.rollcall.com/news/chambers_split_on_east_coast_missile_defense_site-226754-1.html

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Air Force Times.com

STRATCOM Chief: More Missile Defense Tests Necessary

July 31, 2013

By Brian Everstine, Staff writer

The recent failure of a ground-based missile interceptor out of Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., means the nation needs to test more, not less, according to Senate leaders and the top general in U.S. Strategic Command.

Air Force Gen. Robert Kehler said the July 5 test of an interceptor, attempting to take out a missile launched from the Kwajalein Atoll, was an “old problem” in the targeting system, and the Missile Defense Agency needs more tests to work on the system.

“I am still confident that the system will perform in its limited defense role,” Kehler said July 24. “But I’m concerned with the recent test failure and I would like to see more testing done.”

Ideally, Kehler said he would like tests to be done yearly, but that would not be possible due to budget constraints. Still, Kehler said he remains confident in the system of 26 interceptors, which are placed at Vandenberg and Fort Greely, Alaska.

The call for more tests has been echoed by a key lawmaker: Sen. Kelly Ayotte, R-N.H., said the administration and Congress have not placed enough of a priority on missile defense, and the resources need to be available for additional testing.

Ayotte went further, reiterating the call for an East Coast-based missile defense site to counter the threat of Iran. Military leaders have said there was “no validated military requirement” for the site.

Kehler said he was looking into the possibility of the site, but said he believed the existing missile defense structure could protect the nation.

<http://www.airforcetimes.com/article/20130731/NEWS04/307310012/STRATCOM-chief-More-missile-defense-tests-necessary>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Reuters.com – U.S.

Pentagon Downplays Prospects of Cancelling F-35, Bomber

By Andrea Shalal-Esa

Thursday, August 1, 2013

WASHINGTON, Aug 1 (Reuters) - The U.S. military on Thursday downplayed concerns it could cancel the F-35 fighter and a new stealth bomber, after leaked documents from a budget review suggested the programs might be eliminated as one way to deal with deep budget cuts.

Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel said on Wednesday that finding \$500 billion in budget cuts required by law over the next decade, on top of \$487 billion in cuts already being implemented, required tough trade-offs between the size of the military and high-end weapons programs.

Pentagon briefing slides shown to various groups mapped out those tradeoffs in stark terms, indicating that a decision to maintain a larger military could result in the cancellation of the \$392 billion Lockheed Martin Corp F-35 program and a new stealthy, long-range bomber, according to several people who saw the slides.

Defense officials later stressed there were no plans to kill either program, noting that dismantling the F-35 program in particular would have far-reaching consequences for the U.S. military services and 10 foreign countries involved in the program, which is already in production.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



"We have gone to great lengths to stress that this review identified, through a rigorous process of strategic modeling, possible decisions we might face, under scenarios we may or may not face in the future," Pentagon Spokesman George Little told Reuters in an email when asked about the slides.

"Any suggestion that we're now moving away from key modernization programs as a result of yesterday's discussion of the outcomes of the review would be incorrect," he said.

Analysts said Hagel and other Pentagon officials appeared to be leaning toward the option that would emphasize high-end weapons programs over force size.

Mackenzie Eaglen, an analyst at the American Enterprise Institute, said suggestions that the F-35 program "was being targeted was either an oversight or a scare tactic, but it wasn't a serious proposition that the entire program would be cancelled under any circumstances."

She said failure by Congress to reverse deep budget cuts could result in the F-35 program being slowed or scaled back, but outright cancellation was unlikely given the huge investment already made in the new warplane, which is designed to replace over a dozen planes in use around the world.

One defense official, who was not authorized to speak publicly, said the budget document had sketched out a worst-case scenario that was highly unlikely to occur.

"Cancelling the program would be detrimental to our national defense," said the official, noting that the U.S. Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps needed to replace aging fleets of fighter planes that were increasingly expensive to maintain.

Loren Thompson, chief operating officer of the Lexington Institute, cited estimates that it would cost four times the amount needed to buy new F-35s to keep the current force flying. And cutting the planned bomber would generate very little savings since the program - which could eventually cost around \$30 billion - is in the early stages at this point, he said.

"You have to view these options as analytical excursions rather than serious proposals because they're not consistent with what the administration has said it wants to do," he said.

Pentagon acquisition chief Frank Kendall and top U.S. military officials have repeatedly underscored their commitment to the F-35 program in recent months.

On Thursday, Admiral James Winnefeld, vice chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told a House Armed Services Committee that early work to develop a new long-range bomber was on track, and the new bomber would be a vital part of the U.S. nuclear deterrent and potential future warfare concepts.

