



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [General: U.S. Nukes Still 'Credible' Against Russian Missile Defenses](#)

1. [Iranian Defense Ministry Inaugurates Space Center](#)
2. [Iran to Load Heavy Water Reactor with "Virtual Fuel": Nuclear Chief](#)
3. [Iran Eyes 30 Nuclear Bombs a Year: Israel Minister](#)
4. [Iran Denies 'Problem' at Sole Nuclear Reactor](#)
5. [Putin has No Doubts Iran Observes all Nuclear Program-Related Commitments](#)
6. [Syria: US Confirms Assad Used Chemical Weapons](#)
7. [Russia Dismisses U.S. Claims of Chemical Weapons in Syria](#)
8. [N.Korean Army Chief Fingered in Syria Connection](#)
9. [High-level Inter-Korean Talks Called Off](#)
10. [S. Korea Aims to Establish Missile Destruction System by 2020](#)
11. [Chinese Spacecraft Blasts Off from Gobi Desert](#)
12. [S. Korea to Deploy New Surface-to-Air Missiles for Aegis Destroyers](#)
13. [N. Korea Not Answering Panmunjom Communication Line](#)
14. [U.S. Needs to Prepare for Contingency Related to DPRK: Hagel](#)
15. [N. Korea Illustrates 'Hybrid' Military Threats, US General Says](#)
16. [Mali Manual Suggests al-Qaida Has Feared Weapon](#)
17. [Russia's Third Borey-Class Sub Blessed for Sea Trials](#)
18. [Missile Defense Key to Developing US-Russian Ties – MP](#)
19. [US Nuclear Bombs 'Based in Netherlands' - ex-Dutch PM Lubbers](#)
20. [France Orders Nuclear Sub Security Investigation](#)
21. [Pentagon Missile Defense Brass Frown on East Coast Interceptor Sites](#)
22. [Russia May Consider US Spy Leaker's Asylum Request – Media](#)
23. [Gen. Kehler Lays Out Vision for STRATCOM](#)
24. [General: U.S. Nukes Still 'Credible' Against Russian Missile Defenses](#)
25. [Daines Defends ICBMs: Amendment Seeks 'Warm Status' for Missiles Housed in Silos](#)
26. [U.S. to Aid Allies in Cyber Wars](#)
27. [Deterrence is a Lame Excuse for Stockpiling](#)
28. [15-Years after Pokhran II: Deterrence Churning Continues](#)
29. [Enemies from Outer Space](#)
30. [Should Egypt Go Nuclear?](#)
31. [4 Myths about Nuclear Deterrence](#)
32. [US Tests Iran "Bunker Buster" Bomb...So What?](#)
33. ['Decimated' Al-Qaida Could Shoot Down Passenger Jets](#)
34. [New Nukes](#)
35. [Iran: Much More Than Nukes](#)
36. [The Modern Costs of the Yesteryear Bomb](#)

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.1062, 14 June 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

FARS News Agency – Iran
June 9, 2013

Iranian Defense Ministry Inaugurates Space Center

TEHRAN (FNA) - Iranian Defense Minister Brigadier General Ahmad Vahidi inaugurated a new space center to monitor and observe different space objects and satellites passing through the country's atmosphere.

"This center has been inaugurated to maintain the security of Iran's space and spatial systems since we should constantly monitor spatial objects and satellites passing through the country's atmosphere," Vahidi said, addressing a ceremony attended by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to inaugurate Iran's first space center named 'Imam Ja'far Sadeq (PBUH)' in the Central province of Markazi on Sunday.

He said that the center uses three different methods of radar detection, electro-optic detection and radio detection to track and detect space objects.

Vahidi underlined that the system can be used not only by Iran to guide and control its home-made satellites, but also by other countries which have space objects to control trafficking in the orbit.

Iran has taken long strides in recent years to develop its space industry and to build different types of satellites.

Late January, the Defense Ministry's Aerospace Industries Organization announced that it has sent a monkey into the space on the back of Pishgam (Pioneer) explorer rocket, and that it has brought back and recovered the living cargo.

The Aerospace Industries Organization said it had sent the living creature into space aboard an indigenous biocapsule as a prelude to sending humans into space.

The Aerospace Industries Organization said the capsule was sent to an orbit beyond 120km in altitude and carried out telemetry of the environmental data records.

The explorer rocket was launched by the Aerospace Industries Organization and it returned to the Earth after reaching the desired speed and altitude, and the living creature (monkey) was retrieved and found alive.

In mid-March 2011, Iran's Space Agency (ISA) announced the launch of the Kavoshgar-4 rocket carrying a test capsule designed to house the monkey.

The capsule had been unveiled in February 2011 by President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, along with four new prototypes of home-built satellites.

At the time, Director of Iran Space Agency (ISA) Hamid Fazeli called the launch of a large animal into space as the first step towards sending a man into space, which Tehran says is scheduled for 2020.

Iran has already sent small animals into space - a rat, turtles and worms - aboard a capsule carried by its Kavoshgar-3 rocket in 2010.

The Islamic republic, which first put a satellite into orbit in 2009, has outlined an ambitious space program and has, thus far, made giant progress in the field despite western sanctions and pressures against its advancement.

Iran has taken wide strides in aerospace. The country sent the first biocapsule of living creatures into space in February 2011, using its home-made Kavoshgar-3 (Explorer-3) carrier.

Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad announced in 2010 that Iran plans to send astronauts into space in 2024. But, later he said that the issue had gone under a second study at a cabinet meeting and that the cabinet had decided to implement the plan in 2019, five years earlier than the date envisaged in the original plan.

Omid (hope) was Iran's first research satellite that was designed for gathering information and testing equipment. After orbiting for three months, Omid successfully completed its mission without any problem. It completed more than 700 orbits over seven weeks and reentered the Earth's atmosphere on April 25, 2009.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

After launching Omid, Tehran unveiled three new satellites called Tolou, Mesbah II and Navid, respectively. Iran has also unveiled its latest achievements in designing and producing satellite carriers.

A new generation of home-made satellites and a new satellite carrier called Simorgh (Phoenix) were among the latest achievements unveiled by Iran's aerospace industries.

The milk-bottle shaped rocket is equipped to carry a 60-kilogram (132-pound) satellite 500 kilometers (310 miles) into orbit.

The 27-meter (90 foot) tall multi-stage rocket weighs 85 tons and its liquid fuel propulsion system has a thrust of up to 143 tons.

Iran is one of the 24 founding members of the United Nations' Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (UNCOPUOS), which was set up in 1959.

<http://english.farsnews.com/newstext.php?nn=9203180420>

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

Xinhua News – China

Iran to Load Heavy Water Reactor with "Virtual Fuel": Nuclear Chief

English.news.cn

June 10, 2013

TEHRAN, June 9 (Xinhua) -- Head of Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI), Fereidoon Abbasi, said Sunday that his country will load Arak heavy water reactor with "virtual fuel" by the end of current Iranian calendar year, March 20, 2014, local media reported.

Abbasi made the remarks in a ceremony, attended by Iran's President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, in the site to install the "main upper container" of the IR-40 reactor.

The installation "is considered a significant step forward in developing the project," Abbasi was quoted as saying by the state-run IRIB TV on Sunday.

"We hope to push ahead with the required tests concerning the sound operation of the reactor and to start full use of it next year," he added.

Iran states that the reactor will only be used for R&D, medical and industrial isotope production, however, the West suspects that the plant might also be used to reprocess the nuclear fuel into plutonium that can be used in a nuclear weapon.

The world's six major countries in a joint statement on June 5 urged Iran to suspend its nuclear activities contrary to the relevant resolutions of the UN Security Council.

The joint statement made by China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States showed deep concern that Iran continues to advance its nuclear plan including installing advanced centrifuges, production of enriched uranium, and construction of the IR-40 reactor at Arak.

The West accuses Iran of developing nuclear weapon under cover of civilian nuclear program, and imposed a series of sanctions aimed at crippling Iran's economy, while the latter stresses that its nuclear program is for civilian use only.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2013-06/10/c_132444851.htm

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

Global Post – Boston, MA

Iran Eyes 30 Nuclear Bombs a Year: Israel Minister

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)
June 10, 2013

Iran is working round the clock to enlarge its nuclear infrastructure with the eventual aim of developing an industry capable of building up to 30 bombs a year, an Israeli minister charged on Monday.

Speaking to reporters in Jerusalem, Intelligence Minister Yuval Steinitz said Tehran was "very close" to crossing the red line laid out by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu last year.

But he said it was biding its time and building uranium-enrichment facilities before making the final push for weapons-grade material.

"The Iranians are getting very close now to the red line... They have close to 200 kilos -- 190 kilos (418 pounds) -- of 20 percent enriched uranium," Steinitz said.

"Once they have 250 kilos, this is enough to make the final rush to 90 percent," the level of enrichment required for a nuclear warhead, he said in a presentation to the Foreign Press Association.

"It is a matter of weeks or maybe two months to jump from 20 percent to 90 percent with so many centrifuges," he said.

"What they are doing now -- instead of crossing the red line, they are widening and enlarging their capacity by putting in more centrifuges, faster centrifuges."

Iran's aim, he charged, was to build a nuclear arsenal, not just a single bomb.

"Many people are saying it's a question of the Iranian bomb - whether they will have it or not. No. We are speaking about an Iranian arsenal."

Tehran's big fear was that a Western military strike could wipe out their nuclear facilities "within a few hours," he said.

"The Iranians feel very vulnerable, especially from American air operations. This is their main concern -- that if the West, if NATO, if America decide to attack them, a few hours of accurate air raids might destroy their nuclear facilities."

Israel and many Western governments suspect Iran is using its civilian nuclear programme as cover for developing a weapons capability, a charge denied by Tehran.

But the Jewish state, the Middle East's sole, if undeclared, nuclear power, has refused to rule out a pre-emptive military strike to prevent it.

Steinitz also ruled out any change in policy that might result from the Iranian presidential elections which are to take place on Friday, saying the result was already known.

"Nothing is going to change. There will be, unfortunately, no significant changes because of these so-called elections because (supreme leader Ayatollah Ali) Khamenei has already won," he said.

"He is the leader and he makes the decisions and he already made his decision to spend many billions of dollars on building this nuclear industry with only one aim," he charged.

"The decision was already made to get nuclear weapons -- you don't spent so much money and you don't suffer \$70 billion of losses (due to international sanctions) in one year only to show that you can spin some centrifuges," he concluded.

