



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

Articles & Other Documents:

**Featured Article:** Unresolved Issues Hang Over U.S. Missile Shield

1. [US Wants Nuclear Confrontation - Rouhani](#)
2. [White House Extends Olive Branch as Iran President Rouhani Inaugurated](#)
3. [Report: Iran's Arak Reactor to Have Nuclear Weapons Grade Plutonium by Next Summer](#)
4. [Iran's New Leader Rouhani Urges 'Serious' Nuclear Talks](#)
5. [Iran Launch Site 'Likely for Testing Ballistic Missiles', Analysts Say](#)
6. [Wait-Out Risks N-Compromise](#)
7. [Former MI Chief Yadlin Cautions over Iran's Plutonium Program](#)
8. [Rouhani, Putin to Meet in Kyrgyzstan in Sept.: Kremlin](#)
9. [N. Korea Moves to Develop Cutting-Edge Nanotech Industry](#)
10. [NKorea Developing Missiles: New weapons could be Capable of Reaching Guam](#)
11. [Japanese Protesters Call for Japan's Nuclear Armament on Hiroshima Anniversary](#)
12. [Abe Cites N. Korea for Failure to Back Int'l Non-Nuclear Statement](#)
13. [US Institute: NKorea Expanding Nuclear Plant](#)
14. [More Lawmakers Want Japan to Consider Nuclear Arms Option](#)
15. [Russia Should Be Ready to React to Accidents Involving Nuclear Weapons - Defense Minister](#)
16. [Russian Supersonic Missiles Behave Like Wolves](#)
17. [Russian and U.S. Ministers to Discuss Missile Defence](#)
18. [Russia Destroys Over 75% of Its Chemical Weapons Stockpile](#)
19. [LibDems to Vote on Trident Policy](#)
20. [Unresolved Issues Hang Over U.S. Missile Shield](#)
21. [Navy Drops Plans to Repair USS Miami Sub](#)
22. [First ANG Bomb Wing Certified for Nuclear Ops](#)
23. [Scientists to Make Mutant Forms of new Bird Flu to Assess Risk](#)
24. [Does US Have an Effective Deterrent Posture?](#)
25. [Take a Stand against Nuclear Weapons](#)
26. [The Future of Arms Control](#)
27. [KAHLILI: Rouhani's Iranian Nuclear Deception](#)
28. [Paka \(So Long for Now\) Arms Control](#)
29. [The Case for Keeping Trident Is Political, Not Military](#)
30. [Udall Needs to Rethink Huge Spending on B61](#)
31. ['When Obama Says Putin Is Trapped in Cold War Logic, It's True. But So Is Obama.'](#)

*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.1069, 09 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

Al Bawaba – Amman, Jordan

## US Wants Nuclear Confrontation - Rouhani

August 4th, 2013

Via SyndiGate.info

Newly elected Iranian President Hassan Rouhani has been reported as saying that the United States is looking for an excuse to confront Iran over its controversial nuclear programme, Iranian state TV said on Saturday.

According to the TV source, Rouhani made the remarks during a meeting with North Korean official Kim Yong Nam, who was visiting Tehran for Rouhani's inauguration.

"We believe the United States and the Westerners are seeking an excuse to confront the countries that they do not consider friends," Rouhani was quoted as saying, according to AFP.

The West, including the US, believes that Iran is pursuing its nuclear weapons programme despite international regulations, a charge Iran staunchly denies.

Elected in June, Rouhani is considered to be a liberal candidate. He has promised to seek better relations with the West and is seen by many as heralding the end of the turbulent Ahmedinejad era.

Despite his promises during his election campaign, Rouhani is still second in command to the Supreme Leader of Iran, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei.

But the elected president is subordinate, particularly in foreign and security matters, to the clerical leadership.

<http://www.albawaba.com/news/rouhani-iran-president-us-nuclear-511553>

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

The London Guardian – U.K.

## White House Extends Olive Branch as Iran President Rouhani Inaugurated

*Statement says Obama administration will be 'willing partner' if moderate cleric leads Iran in meeting 'international obligations'*

By Matt Williams and agencies

4 August 2013

The inauguration of the new president of Iran, Hasan Rouhani, presents "an opportunity" for Tehran to resolve concerns over its nuclear programme and better engage with the West, the Obama administration said on Sunday.

In a statement marking the formal handing over of power to the moderate cleric from his hardline predecessor, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, the White House congratulated the Iranian people for "making their voices heard" and calling for "change". It added that should the new government in Iran move towards meeting its "international obligations", then it would find a "willing partner in the United States".

But the apparent olive branch comes amid hawkish calls in Washington for tougher sanctions on Tehran and the possibility of military action if no resolution is found. In a letter sent to President Barack Obama, 76 senators demanded tougher economic punishment for Iran until the Islamic republic scales back its nuclear ambitions. It also urged Obama to keep all options on the table, while keeping the door open to diplomacy.

"Until we see a significant slowdown of Iran's nuclear activities, we believe our nation must toughen sanctions and reinforce the credibility of our option to use military force at the same time as we fully explore a diplomatic solution to our dispute with Iran," the letter states, according to a version seen by the Associated Press.

The letter comes just days after the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed new restrictions on Iran's oil sector and its mining and construction industries. Senators are expected to take up the same package in September.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



The stance from Congress is at odds with that of the Obama administration, which has pursued a softer line on Iran as it transitions the presidency. Rouhani has pledged to follow a "path of moderation" and promised greater openness over Iran's nuclear program. The White House appears willing to give the president a chance to put those pledges into action.

The White House statement said: "We note that President Rouhani recognised his election represented a call by the Iranian people for change, and we hope the new Iranian government will heed the will of the voters by making choices that will lead to a better life for the Iranian people. The inauguration of President Rouhani presents an opportunity for Iran to act quickly to resolve the international community's deep concerns over Iran's nuclear program."

The US has long believed that Iran has been working to develop nuclear weapons. Iran insists its program is for peaceful energy and research purposes only.

The last round of talks between Iran and the wider international community over the issue broke down in April, with seemingly little progress. At that point, US secretary of state John Kerry hinted that negotiations could be heading towards a deadline, noting that the talks were not an "interminable process". But the election of Rouhani has seemingly raised hopes of diplomatic solution to the impasse.

<http://www.theguardian.com/world/2013/aug/04/obama-administration-iran>

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

The Jerusalem Post – Israel

## **Report: Iran's Arak Reactor to Have Nuclear Weapons Grade Plutonium by Next Summer**

By JPOST.COM STAFF

5 August 2013

According to the *Wall Street Journal*, the progress at Arak "crept up" on int'l officials whose focus was on Iran's uranium enrichment; says Arak is easier for Israel to attack than other sites.

The Arak heavy water nuclear reactor in Iran will be capable of producing two nuclear bombs' worth of weapons grade plutonium a year and will be capable of producing the material by next summer, according to a *Wall Street Journal* report on Monday that cited US, UN and EU officials.

Progress at Arak could complicate international efforts to negotiate with Iran on its suspected nuclear arms program and it also "heightens the possibility of an Israeli strike on the site," the report stated, citing officials.

According to the report, US and the West has been focused mainly on Iran's program to enrich uranium and that the issue of plutonium, that can also serve as a material for an explosive devise, took some officials by surprise.

Regarding the capabilities of the Arak reactor, the report quoted an official based at the IAEA's Vienna headquarters who said that it "really crept up on us."

The *Wall Street Journal* report stressed that a site like Arak was more vulnerable to attack compared to Iran's other enrichment facilities at Natanz and Qom.

"There's no question that the reactor and its heavy water are more vulnerable targets than the enrichment plants," the report quoted Gary Samore as saying, a former top adviser on nuclear issues to US President Barack Obama.

"This could be another factor in [Prime Minister Binyamin] Netanyahu's calculations in deciding how long to wait before launching military operations," Samore added.

The report cited current and former US officials who said an Israeli strike on Arak would likely have to take place prior to Iran introducing nuclear materials into the facility, in order to prevent an enormous environmental disaster.

Echoing this concern about the consequences of attacking a nuclear facility was a senior Israeli security official.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"Whoever considers attacking an active reactor is willing to invite another Chernobyl," former Israeli military intelligence chief Amos Yadlin said last month, referring to the 1986 Soviet reactor accident which sent radioactive dust across much of Europe. "And there is no one who wants to do that."

In May, Netanyahu said that Iran's work on a heavy-water reactor to build a plutonium-based bomb and its nuclear enrichment program was "the biggest challenge of our time."

The Islamic Republic claims its nuclear program is peaceful, and insists it will use the Arak facility to make isotopes for medical and agricultural use.

*Reuters and Tovah Lazaroff contributed to this report.*

<http://www.jpost.com/Iranian-Threat/News/Report-Iran-Arak-facility-to-have-nuclear-weapons-grade-plutonium-by-next-summer-322093>

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

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) – U.K.  
6 August 2013

## Iran's New Leader Rouhani Urges 'Serious' Nuclear Talks

Iran's President Hassan Rouhani has called for "serious and substantive" negotiations with the international community about its nuclear programme.

At the first news conference since his inauguration on Sunday, Mr Rouhani said he was confident both sides' concerns could be resolved in a short time.

But a solution could be reached solely through "talks, not threats", he added.

The US has said Mr Rouhani's presidency presents an opportunity for Iran to resolve the world's "deep concerns".

"Should this new government choose to engage substantively and seriously to meet its international obligations and find a peaceful solution to this issue, it will find a willing partner in the United States," it added.

Western powers suspect Iran is seeking to develop nuclear weapons, but Tehran insists its nuclear programme is entirely peaceful.

Iran has repeatedly rejected demands by the so-called P5+1 - the five permanent members of the UN Security Council plus Germany - to halt uranium enrichment.

### **US behaviour 'contradictory'**

Addressing domestic and international journalists in Tehran on Tuesday, Mr Rouhani stated that Iran's uranium enrichment programme was peaceful and legal and would continue. But he also said he was determined to resolve the long-running dispute.

"We are ready - seriously and without wasting time - to engage in serious and substantive talks with the other sides. I am certain the concerns of the two sides would be removed through talks in a short period of time.

"However, demands outside any legal framework or illogical and outdated demands will not be useful. We should deal with the issue through a realistic approach."

But he stressed that Iran's rights must be preserved, adding: "The basis of our agenda should be talks, not threats."

Mr Rouhani said the US still did not have a thorough and proper understanding of what was happening in Iran, and that it had not responded in an "appropriate and practical" manner after June's presidential election.



"[Washington's] behaviour and words are contradictory," he said, adding that there was a "war-mongering group" there opposed to talks which was taking orders from a foreign country - presumably a reference to Israel.

Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov welcomed Mr Rouhani's call for negotiations.

"We absolutely agree with what he said. Resolving this, like any other issue, must be not on the basis of ultimatums, but based on a respectful attitude to a partner," he told reporters in Rome.

Earlier, Mr Lavrov's deputy said a new round of talks between Iran and the P5+1 must not be delayed and should take place by mid-September.

On Sunday, Mr Rouhani presented to Iran's parliament, the Majlis, a new cabinet dominated by technocrats who had previously served under a moderate former President, Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani.

Mr Rouhani also vowed at Tuesday's news conference that his government would be accountable and act transparently.

He said he would keep his promise to "report on the progress made and the achievements, as well as the shortcomings and failings".

"Without the people's support, the government will have no chance of meeting its long-term goals," he warned.

Mr Rouhani has inherited a range of problems from his predecessor, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, including high inflation, diminishing revenues and foreign reserves, possible food shortages, as well as sanctions.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-23591371>

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

The London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Iran Launch Site 'Likely for Testing Ballistic Missiles', Analysts Say**

*Iran has built a new rocket launch site which is likely to be used for testing ballistic missiles, according to military analysts publishing satellite images of the structure.*

By Ben Farmer, Defence Correspondent

07 August 2013

Pictures of the newly discovered site have been published weeks after the Iranian government said it was building new space launch bases for its domestic satellite programme.

The new site is close to Iran's first space centre in the northern Semnan province, but analysts believe it is designed to test ballistic missiles rather than launch space rockets.

A picture of the base taken last month and published by IHS Jane's Military and Security Assessments shows a 23m tall launch tower sitting on a launch pad measuring 200m by 140m. The picture also shows a 125m long exhaust deflector.

Analysts said the unfinished site 25 miles south east of the city of Shahrud has no storage for the liquid rocket fuel used in the Iranian space programme, suggesting it is built for ballistic missiles using solid fuel.

Matthew Clements, editor of the assessments, said: "This site could be a facility for launching satellites into orbit. However, Iran is already building at least one other site for this purpose and, looking at the satellite imagery we have got, we believe that this facility is most likely used for testing ballistic missiles.

"Its location and orientation would be suitable for long-range missile tests as they would fly over Iranian territory for 870 miles, meaning large quantities of flight data could be gathered before they drop into the Indian Ocean.

"At the same time, we can't see any storage facilities for the liquid fuel needed for the rockets that launch satellites, suggesting it will be used for solid-fuel ballistic missiles." He said there was no indication the Shahrud base was a nuclear facility.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Tehran has said it will dramatically expand its space programme and earlier this year said it had launched a monkey into space and recovered it safely afterwards. Iran already has one space centre at Semnan, 100 miles to the south west of the new site, and the Iranian government has suggested it is building another in south east Iran in Chabahar.

Mohammad Hassan Nami, minister of communication and information technology, said last month Iran was “building other centres too and we are trying to have a powerful start”.