But he said deepening budget cuts under the Budget Control Act (BCA) of 2011 could threaten the ambitious schedule for the new bomber, which Air Force officials want to field by 2025 -- and potentially the whole program.

"It could impact that program in terms of timing," Winnefeld told lawmakers. "It also would depend a little bit on whether you emphasized capacity or capability in terms of how many you might buy or - or whether you would do the program."

Details are classified, but industry officials and analysts said Lockheed, Northrop Grumman Corp, and Boeing Co have been awarded small-scale study contracts to start working on possible bomber designs, with a formal acquisition process to begin in coming years.

The Air Force requested \$400 million in its fiscal 2014 budget request for what it is trying to keep an affordable program. It plans to spend up to \$550 million each to buy 80 to 100 new bombers in coming years, with an eye to fielding them in the mid-2020s, said spokesman Ed Gulick.

Jim Thomas, vice president at the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, said the two options of a smaller military or sharp cutback in weapons programs represented a false dichotomy.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"This is almost one reasonably attractive option and a straw man that looks pretty unattractive," he said. "I don't think we're going to end up at either of these corners on the map. I think that you're going to get a hybrid solution."

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/08/02/usa-defense-weapons-idUSL1N0G300W20130802>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

National Journal

NNSA Defends B-61 Update Amid Possible New Price Hikes

By Global Security Newswire Staff

August 2, 2013

The National Nuclear Security Administration continues to defend a controversial project to modernize the U.S. stockpile of B-61 nuclear gravity bombs, even though further cost increases appear likely as a result of congressionally mandated federal spending cuts.

The most recent NNSA program cost projection anticipates that \$8.2 billion could be required for refurbishing and consolidating four different versions of the air-dropped munition, according to a classified report given to Congress in the spring.

The initial production batch is not anticipated to come before March 2020 -- a half-year longer than earlier timelines. The delay is due to fiscal 2013 sequestration reductions, which tacked on roughly \$200 million more to the project's overall cost, according to Donald Cook, NNSA deputy administrator for defense programs, who spoke with *Inside the Pentagon*.

Potential fiscal 2014 sequestration cutbacks could mean even more schedule delays, leading to hundreds of millions of dollars in additional program costs, Cook said.

The Senate Appropriations Committee earlier this summer approved spending legislation that would reduce funding for the program by \$168 million. If that spending cut passes into law, it would lead to even more lengthening of the project schedule, according to Cook.

"And if we stretch out the program, that means it's going to cost more," the NNSA deputy administrator said.

The B-61 refurbishment program has come under criticism from legislators and arms control proponents, who contend that the semiautonomous Energy Department agency could pursue instead a less-costly overhaul of the gravity bomb.

Cook defended the more expensive and sweeping approach that the agency is taking.

"We were learning that the less expensive ways of approaching this weren't going to work because we had more problems with the bomb," he reportedly said.

<http://www.nationaljournal.com/global-security-newswire/nnsa-defends-b-61-update-amid-possible-new-price-hikes-20130802>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Omaha World-Herald – Omaha, NE

Friday, August 2, 2013

Senate Confirms Adm. Cecil Haney as New StratCom Commander

By Joseph Morton, World-Herald staff writer

WASHINGTON — The Senate on Thursday night confirmed Adm. Cecil Haney as the next commander of U.S. Strategic Command.

Haney will replace Air Force Gen. C. Robert Kehler, who has been StratCom commander since January 2011.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Sen. Deb Fischer, R-Neb., a member of the Armed Services Committee, hailed Haney's confirmation.

"As a former Strategic Command deputy commander, he is no stranger to its mission and the people of Nebraska," Fischer said. "I was happy to support his nomination and look forward to working with him on efforts to support StratCom's mission."

Located at Offutt Air Force Base, StratCom's mission includes overseeing the nation's nuclear arsenal.

<http://www.omaha.com/article/20130801/NEWS/130809832/1707>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Mirror – U.K.
OPINION/Columnist

John Prescott: It's Time to Sink Trident Now

Britain could make a major step towards disarmament if we were to drop our commitment to having a CASD

By John Prescott
28 July 2013

To replace our Trident defence system is going to cost at least £25billion.

Lib Dem Coalition ministers recently published a review to look at cheaper alternatives.

It showed that a smaller replacement for the present Trident submarine fleet would not be massively cheaper. According to the Defence Secretary, Philip Hammond, it would only save £60million a year or £1.5billion over 25 years.

Alternative nuclear options on land, ship or aircraft were also found to be less effective – and would actually cost more.