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/afp/130610/iran-eyes-30-nuclear-bombs-year-israel-minister-0>

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

Al Arabiya – U.A.E.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



Iran Denies 'Problem' at Sole Nuclear Reactor

Tuesday, 11 June 2013

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

Tehran -- Iran's foreign ministry on Tuesday denied its Russian-built Bushehr nuclear power plant had suffered a malfunction, saying the process of its start-up was going ahead without a hitch.

"No problem has been reported at the Bushehr plant. The Russian contractors are overseeing the ongoing and normal process there," ministry spokesman Abbas Araqchi said in remarks reported by Iranian media.

His remarks came after Iran's ambassador to Moscow, Mahmoud Reza Sadjadi, said on Monday the plant had suffered a malfunction in its main generator, without giving further details.

Sadjadi said that Russian and Iranian specialists had been working "in close cooperation" to fix the malfunction.

He also stressed that the series of earthquakes that shook Iran in recent months had not caused the fault.

Reacting to those comments, Araqchi said Sadjadi may have been misquoted.

"Perhaps his remarks were not correctly reported, or were misinterpreted," Araqchi said.

"Before reaching its maximum capacity, we need to test the plant against all standards and this requires turning it off and on several times to ensure the safety of all equipment there," he added.

Iran's only nuclear power plant in Bushehr, located in the south off the Gulf, was officially inaugurated in September 2011 after years of construction delays.

But since then, the site has faced persistent technical problems, and has failed to reach its full production capacity of 1,000 megawatts.

Iran is the only country in the world with an operational nuclear reactor that does not adhere to the post-Chernobyl Convention on Nuclear Safety.

The country is also under rounds of United Nations Security Council sanctions for its refusal to stop enriching uranium that could be used to make weapons.

The Islamic republic, however, insists its atomic ambitions are limited to peaceful power generation and medical purposes only.

<http://english.alarabiya.net/en/News/middle-east/2013/06/11/Iran-denies-problem-at-sole-nuclear-reactor-.html>

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

ITAR-TASS News Agency – Russia

11 June 2013

Putin has No Doubts Iran Observes all Nuclear Program-Related Commitments

MOSCOW, June 11 (Itar-Tass) - Russian President Vladimir Putin has no doubts that Iran observes all nuclear program-related commitments.

"I have no doubts Iran complies with the rules of the game in that sphere. I have no evidence that might point to the opposite," Putin said, while answering media questions during a visit to the newly-opened studios of the Russia Today television channel on Tuesday. He recalled that the latest IAEA report, too, indicated that Iran was observing its obligations.

Putin said that Iran had the full right to a civilian nuclear program of its own.



"It cannot be discriminated against in that respect in contrast to other world actors," Putin said.

Putin said that Russia was prepared to go ahead with its cooperation with Iran in that sphere. He recalled the Bushehr nuclear power project.

"We have taken it to the logical outcome," he said. However, as far as further cooperation with Iran was concerned, there were certain outstanding contradictions.

"For instance, we invited Iran to have nuclear fuel enriched in our territory. For some reason the Iranian partners refused. It is unclear why. They keep arguing that they wish to do the enrichment on their own within the framework of known international rules," Putin said, adding that Russia recognized Iran's right to such actions.

<http://www.itar-tass.com/en/c32/768447.html>

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

The London Daily Telegraph – U.K.

Syria: US Confirms Assad Used Chemical Weapons

The United States is to provide military support for rebels after confirming that Bashar al-Assad's Syrian regime had crossed President Barack Obama's "red line" by using chemical weapons against opposition forces.

By Peter Foster, Washington and Jon Swaine in New York

14 June 2013

The White House estimated that up to 150 people had been killed in multiple chemical weapons attacks – evidence that Mr Obama previously said would be a "game changer" in US policy.

Ben Rhodes, a senior aide to the president, said the US would now provide "military support" to the opposition Supreme Military Council, increasing its engagement in the civil war by both "scope and scale". However, he stopped short of saying that opposition troops would be armed.

There were reports citing US officials that the US was actively considering enforcing a highly limited no-fly zone to protect rebel training bases in Jordan, but the White House said no decision had been taken.

The plan would be for a zone stretching just 25 miles into Syrian territory that, crucially, would not require pre-emptive strikes against air defence systems provided by Russia.

The US has been reluctant to respond to rebel calls for a wider no-fly zone such as was imposed over Libya because it was seen to require UN authorisation, which would be certain to be blocked by Russia.

Mr Obama would discuss the next step at next week's G8 meeting in Northern Ireland, setting up a potential clash with Russia, the Assad regime's key ally.

"The president has said that the use of chemical weapons would change his calculus, and it has," said Mr Rhodes.

"The president has made a decision on providing more support to Syrian opposition. This includes military support," he said, declining to provide specifics. "Suffice it to say, it will be different in both scope and scale to what we were providing before."

Mr Rhodes stated that the fall of the strategically vital city of Qusayr a week ago to the regime, and the massing of Assad forces ahead of an assault on the central provinces of Homs and Hama, had created a "new sense of urgency".

The change in US policy came on the same day that the United Nations announced that 93,000 have been killed in the civil war.

Britain and France led the way in forcing the EU to lift its arms embargo on Syrian rebels. But William Hague, the Foreign Secretary, who was in Washington for talks this week, faces backbench and even cabinet opposition to further involvement, and has given no timetable for when he might take a decision to send weapons.



However after meeting with his US counterpart John Kerry on Wednesday, Mr Hague said that it was vital for Britain, America and its allies to “do more” to assist the rebels and hasten a political solution to the spiralling conflict.

“We will have to be prepared to do more to save lives, to pressure the Assad regime to negotiate seriously and to prevent the growth of extremism and terrorism if diplomatic efforts are going to succeed,” he warned.

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/syria/10119750/Syria-US-confirms-Assad-used-chemical-weapons.html>

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

The Hindu – India

Russia Dismisses U.S. Claims of Chemical Weapons in Syria

By Vladimir Radyuhin

June 14, 2013

MOSCOW -- Russia has dismissed as “unconvincing” United States’ claim that the Syrian army had used chemical weapons against the opposition.

President Vladimir Putin’s foreign policy aide likened U.S. “facts” of chemical weapons use in Syria to the fabricated evidence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq that justified the 2003 U.S. invasion.

“I wouldn’t like to draw parallels with the notorious [anthrax] vial demonstrated by Secretary of State Colin Powell, but the facts given to us are unconvincing,” Yuri Ushakov told reporters on Friday.

“It would be hard even to call them facts,” Mr Ushakov said referring to the information provided to Russia by the U.S. “What was presented to us by the Americans does not look convincing.”

Mr Ushakov warned that if the Americans “carry out more wide-scale aid” to the rebels this will make it more difficult to convene the international peace conference on Syria, which Russia and the U.S. have agreed to co-sponsor.

At the same time, he said Russia was not “competing” with the U.S. in arms supplies to the warring sides in the Syrian conflict and was not planning “yet” to unfreeze the contract for the delivery of S-300 air defence missiles to the Syrian government forces.

“We are not talking about that as yet,” the Kremlin official said.

A senior Russian lawmaker accused the U.S. of spreading lies about chemical weapons in Syria.

“Information about the use by [President Bashar] Assad of chemical weapons has been fabricated in the same place as the lies about [Saddam] Hussein’s weapons of mass destruction,” said Alexei Pushkov, head of the foreign affairs in the State Duma, the lower house of the Russian Parliament. “Obama is taking the same path as George Bush.”

The lawmaker predicted that the U.S. would now escalate its involvement in the Syrian conflict.

“We cannot rule out the possibility of cruise missile strikes and direct military intervention if these attacks bring no result,” he said.

<http://www.thehindu.com/news/international/russia-dismisses-us-claims-of-chemical-weapons-in-syria/article4814682.ece>

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

The Chosun Ilbo – South Korea

N.Korean Army Chief Fingered in Syria Connection

June 11, 2013



The North Korean military is involved in the Syrian civil war at the initiative of hardline Army chief Gen. Kim Kyok-sik, the Dagongbao daily in Hong Kong speculated Monday.

Kim was allegedly behind the sinking of the South Korean Navy corvette Cheonan and shelling of Yeonpyeong Island in 2010. He is considered one of the key figures in the North Korean regime and was recently promoted from armed forces minister to the chief of the Army's General Staff.

Some dozen North Korean military officers were seen working with Syrian government troops on the northern battlefield of Halab, according to a group called Syrian Observatory for Human Rights.

Information about the reality in strife-torn Syria is notoriously hard to verify, and this piece of news comes from a London-based pan-Arabic newspaper owned by a Saudi prince.

Saudi Arabia is arming the Sunni jihadist opposition to the Assad regime because Syria is a buffer state under the influence of its mortal foe Iran.

A man whose organization monitors developments on the ground has told the prince's Asharq Al-Awsat daily that the North Koreans are acting as advisers to Syrian government forces.

Dagongbao pointed to Kim Kyok-sik as a likely link that would lend credence to the story, since he worked as an assistant military attache at the North Korean Embassy in Damascus in the 1970s and led North Korean and Syrian troops in joint operations for about 10 years.

Kim returned to the North around April 1982.

In Syria, he was in charge of military training and delivery of North Korean weapons.

During the fourth Middle East War in 1973, the North supported Syria's attacks on Israel. Kim is believed to have played an important role in the process. During the Syria-Lebanon War in 1982, the North also sent troops to the frontline to help Syrian troops advance into Lebanon, the daily added.

The North Korea-Syria military connection is also suspected of a crucial role in developing conventional and nuclear weapons. A nuclear facility Syria was building in the desert in the mid-2000s, allegedly with North Korean help, was destroyed by Israeli fighters in 2007.

http://english.chosun.com/site/data/html_dir/2013/06/11/2013061101459.html

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

China Daily – China

High-level Inter-Korean Talks Called Off

June 11, 2013

(Xinhua)

SEOUL - High-level inter-governmental talks between Republic of Korea and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) scheduled to be held on Wednesday and Thursday in Seoul was called off due to the disagreement over the level of chief delegates, the South Korean Unification Ministry said Tuesday.

"The north side (DPRK) unilaterally notified us of its decision to delay the dispatch of its delegation," Kim Hyung-seok, spokesman of the Unification Ministry in charge of inter-Korean relations told a press briefing.