Mr Clements said: “Our findings, along with public Iranian claims, suggest that they would have three launch sites. That seems excessive at a time when Iran is in severe economic difficulties because of Western sanctions.” The development could increase tensions in the Middle East.

Shashank Joshi, a research fellow at the Royal United Services Institute who has written about the Iranian missile programme, said: “We often talk about Iran’s nuclear programme, but what really spooks countries in the region is the ballistic missiles that could act as a delivery system.

“America has long said Iran might be able to test intercontinental ballistic missiles by 2015, though the programme has been crippled in the past few years by sanctions and covert action.” He said Iran had been developing solid fuel rockets which are quicker to deploy than liquid fuel versions.

He said: “If you look at why their missile programme has been so slow, one reason is their difficulties with solid fuel. A testing site which helps in that regard is concerning. Testing is critical. You don’t improve missiles until you test them.”

The Iranian government did not respond to requests for comment.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/10229480/iran-launch-site-likely-for-testing-ballistic-missiles-analysts-say.html>

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

Arab Times Kuwait English Daily – Kuwait

## **Wait-Out Risks N-Compromise**

By Agencies

8 August 2013

DUBAI, Aug 7, (Agencies): The presidency of moderate cleric Hassan Rouhani has opened a window of opportunity in Iran’s delicate nuclear diplomacy with the West but Tehran-watchers say that window could close as each side waits for the other to make the first move. Cautious optimism about talks between Iran and six world powers due to restart in September is a stark contrast to the gloom over on-off negotiations under eight years of previous President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. In that time, ever more stringent UN, US and European Union sanctions on Iran’s energy, shipping and banking sectors have helped weaken its currency, contributed to a steep rise in inflation and nearly halved oil exports since 2011.

Meanwhile the Islamic Republic has continued to enrich uranium, edging towards Israel’s “red line” after which it says it will launch military strikes on Iranian facilities.

The leadership of Rouhani, who defeated more conservative rivals in a June 14 election with just over 50 percent of the vote, appears to offer the prospect of an alternative to the worst case scenario.

“We are prepared, seriously and without wasting time, to enter negotiations which are serious and substantive with the other side,” Rouhani said at his first news conference as president on Tuesday, and in answer to a question did not rule out direct talks with the United States.

The United States, which has said it would be a “willing partner” if Iran were serious about resolving the problem peacefully, was careful in its response.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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





“There are steps they need to take to meet their international obligations and find a peaceful solution to this issue, and the ball is in their court,” said State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki.

The fact that Rouhani has been able to reach out to Washington even in a limited way indicates he has at least the tacit support of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the most powerful figure in Iran’s complex and often opaque power structure.

Khamenei has publicly voiced scepticism of the West’s willingness to compromise, but for now appears to be giving Rouhani room to make a deal. If there is a lack of progress, that could easily change.

Western powers must demonstrate that they are willing to engage or Rouhani’s ability to negotiate might be undercut by conservative elements at home, said Dina Esfandiary, a research associate at the International Institute for Strategic Studies.

“If faced with inertia or a blind insistence on increasing sanctions, then hardliners will discredit him and Iran will revert back to a policy of resistance,” Esfandiary told Reuters.

Rouhani’s key appointment so far has been Mohammad Javad Zarif as foreign minister. Zarif has been involved in back-channel talks and behind-the-scenes negotiations with the United States dating back to the arms-for-hostages deal of the 1980s, and has had contacts with top US officials, including US President Joe Biden and Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel.

A new head of the Supreme National Security Council, who has traditionally acted as Iran’s chief nuclear negotiator, has yet to be appointed. The delay has led some Iran-watchers to speculate Rouhani may want to bring the job of nuclear negotiator under the foreign ministry, giving an even stronger signal that he wants to streamline the talks process.

The basis of a deal is just about visible.

The two governments appear closer to holding direct talks than they have been in many years, perhaps even reviving the idea of a “grand bargain” to resolve all the issues between them dating back to the overthrow of the US-backed Shah in the 1979 Islamic Revolution.

Rouhani has signalled he would be willing to allow more transparency in Tehran’s nuclear activities in return for the acceptance of Iran’s right to enrich for peaceful purposes.

But both the United States and Iran appear to be waiting for the other side to make the first big concession, which is likely to stall any breakthrough.

Rouhani said on Tuesday Iran retained the “right” to enrich uranium, a position that has scuttled past talks and is likely to be a sticking point again.

World powers have demanded Iran cease the enrichment of uranium up to 20 percent and UN Security Council resolutions require Iran to suspend all enrichment.

“It was always going to be unlikely that Iran would happily give up enrichment — the Islamic Republic of Iran has painted itself into a corner by elevating the issue to one of national resistance and pride,” Esfandiary said.

And there are those on both sides arguing for their government to take a tougher stance.

Some in the United States believe it is the strict sanctions that have brought about Iran’s new willingness to negotiate and the opportunity should not be lost to press the advantage home.

A large majority of US senators urged President Barack Obama in a letter this week to step up sanctions to strengthen Washington’s hand in talks. The House of Representatives also passed a bill aiming to choke off Iranian oil exports altogether last week. The full Senate is expected to debate the bill after the summer recess.

Rouhani blamed what he called a “war-mongering group” in US Congress that he said was doing the bidding of Iran’s sworn foe Israel.



“The key issue remains the insistence in both camps that the other side must make the first move,” said Jamie Ingram, Middle East analyst at IHS Country Risk.

“There is inherent mistrust between the US and Iran and each are reticent to make any firm commitments on the back of what they fear may just be ‘rhetoric’,” he told Reuters.

“I think there is some willingness in the Obama administration which sees the potential to make a massive achievement in its final term — conversely, they will be wary of being seen to make a huge mistake.”

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu called on Tuesday for “increased pressure” on Iran, saying it was the “only thing” that would deter it from pursuing a nuclear weapons capability.

He was addressing a delegation of 36 visiting US Congressmen after Iran’s new President Hassan Rowhani called for “serious” talks without delay to allay concerns about Iran’s nuclear programme.

“Iran’s president said that pressure won’t work,” Netanyahu told the delegation led by House Democratic whip Steny Hoyer.

“Not true! The only thing that has worked in the last two decades is pressure. And the only thing that will work now is increased pressure,” Netanyahu said in remarks relayed by his office.

Rowhani had warned that negotiations would not work under pressure and had taken strong issue with a letter signed by 76 US senators calling for tougher sanctions.

The new Iranian president charged that the letter was the work of a “foreign country” and its supporters in the United States, in a clear allusion to Israel.

Despite Iran’s denials, Netanyahu has repeatedly accused it of seeking a nuclear weapons capability, which he has said would constitute an “existential threat” to Israel.

“I have said that before and I’ll say it again, because that’s important to understand,” Netanyahu told the US lawmakers.

“You relent on the pressure, they will go all the way. You should sustain the pressure.”

Both the United States and Israel — which has the Middle East’s sole, if undeclared, nuclear arsenal — have refused to rule out a resort to military action to prevent Iran developing a weapons capability.

<http://www.arabtimesonline.com/NewsDetails/tabid/96/smId/414/ArticleID/198841/reftab/96/t/Wait-out-risks-N-compromise/Default.aspx>

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

The Jerusalem Post – Israel

## **Former MI Chief Yadlin Cautions over Iran's Plutonium Program**

*In 'NYT' op-ed, Yadlin says Netanyahu, West have focused solely on uranium enrichment path to nuclear weapon; warns that Iran appears to be pursuing a parallel track to a nuclear capability through the production of plutonium.*

By JPOST.COM STAFF

09 August 2013

Former Military Intelligence chief Amos Yadlin warned Friday that the West's one dimensional perception of Iran's nuclear program, focusing solely on the uranium enrichment path to a nuclear weapon, could enable the Islamic Republic to build a plutonium bomb without detection.

In an op-ed article Yadlin penned for *The New York Times* together with Avner Golov of the Institute for National Security Studies at Tel Aviv University, he argued that uranium enrichment is one of only three dimensions to Iran's nuclear strategy, a fact that those who enter into negotiations with Iran must take into account.





"A second dimension is Iran's progress toward a quick 'breakout capability' through the stockpiling of large quantities of low-enriched uranium that could be further enriched rapidly to provide weapons-grade fuel. Third, Iran also appears to be pursuing a parallel track to a nuclear capability through the production of plutonium. If there is going to be a nuclear deal with Iran, all three parts of its strategy must be addressed," Yadlin and Golov warned.

Iran's heavy-water reactor being built in Arak could become operational next year, a move that would allow it to make serious progress toward a plutonium-fueled weapon, the article stated.

"A functioning nuclear reactor in Arak could eventually allow Iran to produce sufficient quantities of plutonium for nuclear bombs," Yadlin and Golov said, adding that Western negotiators should demand the Arak reactor be shut down.

"This is crucial because the West would likely seek to avoid an attack on a 'hot' reactor, lest it cause widespread environmental damage. Once Arak is operational, it would effectively be immune from attack and the West would be deprived of its primary 'stick' in its efforts to persuade Iran to forgo a military nuclear capability."

Yadlin and Golov stated that even Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, the most outspoken supporter of harsh action against Iran's nuclear program, related solely to the uranium enrichment track when he presented his "red line" at the UN General Assembly last year.

"Of the three countries that have publicly crossed the nuclear threshold since the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty entered into force in 1970, two — India and North Korea — did so via the plutonium track. In order to deny Iran this route, any agreement between the West and Iran must guarantee that Iran will not retain a breakout or 'sneak out' plutonium-production capacity," they posited.

<http://www.jpost.com/Iranian-Threat/News/Former-MI-chief-Yadlin-cautions-over-Irans-plutonium-program-322577>

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

Press TV – Iran

## **Rouhani, Putin to Meet in Kyrgyzstan in Sept.: Kremlin**

Friday, August 9, 2013

Iranian President Hassan Rouhani and his Russian counterpart Vladimir Putin will hold their first meeting on the sidelines of a regional summit in Kyrgyzstan next month, Kremlin says.

Rouhani and Putin will meet on the sidelines of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) summit on September 13 in Bishkek, Putin's top foreign policy aide Yury Ushakov said Friday, AFP reported.

Rouhani, who won Iran's June 14 presidential election, took office on August 4.

Iran, along with Afghanistan, India, Mongolia, and Pakistan, has an observer status in the Shanghai Cooperation Organization.

The regional body is an intergovernmental security organization that was founded in 2001 in Shanghai by the leaders of China, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, and Uzbekistan.

On August 6, Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov urged support for Rouhani's nuclear stance, saying Moscow "absolutely agrees" that Tehran's nuclear issue should be resolved peacefully, not via ultimatums.

He also called on the P5+1 group of world powers - Russia, China, France, Britain, and the US plus Germany -- to throw their support behind the attitude of the new Iranian administration.

As a veto-wielding power at the UN Security Council, Russia has repeatedly expressed its support for Iran's nuclear energy program, voicing opposition to sanctions slapped on Tehran.

The US has imposed several rounds of illegal sanctions on Iran, which Washington claims to be aimed at pressuring Tehran to abandon its nuclear energy program.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/08/09/317948/rouhani-putin-to-meet-in-sept-kremlin/>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea

August 2, 2013

## **N. Korea Moves to Develop Cutting-Edge Nanotech Industry**

SEOUL, Aug. 2 (Yonhap) -- North Korea is moving to grow its nanotech industry and produce high-tech products, Pyongyang's state media reported Friday.

The Rodong Sinmun newspaper, an organ of the Workers' Party of Korea (WPK), said in an article that the country's nanotech center that was recently built has made advances in medicine, energy, environmental conservation, light industry and farming.

Nanotechnology involves controlling matter on a molecular scale, leading to the creation of materials of high commercial value and with wide-ranging benefits.

The newspaper monitored in Seoul said the nanotech center, built under the guidance of North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, has played a key part in developing the sector. It added that roughly 1,000 nano products and prototypes were on display at the 10th nano science exhibition that opened on Tuesday.

North Korean media started mentioning the nanotech center in April, although no detail was made public on when it was established.

It said the country's technicians from universities and laboratories have been able to develop agricultural sterilizers, growth accelerators, air cleaners and shoes.

The daily also said the total number of products showcased at the exhibit represents a 10-fold increase from just four years ago, highlighting the progress made by the country in the next-generation technology.

The latest news article follows another report by the North's Korean Central News Agency that claimed in May that many practical products to cope with athlete's foot have reached consumers in the communist country.

In June, the Choson Sinbo, a Japan-based pro-Pyongyang newspaper, said an alcoholic beverage made using nano technology enjoyed popularity in Pyongyang.

Related to the media reports, Lim Eul-chul, a research professor at Kyungnam University and North Korea expert, said emphasis on high-tech industries has become more pronounced since Kim's ascension to power in late 2011.

He speculated that the leader may be pushing for technological advances to bolster economic growth and stimulate positive social change.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/techscience/2013/08/02/15/0601000000AEN20130802005500315F.HTML>

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

Pacific Daily News – Guam

## **NKorea Developing Missiles: New weapons could be Capable of Reaching Guam**

By Gaynor Dumat-ol Daleno, Pacific Daily News

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



August 5, 2013

North Korea is developing road-mobile ballistic missiles capable of reaching Guam, the Aleutian Islands and potentially Hawaii, the U.S. Missile Defense Agency's director said, citing the agency's growing concern at a recent Senate Appropriations Committee's Defense Subcommittee hearing.