The Government claims that to keep a Continuous At Sea Deterrence (CASD), with at least one nuclear sub at sea 24 hours a day, we need four submarines.

In the review, Lib Dem Danny Alexander argued we could reduce it to three.

The decision to replace Trident has to be made by 2020, although work on designs for the new subs is already underway and costing us many millions.

The question is whether we still need the round-the-clock deterrent brought in for the Cold War 60 years ago. These days Russia is more likely to cut off our gas supply than launch a nuclear attack.

Labour's defence spokesman Jim Murphy says it is current Labour policy to maintain CASD with four submarines. Ed Miliband says the party will debate this decision. Good. Let's start by defining the enemy.

Those who argue for it say the Trident fleet was a deterrent against the Soviet Union in the Cold War.

They also argue that North Korea and Iran could be a threat because they have the bomb, although they seem to forget that Pakistan, India and Israel have it, too.

Presumably, they are seen as the "goodies".

I seem to remember Iraq was once seen that way, too.

Perhaps we should understand that North Korea and Iran have learnt that having nuclear weapons is actually about holding power and recognition in an international community and justifying it in the name of deterrence – or to stop the West attacking them.

The nuclear non-proliferation treaty was designed when there were four nuclear nations who wanted to stop other countries getting the bomb.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The challenge now is to reduce nuclear weapons. Britain could make a major step towards disarmament if we were to drop our commitment to having a CASD and not replace Trident.

My worry is that costs will continue to soar. Replacing aircraft carriers was meant to cost £3.5billion but it has doubled to £7billion.

Clearly, in this period of austerity, which will last until well after the next election, along with struggling economic growth, health, welfare and public services, we've got to set our priorities.

I believe we should be bold and take the lead.

Of course, the US won't like it but the Scottish Government would – they don't want Trident based in their country, as it is now.

So let's have a proper and informed debate, not one dominated by straw man defence priorities and lobbying from retired defence chiefs and political hawks.

The £25billion cost of Trident is exactly the same amount as the projected black hole in NHS funding by 2020.

I say we scrap Trident for good, stop being the world's policeman and spend that money protecting the health of the nation.

John Prescott, the former Deputy Leader of the Labour Party and UK Deputy Prime Minister is a Sunday Mirror columnist.

<http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/uk-news/john-prescott-its-time-sink-2096704>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Christian Science Monitor
OPINION/Commentary

How US, Russia Can Agree on Missile Defense

US and Russia relations are in a nosedive over Eric Snowden, Syria, and Iran. One way to reverse that is for Presidents Putin and Obama to agree on missile defense at a planned summit in September. US-Russian cooperation in space can serve as a model.

By Kevin Ryan, Simon Saradzhyan, Op-ed contributors
July 29, 2013

Cambridge, Mass. – Relations between the United States and Russia today remind one of the report from the well digger, "We hit bottom and have started to dig." Whether it's over issues like leaker Eric Snowden or Syria and Iran, the US and Russia seem to end up on opposite sides of most major problems. But that trend could soon reverse – at least regarding one contentious subject.

On Aug. 9, American and Russian defense and foreign ministers are expected to meet with their US counterparts in Washington. They will try to find "deliverables" for a summit between President Obama and Russian President Vladimir Putin in September. The two leaders would meet in advance of a G20 summit in St. Petersburg, Russia, Sept. 5-6.

According to Russia's deputy defense minister, Anatoly Antonov, the August meeting will focus on missile defense, a thorny problem that has divided the two countries and scuttled new initiatives in arms control and security. The US maintains its proposed defense shield in Europe is only to protect against long-range Iranian missiles; Moscow objects, saying it could be used against Russia.

In remarks at a NATO meeting July 24, Mr. Antonov may have signaled new Russian flexibility. He did not renew Russia's long-standing demand for legally binding guarantees that US missile defenses won't undermine Russia's strategic nuclear forces. Instead, he called for a US-Russian document that would ensure that the Russian Defense Ministry's contributions to a cooperative project on missile defense would not be later used against Russia. "We are simply bound to find solutions to the problems that are dividing us," Antonov said.

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Over the years, US and Russian presidents have proposed various forms of cooperation in missile defense in order to build trust and improve security, but they have failed to find a way to implement their ideas. To strike a deal on missile defense, Obama and Putin should follow the example of their countries' cooperation in space as a model in carrying out that deal.

Space and rocket science were at the heart of US-Russian strategic competition during the 1950s and '60s. No one then envisioned the two countries sharing a glass of Tang, much less sensitive space technologies.