Kim noted that the DPRK informed us that the inter-Korean talks will not be held unless the ministerial-level official from South Korea comes to the dialogue table.

Seoul's delegation is led by Vice Unification Minister Kim Nam-shik, but the DPRK lashed out at such nomination of lower-level governmental official. The DPRK nominated Kang Ji-young, director at the Committee for the Peaceful Reunification of Korea (CPRK) as chief negotiator.



South Korea and the DPRK agreed on Monday at the working-level talks in the border village of Panmunjom to hold the first high-level talks in six years.

The two sides, however, disagreed on what should be discussed on the agenda and who should lead the five-member delegation on each side.

The delegation of the north side will be headed by minister-level authorities, the DPRK's KCNA news agency report said.

Seoul said it will send Unification Minister Ryoo Kihl-jae to the meeting and wanted Kim Yang Gon, secretary of the Central Committee of Workers' Party of Korea, at the talks, according to South Korea's Yonhap news agency.

Seoul wanted the two-day meeting to discuss normalizing the operation of the Kaesong Industrial Zone, resuming the tours of Mount Kumgang and reunion of families separated by the Korean War.

Pyongyang said the meeting will also talk about the issue of jointly celebrating the 13th anniversary of the June 15 South-North Joint Declaration and 41st anniversary of the July 4 North-South Joint Statement, the KCNA reported.

The DPRK on Thursday proposed holding inter-governmental meetings with South Korea on inter-Korean issues. The latter accepted the proposal the same day, hoping the talks will become an opportunity to help forge trust.

Tensions on the Korean Peninsula have intensified since the DPRK launched a rocket on December 12, 2012 and conducted its third nuclear test on February 12, which drew international condemnation.

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2013-06/11/content_16608513.htm

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea
June 11, 2013

S. Korea Aims to Establish Missile Destruction System by 2020

By Kim Eun-jung

SEOUL, June 11 (Yonhap) -- South Korea plans to establish a pre-emptive missile destruction system by 2020 to guard against growing missile and nuclear threats from North Korea, the defense minister said Tuesday.

The "kill chain" system is designed to detect signs of impending missile or nuclear attacks and launch pre-emptive strikes that eliminate the threat. The system involves spy satellites, surveillance drones for monitoring and attack systems, including missiles, fighter jets and warships.

Currently, Seoul heavily relies on U.S. satellites for intelligence gathering.

"As it is currently under development, it needs to be pushed to be completed under a mid- and long-term plan by 2020," Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin said during a parliamentary interpellation session. "The kill chain system is capable of striking a moving target."

When asked whether the South Korean military can destroy North Korea's mobile missile launchers before they hit the South, Kim said, "We can't say with 100 percent certainty."

Kim said the South Korean military is putting resources to have the ability to detect and destroy North Korea's multiple rocket launchers before it launches an attack.

"We are preparing plans to beef up missile defense and implementing some of them," Kim said. "We need to have missile equipment that is compatible with the current combat system."

North Korea is believed to have multiple launchers that can shoot rockets over 100 kilometers. If launched, they could threaten the entire Seoul metropolitan area, which is less than 50 km from the border, and reach U.S. bases in Gyeonggi Province.



Seoul has been pushing to bolster its defense against North Korea, which is believed to have over 1,000 missiles with varying capabilities, but the mid-term plan has taken on new urgency after the communist country successfully fired off a long-range rocket last December.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2013/06/11/36/0401000000AEN20130611007200315F.HTML>

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

The London Guardian – U.K.

Chinese Spacecraft Blasts Off from Gobi Desert

Shenzhou 10 takes three astronauts to experimental space laboratory where they will give a lecture to students on Earth
Reuters in Beijing

Tuesday, 11 June 2013

A Chinese-manned spacecraft has blasted off with three astronauts on board for a 15-day mission to an experimental laboratory, the latest step towards the development of a space station.

The Shenzhou 10 launched from the Gobi desert in China's far west on Tuesday morning. Once in orbit, it will dock with the Tiangong (Heavenly Palace) 1, a trial space laboratory module, and the astronauts, one of whom is female, will test the module's systems. They will also give a lecture to students on Earth.

China carried out its first manned docking exercise with Tiangong 1 last June, a milestone in its efforts to acquire the technological and logistical skills to run a full space station that can house people for long periods.

President Xi Jinping attended the latest launch and wished the astronauts success. "You are the pride of the Chinese people, and this mission is both glorious and sacred," he said.

The mission will be the longest time Chinese astronauts have spent in space, and marks the second such voyage for Nie Haisheng, the lead astronaut.

It is China's fifth manned mission since 2003, and was accompanied by the usual outpouring of national pride and Communist party celebrations, including children waving off the trio at the space centre.

However, some wondered why China was spending so much money exploring space while there were more pressing issues at home, from food safety and pollution to the prevalence of workplace fire disasters. "Why don't they spend this money solving China's real problems instead of wasting it like this?" wrote one user of Sina Weibo, the microblogging website.

The domestic space programme has come a long way since Mao Zedong, founder of communist China in 1949, lamented that the country could not even launch a potato into space. But it is still far from catching up with the US and Russia.

Rendezvous and docking techniques, such as those China is currently testing, were mastered by the US and former Soviet Union decades ago, and the 10.5 metre-long Tiangong 1 is a only trial module, not a fully fledged space station.

Still, the Shenzhou 10 mission is the latest show of China's growing prowess in space and comes as budget restraints and shifting priorities have stalled US-manned launches.

China also plans an unmanned moon landing and deployment of a rover. Its scientists have raised the possibility of sending an astronaut to the moon after 2020.

While Beijing claims its space programme is for peaceful purposes, a Pentagon report last month highlighted China's increasing space capabilities and said it was pursuing activities aimed at preventing its adversaries from using space-based assets during a crisis.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Fears of a space arms race with the US and other powers mounted after China blew up one of its weather satellites with a ground-based missile in January 2007.

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2013/jun/11/chinese-spacecraft-shenzhou-10-gobi-desert>

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

Yonhap News Agency – South Korea
June 12, 2013

S. Korea to Deploy New Surface-to-Air Missiles for Aegis Destroyers

By Kim Eun-jung

SEOUL, June 12 (Yonhap) -- South Korea will arm its Aegis destroyers with the surface-to-air Standard Missile 6 (SM-6) starting 2016 as part of efforts to bolster its missile defense against North Korean threats, a senior government official said Wednesday.

The SM-6, which is suitable for low-altitude sky defense with a maximum range of 320-400 kilometers, is an upgrade of the SM-2 by U.S. defense firm Raytheon.

The South Korean military has sought to upgrade its SM-2 missiles deployed on one of its three Aegis destroyers as they are considered ineffective in shooting down North Korea's ballistic missiles due to their short range.

The decision to buy the newest naval missiles is part of Seoul's plan to develop an independent, low-tier missile shield called the Korea Air and Missile Defense System (KAMD).

"The defense ministry and the Joint Chiefs of Staff will prepare a plan to develop the KAMD system to deter North Korea's missile and nuclear weapons by the end of this year," the official said, asking for anonymity as he is not allowed to talk to media.

The KAMD involves early warning radars, ship-to-air and land-based missile defense systems, arming Seoul with the ability to track and shoot down the North's low-flying, short- and medium-range missiles, with help of U.S. early warning satellites.

The KAMD plan includes purchasing hundreds of rounds of Patriot Advanced Capability-3 (PAC-3) missiles and additional PAC-2 missiles for deployment from next year, as well as development of mid- and long-range surface-to-air missiles in the next decade.

For that goal, the South Korean military has jointly formed a working group with its U.S. counterparts to conduct a study on the Korean missile defense system, the official said.

"We will operate a working group with the U.S. to analyze the KAMD program," he said. "The research is expected to be completed around February 2014."

The latest move, however, sparked further speculation that Seoul is preparing to join the U.S.-led missile defense system that involves ground-based interceptors and the X-band radar.

The issue of whether to join the costly American program has been a sensitive one in South Korea as it could spur a regional arms race with China and further contribute to mounting costs in the national missile program.

On Tuesday, an opposition lawmaker claimed that South Korea is one of America's partners on its missile defense program, citing Seoul's participation in U.S.-led international defense training and trilateral drills last year, which also included Japan.

Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin, however, denied Seoul's participation in the U.S. missile defense program, saying America's multi-tiered anti-missile defense system does not suit the battlefield environment of the Korean Peninsula.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



As speculation grows, the defense ministry on Wednesday issued a statement to reiterate its earlier stance of not having joined the U.S. missile shield.

"Our military is currently working to establish a Korean missile defense system focusing on final stage, low-altitude defense that fits the strategic atmosphere on the Korean Peninsula," the defense ministry said in a release.

For the effective establishment and operation of the Korean system, Seoul is cooperating with Washington in intelligence sharing, and participating in international missile defense trainings as part of that effort, the ministry said.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/national/2013/06/12/37/0301000000AEN20130612004900315F.HTML>

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

The Korea Herald – South Korea

June 12, 2013

N. Korea Not Answering Panmunjom Communication Line

North Korea on Wednesday failed to answer a call made by the South on the communication line that runs through the truce village of Panmunjom, a day after high-level government talks were called off.

The Ministry of Unification said Seoul placed a call at 9 a.m., but the North did not pick up the phone.

"The latest move is probably linked to the cancellation of talks late Tuesday, although there is a need to wait-and-see how the situation unfolds," said a ministry source, who declined to be identified.

Since Seoul plans to call the North again in the afternoon, it is too early to say if the North has again "severed" the key communication link, he said.

The talks, which might have led to the easing of tensions on the Korean Peninsula, were suspended in the eleventh hour due to disagreements over the selection of chief delegates by the two sides.

The two Koreas exchanged the list of their five-member delegates to represent each other at the talks, but the North complained that South's chief negotiator, Vice Unification Minister Kim Nam-shik was a "low level" official unfit to lead the talks.

Demanding Unification Minister Ryoo Kihl-jae represent the South Korean delegation, Pyongyang warned it would pull out of the talks set for Wednesday and Thursday if the South failed to comply.

Seoul had wanted Kim Yang-gon, head of the United Front Department in the North's ruling Workers' Party, to represent the North, and countered that the relatively little known Kang Ji-yong that the North tapped as the chief negotiator was not of the same stature as its minister.