Road-mobile ballistic missiles are on top of North Korea's ongoing attempts to further develop its long-range ballistic missile system Taepodong-2, according to the U.S. Missile Defense Agency. Though still in development, the Taepodong-2's range could also include Guam, according to the Federation of American Scientists.

North Korea's ballistic missile threat "continues to grow as our potential adversaries are acquiring a greater number of ballistic missiles, increasing their range and making them more complex, survivable, reliable, and accurate," stated Vice Admiral J.D. Syring's July 17 testimony before the Senate subcommittee.

"The missile defense mission is becoming more challenging as potential adversaries incorporate (ballistic missile defense) countermeasures," Syring stated.

### **Missile test impact**

Syring told the Senate committee of the agency's plan this year to demonstrate the ability of an integrated ballistic missile defense system to defeat two near-simultaneous ballistic missile threats.

More missile intercept tests scheduled for next year will include two launches of Minuteman III test flights from Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. Guam, Palau and the Federated States of Micronesia are invited to read a supplemental environmental assessment of next year's tests, in part because during the tests, missile components "will impact within the Exclusive Economic Zones of Guam, the Republic of Palau, and the Federated States of Micronesia," a July 29 Air Force announcement states.

No significant environmental impacts are expected when debris from the tests will fall on "broad ocean areas," but interested members of the public can view the supplemental environmental assessment document at the Hagåtña public library on Guam and the public libraries and U.S. embassies in Palau and FSM between July 29 and Aug. 28, the Air Force announcement states.

### **Missile defense**

The Missile Defense Agency director told the Senate subcommittee of plans to beef up the country's comprehensive U.S. missile defense system amid U.S. lawmakers' calls for the military to run on a tight budget.

"We will also deliver more interceptors for Terminal High Altitude Area Defense ... and Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense ... as we look for ways to make them more operationally effective and cost-effective," Syring testified.

After North Korea made specific mention of Guam when it issued threats to launch missile attacks in April and May, the Defense Department responded by sending a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system, which includes truck-mounted interceptors, to Guam.

It's unclear if the Defense Department has decided whether the THAAD will remain on Guam.

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Martin E. Dempsey said at a congressional hearing in mid-April the military planned to review if the THAAD would remain on Guam after its first 90 days of being posted here.

Guam Delegate Madeleine Bordallo had asked Dempsey whether the THAAD could be stationed on Guam permanently.

Dempsey's response at the hearing in April that he couldn't assure Guam of a permanent THAAD because the system stationed on Guam was the only fully operational system of that kind at the time.

"We would review the decision in about 90 days, and that's because we only have one right now, we have another one in training and another one -- it will come on a year after that," Dempsey said in mid-April.



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Bordallo's office said Tuesday the delegate still was waiting for the Pentagon to say whether the THAAD stays on Guam longer.

The THAAD interceptors are capable of shooting down a ballistic missile both inside and just outside the atmosphere, reducing the risk of fallout from an enemy's weapons of mass destruction, the Missile Defense Agency stated.

Dempsey said in April that Guam will not be left unprotected, adding that an Aegis missile defense can be launched from ships.

The THAAD missile defense system has had a 100-percent success rate -- intercepting 10 out of 10 tests since the program began in 2006, a Missile Defense Agency test report released earlier this month states.

The Aegis missile defense system succeeded in 25 out of 31 test intercept attempts at sea since 2002, the July 8 Ballistic Missile Defense Intercept Flight Test Record shows.

The nation's ground-based midcourse missile defense system succeeded in eight of 16 intercept attempts, the record shows.

### **Congressional report**

A June 24 Congressional Research Service report on Ballistic Missile Defense in the Asia-Pacific Region mentions that, in response to North Korea's threatening actions and statements in early 2013, the Pentagon decided to deploy a THAAD system to Guam two years ahead of schedule.

"Pyongyang has declared its intent to develop a nuclear-armed (intercontinental ballistic missile) capability, but North Korea's longer range missiles capable of reaching Guam, Alaska, or the continental United States appear unreliable and in some cases are untested," the report states.

The congressional report does raise concern of the longer term implications if North Korea's missile tests continue.

A 2013 Defense Department report on military and security developments involving North Korea assesses that Pyongyang will move closer to its goal of a nuclear-armed intercontinental ballistic missile capability if it continues to test missiles and to devote scarce resources to nuclear programs, the congressional report states.

<http://www.guampdn.com/article/20130805/NEWS01/308050023/NKorea-developing-missiles-New-weapons-could-capable-reaching-Guam>

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

PanOrient News – Japan

## **Japanese Protesters Call for Japan's Nuclear Armament on Hiroshima Anniversary**

By Angela Kubo

Tuesday, August 6, 2013

Tokyo- (PanOrient News) A group of Japanese demonstrators gathered in Tokyo today called on their government to obtain nuclear weapons and scrap Japan's peace constitution so that it can have a standing army.

The protest, held on the day Japan marks as the 68th anniversary of the atomic bombing of Hiroshima by U.S. forces, was organized by Zainichi Tokken o Yurusanai Shimin no Kai (Citizens Against Special Privilege of Zainichi Koreans), also known as Zaitokukai, a nationalist group noted for its anti-Korean protests and a far-right doctrine. They also called upon the Japanese government to arm itself in order to resolve its territorial disputes.

"Today is the day that nuclear weapons were dropped for the first time in Japan and for the first time in mankind. This is a demonstration calling for Japan to obtain nuclear weapons in order to protect itself, so that Japan will never be subjected to nuclear dosages ever again," the leader of Zaitokukai, Makoto Sakurai, told PanOrient News.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



Under Article 9 of the post-war constitution, Japan cannot maintain armed military forces. The Japan Self-Defense Forces are limited to peace-keeping and rescue operations. Currently, they cannot initiate attack on a foreign country.

Although Japan maintains a security treaty with the United States that allows the former to maintain military bases on Japanese territory in exchange for protection under the U.S.'s nuclear umbrella, Sakurai doubts that such an arrangement can protect his country from foreign attack and believes that national protection should be left solely to Japan.

"American bases are for the purpose of protecting the United States. They won't necessarily protect Japan, so a country which irresponsibly does not defend itself is not believed in by anyone. It cannot be trusted by anyone. In order to become a country which can be trusted, it must be able to properly protect itself on its own. I think that's obvious," he said.

As the group left Sakamotocho Park in central Tokyo, they were accompanied by police and followed by counter-protesters who organized themselves online. Both groups exchanged verbal threats and abuse.

"The protesters say that Japan can take care of itself if it took up nuclear weapons. That's absurd! I'm against that, and because they're saying these things on August 6, the anniversary of the dropping of the bomb on Hiroshima, I can't forgive them, so that's why I'm here," said Norio Oishi, one of the counter-protesters.

Meanwhile in Hiroshima, about fifty thousand people, including survivors of the 1945 bomb, gathered at a memorial service to observe a moment of silence. The mayor of Hiroshima, Kazumi Matsui, stated in a Peace Declaration, "We will again think of the efforts of our predecessors of 68 years, and pledge to abolish nuclear weapons which are an absolute evil and work towards the realization of a peaceful world."

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe, who also attended the memorial ceremony, said, "We Japanese are the only people to have experienced the horror of nuclear devastation in war. As such a people, we bear a responsibility to bring about a world without nuclear weapons without fail." At the conclusion of his speech he stated that Japan will continue to adhere to the "Three Non-Nuclear Principles" and work towards the "total abolition of nuclear weapons and the realization of eternal world peace."

In Tokyo, when the protesters arrived at the ruling Liberal Democratic Party Headquarters, organizers entered the building to submit a letter addressed to Prime Minister Shinzo Abe that called on for him to rethink Japan's nuclear weapons' policy.

A copy of the letter, which was obtained by PanOrient News, congratulated Abe on his Upper House election win last month. It argued, "Already China and North Korea show off the existence of nuclear weapons to their neighbors, including Japan. It can be said that they demonstrate sufficient power when viewed as a nuclear deterrent. On the other hand, although our country has focused on missile defense, it is impossible that it can absolutely intercept all ballistic missiles, so it is a matter of course that Japan builds its own nuclear deterrent as an umbrella."

Furthermore, the letter stated, "Indeed, Japan is the only country in this world which is suffered from atomic bombings. However, our neighboring countries do not spare any extra consideration for that. As a matter fact, China and North Korea have been imposing threats of nuclear attacks against Japan as they possess nuclear weapons. The government has to think of all the possibilities to protect its nation."

The letter concluded by requesting that the Prime Minister quickly start a debate within the government about arming the country with nuclear weapons in order to protect itself. Despite the strong stigma surrounding anything nuclear due to the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the Fukushima meltdown two years earlier, the Zaitokukai have indicated their determination to put Japan's rearmament on the national radar.

<http://www.panorientnews.com/en/news.php?k=2013>

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Global Post – Boston, MA

## **Abe Cites N. Korea for Failure to Back Int'l Non-Nuclear Statement**

Kyodo News International

August 6, 2013

Prime Minister Shinzo Abe said Tuesday that a worsening security environment surrounding Japan, including North Korea's nuclear ambitions, had influenced Tokyo's recent decision not to back an international statement urging that nuclear weapons never be used under any circumstances.

"It was very regrettable," Abe said at a press conference in Hiroshima, referring to the failure to endorse the statement on nuclear weapons' inhumanity supported by 80 countries at a preparatory committee session in April in Geneva for the next Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty review meeting.

Antinuclear groups and peace campaigners have been criticizing the government stance, which they believe stems from Japan's reliance on the deterrence offered by U.S. nuclear umbrella.

Abe said Japan "of course" supported the basic idea of the statement, as the only country to have come under nuclear attack. But, "We also face the severe reality where North Korea has been implementing nuclear development," he said.

"We do not have a choice but to deal with the severe environment surrounding our country in terms of safety," said Abe, who earlier in the day attended a ceremony commemorating the 68th anniversary of the U.S. atomic bombing of Hiroshima in the closing days of World War II.

Abe said Japan would keep striving to realize a world without nuclear weapons, noting "We intend to explore the possibility of joining a similar statement in the future in earnest."

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/kyodo-news-international/130806/abe-cites-n-korea-failure-back-intl-non-nuclear-statem>

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

U.S. News & World Report

## **US Institute: NKorea Expanding Nuclear Plant**

By GEORGE JAHN, Associated Press (AP)

August 7, 2013

VIENNA (AP) — A U.S. institute tracking North Korea's nuclear weapons program says recent satellite photos show Pyongyang is doubling the size of its uranium enrichment plant, jibing with the country's announced plans to expand technology that can be used both to create energy and the core of nuclear weapons.

The imagery comes from two sources, satellite companies Digital Globe and Astrium Geoinformation Services, and was seen by The Associated Press ahead of publication by the Institute for Science and International Security on Wednesday. In an accompanying note, ISIS said the photos of the Nyongbyon nuclear complex show construction under way to "effectively double" the size of the enrichment hall.

That, said ISIS, would allow North Korea to also double the number of centrifuges now enriching uranium. Revealing the existence of a uranium enrichment program three years ago, Pyongyang said the plant contained 2,000 centrifuges — machines that are linked up in series and spin uranium gas into material that can be used either to power reactors or arm nuclear weapons, depending on the degree of enrichment.

That means the 4,000 centrifuges that the space is apparently being expanded for could potentially make twice that amount, giving them the capacity to build up to 4 bombs a year, should the country decide to use them for that purpose.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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





The most recent satellite photo was taken July 28. ISIS says that measured against earlier images, it shows construction at the Nyongbyon site, including "the expansion of the gas centrifuge building" to twice its previous size.

The Washington-based think tank said the images indicate that work on the structure seems to have begun sometime in March. It cited a North Korean government announcement that came shortly afterward revealing plans for "readjusting and restarting all the nuclear facilities in Nyongbyon, including (the) uranium enrichment plant."

Government offices in Pyongyang that could comment were shut for the day ahead of publication of the ISIS report. A North Korean diplomat with his country's mission to the United Nations in New York said he had no comment because he had not yet seen the report. He demanded anonymity because he was not authorized to speak publicly about his country's nuclear program.

Experts believe the plant is meant primarily to provide fuel for the power-hungry country. But centrifuges producing such fuel can be reconfigured to make weapons-grade uranium. That has led to international concerns because of three nuclear weapon tests by the North Koreans — the most recent in February — and its stated intention to continue down the nuclear weapons path.

The first two tests are believed to have used plutonium, fissile material that also can be used in weapons. But experts and governments say that with its uranium enrichment program confirmed and operating, the third explosion may have used highly enriched uranium.

Experts believe that a uranium-based weapon would be easier to make. Basing estimates on the 2,000 centrifuges, they have said that if the machines were configured to make weapons-grade uranium they would produce enough material for one to two bombs a year — meaning doubling the centrifuges would double the output.

But ISIS, the U.S. institute, said much of the output would likely fuel an experimental light-water reactor at the Nyongbyon site that is nearing completion. That, it said, means that any left-over capacity would only be enough to potentially produce no more than two weapons a year.

Harvard physicist Hui Zang, in an analysis for the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists earlier this year, said a uranium-based nuclear weapon would be "relatively easy to construct" compared to those with plutonium and also noted that it is less hazardous to health because of its low radiation level. Additionally, North Korea's plutonium stocks are low and its estimated arsenal is limited to only an estimated six to 12 crude bombs. That could feed North Korean interest in using enrichment for a weapons program

Pyongyang announced in April that it is restarting a plutonium-producing reactor it shuttered at Nyongbyon in 2007 as part of international disarmament talks, a process that experts back then said could vary from three months to a year. But even if the reactor is now up and running, Ralph Cossa, president of the Pacific Forum CSIS think tank in Hawaii, estimates it would take two to three years before scientists could obtain more plutonium for bombs.