But gradually, with permission and guidance from the top, the countries began opening up cooperation in space. When the Cold War ended and defense budgets on both sides declined, the realm of space exploration transformed from one of confrontation into one of cooperation. The reason was primarily economic. Russia and the US found that together they could afford to do what they could not do separately.

The political and technical realities of today preclude a fully joint US-Russian missile defense system. Nevertheless, even a modest level of cooperation could provide better and cheaper overall defense for both sides. The way in which the US and Russia changed their space competition into cooperation can serve as a model for changing the relationship in missile defense. Here are five steps the governments can borrow from space cooperation:

Set common goals. The US and Russia could not have achieved cooperation in space, if they had not agreed on common goals, such as building the International Space Station. Moscow and Washington should focus on a common goal of protecting against ballistic missile threats.

Synchronize bureaucracies. In 1992, Moscow created the Russian Space Agency, providing NASA a direct counterpart, greatly facilitating cooperation. Russia should do the same for the US Missile Defense Agency.

Establish legal frameworks. Beginning in 1992, legal agreements allowed for the first launch of a US satellite on a Russian rocket and docking of US shuttles at Russia's space station. Similar agreements are needed to enable businesses from both sides to risk money in missile defense cooperation.

Ease technology-sharing restrictions. The US and Russia could benefit from technology sharing in missile defense if both governments would open the door for industry to pursue cooperation. This has already been done in space for some of the same companies that do missile defense.

Explore cost-cutting synergies. Hi-tech US and Russian businesses found ways to collaborate when freed to do so by their governments. They successfully cut costs while protecting national and industrial secrets. They can do the same in missile defense.

It's always darkest before the dawn. This could be the time for the two presidents to really lead. Cooperation in space exploration proves that the relationship does not have to remain at the bottom of the well.

Gen. Kevin Ryan is director of defense and intelligence projects at Harvard Kennedy School's Belfer Center and former chief of staff for the Army's Space and Missile Defense Command. Simon Saradzhyan is a research fellow at the Belfer Center and former Moscow correspondent for Space News.

<http://www.csmonitor.com/Commentary/Opinion/2013/0729/How-US-Russia-can-agree-on-missile-defense>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

The Diplomat – Japan
OPINION/Flashpoints

India's First Ballistic Missile Sub to Begin Sea Trials

By Zachary Keck
July 30, 2013

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



India's first indigenously-built, nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine, *INS Arihant*, is set to begin sea trials shortly India's *The Tribune* reported on Sunday, citing unnamed Indian officials.

"The nuclear reactor that will power the submarine can be formally declared 'critical' anytime now, while the nuclear-tipped missiles to be launched from underwater are in place," an unnamed source was quoted as saying.

The sea trials are set to begin in mid-August with the wait being attributed to the rough waters caused by India's yearly monsoon, which begins to weaken in mid-August according to the source. Once it sets sail the submarine will undergo extensive testing underwater including test launching submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

Once the *INS Arihant* is ready to conduct deterrent patrols, perhaps as early as the end of this year, India will have at least a nascent nuclear triad—the ability to launch nuclear weapons by land, air or sea.

India is only the sixth country to acquire a sea-based nuclear leg, with the others being the U.S., the UK, France, Russia and China, albeit—as noted last week—Beijing's ballistic missile submarines are not believed to have conducted deterrent patrols.

India's quest to build a nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine (SSBN, in U.S. Navy parlance), reportedly began in 1970 under Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. Code-named the Advanced Technology Vehicle (ATV) program, its existence was kept under wraps for more than three decades ago before the former chairman of India's Atomic Energy Commission, PK Iyengar, revealed it at a public forum back in 2007.

"Indian scientists and technologists are capable of making light water reactors and we are already constructing an LWR at Kalpakkam in south India for the submarine," Iyengar was quoted by *The Guardian at the time as saying*.

Russia is thought to have helped design the vessel, although India claims it built the LWR entirely by itself.

The *INS Arihant* (slayer of enemies) was first launched in 2009 without any corresponding submarine-launched ballistic missiles or the LWR. The vessel weighs 6,000 tons, has a length of 367 feet (110 meters) and reportedly travels at twenty four knots underwater. According to the *Tribune*, it cost Rs 15,000 crore (appx. US\$2.5 billion) to build.

It is powered by an 80-mw pressurized water reactor that uses uranium as fuel and light water as a coolant and moderator. This will allow it to operate quietly and stay submerged for about 2 months at a time.

The SSBN can reportedly carry up to 12 K-15 Sagarika submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), that have a range of around 700 km, or 4 K-4 SLBMs, which have a range of 3,500 km and are comparable in many ways to India's Agni-III land-based missile. The K-4 Missiles are still under development, however. It is also believed to be developing a K-5 SLBM with a range of nearly 1,864 mi.