The lack of response to calls placed by the South, meanwhile, comes after the North re-established the Red Cross liaison channel on Friday, a day after it proposed working level government-to-government talks.

The North unilaterally cut the communication link made up of one phone and one fax line on March 11, citing provocations by the South that was conducting military drills with the United States at the time.

In the past, the two sides have made contact twice each day at 9 a.m. and 4 p.m., although calls can be placed at any time if the situation requires. (Yonhap News)

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20130612000460>

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

Xinhua News – China

U.S. Needs to Prepare for Contingency Related to DPRK: Hagel



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

English.news.cn
June 12, 2013

WASHINGTON, June 11 (Xinhua) -- The United States needs to be prepared for every option and contingency as the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) remains "a dangerous and unpredictable country," U.S. Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel said Tuesday.

Hagel made the remarks while testifying at a hearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee's defense subcommittee on the defense budget, together with Martin Dempsey, chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"We know the kind of armaments and artillery that (the DPRK has) lined up against Seoul, (and) their capacity," Hagel told the panel, adding that this is the reason why the Pentagon deployed a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense battery in Guam.

"We have to be prepared for every option, every contingency," he said.

The DPRK carried out its third nuclear test in February as a countermeasure against U.S.-led sanctions and the U.S.-South Korean military exercises. Pyongyang also decided to nullify the armistice agreement signed in 1953 to halt the Korean War and even threaten to launch preemptive nuclear strikes against the United States.

For his part, Dempsey said the U.S. security interests in relation to the Korean Peninsula are to defend the homeland, preserve the Korean Armistice, mitigate the risk of Pyongyang's weapons and protect America's allies in the region.

On Iran, Hagel and Dempsey both said Tehran has not made a decision to build a nuclear weapon, but appears to be positioning itself to preserve that option.

Hagel said the U.S. policy remains "preventing the Iranians from acquiring any capability to weaponize."

Dempsey said the Pentagon has options "both for their acquisition of a nuclear weapon, but also for the other things they are doing," including cyberattacks and weapons proliferation.

The U.S. government has applied a series of draconian sanctions against Iran in an attempt to prevent it from acquiring a nuclear weapon, though Tehran insists its nuclear program is purely for civilian research purposes.

At the same time, Washington has vowed to use any options, including the use of force, to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2013-06/12/c_132449057.htm

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

Global Post – Boston, MA

N. Korea Illustrates 'Hybrid' Military Threats, US General Says

By Lee Chi-dong, Yonhap News Agency

June 12, 2013

WASHINGTON, June 12 (Yonhap) -- North Korea, armed with nuclear bombs, advanced missiles and various other types of provocations, represents "hybrid threats" that the U.S. and its allies may face down the road, an American general said Wednesday.

"North Korea and their cycle of provocation I think was another dramatic indicator of the kinds of hybrid threats that we could be facing as the future approaches," Gen. Robert Kehler, head of the U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM), said at a congressional seminar.

In December, North Korea succeeded in putting into orbit what it claims to be a communication satellite, followed by another underground nuclear test two months later.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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 U.S. views the launch of the long-range rocket as a de-facto test of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

Pyeongyang also threatened to shoot a nuclear-tipped missile toward the U.S. and South Korea, although it has shifted to a more conciliatory tone in recent weeks.

Kehler said the U.S. has deployed a missile defense system, which is limited in scope and capability, to counter threats from North Korea or Iran.

North Korea's speedier-than-expected development of missiles has prompted the U.S. to beef up its shield.

"We have begun that ballistic missile defense system with the notion that it could be incrementally improved over time. And so we have gone through a series of incremental improvements to sensors, interceptors, et cetera," the general said.

In March, when North Korea's military threats peaked, the Pentagon announced plans to deploy 14 additional ground-based interceptors (GBIs) in Alaska.

U.S. officials said the move will help the U.S. protect itself from North Korea's missile threats.

"The additional GBIs deployed in the United States will address the potential ICBM threat from North Korea sooner than the SM-3 IIB would have been available," Frank Rose, deputy assistant secretary of state for arms control, said Wednesday at a forum in London, according to a transcript released by the department.

He admitted Washington's push for a stronger missile defense network in Europe is a source of dispute with Russia.

"Russia continues to request legal guarantees that could create limitations on our ability to develop and deploy future missile defense systems against regional ballistic missile threats such as those presented by Iran and North Korea," he said.

"We have made clear that we cannot and will not accept limitations on our ability to defend ourselves, our allies, and our partners, including where we deploy our BMD-capable Aegis ships," Rose added, using the acronym for ballistic missile defense.

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/yonhap-news-agency/130612/n-korea-illustrates-hybrid-military-threats-us-general-says>

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

San Francisco Chronicle

Mali Manual Suggests al-Qaida Has Feared Weapon

By RUKMINI CALLIMACHI, Associated Press

Tuesday, June 11, 2013

TIMBUKTU, Mali (AP) — The photocopies of the manual lay in heaps on the floor, in stacks that scaled one wall, like Xeroxed, stapled handouts for a class.

Except that the students in this case were al-Qaida fighters in Mali. And the manual was a detailed guide, with diagrams and photographs, on how to use a weapon that particularly concerns the United States: A surface-to-air missile capable of taking down a commercial airplane.

The 26-page document in Arabic, recovered by The Associated Press in a building that had been occupied by al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb in Timbuktu, strongly suggests the group now possesses the SA-7 surface-to-air missile, known to the Pentagon as the Grail, according to terrorism specialists. And it confirms that the al-Qaida cell is actively training its fighters to use these weapons, also called man-portable air-defense systems, or MANPADS, which likely came from the arms depots of ex-Libyan strongman Col. Moammar Gadhafi.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



"The existence of what apparently constitutes a 'Dummies Guide to MANPADS' is strong circumstantial evidence of al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb having the missiles," said Atlantic Council analyst Peter Pham, a former adviser to the United States' military command in Africa and an instructor to U.S. Special Forces. "Why else bother to write the guide if you don't have the weapons? ... If AQIM not only has the MANPADS, but also fighters who know how to use them effectively," he added, "then the impact is significant, not only on the current conflict, but on security throughout North and West Africa, and possibly beyond."

This is not the first al-Qaida-linked group thought to have MANPADS - they were circulating in Afghanistan and Iraq, and a terror cell in Somalia recently claimed to have the SA-7 in a video. But the U.S. desperately wanted to keep the weapons out of the hands of al-Qaida's largest affiliate on the continent, based in Mali. In the spring of 2011, before the fighting in Tripoli had even stopped, a U.S. team flew to Libya to secure Gadhafi's stockpile of thousands of heat-seeking, shoulder-fired missiles.

By the time they got there, many had already been looted.

"The MANPADS were specifically being sought out," said Peter Bouckaert, emergencies director for Human Rights Watch, who catalogued missing weapons at dozens of munitions depots and often found nothing in the boxes labeled with the code for surface-to-air missiles.

The manual is believed to be an excerpt from a terrorist encyclopedia edited by Osama bin Laden. It adds to evidence for the weapon found by French forces during their land assault in Mali earlier this year, including the discovery of the SA-7's battery pack and launch tube, according to military statements and an aviation official who spoke on condition of anonymity because he wasn't authorized to comment.

The knowledge that the terrorists have the weapon has already changed the way the French are carrying out their five-month-old offensive in Mali. They are using more fighter jets rather than helicopters to fly above its range of 1.4 miles (2.3 kilometers) from the ground, even though that makes it harder to attack the jihadists. They are also making cargo planes land and take off more steeply to limit how long they are exposed, in line with similar practices in Iraq after an SA-14 hit the wing of a DHL cargo plane in 2003.

And they have added their own surveillance at Mali's international airport in Bamako, according to two French aviation officials and an officer in the Operation Serval force. All three spoke on condition of anonymity because they were not authorized to comment.

"There are patrols every day," said the French officer. "It's one of the things we have not entrusted to the Malians, because the stakes are too high."

First introduced in the 1960s in the Soviet Union, the SA-7 was designed to be portable. Not much larger than a poster tube, it can be packed into a duffel bag and easily carried. It's also affordable, with some SA-7s selling for as little as \$5,000.

Since 1975, at least 40 civilian aircraft have been hit by different types of MANPADS, causing about 28 crashes and more than 800 deaths around the world, according to the U.S. Department of State.

The SA-7 is an old generation model, which means most military planes now come equipped with a built-in protection mechanism against it. But that's not the case for commercial planes, and the threat is greatest to civilian aviation.

In Kenya in 2002, suspected Islamic extremists fired two SA-7s at a Boeing 757 carrying 271 vacationers back to Israel, but missed. Insurgents in Iraq used the weapons, and YouTube videos abound purporting to show Syrian rebels using the SA-7 to shoot down regime planes.

An SA-7 tracks a plane by directing itself toward the source of the heat, the engine. It takes time and practice, however, to fire it within range. The failure of the jihadists in Mali so far to hit a plane could mean that they cannot position themselves near airports with commercial flights, or that they are not yet fully trained to use the missile.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"This is not a 'Fire and forget' weapon," said Bruce Hoffman, director of the Center for Security Studies at Georgetown University. "There's a paradox here. On the one hand it's not easy to use, but against any commercial aircraft there would be no defenses against them. It's impossible to protect against it. ... If terrorists start training and learn how to use them, we'll be in a lot of trouble."

In Timbuktu, SA-7 training was likely part of the curriculum at the 'Jihad Academy' housed in a former police station, said Jean-Paul Rouiller, director of the Geneva Center for Training and Analysis of Terrorism, one of three experts who reviewed the manual for AP. It's located less than 3 miles (5 kilometers) from the Ministry of Finance's Budget Division building where the manual was found.

Neighbors say they saw foreign fighters running laps each day, carrying out target practice and inhaling and holding their breath with a pipe-like object on their shoulder. The drill is standard practice for shoulder-held missiles, including the SA-7.

As the jihadists fled ahead of the arrival of French troops who liberated Timbuktu on Jan. 28, they left the manual behind, along with other instructional material, including a spiral-bound pamphlet showing how to use the KPV-14.5 anti-aircraft machine gun and another on how to make a bomb out of ammonium nitrate, among other documents retrieved by the AP. Residents said the jihadists grabbed reams of paper from inside the building, doused them in fuel and set them alight. The black, feathery ash lay on top of the sand in a ditch just outside the building's gate.

However, numerous buildings were still full of scattered papers.