Nuclear Physicist Siefried Heckler was shown the centrifuges at Nyongbyon in 2010 but says he and others in his delegation were not allowed a close-up inspection to see whether they were running, let alone to check on their configuration to see what grade material they might be producing.

Noting that Pyongyang only revealed the existence of the facility in 2010, he and others say other enrichment plants may be hidden elsewhere.

*Associated Press writer Edith Lederer contributed from the United Nations in New York.*

<http://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2013/08/07/us-institute-nkorea-expanding-nuclear-plant>

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

The Mainichi Daily News – Japan

## **More Lawmakers Want Japan to Consider Nuclear Arms Option**



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

August 08, 2013

Views among lawmakers over whether Japan, the only country ever to have suffered an atomic attack, should arm itself with nuclear weapons have been changing over the last few years due in part to concerns over North Korea's nuclear threats and simmering territorial disputes with China and South Korea.

The Mainichi Shimbun has asked candidates in all national elections held since the 2003 House of Representatives election about whether Japan should go nuclear. Twenty-nine percent of the winners in the 2012 House of Representatives election replied to the Mainichi survey that "Depending on the international situation, Japan should consider arming itself with nuclear weapons," a sharp rise from 7 percent of the winners in the 2009 lower house contest. Similarly, 28 percent of the winners in the July 2013 House of Councillors election gave the same reply, up from 18 percent of the winners in the 2010 upper house poll.

On the other hand, 61 percent of the winners in the 2012 lower house election replied that "Japan should never consider possessing nuclear arms in the future," while 64 percent of the winners in the July 2013 upper house contest gave the same reply. More conspicuously, the figure dropped 26 percentage points to the 60-percent level for the first time at the time of the 2012 lower house election in which the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) took back the reins of government from 87 percent when the Democratic Party of Japan (DPJ) rose to power after its victory in the 2009 lower chamber election. Of all the LDP winners in the July 2013 upper house election, 43 percent replied that "Japan should not consider arming itself with nuclear weapons," while 46 percent said "Depending on the international situation, Japan should consider arming itself with nuclear weapons."

Five percent of the winners in the 2012 lower house election said Japan should more proactively "start considering" arming itself with nuclear weapons, while 3 percent of the winners in the July 2013 upper house election gave the same reply.

Japan views the self-imposed "three non-nuclear principles" of not producing, not possessing and not allowing the entry of nuclear weapons into the country as a national virtue. But the number of lawmakers who think positively about a nuclear-armed Japan has been increasing on the backdrop of an increase in the number of seats the LDP holds in both chambers of the Diet as well as concerns over North Korea's nuclear weapons and missile programs. Nagoya University professor Fusao Ushiro said, "It is probably attributed to frustrations over unsuccessful diplomacy with China and South Korea. Even if Japan were to possess nuclear weapons, without diplomatic power it would not be able to exert its influence. If Japan has diplomatic power, it doesn't need nuclear weapons."

<http://mainichi.jp/english/english/newsselect/news/20130808p2a00m0na018000c.html>

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

Russia Beyond the Headlines (RBTH) – Russia

## **Russia Should Be Ready to React to Accidents Involving Nuclear Weapons - Defense Minister**

August 5, 2013

Interfax

The Russian military are practicing new approaches to dealing with the aftermath of accidents involving nuclear weapons, Russian Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu said.

"The active phase of the tactical special comprehensive training Avariya 2013 has begun today. The purpose of this training is to test new approaches to the organization of the liquidation of the consequences of accidents involving nuclear weapons," Shoigu said while meeting with top Defense Ministry officials in the ministry's situation center on Monday.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



"Possessing such weapons gives us serious obligations to ensure its security," the minister said. "That, in turn, requires coordinated actions, resources and funds from the Defense Ministry and divisions of the state corporation Rosatom, OAO Russian Railways, and other agencies," Shoigu said.

"We should always be ready to react to possible emergency situations involving nuclear weapons," the minister said.

After listening to a report by Colonel-General Alexander Postnikov, who leads the training, Shoigu pointed out the importance of strict observance of the safety requirements during and after the training.

[http://rbth.ru/news/2013/08/05/russia should be ready to react to accidents involving nuclear weapons - 28651.html](http://rbth.ru/news/2013/08/05/russia%20should%20be%20ready%20to%20react%20to%20accidents%20involving%20nuclear%20weapons%20-%2028651.html)

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

Russia Beyond the Headlines (RBTH) – Russia

## **Russian Supersonic Missiles Behave Like Wolves**

*Large-scale construction of the next-generation Project 885 Yasen-class submarine armed with Onyx supersonic missiles is starting in Russia. These ships will compete with the latest American Seawolf-class nuclear submarines and will be world leaders in terms of fire power.*

August 8, 2013

By Viktor Litovkin, special to RBTH

Large-scale construction of the next-generation Project 885 Yasen-class multi-purpose nuclear attack submarine, armed with Onyx supersonic cruise missiles, is starting in Russia. The ships will compete with the latest American Seawolf-class nuclear submarines in terms of their noise profile and will be world leaders in terms of fire power.

Moscow plans to acquire at least 10 of these boats by 2020. The fourth submarine in this class was laid down in Severodvinsk on the eve of Navy Day, which was celebrated on July 28.

The Project 885 nuclear submarine is the quintessence of everything the Russian military industrial complex has achieved in over half a century of building submarines.

The vessel has a hull made from high-resilience, low-magnetic steel, and can dive to a depth of more than 1,968.5 feet (conventional boats cannot go deeper than 984.2 feet), which effectively puts it out of reach of all types of modern anti-submarine weapons. Its maximum speed is more than 30 knots (about 34.5 miles per hour). The nuclear submarine is equipped with an escape pod for the whole crew.

The Russian designers say that the Yasen is not only quieter than the quietest Russian nuclear submarine (the Project 971 Akula - 'Shark'), but also quieter than the latest American Seawolf nuclear submarine.

Moreover, unlike those vessels, the new missile submarine will be more functional, thanks to the weapons at its disposal (several types of cruise missiles and torpedoes). It will be able to fulfil a wide range of roles at sea.

### **Formidable**

The Akula nuclear submarine currently forms the basis of the Russian group of multi-purpose attack submarines designed for raiding operations against sea lanes. Virtually inaudible in the depths of the ocean, they are equally effective against transport vessels and warships, and can also hit the enemy's coastal infrastructure with cruise missiles.

Akula submarines were recently reported within the 200-mile zone of the coasts of the United States and Canada, which caused a serious commotion among the countries' respective militaries. Having discovered the presence of these "guests," neither of them was able to track their movement, which naturally caused serious concern.

After all, the Akula carries 28 Kh-55 Granat cruise missiles on board — the equivalent of the American Tomahawk, which can fly 1,864.1 miles and deliver 200-kiloton nuclear warheads to their targets.



**USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

## **Invulnerable**

The main attack system on the Yasen is the P-800 Onyx — the latest Russian supersonic cruise missile. The missile is the basis for two absolutely identical export versions: The Russian Yakhont and the Indian BrahMos have a similar appearance to the Onyx, but with significantly reduced combat characteristics.

The Onyx devices are capable of being fired from underwater, and they fly at a speed of 2,460 feet per second, carrying a devastating, high-explosive warhead weighing half a ton. The missiles have a range of more than 372.8 miles.

The Onyx is guided to its target by a navigational system that operates on target designation data provisionally input to the missile before it is launched. At a predetermined point in the trajectory (15–50 miles), the missile's homing device is briefly activated and determines the precise location of the target.

The next time the homing device is activated is after a sharp reduction in altitude to 15–50 feet, just seconds before it hits the enemy. This is to ensure that, when the enemy detects the missile's launch, it cannot "jam" the missile with electronic countermeasures.

## **Wolf pack**

It is not the missile's high speed or the protection of its homing device against electronic countermeasures that makes the Onyx a super-modern weapon.

Once it is launched from the submarine, the missile finds the target by itself. After determining their coordinates, the missiles "wait" until the last one is out of the launch tubes and then line up, just like a wolf pack, and begin to "home in on their prey."

The designers are not really advertising this point, but it is the missiles themselves that decide which missile attacks, which target and how. The missile "pack" decides these targets, classifies them in terms of importance, and selects the tactics for the attack and the plan for its execution.

In order to prevent mistakes, the missile's onboard computer system is programmed with electronic data on all modern classes of ship. This is purely tactical information—for example, on the class of vessel.

This enables the missiles to determine what they are up against — whether it be an aircraft-carrier or landing group—and then to attack the main targets within the group. The Onyx missile's onboard computer also holds data on how to counter the enemy's electronic warfare systems, which can divert a missile from its target, and systems for evading anti-aircraft defense systems.

At the same time, like wolves in a real pack, the missiles themselves decide which one of them is the main attacker and which must take the role of the decoy to lure the enemy's aircraft and air defense systems away.

Once the main selected target has been destroyed, the other missiles immediately redistribute the combat assignments between themselves and begin to destroy other vessels. There is no ship in the world that can dodge an attack by Onyx missiles.

Yes, ship-borne radar systems can detect that they have been launched, but then further resistance is useless. The speed of these missiles and the way they constantly maneuver above the surface of the sea makes it practically impossible to intercept them with air defense systems or aircraft.

## **Universal**

Another advantage of the Onyx missile is that it can be used with various types of carriers. In Russia, it is installed not only in submarines but also on surface vessels and mobile land-based platforms — the Bastion shore-based missile systems. It is the presence of these systems in Syria that so worries Washington today.



Onyx will also be included in the weaponry of the Su-30MK family of fighters and the latest Su-34 frontline bombers. Still, the most important thing is that the next generation following the Onyx is already on its way. This is the Zircon — the first hypersonic combat missile system, which is due to start testing next year.

[http://rbth.ru/science\\_and\\_tech/2013/08/08/russian\\_supersonic\\_missiles\\_behave\\_like\\_wolves\\_28781.html](http://rbth.ru/science_and_tech/2013/08/08/russian_supersonic_missiles_behave_like_wolves_28781.html)

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

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Russia

8 August 2013

## **Russian and U.S. Ministers to Discuss Missile Defence**

WASHINGTON, August 8 (Itar-Tass) - Missile defense, nuclear disarmament and military-technical cooperation will be in the focus of Friday's talks between Russian and U.S. foreign and defense ministers, Russian Deputy Defense Minister Anatoly Antonov told journalists.

Russia's Defense Minister Sergei Shoigu and Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov will take part in the talks.

"This is the first meeting between the defense ministers. That is why our priority is to review everything what has been done in the past years and to determine plans for the future," Antonov said, adding that Russian-U.S. consultations within the 2+2 format would centre on common approaches, which "allow us to move forward". "Primarily, this is missile defense," the Russian Deputy Defense minister said.

The Russian delegation hopes to explain the country's position on further steps towards nuclear disarmament and strengthening strategic stability, and prospects for military-technical cooperation, Antonov said.

"Despite certain nuances in Russian-American relations, we hope that the consultations will be held in a constructive atmosphere and make steps towards strengthening strategic stability possible. Many people wait for concrete results because cooperation within the Russia-NATO Council and the global situation will depend on how Russia and the U.S. can agree so far," Antonov stressed.

<http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c32/834123.html>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Destroys Over 75% of Its Chemical Weapons Stockpile**

08 August 2013

MOSCOW, August (RIA Novosti) – Russia has destroyed more than 30,000 metric tons of chemical warfare agents, or about 76 percent of its chemical weapons stockpile, Russia's industry and trade minister said Thursday.

Russia has destroyed more chemical agents than any other of the 180 signees of the 1997 Chemical Weapons Convention, Minister Denis Manturov said while visiting a chemical weapons disposal facility in the Bryansk Region, which borders Ukraine and Belarus.

More than 500 inspections of Russia's chemical weapons stockpile have been conducted since the convention came into effect, and not a single violation has been detected in this respect, the official added.

Last year, Deputy Industry and Trade Minister Georgy Kalamonov said Russia planned to destroy all of its chemical weapons by 2015.

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20130808/182657926/Russia-Destroys-Over-75-of-Its-Chemical-Weapons-Stockpile.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130808/182657926/Russia-Destroys-Over-75-of-Its-Chemical-Weapons-Stockpile.html)

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Herald Scotland – Scotland, U.K.

## **LibDems to Vote on Trident Policy**

Tuesday, 6 August 2013

Liberal Democrat activists will be asked to back calls for an end to routine nuclear-armed submarine patrols at their annual conference in Glasgow next month.

The move would commit the party to a significant scaling back of the nuclear deterrent in the Clyde.

It follows a Coalition Government review of plans to replace the ageing Trident fleet. That recommended billions of pounds could be saved by cutting the number of submarines from four to two.

Such a move would end the current principle of a "continuous at sea deterrent" supported by the LibDems' Coalition partners the Conservatives.

The LibDem proposals, in a defence policy paper, call for the UK to abandon round-the-clock patrols and to commit to putting the submarines to sea unarmed, except in the event of a "deteriorating security picture".

The motion says that the LibDems are "wholly unconvinced that Britain needs to renew its submarine-based nuclear weapons system on the same Cold War scale as the system designed in 1980".

Delegates will also be asked to back a call to bring back the 50p top rate of tax and to abandon opposition to student tuition fees.