In 2008, Rear Admiral (retired) Raja Menon was quoted by *India Today* as saying, "One submarine carries at least 12 [K-15] missiles with Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicles, which could mean as many as 96 warheads."

India first announced that it had tested a K-15 SLBM from a submerged pontoon at a depth of 50 meters in January of this year (see video below). At the time it said that it had secretly conducted over a dozen earlier tests of the K-15, and that the development phase was now complete.

Altogether, India plans to field 3 SSBNs with the goal of keeping two on patrol at all times, a highly ambitious plan given needed repairs.

As noted last week, U.S. intelligence reportedly believes that China will deploy its own new SLBM, giving it an effective sea-based deterrent for the first time. Both China and India maintain no-first-use nuclear policies. SSBN's are seen as the most survivable leg of the nuclear triad.

Zachary Keck is Assistant Editor of The Diplomat. He has previously served as a Deputy Editor for E-IR and as an Editorial Assistant for The Diplomat.

<http://thedi diplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2013/07/30/indias-first-ballistic-missile-sub-to-begin-sea-trials/>



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Arms Control Wonk.com
OPINION/Commentary

What Went Wrong with Arms Control?

By Michael Krepon
30 July 2013

In the mid-1980s, many smart people predicted the death of arms control. Thomas Schelling was one of them. Others included Richard Haass, Albert Carnesale, Les Gelb, and Zbigniew Brzezinski.

US-Soviet relations were in terrible shape. The White House and the Kremlin were talking past each other. Uber-hawks in the Reagan administration compiled a long list of Soviet treaty violations – some true, mostly over the top – to block new accords, which seemed unlikely in any event, given the one-sided nature of the administration's proposals. Almost everybody was surprised when President Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev threw nuclear orthodoxy out the window to reach a deal eliminating intermediate- and shorter-range nuclear missiles in 1987.

Schelling's pessimistic appraisal, "What Went Wrong with Arms Control?" appeared in the Winter 1985/86 issue of *Foreign Affairs*. His critique deserves another read because he was a founding father of nuclear arms control and because prospects for treaty making have once again ebbed. Schelling argued that arms control had "gone off the tracks" in part because "it often looks as if it is the arms negotiations that are driving the arms race." More fundamentally, Schelling's complaint had to do with how misshapen the process had become. In his view, the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty was "not merely the high point but the end point of successful arms control."

The enterprise went astray, in Schelling's opinion, for the lack of "any coherent theory of what arms control is supposed to accomplish." He wrote, "I judge the proposals and negotiations on offensive weapons to have been mostly mindless, without a guiding philosophy." A major contributing factor to Schelling's disillusionment was "the shift of interest from the *character* of weapons to their *numbers*." The obsession over "matching enemy capabilities whether we like them or not" made no sense. More heresies followed:

"Nobody ever offers a convincing reason for preferring smaller numbers (I may exaggerate: saving money is a legitimate reason...). And some people think that with fewer numbers there is less likelihood that one will fall into mischievous hands or be launched by mechanical error; this I think is incorrect, but may not be worth refuting because it is in no one's main motivation. For the most part, people simply think that smaller numbers are better than bigger... If people really believe that zero is the ultimate goal it is easy to see that downward is the direction they should go. But hardly anyone who takes arms control seriously believes that zero is the goal."

What, then, should strategic arms control be about? Or, as Schelling asked, "If you were to limit something, what would you want to limit?" His answer was limits to promote force postures consisting of "economical and reliable retaliatory weapons that are neither susceptible to preemption nor capable of preemption." Stabilizing, offsetting nuclear force postures would share three "crucial elements:" an assured retaliatory capability, "restrained targeting and some capacity for war termination." No surprise about element #1. Element #2 — counterforce targeting as the enemy of stabilizing deterrence and arms control — was ignored once these capabilities were in reach. Element #3 was hardly discussed.

Schelling thought highly of the ABM Treaty because it reinforced cautionary behavior:

"A prudent restraint from aggressive violence that is based on acknowledgment that the world is too small to support a nuclear war is a healthier basis for peace than unilateral efforts to build defenses... Most of what we call civilization depends on reciprocal vulnerability."

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The counterforce compulsion trumped the ABM Treaty. The United States and the Soviet Union didn't take Schelling's advice because decision makers were listening instead to powerful domestic constituencies, including competing laboratories, military services and missile production complexes. The three states currently increasing their nuclear arsenals at the fastest rate – China, India and Pakistan – might just succeed in avoiding the counterforce trap, despite having familiar domestic drivers. It's too soon to tell, but so far, Beijing and New Delhi have been focusing on economic growth while competing well below their military industrial capacity.