"They just couldn't destroy everything," said neighbor Mohamed Alassane. "They appeared to be in a panic when the French came. They left in a state of disorder."

The manual is illustrated with grainy images of Soviet-looking soldiers firing the weapon. Point-by-point instructions explain how to insert the battery, focus on the target and fire.

The manual also explains that the missile will malfunction above 45 degrees Celsius, the temperature in the deserts north of Timbuktu. And it advises the shooter to change immediately into a second set of clothes after firing to avoid detection.

Its pages are numbered 313 through 338, suggesting they came from elsewhere. Mathieu Guidere, an expert on Islamic extremists at the University of Toulouse, believes the excerpts are lifted from the Encyclopedia of Jihad, an 11-volume survey on the craft of war first compiled by the Taliban in the 1990s and later codified by Osama bin Laden. Bin Laden, who led a contingent of Arab fighters in Afghanistan at the time, paid to have the encyclopedia translated into Arabic, according to Guidere, author of a book on al-Qaida's North African branch.

However, the cover page of the manual boasts the name of al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb.

"It's a way to make it their own," said Guidere. "It's like putting a logo on something. ... It shows the historic as well as the present link between al-Qaida core and AQIM."

Bin Laden later assembled a team of editors to update the manual, put it on CD-ROMs and eventually place it on the Internet, in a move that lay the groundwork for the globalization of jihad, according to terrorism expert Jarret Brachman, who was the director of research at the Combating Terrorism Center when the al-Qaida encyclopedia was first found.

N.R. Jenzen-Jones, an arms expert in Australia, confirmed that the information in the manual in Timbuktu on the missile's engagement range, altitude and weight appeared largely correct. He cautions though that the history of the SA-7 is one of near-misses, specifically because it takes training to use.

"Even if you get your hands on an SA-7, it's no guarantee of success," he said. "However, if someone manages to take down a civilian aircraft, it's hundreds of dead instantly. It's a high impact, low-frequency event, and it sows a lot of fear."

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

Associated Press writer Lori Hinnant contributed to this report from Paris, and AP journalist Amir Bibawy translated the document. Callimachi reported this article in Timbuktu, Mali and in Dakar, Senegal.

<http://www.sfgate.com/news/world/article/Mali-manual-suggests-al-Qaida-has-feared-weapon-4593319.php>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia's Third Borey-Class Sub Blessed for Sea Trials

10 June 2013

MOSCOW, June 10 (RIA Novosti) – A third Borey-class nuclear-powered submarine will soon begin trials in the White Sea, and a Russian Orthodox priest has blessed the sub and its crew, the Sevmash shipyard said Monday.

The Vladimir Monomakh is due to enter service in 2014. “Today a prayer was conducted on board the guided missile submarine to evoke the Holy Spirit to serve a good cause,” the spokesman said, adding that the priest had also blessed the shipyard personnel.

The spokesman declined to say exactly when the submarine would go to sea.

The first Borey-class submarine, the Yury Dolgoruky, was commissioned into the Northern Fleet in January, and the second, the Alexander Nevsky, will be handed over to the Russian Navy by the end of the year.

The Alexander Nevsky has been undergoing trials at the Sevmash shipyard since 2012. There will be three sea trials this year, and a Bulava ballistic missile will be test-launched from the submarine in the summer, the official said.

The first three vessels in the Borey series, also known as Project 955, are capable of carrying 16 Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missiles. A total of eight Borey-class submarines are to be built for the Russian Navy by 2020.

Sevmash will start construction this year of two upgraded Borey-class submarines under Project 955A – the Alexander Suvorov and the Mikhail Kutuzov – capable of carrying 20 ballistic missiles each.

Borey class submarines are to become the mainstay of the navy's strategic nuclear deterrent, replacing the aging Project 941 (NATO Typhoon class) and Project 667 class (Delta-3 and Delta-4) boats.

http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20130610/181601631/Russias-Third-Borey-Class-Sub-Blessed-for-Sea-Trials.html

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Missile Defense Key to Developing US-Russian Ties – MP

10 June 2013

MOSCOW, June 10 (RIA Novosti) – Resolving differences between Russia and the United States over missile defense is key to developing bilateral relations, a senior Russian lawmaker said Monday.

“Missile defense has become a key issue: If we find a common language here, we could speak of a beginning of new positive dynamics in US-Russian relations,” Alexei Pushkov, head of the Russian lower house of parliament’s international affairs committee, said at a RIA Novosti press conference.

Pushkov said Russian President Vladimir Putin and his US counterpart, Barack Obama, were expected to discuss missile defense, which remains a sticking point in bilateral ties, at the upcoming G8 summit in Northern Ireland’s Lough Erne on June 17-18.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

Russia and NATO had initially agreed at the Lisbon summit in November 2010 to cooperate with a US-proposed missile defense system in Eastern Europe. But further talks between Russia and the alliance have floundered over NATO's refusal to grant Russia legal guarantees that the system would not be aimed at Russian nuclear deterrence forces.

NATO and the United States insist that the shield would be designed to defend NATO member states against missiles from emerging threat nations like North Korea and Iran, and would not be directed at Russia. The alliance has vowed to continue developing and deploying its missile defenses, regardless of the status of missile defense cooperation with Russia.

In mid-March, the US announced it was modifying its planned missile defense deployment in Poland, dropping plans to station SM-3 IIB interceptor missiles in the country by 2022. Russian officials responded by saying that this did nothing to allay their concerns over US missile defense in Eastern Europe, and reiterated their demand for legally binding agreements guaranteeing that Russia's strategic nuclear forces would not be targeted.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20130610/181598536/Missile-Defense-Key-to-Developing-US-Russian-Ties--MP.html>

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

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) News – U.K.
June 10, 2013

US Nuclear Bombs 'Based in Netherlands' - ex-Dutch PM Lubbers

Some 22 US nuclear weapons are stored on Dutch territory, says former Dutch Prime Minister Ruud Lubbers.

Mr Lubbers, a centre-right prime minister from 1982-94, said they were stored underground in strong-rooms at the Volkel air base in Brabant.

He made the revelation in a documentary for National Geographic - saying: "I would never have thought those silly things would still be there in 2013."

The presence of nuclear weapons on Dutch soil has long been rumoured.

'Pointless'

However, Mr Lubbers is believed to be the most senior person to confirm their existence.

"I think they are an absolutely pointless part of a tradition in military thinking," Mr Lubbers said.

The Telegraaf newspaper quoted experts as saying the weapons held at Volkel were B61 bombs that were developed in the US in the 1960s. At 50 kilotons, they are four times the strength of atom bombs used on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima or Nagasaki at the end of World War II.

There has been widespread speculation about the presence of nuclear weapons or parts of them on Dutch soil for decades.

The "poorly kept secret" of the existence of nuclear weapons in concrete vaults emerged in 2010 in the classified US documents published by WikiLeaks, reported NRC Handelsblad newspaper.

It was mentioned in a report on a conversation involving US Ambassador to Berlin Philip Murphy, US diplomat Phil Gordon and German Chancellor Angela Merkel's national security adviser, Christoph Heusgen.

In November 2010, then-Foreign Minister Uri Rosenthal declined to give any explanation to the Dutch parliament.

A spokesman for the Royal Dutch Air Force was quoted by Dutch broadcaster NOS on Monday as saying these issues "are never spoken of".

"[Mr Lubbers], as former prime minister, knows that well," he added.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

Mr Lubbers said in the documentary that he first heard about the existence of the bombs when he was working for the air force at Volkel in 1963.

A colonel asked him how the bombs' existence could be kept secret, and Mr Lubbers advised him to give each nuclear weapon part a number so they would not attract attention, he said.

"And that's what happened", he added.

In October 1983, while Mr Lubbers' was prime minister, more than 500,000 protesters demonstrated in The Hague against the placement of US nuclear-armed Cruise missiles in the Netherlands.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-22840880>

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

Space War.com

France Orders Nuclear Sub Security Investigation

By Staff Writers

Paris, Agence France-Presse (AFP)

June 11, 2013

France on Tuesday ordered an inquiry into security at a nuclear submarine base off its western coast following a report that the ultra-sensitive site could easily be targeted by terrorists.

Defence Minister Jean-Yves Le Drian has ordered an immediate review of the ground, maritime and aerial security of the base on Ile Longue, an island off the Brittany coast, officials said.

The move follows a report in the regional daily *Telegramme de Brest* detailing a string of shortcomings in security at the base.

According to the newspaper, it can be accessed by anyone who has an easy-to-copy identity badge and there is no system of biometric identification of staff via their irises or finger prints.

For vehicles, a simple piece of paper with a few basic details is sufficient to get past checkpoints and, as a result of ongoing upgrading work, trucks entering the site have not been subject to systematic checks.

The paper also noted that a large number of the 115 military police deployed to protect the site were part-time volunteers, many of whom were young, inexperienced and poorly paid.

http://www.spacewar.com/reports/France_orders_nuclear_sub_security_investigation_999.html

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

Defense News

Pentagon Missile Defense Brass Frown on East Coast Interceptor Sites

June 11, 2013

By PAUL MCLEARY

WASHINGTON — The nation's two top military officers leading the US missile defense enterprise replied to a letter from Sen. Carl Levin today, telling him that there is "no validated military requirement" for a proposed East Coast missile defense site as some on Capitol Hill have proposed.

The letter comes in response to a June 6 missive from Levin asking Vice Adm. James Syring, director of the Missile Defense Agency, and Lt. Gen. Richard Formica, commander of the Joint Functional Component Command for Integrated Missile Defense, for their opinions on the proposed plan.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



Last week, the Republican-controlled House Armed Services Committee voted to fund a missile defense system on the East Coast, making a second attempt to get the site built despite having a similar proposal shot down by the Senate Armed Services Committee last year.

While the existing missile defense sites on the West Coast are envisioned as a way to deter — or defeat — the threat from North Korean long-range missiles, the East Coast plan is aimed at the nascent Iranian threat, lawmakers and supporters say.

Levin's letter asked the pair if kickstarting the East Coast project before environmental assessments are completed would help identify the best location of the missile interceptor sites, to which the officers also replied "No."

Levin also asked if there is a less expensive alternative to an East Coast site that could come on line faster than constructing a new ground-based site.

As expected, the two said that "Investment in Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) discrimination and sensor capabilities would result in more cost-effective near-term improvements to homeland missile defense."