In a message to his party, leader Nick Clegg said creating jobs must be the top priority but also said his party would "make the positive case for Scotland's continued place in the UK family".

Controversy is expected over the call for the party to abandon its policy of opposition to tuition fees. Mr Clegg was forced to apologise this time last year for his U-turn on increasing fees.

<http://www.heraldsotland.com/politics/political-news/libdems-to-vote-on-trident-policy.21791658>

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

National Defense

## **Unresolved Issues Hang Over U.S. Missile Shield**

By Sandra I. Erwin

August 6, 2013

For the second year in a row, lawmakers will be squabbling this fall over if and when the United States should shore up its defenses against North Korean and Iranian ballistic missiles.

The lightning rod in this debate is a Republican-led proposal to build a new ground-based missile interceptor site on the U.S. East. Cost proponents contend that current sites, based in Alaska and California, do not provide enough coverage against a future possible attack by Iran, which is reportedly developing intercontinental ballistic missiles that could target the United States.

The deployment of a new site — endorsed by the House in its version of the 2014 defense authorization bill — is one of several controversial items that the Senate will take up in the coming months.

A confluence of trends and factors — Pentagon budget cuts, competing demands for homeland and overseas missile defense systems, poor test results of U.S. ground-based interceptors, and a toxic political environment — makes it a safe bet that an East Coast site or any significant enhancements to the nation's missile shield systems will be deferred years into the future, possibly into the next administration.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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





The missile shield discussion, like most other topics in national security, has become a political football.

The East Coast site is being championed by defense hawks at a time when the Pentagon faces deep budget cuts and pressures to deploy regional missile defense systems around the world. And it has emerged as a coveted jobs program for states such as Maine and New York, where several locations are in contention for the East Coast site.

Democrats have cited the poor track record of the ground-based missile defense system — of 10 tests, only three successful hits and none in the past five years — as a justification for delaying or nixing the East Coast location. But the elephant in the room clearly is the budget — whether the nation can afford to pour billions of dollars into new missile defenses when government spending is being squeezed.

Within the Pentagon's existing budget, funding for the Missile Defense Agency is expected to remain steady or drop slightly, but MDA resources already are stretched thin, analysts point out, by the demands of other parts of the world where the U.S. military wants to build missile shields, including Europe, the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific region.

The U.S. missile-defense system relies on kinetic-kill vehicles to intercept ballistic missiles at various points in the missile's trajectory. Ground-based interceptors are designed to counter ICBMs that are aimed at the continental United States. Tactical, shorter range systems such as the Patriot, the Navy's Aegis SM-3 and the Army's theater high-altitude air defense are intended to protect regional forces.

The Pentagon is under pressure to bolster U.S. defenses against enemy ICBMs as it also contemplates how to satisfy commanders' requests for tactical missile shields to protect U.S. forces abroad and allies.

Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel in March agreed to fund 14 additional interceptor sites in Alaska, at a cost of about \$1 billion. This would raise the number of domestic launch pads to 44. The Pentagon also is leading a five-year effort to deploy missile defense systems in Europe, the cost of which is still unknown. In Asia, the Navy has joined forces with Japan to develop a more advanced variant of the SM-3 interceptor, which would be deployed aboard ships and shore-based Aegis sites.

The Navy has set ambitious goals to intercept more sophisticated ballistic missiles and eventually to develop limited capabilities against ICBMs. Existing plans call for 41 BMD-capable Aegis vessels and more than 300 SM-3s deployed by 2018, said a Congressional Research Service report.

While the military and congressional missile-defense wish list keeps getting longer, funding for these programs is likely to shrink, said James Lewis, spokesman for the Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation. The East Coast site proposal, he said, is an example of Washington not coming to grips with budget reality.

"U.S. military leaders have repeatedly stated that there are more cost-effective alternatives to improve long-range missile defense capabilities than to rush forward with the construction of an East Coast site," he said. "This is especially true given the current budget environment and threat of the implementation of sequestration for the long haul."

Benjamin Loehrke, senior analyst at the Ploughshares Fund, noted that the Pentagon's \$47.4 billion five-year budget for missile defense — which does not reflect sequestration cuts — leaves MDA "relatively unscathed." But even with \$9 billion to \$10 billion a year, MDA will be hard pressed to fund existing programs, Loehrke writes in a blog post.

"The missile defense budget is going stagnant," he said. "Particularly in a time of austerity, it's survival of the fittest, where the weakest programs get cancelled so that growing programs can absorb the funds."

The Pentagon is planning to end participation in the multinational MEADS medium-range extended air defense program and will terminate the Precision Tracking Space System, which would save \$17.5 billion over 10 years. More cuts could be coming, Loehrke suggested. "If the DoD budget sees substantial cuts in the years ahead, it will need to rethink its missile defense strategy."

By most accounts, the Pentagon could not afford to fund the East Coast site absent a significant influx of new money or cancellations of other programs. In June the Congressional Budget Office estimated that putting a ground-based midcourse defense system on the East Coast consisting of 20 interceptors will cost \$3.4 billion over the next five years,



Lewis said. A September 2012 report by the National Academy of Sciences projected that the 20-year life cycle costs to deploy a brand new long-range missile defense system at a third site on the East Coast and at a fourth site elsewhere could reach \$25 billion.

CBO also weighed in on the potential price tag for installing the X-band radar at a new U.S. missile-defense site. Because advanced X-band radars that can track ICBMs cost about a billion dollars, CBO assumed that the Defense Department would not acquire a new one for the East Coast but would upgrade an existing radar used for missile testing at the Ronald Reagan Test Range on Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific Ocean. That radar is a prototype ground-based radar called the GBR-P. CBO said the radar could be moved to a selected East Coast site at a cost of about \$650 million between 2014 and 2018. That amount includes the costs of upgrading the GBR-P and buying communications equipment (\$220 million), preparing the site and building facilities (\$290 million), and operating the radar through 2018 (\$140 million).

The Missile Defense Agency is going ahead with a series of studies on the possible environmental impact a missile defense site would have on three yet-to-be-selected East Coast facilities.

MDA spokesman Richard Lehner said there has been no decision to build an East Coast site so there is no plan or estimate of what it would cost to build one. "Per congressional direction, an environmental impact study process will begin after three sites are selected by the end of the year," he told *National Defense* by email. The studies could take up to two years to complete. By conducting these studies, he said, MDA would help shorten the time it would take to build a new site, "But at this point there is no plan for an additional missile defense site in the United States," Lehner said.

Comments by senior military officials in recent months suggest that the Pentagon is less interested in deploying additional sites and more keen on investing missile-defense dollars in research and development to make the system perform better.

In a June 6 letter to Armed Services Committee Chairman Sen. Carl Levin, D-Mich., Vice Adm. James Syring, director of the Missile Defense Agency, and Lt. Gen. Richard Formica, commander of U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, insisted that "discrimination and sensor capabilities would result in more cost-effective near-term improvements to homeland missile defense."

Air Force Gen. C. Robert "Bob" Kehler, commander of U.S. Strategic Command, pleaded a similar case. To improve missile defense, he said, the key is to add sensors and connect the data from different sensors so incoming missiles can be better identified and targeted. "Every time we do that, our ability to discriminate gets better, our ability to track gets better," he told reporters in Washington, D.C.

"We believe that incrementally improving the command and control system is something we need to do while we're looking at the possibility of an East Coast missile site," Kehler said. "We can defend the entire United States from a limited attack from either North Korea or in the future if it develops, from Iran with interceptors that are based at Fort Greely, but we do better at that if we have better sensor coverage, better command and control, and then ultimately our analysis is going to tell us if an East Coast missile site will contribute to this, and if so, how."

Officials from The Raytheon Co., which supplies many of the key components of U.S. missile defense systems, second that view.

"There is a clear need for more discrimination," Jim Bedingfield, director of missile defense and space programs at Raytheon, said in an interview last month. "The better the discrimination, the fewer interceptor missiles have to be fired, he said. The termination of the Precision Tracking Space System, Raytheon officials have said, could create a gap in sensor coverage unless MDA chooses to deploy other sensors.

Kehler would like to see more money spent on testing the existing ground-based interceptors before the U.S. government commits fresh funding for new sites.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The most recent test failure July 5 has cast further doubts on the performance of the system. A ground-based interceptor was launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., against a rocket fired from the Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific. According to Syring, the “kill vehicle did not separate” from the booster rocket.

Kehler said he is “concerned with the recent test failure and I would like to see more testing done. ... I think that’s a priority call within the resources that are available for missile defense.”

Each test is estimated to cost about \$100 million. Nonetheless, said Kehler, “adding tests is necessary in my view” even if MDA has to raid other programs to pay for them. “I believe those choices have to be made.”

The public has to be assured that the system works before any more money is wasted on new sites, said Kingston Reif, director of non-proliferation programs at the Council for a Livable World. “We cannot simply move a broken system from the West Coast to the East Coast.”

<http://www.nationaldefensemagazine.org/blog/Lists/Posts/Post.aspx?ID=1224>

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

Businessweek

## **Navy Drops Plans to Repair USS Miami Sub**

By David Sharp, Associated Press (AP)

August 07, 2013

PORTLAND, Maine (AP) — The Navy has decided to scrap the USS Miami instead of repairing the nuclear-powered submarine because of budget cuts accompanied by growing costs of repairing damage from a fire set by a civilian worker at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, officials said Tuesday.

Rear Adm. Rick Breckenridge, director of undersea warfare, said repairing the Groton, Conn.-based sub would have meant canceling work on dozens of other ships because of new budget constraints.

He said that would've hurt the Navy's overall readiness.

"The Navy and the nation simply cannot afford to weaken other fleet readiness in the way that would be required to afford repairs to Miami," Breckenridge said in a statement.

Inspections revealed a significant number of components in the torpedo room and auxiliary machinery room would require replacement, further driving up the repair costs for the USS Miami. The Navy originally said it planned to repair the submarine but the discovery of additional damage raised the cost, originally estimated to be about \$450 million.

A shipyard worker, Casey James Fury, of Portsmouth, N.H., was sentenced to 17 years in prison after admitting he set fire to the Miami, which was in dry dock during a 20-month overhaul at the Kittery shipyard.

It took 12 hours and the efforts of more than 100 firefighters to save the Los Angeles-class attack submarine. Seven people were hurt.

The fire, set on May 23, 2012, damaged forward compartments including living quarters, a command and control center and the torpedo room. Weapons had been removed for the repair, and the fire never reached the rear of the submarine, where the nuclear propulsion components are located.

U.S. Sens. Susan Collins and Angus King of Maine and Jeanne Shaheen and Kelly Ayotte of New Hampshire issued a statement blaming the decision to scrap the submarine on the automatic budget cuts known as sequestration.

"We are disappointed by the Navy's decision to discontinue repairs to the USS Miami. Inactivating the Miami will mean a loss to our nuclear submarine fleet — yet another unfortunate consequence of the across-the-board cuts known as sequestration. We will continue to work together to find a responsible budget solution that replaces sequestration," they said.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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 Navy announced last summer that it intended to repair the Miami with a goal of returning it to service in 2015. The Navy said it would be cost-effective because the 23-year-old submarine could serve another 10 years.

The decision to inactivate the Miami was a difficult one, "taken after hard analysis and not made lightly," Breckenridge said in his statement. "But in exchange for avoiding the cost of repairs, we will open up funds to support other vital maintenance efforts, improving the wholeness and readiness of the fleet."

The repairs have potential implications for both Portsmouth Naval Shipyard workers and workers from Electric Boat in Groton, who expected to play a major role in the repair effort.

U.S. Rep. Chellie Pingree, whose Maine district includes the shipyard, blamed the submarine's loss on Congress' inability to come up with a budget.

"It's outrageous that the yard won't get the chance to put the Miami back in service because of sequestration," she said.

<http://www.businessweek.com/ap/2013-08-07/navy-drops-plans-to-repair-uss-miami-sub>

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

Military.com

## **First ANG Bomb Wing Certified for Nuclear Ops**

August 09, 2013

Air Force News, by Capt. Rachel Savage

WHITEMAN Air Force Base, Mo -- The Air National Guard celebrated a historic milestone this week as the 131st Bomb Wing, the nation's only Guard unit to fly and maintain the B-2 Spirit, was certified to conduct the nuclear mission upon completion of their Initial Nuclear Surety Inspection.

With this certification, the 131st BW reached full operational capability with the B-2, bringing to conclusion a six-year journey that began with the unit's transition from the F-15 Eagle mission in 2007, said Maj. Gen. Steve Danner, Adjutant General of Missouri.

"The Airmen of the 131st Bomb Wing have proven they are up to the task in carrying out this critical national security mission," Danner said. "This confirmation is the result of years of hard work and the commencement of a new chapter in Air National Guard history. The 131st Bomb Wing is officially open for business - Col. Michael Francis and his team should be proud."

This momentous event marks the first time in the history of the Guard that a bomb wing has been certified in the delivery of nuclear weapons.

"The 131st Citizen-Airmen have proven they can exceed every stringent challenge posed in the nuclear realm," said Francis, the 131st Bomb Wing commander. "Their countless hours have deservingly evolved in to this success and I couldn't be more proud."

The four-day inspection consisted of assessments in key areas, and graded the wing's ability to be caretakers of an unrivaled combat power.

"The result of the inspection validates the wing's ability to carry out the nuclear mission, which requires adherence to the strictest standards" said Henry Jenkins, Air Force Global Strike Command Inspector General Team chief.