The Cold War fixation with nuclear numerology may have been wrongly applied, but it remains our temperature gauge for nuclear dangers, our surrogate for measuring the health of the Nonproliferation Treaty regime and a key indicator of how much effort Washington and Moscow devote to reversing nuclear excess. Numbers continue to matter. They tell us whether countries are in a holding pattern, or headed in a more dangerous or saner direction. Getting to zero may well be an impossible journey, but movement in this direction is the glue that helps keep the NPT intact.

Schelling was nonetheless right about many things, especially the overriding need to focus on avoiding or reducing the war-fighting character of nuclear arsenals. Once counterforce requirements have been embraced, nuclear excess is sure to follow. Counterforce capabilities present far more of a roadblock than missile defenses in reducing the size of large nuclear arsenals. The safest harbor for stabilizing deterrence, as Schelling advised, can be found when retaliatory weapons are neither susceptible to preemption nor capable of preemption.

Michael Krepon is Co-founder of the Henry L. Stimson Center and the author or editor of thirteen books and over 350 articles. Prior to co-founding the Stimson Center, Krepon worked at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the US Arms Control and Disarmament Agency during the Carter administration, and in the US House of Representatives, assisting Congressman Norm Dicks.

<http://krepon.armscontrolwonk.com/archive/3853/what-went-wrong-with-arms-control>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

U.S. News & World Report
OPINION/World Report

The Folly of Nuclear Disarmament

By Peter Huessy
July 31, 2013

In Washington, it is said, bad ideas never truly go away. So it is with the concept of nuclear disarmament that so preoccupied the Obama administration during its first term. In recent months, the White House has renewed its fixation on reducing the level of nuclear weapons in the U.S. arsenal.

But its efforts are fraught with peril, because they can contribute significantly to instability in a crisis. At the lower levels of delivery vehicles being advocated by some, and possibly being considered by the White House, we may be at increased risk of sudden attack in a crisis because our arsenal will have shrunk to such an extent as to make an successful disarming "first strike" plausible.

We have faced this problem before. Thirty years ago, the U.S. was confronting an adversary armed with more than 40,000 nuclear warheads. America's own nuclear forces at the time were old and rusting.

But we got creative. We proposed a "build-down," modernizing our nuclear force while significantly reducing overall warhead numbers. To this effort, we added a missile defense research program designed to eventually help make a first strike by an adversary (in the Cold War case, the Soviet Union) far less plausible. Most importantly, we fielded a nuclear deterrent force that was highly survivable, adding permanence to our nuclear deterrent in the process.

Why is survivability so important? The deployed strategic nuclear forces of the United States are calculated based upon what is needed for retaliation, not first use. That retaliatory strike must be able to hold at risk or target what the bad guys prize in the event of a conflict, most of all military forces (including enemy nuclear assets).

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Our current force – which numbers 420 to 450 Minuteman, 12 Trident submarines and 60 B52 and B2 bombers – allows us to do this. But at lower numbers, such a sustainable second strike capability is called into question. Already, some Congressional proponents of disarmament have pushed for cutting our platforms significantly (although House votes this week defeated such measures overwhelmingly).

Unfortunately, the possibility of future instability is greater than ever before. China may soon have 100 missiles capable of striking America. According to a new intelligence assessment by the U.S. Air Force, both North Korea and Iran will also have the capability of striking the U.S. with a ballistic missile by 2015. Russia is also fully modernizing its nearly 500 submarine and land based-missiles and bombers. China is doing the same with its nuclear arsenal, while building missiles at a faster rate than any other country in the world.

If we reduce our warheads to 1000 from 1550, it could mean the mothballing of an entire wing (or more) of Minutemen missiles – and a partial (but serious) hollowing of both our submarine and bomber capabilities. Moreover, it could mean such a constriction at precisely the time when our adversaries and strategic competitors are headed in the opposite direction. The result would be the worst of both worlds – heightened strategic instability and the U.S. with a limited and old deterrent force.

The threats we face from North Korean, Chinese and Iranian nuclear and missile modernization are serious. They require better and more robust missile defenses, more vigorous counter-proliferation efforts, a second to none deterrent posture and the stability afforded by a robust nuclear deterrent capability. It's called "providing for the common defense." The White House would do well to seriously look into the idea. Stability really does matter.

Peter Huessy is Senior Fellow in National Security Affairs at the American Foreign Policy Council in Washington, DC.