The DoD is also looking at potential sensor enhancements to increase threat detection, they write, warning that "While a potential East Coast site would add operational capability it would also come at a significant material development and service sustainment cost."

The House Republican proposal comes on the heels of Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel's announcement in March that he would fund the emplacement of 14 additional missile interceptors in Alaska to guard against a possible missile attack from North Korea, which would bolster the 26 already deployed in Alaska and four in California. Plans call for the \$1 billion project to be in place by the fall of 2017.

The House Armed Services Committee voted to fund the East Coast missile defense site in their 2014 defense bill markup on June 5, and the House Appropriations Defense subcommittee put more than \$70 million in its 2014 Pentagon spending bill to begin constructing the shield.

GOP Rep. Mike Turner of Ohio offered an amendment to the bill saying, "the Missile Defense Agency shall construct and make operational in fiscal year 2018 an additional homeland missile defense site capable of protecting the homeland, designed to complement existing sites in Alaska and California, to deal more effectively with the long-range ballistic missile threat from the Middle East."

The answers the generals gave Levin should come as no surprise to lawmakers, since when asked during the course of a May 8 House Strategic Forces subcommittee hearing if the \$250 million proposal for an East Coast site would be a good idea, Syring replied simply, "not at this time."

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130611/DEFREG02/306110024/Pentagon-Missile-Defense-Brass-Frown-East-Coast-Interceptor-Sites>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

Russia May Consider US Spy Leaker's Asylum Request – Media

11 June 2013

MOSCOW, June 11 (RIA Novosti) – The Russian authorities will consider political asylum for Edward Snowden, who risks prosecution in the United States for his recent blockbuster spy leaks, if he sends a proper request, business daily Kommersant said Tuesday, citing the Kremlin spokesman.

"If we receive such a request, we will consider it," Kommersant quoted presidential press secretary Dmitry Peskov as saying.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Snowden, a 29-year-old former employee of the CIA and the National Security Agency (NSA), unmasked himself on Sunday as a source of recent disclosures about US government's secret surveillance programs.

He said he was aware of possible prosecution but disclosed secret documents in response to America's systematic surveillance of innocent citizens.

The leaks have led the NSA to ask the US Justice Department to conduct a criminal investigation with possible "state treason" charges. The Justice Department did not comment on the issue saying only that it was in the "initial stages of an investigation" into the unauthorized disclosure of classified information, according to The Washington Post.

Snowden, who moved to Hong Kong from the United States before revealing secrets to media, earlier told The Washington Post that he was seeking "asylum from any countries that believe in free speech and oppose the victimization of global privacy."

W---leaks founder Julian Assange, who has been hiding at the Ecuadorian Embassy in London since June last year to avoid his extradition to Sweden, on Monday called Snowden a "hero" and urged other countries to grant the US whistleblower political asylum.

"What other countries need to do is line up to give support for him. Everyone should go to their politicians and press and demand that they offer Mr. Snowden asylum in their country," Sky News quoted him as saying.

<http://en.rian.ru/russia/20130611/181607633/Russia-May-Consider-US-Spy-Leakers-Asylum-Request-Media.html>

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

Defense News

Gen. Kehler Lays Out Vision for STRATCOM

June 12, 2013 |

By AARON MEHTA

WASHINGTON — The head of U.S. Strategic Command made the case this morning that STRATCOM cannot be viewed simply as the nuclear arm of the Pentagon.

"This is not your father's STRATCOM," Gen. Robert Kehler said at a speech hosted at the Capitol Hill Club here. "Those who continue to view Strategic Command as 'the nuclear command' are only getting it partially right."

Instead, Kehler laid out his view of STRATCOM and its modern role as a multifunctional command that is largely a support team to the other commands. As part of its portfolio, Kehler highlighted cyber, space, missile defense and coordination of ISR assets.

Rather than regular vs irregular warfare, the U.S. now faces "hybrid" threats, requiring an overall strategic view of enemies regardless of if they are extremist groups like al-Qaida or nations like North Korea. STRATCOM should be the place where that information is collected to form a strategic plan for handling these threats, Kehler argued.

"[STRATCOM] attributes are unique among the combatant commands," Kehler said. "Our nuclear and conventional strike, space, cyber and other capabilities remain foundational to confronting the challenges of the future. The United States can neither deter adversaries nor assure allies, nor prevail in a conflict, without them."

It was hard to miss the subtext to the general's comments — STRATCOM's wide portfolio, which supports DoD operations around the globe, are all vital and need funding. The general's comments were made across the street from the House office buildings, where members of Congress are debating the Pentagon's funding.

"I'm very concerned about the impact on readiness from sequestration," Kehler said. "Today, STRATCOM can perform all of its assigned missions. I'm worried about six months from now, a year from now, 18 months from now if the harm to the readiness accounts continue."

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

Kehler also pointed out that 60 percent of STRATCOM's force are civilian workers, who now face furloughs due to sequestration. "They are us, we are them, and I am very worried about the long-term effect on our people, their morale and their families."

While emphasizing STRATCOM's non-nuclear areas, Kehler made it clear that managing the U.S. nuclear arsenal is still a major responsibility.

"The weapons still exist around the world, and as long as they do, that will remain my No. 1 job: to make sure to deter their use against the US or its allies and partners," Kehler said.

Responding to a question from the audience, Kehler said he was "very concerned" about the future of the domestic industrial base for nuclear weapons as the US looks to draw down its arsenal. While praising the reduction in nuclear weapons, Kehler called it a good news/bad news situation.

"The good news is [the arsenal] shrunk. The bad news is, it shrunk" — leaving a drain of talent across the nuclear industry, including strategists and planners.

To help counter that brain drain, the Pentagon and industry need to work together to train the next generation of nuclear experts, Kehler said. In recent years, STRATCOM has held an annual symposium on nuclear matters with about 500 people to discuss these issues. But due to sequestration, the event will be held as a webinar.

<http://www.defensenews.com/article/20130612/DEFREG02/306120019/Gen-Kehler-Lays-Out-Vision-STRATCOM>

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

Global Security Newswire

General: U.S. Nukes Still 'Credible' Against Russian Missile Defenses

June 12, 2013

By Rachel Oswald, *Global Security Newswire*

WASHINGTON -- The four-star head of U.S. Strategic Command on Wednesday said he is not worried that Russia's efforts to develop a next-generation missile interceptor system will weaken the credibility of Washington's nuclear deterrent force.

Russia has boasted that the S-500, when complete, will have capabilities to stop launched ballistic missiles that surpass those of equivalent U.S. interceptors.

The time frame for deployment of the new system has changed several times. However, according to the most recent claims made a year ago by the Russian military, it could happen as early as this year.

"That particular item doesn't overly concern me," Air Force Gen. Robert Kehler said at a Capitol Hill breakfast event, in response to an audience question. "I believe that our deterrent force is credible, and will remain credible in the face of their defensive system."

The mobile, surface-to-air antimissile system "is currently being developed to have the capability of destroying supersonic aircraft, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles. ... the S-500 will be designed to combat intercontinental ballistic missiles," according to the George C. Marshall and Claremont Institutes' Missile Threat website. It is an enhanced version of the S-400, which was first deployed in 2007.

Russian Weapons developer Almaz-Antey, however, in February 2012 hinted that management problems and difficulties with the cutting-edge technology could mean work on the system is not finished until 2017.

"Since the end of the Cold War, we don't view Russia as our enemy," Kehler said. He added that Russia will make decisions on its missile defense development "on behalf of their national security interests, just like we do."

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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 general was responding to a question raised by Greg Thielmann, senior fellow with the Arms Control Association, on whether Russia's pursuit of the S-500 and other advanced strategic antimissile systems is worrisome to the United States.

Thielmann subsequently told *Global Security Newswire* that Kehler's response confirmed for him that Strategic Command officials are "confident in their ability" to penetrate present and future Russian strategic missile defense.

Russia and the United States both hold enough nuclear weapons that, to date, have allowed each to remain confident that they could overwhelm the other's ballistic missile defenses, which employ a much smaller quantity of interceptors.

Additionally, each country is presumed to have equipped their long-range ballistic missiles with abilities to penetrate and confuse an opponent's defensive systems, Thielmann noted. These are likely to include the use of decoys to confuse antimissile sensors as to the location of the actual warhead in flight.

"I think what I get concerned about is that there are only a couple of countries in the world that could destroy the United States. I don't think they have any intent to do it ... but the capability exists," Kehler said. "And so I remain concerned about our need to ensure that day never comes. I believe that we can deter that."

The general also emphasized that U.S. missile defenses do not threaten Russia's deterrence force, something that continues to draw doubts in Moscow.

"Our missile defense system in its orientation and in its capacity is not capable of threatening the Russian retaliatory force," the strategic commander said.

"The U.S. has not figured out how to discriminate against decoys so the thing that Gen. Kehler conceded is that our systems cannot defend against Russian missiles" and vice versa, Thielmann said.

<http://www.nti.org/gsn/article/general-us-nukes-still-credible-against-russian-missile-defenses/>

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

Great Falls Tribune – Great Falls, MT

Daines Defends ICBMs: Amendment Seeks 'Warm Status' for Missiles Housed in Silos

By Jenn Rowell, Tribune Staff Writer
June 14, 2013

The House of Representatives approved an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act Thursday that could affect Malmstrom Air Force Base.

Rep. Steve Daines, R-Mont., joined Reps. Cynthia Lummis, R-Wyo., and Kevin Cramer, R-N.D., in introducing the amendment that requires the Department of Defense to maintain the 450 intercontinental ballistic missile silos in "warm status." Malmstrom has 150 ICBMs.

Warm status, according to the amendment, allows the silo to remain a fully functioning element of the missile field and be made fully operational with a deployed missile.

Land-based ICBMs are one leg of the nuclear triad, which includes nuclear weapons carried by submarines and bombers.

The New START treaty calls for reductions in the nuclear arsenal.

According to the U.S. State Department, the treaty limits the U.S. and Russia to 1,550 warheads, which are deployed on ICBMs, Submarine Launched Ballistic Missiles, or SLBMs, and heavy bombers.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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 treaty also gives each country a combined limit of 800 deployed and non-deployed ICBM and SLBM launchers and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments.

There's also a separate limit of 700 deployed ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy deployed bombers equipped for nuclear armaments.