As part of the Air Force's Total Force Integration initiative to combine active duty with Guard Airmen, the two wings were integrated in 2007 when the 131st received its new operational mission. The unit became a classic associate with the active duty's 509th Bomb Wing, enabling the 131st to become the first-ever Guard unit to fly the B-2.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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 integration efforts began seven years ago on Feb. 27, 2006, when the Secretary of the Air Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force approved Total Force Initiative Phase II, which directed the creation of a Classic Association with the 509th and the 131st.

In 2008, the wing had fewer than 60 members stationed at Whiteman when they conducted the first all guard B-2 sortie, which included both the launch and operation of the aircraft. Today, nearly all 800 members are based at Whiteman, with completely integrated maintenance crews and almost three times the number of qualified pilots.

"The Airmen of the 509th Bomb Wing and the 131st Bomb Wing are physically and functionally integrated at every level," said Brig. Gen. Thomas Bussiere, 509th Bomb Wing commander. "When you walk on the flight line at Whiteman, you can't tell the difference between an active-duty or Guard pilot, maintainer, or load crew team. This certification was the last remaining event to align our mission capabilities and we are honored to be defending this great nation with the warriors of the Missouri Air National Guard!"

The first combat total force integration mission the wings conducted came in March 2011 when three B-2s flew over Libya, dropping 45 Joint Direct Attack Munitions to destroy hardened aircraft shelters, crippling Muammar Gaddafi's air forces and helping enforce the United Nations' no-fly zone.

The six aircrew members who flew that mission included both active duty and Guard pilots, demonstrating success in the first real-world combat mission the B-2 conducted since Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003.

"Our certification is a culmination of years of long hours and concentrated effort coupled with each Airman's determination to go above and beyond every day," said Chief Master Sgt. Paul Carney, 131st Bomb Wing command chief. "It was no easy feat logistically to move the wing and take on a new mission, especially one as demanding as the no-fail nuclear mission...but we did it."

<http://www.military.com/daily-news/2013/08/09/first-ang-bomb-wing-certified-for-nuclear-ops.html?comp=1199436026997&rank=2>

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

Reuters – U.S.

## Scientists to Make Mutant Forms of new Bird Flu to Assess Risk

By Kate Kelland, Health and Science Correspondent  
Wednesday, August 07, 2013

LONDON (Reuters) - Scientists are to create mutant forms of the H7N9 bird flu virus that has emerged in China so they can gauge the risk of it becoming a lethal human pandemic.

The genetic modification work will result in highly transmissible and deadly forms of H7N9 being made in several high security laboratories around the world, but it is vital to prepare for the threat, the scientists say.

The new bird flu virus, which was unknown in humans until February, has already infected at least 133 people in China and Taiwan, killing 43 of them, according to the latest World Health Organization (WHO) data.

Announcing plans to start the controversial experiments, leading virologists Ron Fouchier and Yoshihiro Kawaoka said H7N9's pandemic risk would rise "exponentially" if it gained the ability to spread easily among people.

And the only way to find out how likely that is, and how many genetic changes would need to take place before it could happen, is to engineer those mutations in laboratory conditions and test the virus's potential using animal models, they said.

"It's clear this H7N9 virus has some hallmarks of pandemic viruses, and it's also clear it is still missing at least one or two of the hallmarks we've seen in the pandemic viruses of the last century," Fouchier told Reuters in a telephone interview.

"So the most logical step forward is to put in those (missing) mutations first."

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



Writing in the journals *Nature* and *Science* on behalf of 22 scientists who will carry out various aspects of the H7N9 work, Fouchier said because the risk of a pandemic caused by a bird flu virus exists in nature, it was critical for risk-mitigation plans to study the likely mutations that could make that happen.

This kind of science is known as "gain of function" (GOF) research. It aims to identify combinations of genetic mutations that allow an animal virus to jump to humans and spread easily.

By finding the mutations needed, researchers and health authorities can better assess how likely it is that a new virus could become dangerous and if so, how soon they should begin developing drugs, vaccines and other scientific defenses.

Yet such work is highly controversial. It has fuelled an international row in the past two years after it was carried out on another threatening bird flu virus called H5N1.

#### BIOTERRORISM FEARS

When Fouchier, of the Erasmus Medical Centre in Rotterdam, The Netherlands, and Kawaoka, at the University of Wisconsin in the United States, announced in late 2011 they had found how to make H5N1 into a form that could spread between mammals, the U.S. National Science Advisory Board for Biosecurity (NSABB) was so alarmed that it took the unprecedented step of trying to censor publication of the studies.

The NSABB said it feared details of the work could fall into the wrong hands and be used for bioterrorism. A year-long moratorium on such research followed while the World Health Organization, U.S. security advisers and international flu researchers sought ways to ensure the highest safety controls.

The laboratory Fouchier will be working in is known as a BSL3 Enhanced lab (Bio-Safety Level 3), the highest level of biosecurity that can be achieved in academic research.

"Nature is the biggest threat to us, not what we do in the lab. What we do in the lab is under very intense biosecurity measures," he said. "There are layers upon layers of layers of biosafety measures such that if one layer might break there are additional layers to prevent this virus ever coming out."

Fouchier conceded that GOF research has been "under fire" recently. "One of the accusations against the flu community was that we were not transparent enough about what experiments were being done, and why and how they were being done," he said. "We're trying to pre-empt such accusations this time."

The H7N9 bird flu outbreak currently appears under control with only 3 new human cases in May after 87 in April and 30 in March. Experts say this is largely thanks to the closure of many live poultry markets and because of warmer weather.

Yet as winter approaches in China, many experts believe H7N9 could re-emerge, meaning the threat of a pandemic looms if it mutates to become easily transmissible between people.

The first scientific analysis of probable human-to-human transmission of H7N9 raised concern about its pandemic potential and prompted scientists James Rudge and Richard Coker of the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine to warn: "The threat posed by H7N9 has by no means passed.

Fouchier and colleagues said they hope to unravel the molecular processes behind H7N9 by manipulating its genetic material to increase virulence or induce drug resistance.

Wendy Barclay, an Imperial College London flu expert, said it would be ludicrous to shy away from such studies. "This type of work is like fitting glasses for someone who can't see well," she said. "Without the glasses the vision is blurred and uncertain, with them you can focus on the world and deal with it a lot more easily."

*Reporting by Kate Kelland; editing by David Evans.*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/08/07/us-birdflu-research-idUSBRE9760WV20130807>





USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

Defense News  
OPINION/Commentary

## Does US Have an Effective Deterrent Posture?

August 4, 2013

By EUGENE FOX and STANLEY ORMAN

Two forms of deterrence create security in this unstable world of nuclear and missile proliferation.

The traditional concept was to make a potential opponent understand that hostilities could not succeed because it would prompt such an overwhelming response the aggressor would cease to exist.

Later, President Reagan enhanced the concept to include anti-ballistic missile defense, demonstrating that an attack could not succeed and providing more time for assessment before launching a nuclear response.

Both elements are equally important because deterrence is far from a precise procedure and is highly dependent on the perception that each side has of the other.

Our fear for some years has been that nations like North Korea and Iran may not be dissuaded from attacking American facilities by the threat of nuclear retaliation. Certainly, terrorist groups to whom either nation might be tempted to pass on offensive capabilities would not be deterred by such threats.

It is in this environment that effective missile defense assumes the greatest importance, and why the failure of the July 5 test of the Ground-based Midcourse Defense system has sent the wrong message to those we want to deter.

Somewhat belatedly, the test failure induced senators and House members to write to the secretary of defense to express their concern. Their concern is well founded, but where was it over the past five years when two other tests failed? And why are Republican lawmakers suggesting that limited funding by the Obama administration could be responsible for the recent failure?

This recent test was of an operational system that was hurriedly deployed in 2004 to meet the President Bush objective of having a capability against enemies that might not be deterred by the threat of overwhelming retaliation. When the system was deployed in Alaska, we noted in a letter (Defense News, 7/17/06) that while we were sympathetic to those who want to see progress, "we also recognize the danger of placing undue reliance on an untested system. To date too much faith has been placed on partial and simulated tests."

The continued reliance on a few well-scripted tests and more computer simulations has led to the belated interest now being shown by some members of Congress. According to first reports of the failed test, the kill vehicle did not separate from the booster rocket. If correct, the limited data that have been collected from the test will provide little additional knowledge of the performance of the kill vehicle.

Rather than introducing party politics, Congress and the Pentagon should be calling for a thorough overhaul of ballistic missile defense (BMD) activities. The naval Aegis BMD system has demonstrated much more successful development than the current national missile defense (NMD). There is little confidence an upgraded NMD system will work any better.

Critics have repeatedly claimed that hostile nations could add decoys to outwit our defensive system. Although we know that such additions are not easy to introduce, the initial NMD was deployed on the understanding that it could only intercept comparatively simple ballistic trajectory missiles and later be enhanced to ensure interception of more sophisticated attacks.

But testing has been so limited there is no functioning NMD baseline on which to introduce such improvements.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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 US fails to recognize that many nations hostile toward us exchange information and capabilities in the same manner as we do with trusted allies. That is how Pakistan and North Korea rapidly became nuclear weapon nations, shortly to be followed by Iran.

The Reagan doctrine to add missile defense would give the president options beyond launching a nuclear reprisal when advised that a launch had been made against us. Confidence that incoming missiles could be intercepted provides breathing space for a more considered response.

The problem revealed by the recent test failure and the neglect of adequate testing has effectively nullified the enhancement envisaged by Reagan. This leaves our security resting on our nuclear deterrent — an effectiveness that relies on how hostile nations perceive we might react if attacked.

The reliability of our warhead stockpile also relies on computer simulation, together with breakdown and reassembly of existing warheads. We have previously expressed our concern on the loss of nuclear expertise and capabilities.

Congress should know that both systems are too reliant on computer simulation and far too short on demonstrated capability.

*Eugene Fox is vice president, and Stanley Orman, chief executive of Orman Associates, a defense and international consultancy, Rockville, Md.*

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130804/DEFREG02/308040009/Does-US-an-Effective-Deterrent-Posture->

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

The Japan Times – Japan  
OPINION/Editorial

## Take a Stand against Nuclear Weapons

August 6, 2013

Sixty-eight years have passed since atomic bombs were used against people for the first time — on Aug. 6, 1945, in Hiroshima and three days later in Nagasaki. Policymakers the world over should take concrete action toward the abolition of nuclear weapons by listening to what Hiroshima Mayor Kazumi Matsui said in his 2013 Peace Declaration on Tuesday, the 68th anniversary of the Hiroshima bombing.

Mr. Matsui reminded us that nuclear weapons are “the ultimate inhumane weapon and an absolute evil” because of their nature: “Indiscriminately stealing the lives of innocent people, permanently altering the lives of survivors, and stalking their minds and bodies to the end of their days.”

His next statement expressed common sense thinking that leaders of nuclear weapons states should take to heart. “Policymakers of the world, how long will you remain imprisoned by distrust and animosity? Do you honestly believe you can continue to maintain national security by rattling your sabers?”

He continued: “Please come to Hiroshima. Encounter the spirit of the *hibakusha* (atomic bombing survivors). Look squarely at the future of the human family without being trapped in the past, and decide to shift to a system of security based on trust and dialogue.”

The current situation is far from the ideal as described by the Hiroshima mayor. There are some 17,000 nuclear weapons all over the world, including those to be scrapped. Despite U.S. President Barack Obama’s call for further mutual cuts in nuclear arsenals, Russia has not yet responded positively. In February, North Korea carried out its third nuclear explosion test. There is a report that Iran already possesses enough enriched uranium to make six or more nuclear bombs.

In Japan, the nuclear crisis at Tokyo Electric Power Co.’s Fukushima No. 1 nuclear power plant continues, threatening further contamination of the environment with radioactive materials. In addition, Japan has stockpiled some 44 tons of

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

plutonium extracted from spent nuclear fuel. Such plutonium can be converted into the ingredients for a nuclear weapon.

As the first country to suffer the dread of exposure to radiation from a nuclear attack, Japan has a special responsibility to move forward with efforts to eliminate such weapons. Yet, on April 24 it refused to sign an important statement supported by 74 countries at the second session in Geneva of the Preparatory Committee for the 2015 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The statement said in part, "It is in the interest of the very survival of humanity that nuclear weapons are never used again, under any circumstances."

Japanese officials stress that because Japan is under the U.S. nuclear umbrella, it cannot sign such a statement. But even if the current security arrangement cannot be changed anytime soon, the Japanese government has a moral duty to draw up a long-term security plan that is not dependent on nuclear weapons. Japan, which knows firsthand the inhumane nature of nuclear weapons, must have the courage to declare that nuclear weapons are an absolute evil, and work strenuously toward their abolishment.

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2013/08/06/editorials/take-a-stand-against-nuclear-weapons/>

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

Arms Control Wonk.com

OPINION/Commentary

## The Future of Arms Control

By Michael Krepon

6 August 2013

The control of weapons of mass destruction has been about numbers, treaties and norms. The first two get most of the attention, even though the third is the grand prize. Numbers and treaties are essential tools to build an edifice of normative behavior and customary practice. Numbers and treaties are the means. Norms are the ends.

Strategic arms control is a process, and is therefore numbers-oriented. Treaties relating to nuclear testing, chemical and biological weapons codify norms. As treaties become harder to enter into force, or as they enter into force without key states, customary practice becomes all important. Treaties and numbers still matter, in large measure because they reinforce norms. The number of treaty signatories is consequential even when some of them do not deposit instruments of ratification, preventing entry into force. Through customary practice, norms can become stronger over time even when treaties are stalled.