<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/07/31/obamas-nuclear-disarmament-plan-is-dangerous-policy>

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Huffington Post
OPINION/The Blog

The INF Treaty and Regional Missile Threats

By David W. Kearns
August 1, 2013

The 1987 Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, signed by President Ronald Reagan and General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev was a diplomatic watershed that signaled the beginning of the end of the Cold War. For the first time, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to eliminate an entire class of weapons. Almost 2,700 land-based, intermediate-range ballistic missiles and cruise missiles (with ranges between 500 and 5,500 km) were scrapped along with their launchers and other support systems. Development and testing was banned to prevent reconstitution of these forces, and an intrusive monitoring regime (including on-site inspection) was implemented. The Treaty created a basis for security and stability in Europe and contributed to the peaceful resolution of the 50 year superpower rivalry.

Some defense experts have questioned whether the INF Treaty continues to serve U.S. security interests. They are not alone. In 2007, Russian President Vladimir Putin threatened to withdraw from the Treaty, largely out of frustration with planned U.S. ballistic missile defenses in Central Europe. But Putin's threats also highlighted a more basic concern: the spread of intermediate range missile forces (also known as "theater missiles") around the globe. These types of weapons have emerged in the arsenals of known proliferators like Iran and North Korea, as well as nuclear-armed regional rivals like India and Pakistan.

Perhaps most importantly for the United States, China has engaged in an expansive modernization program centered on short- and intermediate-range conventional missiles. These weapons could significantly undermine the ability of the United States to effectively respond to a Taiwan crisis by placing U.S. forward bases and naval assets in the region at

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*



risk. If the conventional balance continues to shift in China's favor, the perceived effectiveness of the U.S. deterrent may decrease, potentially inviting provocation and eroding stability.

The question that arises is whether the United States requires its own conventional theater missiles to effectively respond to these pressing regional threats, and thus consider withdrawing from the INF Treaty. The short answer is "no." Given its overwhelming conventional military superiority, increasing missile defense capabilities, and guarantees to key allies, the United States does not require these missiles to deter Iran or North Korea. In addressing the challenge posed by China's military modernization, the deployment of a new generation of conventional theater missiles could enhance U.S. conventional offensive capabilities in the region, but such a program would also be costly and limited by a lack of feasible basing options. Moreover, Washington possesses other means to effectively address this challenge, and can continue to leverage U.S. advantages in the development of extended-range munitions, air power, surface combatants and submarines over the longer-term.

At the same time, the potential implications of a U.S. withdrawal from the INF Treaty would likely be far-reaching. First, an American withdrawal and the subsequent deployment of U.S. missiles is unlikely to alter the course of China's military buildup and will likely exacerbate tensions between Washington and Beijing, reinforcing the perception that the United States is a threat to China's rise. This only makes the task of deterring China more difficult in the future, decreasing the stability of a critically-important region and complicating the policies of key U.S. allies like Japan, South Korean and the Philippines.

Second, with a new generation of potentially nuclear-armed intermediate range missiles, Moscow's assertions of influence in its traditional "near abroad" will have much more force behind them. For our NATO allies, this would be troubling. A unilateral U.S. withdrawal could seriously undermine the alliance, exacerbating tensions between Western and newer Central European members and calling into question U.S. leadership and Washington's commitment to collective security. Russia has also engaged in a dispute with Japan over the Kurile Islands and the deployment of Russian missiles in its Eastern territories would provide Moscow with a new capability to compel or bully Japan. At the same time, Russia will continue to be suspicious of Washington's longer-term motives after this clear reversal of longstanding arms control and nonproliferation policies.

In general, given the existing Chinese program and the newfound capacity of Moscow to develop theater missiles, it should be expected that proliferation of missiles and associated technologies will increase, undermining the successes of various bilateral U.S. diplomatic efforts and multilateral initiatives, like the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) or the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI). Such a policy would also seem to be detrimental to ongoing U.S. investments in missile defenses.

Maintaining the Treaty will avoid many of these diplomatic and security problems. Over time, Washington may be able to leverage Russian concerns about China's modernization to engage Beijing in negotiations on expanding the Treaty as well as other interested states like India and Pakistan. Working with Russia to maintain and expand the treaty is a prudent diplomatic strategy. Conversely, undertaking a unilateral diplomatic action that could dramatically alter the security environments of some of America's closest allies seems risky and potentially damaging for U.S. interests.

Dr. David W. Kearn, Jr. is an assistant professor of Government & Politics at St. John's University in Queens, New York. His research focuses on the impact of technological change on military affairs, international relations theory, arms control, terrorism, and U.S. foreign policy.