"For several decades, this peace through strength policy has worked, which is why I believe it would be deeply unwise to degrade the very infrastructure which implements our effective policy for peace," Daines said on the House floor Tuesday. "By requiring that the Pentagon keep our ICBM silos in warm status, our amendment will help keep potential adversaries at bay and ensure that our crucial nuclear force remains strong, flexible and responsive."

Malmstrom operates and maintains 150 ICBMs throughout its missile field, which is the largest of the three American missile fields. The other two are F.E. Warren AFB in Wyoming and Minot AFB in North Dakota.

Montana Sens. Jon Tester and Max Baucus said in April that Malmstrom's ICBM mission accounts for more than 40 percent of the economy in northcentral Montana and contributes to about 5,000 jobs.

Tester and Baucus, with five other senators, wrote to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel in early April saying they understand further reductions to the nuclear arsenal may be necessary to comply with START treaties, but asked that the Department of Defense maintain "at least 420 ICBMs on alert, and preserve all 450 existing ICBM silos in warm operational status.

"We further urge that any reductions be spread equally between each of the three operational ICBM bases. Such dispersal provides the maximum effective deterrent with the remaining missiles and maintaining all 450 silos in a warm status creates intelligence and targeting problems for our adversaries while allowing us to realize maintenance efficiencies within the remaining ICBM force."

The proposed defense budget included funding to modernize and sustain the nation's intercontinental ballistic missile force through 2030.

<http://www.greatfallsribune.com/article/20130613/NEWS01/306130022/Daines-defends-ICBMs-Amendment-seeks-warm-status-missiles-housed-silos>

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

United Press International (UPI)

U.S. to Aid Allies in Cyber Wars

June 8, 2013

WASHINGTON, June 8 (UPI) -- The United States has pledged to help allies in Asia and the Middle East defend against cyberattacks launched by Iran and North Korea, officials said.

In a presidential directive made public Friday, President Barack Obama authorized various government agencies to begin working with allies in both regions to defend critical infrastructure from attacks by rogue states.

Though the directive doesn't list which particular countries are receiving the computer aid, unidentified security officials told The New York Times it is likely Saudi Arabia, Bahrain and the United Arab Emirates, a trio of Arab countries generally at odds with Iran.

In Asia, the United States is helping allies Japan and South Korea defend against the North.

The Times said it's likely North Korea and Iran are working together to develop cyberweapons to attack America and its allies. The two nations have worked together to develop traditional weapons arsenals, particularly missile systems.

North Korea is believed to be responsible for a cyberattack against South Korea that forced several banks to close temporarily.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Iran, whose cyberattack capabilities have grown quickly, security officials said, was responsible for an attack on Saudi Aramco, the Arab kingdom's largest oil company. That attack rendered 30,000 computers useless but ultimately did not stem oil production capabilities.

The Times said aid to friendly nations is limited to defensive hardware, software and training. It does not include the broad spectrum of offensive cyberweapons at the military's disposal. Like nuclear weapons, U.S. cyberweapons may only be deployed by presidential order.

<http://m.upi.com/story/UPI-36041370727396/>

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

DNA.com – India
OPINION/Columnist

Deterrence is a Lame Excuse for Stockpiling

Indo-Pak nuclear race has deadly consequences.

By Firdous Syed
June 10, 2013

Last week, the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) claimed that “India and Pakistan have increased their nuclear weapons by about 10 warheads each in the past year”. Obviously, man is uniquely gifted with a capacity to reason and rationalise.

Yet the failures of man that may eventually cause his ultimate destruction are too stark to be missed. The astonishing progress of human civilization also leads to an irreversible path of devastation. Industrialisation carries within its womb the seed of unimaginable destruction. Despite the invention of the atom bomb, man continues to assume that what has been invented to destroy will never ever be able to wipe out civilisation. What wishful thinking!

Within days of the invention of the atom bomb, Hiroshima and Nagasaki were nuked. A gap of 68 years, however, provides no assurance that these deadly weapons will never be used again. Only the complete elimination of atom bombs can provide a firm assurance that nuclear weapons will never be used in future, but will that ever happen? Till the nuclear powers continue to possess and upgrade the deadly potential of their nuclear arsenal, a small incident or for that matter an accident is enough to trigger a nuclear holocaust. In a highly volatile Indo-Pak situation, the belief that the atom bomb is the only weapon of deterrence is moonshine.

For the moment, atom bombs may have prevented an Indo-Pak war, but to accept conclusively that there will never be a nuclear war between two estranged neighbours is too much of wishful thinking. According to SIPRI, “India has 90-100 and Pakistan 100-110 deployable nuclear warheads”. If deterrence is the *raison d'être* for the development of an atom bomb, the existence of a potential or the deployment of a few warheads should ideally have sufficed. Since both India and Pakistan continue to possess and develop more nuclear weapons, the nuclear war between the two is not merely a risk; it's a highly-likely outcome.

The Middle East could be the other nuclear battlefield, provided Iran succeeds in developing an atom bomb. Such a possibility is still a few years away or it may never happen. Israel backed by America will make every attempt to checkmate Iran's alleged nuclear ambitions.

India and Pakistan, however, are almost at a precipice; a nuclear flashpoint is just an incident away. India's strategic community is of the view that Pakistan by developing tactical weapons — “miniaturizing its weapons to be carried on short-range missiles” — is aiming to reduce the nuclear threshold. Shyam Saran, convener of the National Security Advisory Board, has publicly accused Pakistan of “nuclear blackmail”. Saran asserts that, “Pakistani motivation is to dissuade India from contemplating conventional punitive retaliation to sub-conventional but highly destructive and disruptive cross-border terrorist strikes such as the horrific 26/11 attack on Mumbai.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

What Pakistan is signalling to India and to the world is that India should not contemplate retaliation even if there is another 26/11 because Pakistan has lowered the threshold of nuclear use to the theatre level. This is nothing short of nuclear blackmail." Saran chillingly warns Pakistan that "India will not be the first to use nuclear weapons, but if it is attacked with such weapons, it would engage in nuclear retaliation which will be massive and designed to inflict unacceptable damage on its adversary. The label on a nuclear weapon used for attacking India, strategic or tactical, is irrelevant from the Indian perspective".

Dr Maleeha Lodhi, Pakistan's former ambassador to America and a strategic expert, is believed to have taken a cue from the security establishment of her country. Through a newspaper article she has angrily retorted to Saran's statement: "But he (Saran) then warns that if Pakistan tried to deter an Indian conventional attack by its TNWs, India would retaliate with nuclear weapons.

This represents dangerous thinking. But the strategic hole in Saran's escalatory scenario is this. In holding out the threat of 'massive retaliation' he fails to factor in Pakistan's full spectrum capabilities to counter 'massive retaliation', not to speak of its potent second-strike capability. It is surprising why this typical but dangerous Mutually Assured Destruction scenario has not been carefully thought through to its logical conclusion".

More often, we assume that India and Pakistan are keen for a peaceful co-existence. Is it not bone-chilling that the strategic communities of both the countries are busy in publicly discussing the potential of "second strike capability" and scenarios of "Mutually Assured Destruction"? What a cavalier way of brinkmanship.

Even if for a moment the nuclear threats are to be ignored as a bellicose exchange, discounting these pugnacious remarks hardly allay real concerns. Will there be no Mumbai type terrorist attack in India? And, if there is one, we know it may lead to an all-out nuclear conflict between India and Pakistan.

Let's try to ask this question in reverse: has Indo-Pak relations acquired such a traction that it can prove detrimental to the non-state actors if they carry out another spectacular terrorist strike? Your guess is as good as mine. However, it's foolish to believe that nuclear weapons provide a sense of security. How can an intrinsically self-annihilating measure ultimately prove beneficial to the well-being of the human race? What is designed to cause unlimited and immitigable destruction for sure will be a reason for an unimaginable devastation. Alas!

The author based in Srinagar writes on contemporary issues. Views expressed are personal.

<http://www.dnaindia.com/analysis/1845964/column-deterrence-is-a-lame-excuse-for-stockpiling#>

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

Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) – India
OPINION/IDSA Comment

15-Years after Pokhran II: Deterrence Churning Continues

By A. Vinod Kumar
June 10, 2013

For over two decades, a dominant section of western analysts harped on the volatilities of the India and Pakistan nuclear dyad, often overselling the 'South Asia as a nuclear flashpoint' axiom, and portending a potential nuclear flare-up in every major stand-off between the two countries. The turbulence in the sub-continent propelled such presages, with one crisis after another billowing towards serious confrontations, but eventually easing out on all occasions. While the optimists described this as evidence of nuclear deterrence gradually consolidating in this dyad, the pessimists saw in it the ingredients of instability that could lead to a nuclear conflict. Though there is no denial of the fact that the three major crises since the 1998 nuclear tests – Kargil (1999), the Parliament attack and Operation Parakram (2001-2002) and the Mumbai terror strike (2008) – brought the two rivals precariously close to nuclear showdowns, not once had their leaderships lost complete faith in the efficacy of mutual deterrence. Fifteen years after the nuclear tests, it is relevant to examine if deterrence remains weak in this dyad or has consolidated towards greater stability.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



A complex deterrence matrix

With its history of deep-rooted hostility, the South Asian binary went through a tumultuous evolution of deterrence structures and postures. The early years were marked by limited war and terror strikes literally validating the western notion of an unstable region. India's perceptibly transparent no-first-use (NFU) doctrine was met with a policy of strategic ambiguity from Pakistan, which preferred to keep its nuclear first-use option open and at the same time refusing to declare its threshold(s). The proclaimed aim was to deter India at all levels of military action – sub-conventional, conventional or nuclear. India's military might was cited as justification for such postural asymmetry. The unprofessed objective though was to carve out a space to sustain the low-intensity conflict (Kashmir insurgency and terror strikes in Indian heartland) while mitigating any Indian retaliation. With its nuclear brinkmanship behaviour fuelling global paranoia, the early years of nuclearisation and its primal instability was proving to benefit Pakistan with no decisive Indian challenge to its sub-conventional influx.