Sometimes the attention paid to numbers is misplaced, as Thomas Schelling argued and as discussed in last week's post. Even so, numbers still have considerable import, as they provide a snapshot of the work in progress we call arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation. No construction plans are fixed and complete, despite the blueprints we have to work with.

Occasionally, construction projects require build-downs. Strengthening the global regime against nuclear proliferation is linked to responsible behavior by the two states with the worst records of nuclear excess. Reductions in nuclear force structure and inventories by the United States and Russia are necessary, but hardly sufficient to strengthen the norm of nuclear nonproliferation.

In terms of the strategic balance, it doesn't matter whether Vladimir Putin tries to build up to New START ceilings with a liquid-fueled, MIRVed replacement to the SS-18. Nonetheless, it matters a great deal if Putin stiffes President Obama's offer for parallel reductions below New START limits. Putin seems intent to mortgage Russia's future in many ways, one of which is to equate national power with weapons that will not influence events in Moscow's favor. He does, however, have the power to slow down a quarter-century-long process of parallel strategic arms reduction and corrode the bargain between nuclear haves and have-nots in the Nonproliferation Treaty – that continued abstention is predicated on the sincere pursuit of disarmament among bomb holders.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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



Yes, I know the counter argument: non-nuclear weapon states continue to pledge allegiance to the NPT out of self-interest, regardless of nuclear numerology. This revisionist argument is unpersuasive because it disregards the central bargain on which the NPT regime was constructed. Moreover, it can have pernicious consequences by providing cover for bomb holders to become slackers, while discounting the importance of numbers in the calculations of abstainers as to whether the NPT remains in their national security interests. Deeper cuts by Washington and Moscow are just one indicator of the continued health of the NPT regime — but an important one. Abstainers that rely on extended US nuclear deterrence do not require New START-level numbers for solace; lesser numbers will do. Even so, other corrosive developments will plague the NPT, particularly from the nuclear weapon-related programs in Iran and North Korea.

Free-riders watch on the sidelines as others engage in construction projects. Free-riders to the NPT like India and Pakistan are growing their nuclear inventories while enjoying norms that make it more costly and more obvious for new entrants into the bomb-making business. The subcontinent's free-riders have not repaid debts to the NPT with signatures on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

China, another state with a growing nuclear inventory, has not ratified the CTBT. Beijing has benefited as much, if not more, than any state party to the NPT, while North Korea, which depends on China's largesse, continues to grow fissile material stocks and has not ruled out additional nuclear tests. Another free rider, Israel, has refrained from ratifying the CTBT. If the United States and Russia remain stuck on New START numbers — less than three years after reaching them, with seven more years before the Treaty's current end date — they, too, will hold passes as free riders. Free ridership corrodes norms and treaties.

The number that matters most in norm-setting is zero. This number is the clearest and most meaningful way to sets norms and customary practices among responsible states. The number zero is embedded in the CTBT, the Chemical Weapons Convention, and the Biological Weapons Convention. States that do not honor the number zero become, ipso facto, outliers. Because numbers of chemical and biological weapons that are greater than zero can be hidden, suspicions can only be conclusively affirmed by use, if they cannot be revealed by national technical means or intrusive treaty-monitoring regimes.

Norms are about behavior as well as numbers. Behavior is usually easier to monitor than numbers. The use of chemical and biological weapons becomes an indelible stain on the user. Who wants a resumé like that of Bashar al-Assad? How many states wish to join the company of North Korea in testing nuclear weapons?

Norms are also being codified in conventions against the transfer and use of certain conventional weapons, including some types of land mines and cluster munitions. These norms have important outliers, as well. Being an outlier in compacts dealing with conventional weapons entails less stigma, at least until customary, responsible practice becomes more recognizable and expected over time. This long and winding road lies ahead.

The clearest and cleanest way to codify norms and numbers is by treaties but, as noted, treaties for the foreseeable future won't enter into force or, if they do, they will enter into force without key parties. As long as treaties remain in this limbo, success in arms control, disarmament and nonproliferation will depend increasingly on customary, responsible practices that harden over time into norms.

*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/3858/the-future-of-arms-control>

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

The Washington Times  
OPINION/Commentary



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER  
**CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**  
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

## **KAHLILI: Rouhani's Iranian Nuclear Deception**

*How the 'moderate' new president secretly pushed the weapons program*

By Reza Kahlili

Wednesday, August 7, 2013

Iran's newly elected president, Hasan Rouhani, officially took office Sunday and, with the blessing of the supreme leader, promised moderation. Don't believe it.

Mr. Rouhani's election was orchestrated by Ayatollah Ali Khamenei for a specific mission: buy time so the Islamic regime can complete its nuclear-weapons program, according to a former intelligence officer who defected to a Scandinavian country.

A second goal is to persuade the United States to relieve some of the crippling sanctions as a sign of good faith. Iran's economic situation has deteriorated to the point that officials have warned of the possibility of food rationing. Inflation is rampant, and unemployment growing.

Mr. Rouhani, through his Cabinet picks, is sending a signal that he is willing to engage the West and even hold direct talks with the United States. He already has named former U.N. Ambassador Mohammad Javad Zarif, who has had deep conversations with U.S. officials before, as foreign minister, and Mohammad Nahavandian, a U.S.-educated businessman, as his chief of staff.

Though the new government is trying to paint an image of moderation, almost all aspects of the regime are controlled by the supreme leader. As I revealed on YouTube Monday, Mr. Rouhani bragged in a pre-election, videotaped interview that he deceived the West over the regime's illicit nuclear program and claimed credit for vastly expanding it. "We wanted to complete all of these [nuclear programs]. We needed time," he said.

Mr. Rouhani was Iran's nuclear negotiator starting in October 2003 in talks with France, Britain and Germany.

"The day that we invited the three European ministers [to the talks], only 10 centrifuges were spinning at [the Iranian nuclear facility of] Natanz," Mr. Rouhani said on the tape.

He said the three European ministers promised to block the U.S. desire to transfer the Iran nuclear dossier to the United Nations, using veto power if necessary. He called Iran's claim that it stopped its nuclear program in 2003 a statement for the uneducated and admitted that the program not only was not stopped, but was significantly expanded under his tenure.

While President George W. Bush was increasing pressure on Iran in 2007, a report by American intelligence agencies concluded that Iran halted its nuclear program in 2003 and that the program had remained frozen since.

In the interview, Mr. Rouhani said that when he took over the country's nuclear project, the country's 150 centrifuges grew to more than 1,700 by the time he left the project.

Then Mr. Rouhani made his boldest statement: "We did not stop. We completed the program." He said Iran's nuclear activity was under the supervision of the supreme leader and that he, as Ayatollah Khamenei's representative, was to make sure of this deceit.

Today, Iran has more than 10,000 centrifuges spinning at its Natanz facility and has stockpiled enough low-enriched uranium for six nuclear bombs while its stock of the higher-enriched uranium is constantly rising.

By his own confession, Mr. Rouhani clearly proved that the Islamic regime never intended to engage in serious negotiations, but was intent on building nuclear weapons.

Decade-long negotiations have been fruitless, and all the U.N. resolutions and even harsh sanctions have not forced the tyrannical clerics to abandon their goal of a nuclear-armed state.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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 regime thinks that the United States and the West will not risk war and disruption of the global economy to thwart Iran's goals, and that the worst they can do are sanctions. It also thinks that through Mr. Rouhani's image of moderation, the West might back off on some of its sanctions without Iran taking a meaningful step toward accommodation.

It's only a matter of time before Iran successfully arms its ballistic missiles with nuclear warheads, which will change the geopolitics of the region and the world. Reports indicate that by next year, Iran will have completed its nuclear bomb program, its intercontinental ballistic-missile program, putting the United States within its reach. Its heavy-water plant will provide the regime a second path to nuclear arms by way of plutonium. Global security and the global economy will become hostages to the radicals in Iran.

Mr. Rouhani, by his own videotaped statements, has shown that he is indeed a wolf in sheep's clothing. Any future negotiations must be limited and to the point, and sanctions increased if there is no immediate conciliation by the Iranian regime.

The regime is looking for a way out of the current impasse without giving up its goal of obtaining nuclear weapons. We must not allow it any more time. We must make it much harder on the regime economically while openly supporting the aspirations of the Iranian people for change.

It's only then that war can be avoided, and the regime will either fold, or Iranians will do it for them. Either way, the regime will be defeated, and that could go a long way for major change in Iran.

*Reza Kahlili is a pseudonym for a former CIA operative in Iran's Revolutionary Guards and author of "A Time to Betray" (Simon & Schuster, 2010).*

<http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2013/aug/7/khalili-rouhanis-iranian-nuclear-deception/?page=all#pagebreak>

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

Huffington Post  
OPINION/The Blog

## **Paka (So Long for Now) Arms Control**

By Jon Wolfsthal  
August 7, 2013

Let me be clear. Negotiated nuclear arms control treaties are good for American security. They help provide certainty and transparency, and a legal framework for managing what can often be challenging and complex issues. A process where two countries have to agree on something that meets their mutual interest moderates the behavior of both states and can produce associated benefits for the broader relationship. And in the case of strategic nuclear arms control between the United States and Russia, arms agreement have wider benefits in helping to sustain the broader international nonproliferation regime.

All this as a given, there has been little cause for optimism that the United States and Russia will be able to agree on a new agreement to reduce mutual arsenals below the 1,550 strategic offensive nuclear weapon levels established in New START Treaty anytime soon. Russia has tried to load up the list of demands with too many unrelated issues and, frankly, depends more on its nuclear weapons than does the United States. They need more nuclear weapons than we do to feel secure.

### **Nyet to a Russia Veto**

Moreover, given Russia's lack of interest in reductions, it is unwise to create a situation where Russia has veto power over how America sets its nuclear priorities or allocates its scarce defense dollars. If Moscow wants to waste its money on nuclear weapons they can't use, why should America be forced to do the same? America's military and civilian

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

leaders believe we have many more nuclear weapons than we need, regardless of Russia's arsenal. Why should we maintain an oversized force just because Russia's conventional forces are weaker than our own?

However, the decision by President Putin to give former NSA contractor Edward Snowden asylum essentially kills any chance of a negotiated treaty with Russia for the remainder of the Obama presidency. Even if Russia were ready to deal, no U.S.-Russia Treaty will be approved by the United States Senate in the Snowden aftermath.

Even before Snowden fled to Moscow, there was a solid block of 20 GOP Senators ready to oppose any Obama initiative based purely on its source. This bloc is simply unprepared to cooperate with President Obama on the nuclear reduction agenda. Some believe the U.S. should maintain or even expand its current nuclear forces, other do not trust the president and still others are seeking to deny the president any political victories on any subject. In sum, any Treaty submitted by President Obama would have been a tough sell, as witnessed by the New START battle.

Now, in the wake of Snowden's successful asylum request, any Treaty with Russia would be more radioactive than the warheads it would seek to eliminate. Those predisposed to see Russia as a geo-political adversary see vindication and others, perhaps half a dozen thought to be running for President in 2016, would seek to posture against Russia at the expense of any nuclear Treaty. Striking at a nuclear reduction agreement with no material affect on them or their states would be too tempting a target to pass up.

Even in the darkest days of the cold war, the United States and Soviet Union found ways to manage their nuclear competition. Perhaps the Senate took their responsibilities more seriously then, or perhaps our political system as become too ionized and toxic for Senators to rise above too many issues. Regardless, any US-Russia nuclear pact submitted to the Senate has zero chance of approval in the next three years.

This is a bigger issue than whether the president should meet with Russian President Putin in Moscow. If there is progress to be made on the nuclear agenda or elsewhere, the president should pursue it. But given the conditions in the United States, discussions should focus on possible bilateral reciprocal steps both countries can take to further reduce nuclear numbers and increase nuclear transparency. Anything else is likely wasted effort. Worse, completing an agreement likely to be rejected by the Senate would create a point of conflict where one need not exist.

### **More Than One Way To Protect America**

Instead, the president and his advisers should prepare other options for reducing the nuclear arsenal to the lowest level consistent with American security. A recent review has found that level to be perhaps 30 percent below those set in New START. The costs of maintaining an oversized arsenal may be manageable in the next few years but replacing aging system one for one will be prohibitively expensive. At the same time, GOP members of the House and Senate are already seeking to tie the President's hands and deny him funds to implement even those reductions already approved in New START and the law of the land. Veto threats will be required to protect the President's authority as commander in chief to set U.S. military requirements, an prevent Congress for deny him funds to eliminate systems no longer needed for deterrence or security.

That Russia should shelter Edward Snowden is an unfortunate body blow to the already weakened U.S.-Russian relationship. To be sure, we continue to have shared interests and should work together where we can to pursue them. But the political fallout from the asylum approval make all but clear that codifying nuclear reductions by Treaty will be impossible, leaving the president with fewer options for further reducing the role of American nuclear weapons in our security policy. But those options remain viable and for our security must be pursued.

*Jon Wolfsthal is the Deputy Director of the James Martin Center for Nonproliferation Studies (cns.miis.edu) at the Monterey Institute of International Studies. He served for three years as the special advisor to Vice President Joseph Biden for nuclear security and nonproliferation and as a director at the National Security Council.*

[http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jon-wolfsthal/paka-so-long-for-now-arms\\_b\\_3714107.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/jon-wolfsthal/paka-so-long-for-now-arms_b_3714107.html)

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

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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 London Independent – U.K.  
OPINION/Independent Voices

## The Case for Keeping Trident Is Political, Not Military

*As chief of the defence staff during the Cold War I completely endorsed our thinking on the need for a nuclear deterrent - but the world has changed since then*

By Edwin Bramall

Thursday, 08 August 2013

Danny Alexander, launching the Coalition's recent Trident Alternatives Review, said he hoped it would be the start of the debate, not the end. In my judgement, as a former chief of the defence staff during the Cold War, this debate is both essential and long overdue. Yet there is still no sign of it.