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-w-kearn/the-inf-treaty-and-regional_b_3683221.html

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Foreign Policy
OPINION/The Cable

Snowden Asylum Could Blow Up Nuke Talks

By John Hudson



Thursday, August 1, 2013

It's one of the signature issues of President Obama's second term, and Edward Snowden may have caused it to crack.

On Thursday, nuclear arms control advocates shuddered as Washington erupted in rage over Russia's decision to grant temporary asylum to the former NSA contractor. With Republicans in Congress demanding retaliation and White House officials openly casting doubt on a planned Moscow summit, the worry is that Obama's ambitious goal of reducing deployed strategic nuclear weapons by one-third may have just flown out the window.

"It's one of the president's key legacy issues and the Russians are in no uncertain terms critical partners for it," Matt Rojansky, a Russia expert at the Wilson Center, told *The Cable*. "I don't know how they pull it off now. The idea of lowering deployed numbers is substantially weakened if you don't have a Russian counterpart."

For Kingston Reif, a director at the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, an already difficult situation just got a whole lot worse. "There have always been ups and downs in the US and Russia relationship [but] we appear to be in one of those down periods," he told *The Cable*. "The prospects for major progress on a modus vivendi on missile defense and a framework for further nuclear weapons reductions during the President's planned visit to Moscow in September weren't particularly high to begin with."

Today, both White House and State Department officials noted their "extreme" disappointment with Russia for refusing to return Snowden to the U.S. On top of that, spokesman Jay Carney said "We are evaluating the utility of a summit," referring to Obama's scheduled visit to Moscow ahead of the G-20 gathering in St. Petersburg next month. "We are extremely disappointed that the Russian government would take this step despite our very clear and lawful request in public and in private," Carney said.

Meanwhile, Russia hawks in Congress fired off a volley of press releases condemning the Kremlin. "[Obama] should immediately announce that he will not meet one-on-one with the Russian president at the upcoming G-20 Summit in Russia in September," Ed Royce, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee said in one such statement. Ranking member Eliot Engel added that the Russians "must understand that there will be a strong U.S. response to this." Going further, Sen. John McCain called on the U.S. to "fundamentally rethink our relationship with Putin's Russia" while Sen. Lindsey Graham called on the U.S. to expand NATO membership to Georgia and complete a controversial missile defense shield in Europe.

For non-proliferation advocates, the Snowden disruption reverberates given the fact that the U.S. and Russia possess more than 90 percent of the nuclear weapons on the planet. In his Berlin speech in June, Obama punctuated his goal of a one-third reduction in deployed strategic warheads below the New Start treaty levels with Russia. He also expressed an interest in pursuing reductions with Russia in nonstrategic nuclear weapons. "Achieving these goals requires Russian cooperation, not stonewalling," said Reif. "Given the disproportionate size of the US and Russian arsenals, further bilateral reductions are necessary to bring other nuclear weapons states into the arms control process, most notably China."

Still, a State Department official familiar with nuclear issues emphasized that the president's nuclear reduction goals could still be salvaged. "Even in the darkest days of the Cold War, we continued to work on nuclear limitations and strategic stability because it was in our national security interest. Not anybody else's," said the official.

Rojansky suspects that if the Russians prove too difficult to work with, Obama may simply make a personal legacy call and reduce U.S. stockpiles unilaterally. "If they have no other choice, they may make this a defining legacy issue," said Rojansky, noting that president's often look to foreign policy achievements to boost their second term profiles. "At this point, Obama got bin Laden, he kind of successfully wound down Iraq and Afghanistan, though the jury is still very much out. You'd have to be naive to think he's going to have Israel-Palestine. He doesn't have Iran and he obviously doesn't have Syria," he said. "That's a pretty short list of foreign policy accomplishments, which makes unilateral reductions more attractive."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

However, State Department officials insisted the Snowden controversy doesn't have to undermine the relationship as a whole. "We're not going to stop engaging with them on Syria, on the way forward, on missile defense, on any of these issues because one meeting does or does not happen," said spokeswoman Marie Harf. "In light of the fact that they have taken such action, it behooves us to evaluate where the relationship is, whether the summit makes sense. But again, I don't want to get ahead of any decision on that at this point."

John Hudson reports on national security and foreign policy from the Pentagon to Foggy Bottom, the White House to Embassy Row, for The Cable.

http://thecable.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2013/08/01/snowden_asylum_may_jeopardize_russian_nuke_cooperation

[\(Return to Articles and Documents List\)](#)

Issue No. 1068, 02 August 2013

*United States Air Force Counterproliferation Research & Education | Maxwell AFB, Montgomery AL
Phone: 334.953.7538 | Fax: 334.953.7530*