Doubtless, the news that President Obama has cancelled plans for a US-Russian summit because President Putin has granted asylum to Mr Snowden will prompt claims in some quarters that we cannot in the least degree drop our nuclear guard. Such claims make no sense, however. Since the end of the massive Soviet conventional threat to Western Europe, nuclear weapons have had no military utility.

Nevertheless, we retain a so-called independent nuclear deterrent as a political tool of last resort, providing the ultimate guarantee of national security whatever the future may hold. But this is on the basis that a threat would be so direct and extreme that it could only be prevented by a continuous nuclear counter-threat of destruction for any hypothetical aggressor.

These none-too-likely circumstances were just credible during the Cold War, with the confrontation of two superpowers and the threat of world domination by an ideology irreconcilable with Western democracy. Our nuclear deterrent, while insignificant in comparison with that of the US, was just conceivably a guarantee of our territorial integrity in the unthinkable event we could not count on a credible response by America in support of Nato as a whole.

As chief of the defence staff, I completely endorsed our deterrent on that basis, and as a back-up of our then too-weak conventional forces. Today, however, I do not believe that the circumstances on which the rationality of our deterrent were based apply. The present threat is no longer interstate but from a multiplicity of ill-defined non-state players. Our deterrent has not, does not and could not counter such threats. Even the spectre of nuclear weapons falling into the hands of such hostile elements could not be countered by the threat of nuclear retaliation.

The oft-quoted price of a seat at "the top table" has also worn thin. It was never a qualification for permanent membership of the Security Council, and in today's world it is economic strength, wise counsel and an ever-ready capability for peacekeeping which buy influence not the ability to destroy en masse.

It is this inability of our present nuclear deterrent to do the job that it is supposed to do, combined with the scarcely affordable cost of a like-for-like successor for another 40 to 50 years, that make it all the more necessary that the debate be truly opened up. I am not a unilateralist; however, because the nuclear option is simply not a credible or practical response to non-state threats I would wish to re-examine the non-nuclear options – in particular, improved intelligence. And at the same time I would want our nuclear stance to be re-examined in the light of the changed threat from nation states.

But I recognise that, in the real world, a British government would find it politically unaffordable not to be seen to have the best nuclear weapon money could buy. Even if it were minded to take a rational step, could it really defy popular feeling, which could so easily be whipped up to claim, however inaccurately, that the Government would be giving away Britain's ultimate guarantee of homeland security? Politically, it is far easier to let a planned successor to Trident go ahead, whatever its irrationality, and whatever its opportunity cost.

Governments are, in effect, impaled on Trident. Only breathing space – time – can get them off the hook. But that time must be used positively. To begin with, we should recognise that in the post-Cold War world we do not need to have a nuclear-firing submarine at sea at all times in order to demonstrate an effective deterrent capability. Periodically, one

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

boat would be on patrol for training, and at other times a submarine could be at short notice to put to sea if the threat to either us or our vital interests were perceived to have increased. This variable state of readiness would still maintain that useful sense of uncertainty, and could even, at times of particular tension, appear to enhance our commitment and resolve.

Some worthwhile economies would arise from a system of reduced readiness, which, by adding to the lifespan of the existing Trident, might go some way to assuage lingering voter doubts. Even more importantly, it would allow a breathing space to perfect, hand-in-hand with improved intelligence, a more relevant, economical and usable system.

I believe stepping down from the immediate-response nature of our current nuclear stance could be implemented in a way that persuades people, at home and abroad, that it is both a sound and a progressive step, designed not to prepare quixotically again for the last war, but to present a more balanced and relevant defence programme. Moreover, by making a significant contribution to the general dialogue for multinational nuclear disarmament, it could enhance the value of our counsel in international affairs and as a key member of the Security Council.

*Edwin Bramall served as Chief of the General Staff of the British Army between 1979 and 1982 and as Chief of the Defence Staff from 1982 to 1985.*

<http://www.independent.co.uk/voices/comment/the-case-for-keeping-trident-is-political-not-military-8750286.html>

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

Albuquerque Journal – Albuquerque, N.M.

OPINION/Guest Columns

## **Udall Needs to Rethink Huge Spending on B61**

By Daryl Kimball and Jay Coghlan

August 8, 2013

President Barack Obama and the Pentagon announced on July 19 that they have determined that the United States can reduce the size of the U.S. strategic nuclear arsenal by one-third while ensuring a strong nuclear deterrent.

The president also said he will seek “bold” reductions in tactical nuclear bombs along with Russia. At the same time, Congress has directed the Pentagon and the National Nuclear Security Administration to achieve some \$500 billion in defense-related budget cuts over the next decade.

Unfortunately, his National Nuclear Security Administration and the nuclear weapons labs do not seem to have gotten the message. The NNSA is aggressively planning a “life extension program” for 400 B61 nuclear bombs, 180 of which are deployed in NATO countries.

According to a Pentagon audit, the cost of upgrading about 300 units of the tactical version and about 100 of the strategic version of the warhead has exploded from \$4 billion to more than \$10 billion. That makes the cost of each bomb twice its weight in gold.

Earlier this year, Obama requested \$537 million for the B61 life extension in FY 2014 (a 45 percent increase), which the House approved. But over in the Senate, appropriators cut that by \$168 million.

Congress can and should enforce greater budgetary and design discipline for the ambitious B61 program. For example, Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., chair of the Appropriations Energy and Water Development Subcommittee, said in April that NNSA has studied another option for the B61 life extension program that would cost billions less.

This option, known as the triple alteration or “triple-alt,” would replace only three key bomb parts that are said to be nearing the end of their useful lives in the next ten years: the bomb’s neutron generator, power source and radar system. This plan would extend the life of B61 bombs for another 10 years, according to NNSA, and would cost approximately \$3 billion, according to the Defense Department.

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

Unfortunately, New Mexico's Sen. Tom Udall has been pushing for the gold-plated, \$10 billion version of the B61 bomb.

Earlier this year, he threatened to vote against the entire \$35 billion Energy and Water Appropriations bill unless measures were included to possibly restore that money, later saying that he wanted to protect 200 jobs in New Mexico.

Worse, the gold-plated plan Udall and the Los Alamos and Sandia labs are seeking would also give the B61 significant new military capabilities. Proposed new tail fin guidance kits would transform the B61 into the world's first nuclear "smart" bomb for delivery on the new, stealthy, and costly F35 bomber.

With the end of the Cold War, there is still no identifiable threat that would justify this expensive and potentially provocative new military capability.

The NNSA says its main goal is simply to refurbish the nuclear and nonnuclear components to assure extended service life, and improve the safety, reliability, and security of the bomb.

However, there are better ways to achieve goals of maintaining safety, security and reliability of the B61 at lower cost. Safety has far more to do with how the weapons are handled rather than the bombs themselves. Better security can be achieved by withdrawing the United States' B61 bomb from the European air bases, where they serve no military role for NATO's defense.

When Congress reconvenes this fall, the House and Senate will have to reconcile differences in their budget allocations for the B61 program.

Udall should take a closer look at the costly B61 life extension program, support less expensive alternatives and encourage mission and jobs diversification at the labs. But most of all, he needs to do more to prevent the labs from designing new military capabilities into existing nuclear weapons.

Unnecessary and expensive improvements to U.S. nuclear weapons capabilities make it all the more difficult to pressure other countries not to acquire them.

*By Daryl Kimball is the Executive Director of the, Arms Control Association and Jay Coghlan is the Executive Director of the Nuclear Watch New Mexico.*

<http://www.abqjournal.com/243904/opinion/udall-needs-to-rethink-huge-spending-on-b61.html>

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

The Washington Post  
OPINION/WONKBLOG

## 'When Obama Says Putin Is Trapped in Cold War Logic, It's True. But So Is Obama.'

By Ezra Klein  
August 8, 2013

*A few years ago, the hope was that the U.S. and Russia were moving towards a "reset" of their relationship — and with that reset, a renewed commitment to mutual nuclear disarmament. That's not looking so good anymore — and it's one reason President Obama canceled the summit with Vladimir Putin.*

*Joseph Cirincione is president of Ploughshares Fund, a global security foundation, and a member of Secretary of State John Kerry's International Security Advisory Board and the Council on Foreign Relations. He's also the author of "Bomb Scare: The History and Future of Nuclear Weapons." We spoke this afternoon.*

### **Ezra Klein: What does President Obama want from the talks with Russia?**

Joe Cirincione: If Russia would agree, Obama would dramatically reduce the U.S. arsenal. He's hesitant to do it independently. He wants Russian agreement. But Russia won't agree. And Russia is hanging all these other issues on

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

nuclear agreement. Putin wants to talk NATO conventional forces. He wants to talk new precision strike weapons the U.S. has that some fear can knock out Russian nuclear targets. He wants to talk missile defense. And he has a very active missile industrial complex in Russia.

**EK: Let's say Putin woke up tomorrow morning and decided to agree to everything Obama wanted. What's the size of the disarmament we're talking about?**

JC: It is not a Reagan and Gorbachev moment. At Reykjavik they came very close to agreeing to eliminate everything in 10 years. Tragically, we're not talking about that with Putin or Obama. We're talking about another step: A 1/3rd reduction.

The START treaty says both sides can have 1,550 full, operationally deployed strategic warheads. That's the ceiling. The treaty doesn't go into effect until 2018 so we're building down to that. The latest data shows we're down to 1,664. We have 100 more than the treaty permits. Russia is down to 1,480 — they're already below, and going lower, because their missiles are aging and they're retiring them faster than they can replace them. They have plans for a big, new heavy ICBM, but estimates are that the Russian force will decline to 1,000 warheads by the end of the decade.

Suppose we follow them down. Then we maybe reduce the incentive for Russia to build this new, big, heavy ICBM.

**EK: If Russia is already falling so quickly, why does Obama need their cooperation at all? Couldn't we just pick up the pace on disarmament?**

JC: That is true. That's another level of the discussion. We could do this unilaterally and the chiefs would probably do that. They've already said we can accomplish all our missions at this level. Think about 1,000 strategic warheads — how many do you need? What military mission requires 1,000 strategic warheads? Imagine if we had only 500. There's no conceivable mission in which the U.S. would launch 500 hydrogen bombs, each one at 10-50 times the power of Hiroshima.

**EK: So what's the point of having so many?**

JC: It's still Cold War logic. When Obama says Putin is trapped in Cold War logic, it's true. But so is Obama and so is his bureaucracy. The only reason you need all these weapons is if you're preparing for global thermonuclear war with Russia. You don't need them to deal with Iran or North Korea. It does nothing about terrorism. It just keeps going because it's tethered to the nuclear-weapons complex. The people who build nuclear weapons keep building them. The people with the bases want to keep maintaining them. The commanders of the strategic forces are vested in this complex. But do you need it? You have to really go down to some hard-core, unreconstructed Cold War theorists in town to find people who will justify this arsenal.

But the problem is the echo of that thinking is still found in the Department of Defense. Ash Carter, as deputy secretary, has exempted nuclear weapons from the effects of the sequester. He shielded them off, arguing that we have to protect the nuclear deterrent. Really? An 8 percent cut in our nuclear budget would imperil the defense of this nation? If we reduced the patrols of the Trident sub? Slowed down the procurement programs for the new generation? So instead he shifts the budget cuts to conventional forces and civilian furloughs.

**EK: But if we're just talking about going from 1,600 operational warheads to 1,000, or 800, why should I care? Which is to say, that's still more than enough to wipe out human life many times over. So if nothing close to disarmament is on the table, what does it matter if we have 800 or 2,000?**

JC: Two reasons. You can't cut everything at once. So this is a step. It's the next step. And once the U.S. and Russia go down to a 1,000 weapons, you can begin involving other nuclear nations in the discussion, particularly China. You don't want to start cutting to 500 and risk that China will race past you. So pretty much everyone agrees at that point China will have to be brought into the conversation. So it's essential to getting to the step afterwards.

Number two is it makes you safer in and of itself because it reduces the risk one will be launched by accident or miscalculation. The U.S. and Russia both have about 1,000 hydrogen missiles ready to launch on 15 minutes' notice. You

**Issue No. 1069, 09 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

might remember we had this big detargeting initiative during the Yeltsin era. But those targets can be loaded back on in less than a minute. It's all computerized. And human beings are fallible. Improbable things happen all the time. We load missiles on our B52s and fly them across the country not knowing we've put nuclear weapons on them — this happened in 2007 on a flight from a base from North Dakota to Louisiana. In 1995, Russia's radar misinterpreted a Norwegian weather rocket as a nuclear missile and Boris Yeltsin was presented with the nuclear football. Luckily, he wasn't drunk and he didn't believe the report. But accidents happen.

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/08/08/when-obama-says-putin-is-trapped-in-cold-war-logic-its-true-but-so-is-obama/?tid=pm\\_business\\_pop](http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/wonkblog/wp/2013/08/08/when-obama-says-putin-is-trapped-in-cold-war-logic-its-true-but-so-is-obama/?tid=pm_business_pop)

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

**Issue No. 1069, 09 August 2013**

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