Many Indian analysts highlighted this as evidence of the doctrinal imbalance, with some questioning the efficacy of nuclear deterrence against Pakistan and a few others even demanding a review of India's NFU posture. Though the Indian leadership upheld the NFU as sacrosanct, the need to challenge the *status quo* began to be felt after the 2001-2002 crises. Largely attributed to the 'lessons' of Operation Parakram (which proved to be a costly mobilisation effort with scope for rapid escalation), the Indian Army initiated a major doctrinal shift at the conventional level through what is termed as the 'Cold Start' strategy. With its plan for rapid battle-group thrusts into Pakistani territory without hitting its perceived nuclear tripwires, the military leadership conceived the possibility of calling Pakistan's 'nuclear bluff' by taking its response to Pakistani soil. Though backed by an incipient belief that the space for a limited conventional war exists, Cold Start embodied India's resolve to alter the deterrence landscape without disturbing the nuclear doctrinal framework.

Albeit the feasibility of this strategy was consistently doubted, its signalling spin-off was immense as Pakistan began to doubt the credibility of its brinkmanship behaviour and ability to sustain the LIC without inviting India's retaliation. Through an assortment of political campaigns (by hyping the Cold Start as escalatory) and technological responses (Nasr tactical nuclear missile, Babar and Ra'ad cruise missiles), Pakistan struggled to project confidence in its deterrent. The lack of a unitary effort from the security establishment to promote the Cold Start and the Indian Army eventually having to disown it (by renaming as proactive strategy) largely denoted the efficacy of Pakistan's campaign, aided in some measure by the western alarmists.

Yet, its introduction marked a complex game of deterrence: while one actor propagated a proactive nuclear posture to feed its sub-conventional plan, the other responded with a proactive conventional posture for a range of non-nuclear responses. The official silence on Cold Start matched by Pakistan's refusal to brand the Nasr as a tactical nuclear response only added to this complexity, until the recent articulation by the Chairman of India's National Security Advisory Board (NSAB).¹ By clarifying that India will not differentiate between tactical and strategic nuclear weapons and will consider any such use against its forces or territory as a first-strike (implicitly inviting nuclear retaliation), the security establishment has belatedly implied the existence of its proactive strategy. The next stage in this deterrence churning could come in the form of Pakistan's response to the latest Indian posturing, even as western observers anticipate India's proactive military plan to see action after the next major terror strike.

While its tryst with doctrinal realignments continues, India initiated a decisive new level of posturing, with greater implications for the deterrence calculus, by introducing ballistic missile defence (BMD) into the scene. Although India's BMD programme originated out of concerns on Pakistan's missile prowess and the China-Pakistan proliferation nexus, the rapid advances on India's BMD platforms has emerged as a potent challenge to Pakistan's deterrent. Despite the fact that interception technologies are still evolving and are yet to guarantee leak-proof protection, the Indian programme is geared towards developing an extended area defence capability, and possibly a nationwide shield, that could limit the damage from Pakistani (and Chinese) missiles, if not absolute destruction. With no technological counter of its own, but for the nascent cruise missile inventory (with limited engagement scope against BMD systems), Pakistan realises that India's pursuit of a multi-tier interception network will negate its first-strike advantage, and could provide India with greater defensive depth, which it argues, could encourage India towards pre-emption. Besides the fact that



even a failed first-use might invite Indian retaliation, the shift in the deterrence calculus is such that even a marginally-effective Indian BMD could diminish the combative edge of Pakistan's strategic forces.

Similar to its response to the Cold Start, Pakistan is now projecting missile defence as causal for instability and had reportedly argued against its deployment at the recent talks on nuclear Confidence Building Measures (CBMs). Consequently, Pakistan attempted a weakly-devised signalling effort in May 2012 by declaring a survivable second-strike capability on its naval platforms.² While the strategic component of its naval platforms remains unclear, the fact that Pakistan declared a second-strike alternative (after years of reliance on its first-strike posture) is intrinsically a reflection of its desperation on the Indian BMD. However, with no takers for this signalling effort,³ Pakistan may now be left with fewer options, including: (a) developing its own BMD capability, which could be too costly for its sinking economy,⁴ and (b) seek technological assistance from China or acquisition of its air and missile defence systems.

What's in store?

Fifteen years of nuclear South Asia was all about a paradoxical deterrence seesaw that was intense, yet not unstable enough to cause its failure. After the gains that Pakistan accrued from the initial asymmetry, the scales are now favouring India with its doctrinal rejuvenation and technological advances. Events like the Indo-US nuclear deal, the Abbottabad operation and restoration of democracy in Pakistan have also impacted this turnaround. While Pakistan attempted to match India's nuclear deal advantage by feverishly augmenting its fissile stocks, the Abbottabad operation eroded the credibility of its Army and diminished its leverage in the India-Pakistan reconciliation process. With its leading political parties now favouring improved relations with India, there is scope for a postural balancing that could contribute to greater stability between the two nuclear neighbours. President Zardari's suggestion for Pakistan's adoption of a NFU posture is one such step that the new civilian government could consider in this direction.

However, as is a well known fact, it will be the Pakistani army which will have the final say on nuclear policy issues. Besides resisting any such proposal to alter its nuclear policy, the army will have the strongest urge to counter India's recent gains by triggering newer crises. But with conditions no longer favouring any strategy of brinkmanship, the onus may now shift on to the civilian government to devise a postural transformation that could project Pakistan as a more responsible and rational nuclear power. This is an imperative forced upon Pakistan not just by the current strategic environment, but also will be a factor in determining its future status in the normative structures of the non-proliferation regime.

A. Vinod Kumar is Associate Fellow at Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi and his areas of expertise are Counter-Proliferation, Missile Defence and the Defence Industry.

Views expressed are of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the IDSA or of the Government of India.

1. Ambassador Shyam Saran clarified on the Indian approach in a lecture on April 24, 2013 in New Delhi titled: "Is India's Nuclear Deterrent Credible?" Text available at: http://ris.org.in/images/RIS_images/pdf/Final%20India's%20Nuclear%20Deterrent%20Credible-%20rev1%202%202.pdf. Also see Shyam Saran, "Weapon that has more than symbolic value," *The Hindu*, May 4, 2013. Amb. Saran's exposition is seen as a typical signalling exercise by a high-ranking personality who is not within the government, but represents its thinking. A similar earlier example was the handful of articles by prominent ex-officials describing Pakistan's response to India's draft nuclear doctrine.
2. See "Naval Chief Inaugurates Naval Strategic Forces Headquarters," No. PR122/2012-ISPR, May 19, 2012, http://www.ispr.gov.pk/front/main.asp?o=t-press_release&id=2067.
3. Despite the declaration being through an Inter-Services Public Relations press release, the absence of any major response was surprising, considering that the ISPR releases is an oft-relied medium for Pakistan's official statements and posturing.
4. Comparisons are already drawn with the US-Soviet competition of the 1980s, wherein the Strategic Defence Initiative or Star Wars was supposed to have economically bled the Soviet Union towards disintegration. Some Pakistani voices have termed the Indian BMD as a similar effort to draw Pakistan into an unaffordable arms race.

http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/15YearsafterPokhranII_ankumar_100613

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The Moscow Times
OPINION/Commentary

Enemies from Outer Space

10 June 2013 | Issue 5145

By Alexander Golts

At an international conference in May, Defense Ministry officials tried to frighten their Western colleagues with what they claimed were new weapons that could counter the U.S. missile defense system. No sooner had the conference ended than the Defense Ministry conducted unannounced exercises of the recently created Aerospace Defense Forces, or ADF, a unit of long range military transport aviation, as well as Air Force and air defense units of the Western Military District.

In the maneuvers, four ADF regiments deployed to the Ashuluk test range in the Astrakhan region repelled attacks by multiple aircraft and cruise missiles simulating aircraft of the Western Strategic Command. The war-games scenario apparently represented a limited nuclear conflict in which Russian nuclear aircraft had to respond to an attack by its enemy. The media also reported that as part of the computer-based maneuvers, Western district air defenses repelled a direct air attack against Moscow. In a conference call, the Defense Minister and other top brass reported that all of the targets in the exercises were destroyed without problem, and the snap exercises perfectly illustrated that the creation of the ADF was justified.

In fact, the scenario of the surprise exercises and the manner in which they were carried out demonstrate the problem of the new forces. The maneuvers proved what some analysts had earlier contended: that the ADF is more a myth than reality. The problem is that missile and air defense systems have little in common. One system would have to destroy targets moving at very high speed through space, while the other would target objects flying more slowly through the air, and therefore both require completely different technologies. It is no coincidence that only air defense forces took part in the exercises, while space defense units seem to have been entirely absent. Those units are mostly responsible for the early warning system against missile attacks that includes a dozen radar detection stations and satellite groups.

The main task of missile defense systems is to detect a massive missile launch aimed against Russia as early as possible and inform the president of a nuclear attack so that he can make a decision regarding a counterstrike. The space defense forces also include missile defense units charged with protecting Moscow. Their task is to destroy enemy warheads with nuclear explosions as they fly through space toward the Russian capital. It is difficult to predict what effect a series of nuclear explosions in space over parts of Moscow and the Moscow region would have. But the goal of Russia's missile defense system is not to protect Moscow but to buy time for military chiefs to move to safe command centers.

Obviously, it is difficult to stage such complex military maneuvers as a surprise move. After all, if early warning systems manage to detect the launch of enemy missiles in time, the next step is to determine the nature of the counterstrike. But Moscow must give Washington advance notice before launching any missiles. The element of surprise for the exercises would therefore be lost if the maneuvers and the launch were laid out in advance, and all the more if a missile defense system in the Moscow region were employed.

This confirms my conviction that Russia's missile defense and air defense systems are incompatible. What's more, the surprise exercise clearly demonstrated the true value of the Defense Ministry's boasts that it can, under any conditions, intercept any missile flying over Russian territory. In their view, this explains why the U.S. and the European Union should not create their own missile defense system. But if they do create one, the Russian brass contend that it would not be intended to defend against missiles from Iran or North Korea but exclusively to upset the strategic balance with Russia.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



This would seem like the perfect time for Moscow to demonstrate its ability to intercept any missiles flying over Russian territory, but military commanders have decided to play it safe and refrain from any such tests. The truth of the matter is that Russia relies for its protection entirely on the nuclear-armed missiles of missile defense system located in the Moscow region. It has been said that the new S-400 air defense system is capable of destroying ballistic missiles, but only three regiments have been deployed and the system has only a 400-kilometer range, which is far too short to protect the entire territory of this vast country.

And the most curious thing is that, even while Russia's military is perfecting its ability to repulse the make-believe threat from outer space — a danger posed only by martians — everyone knows that in just one year this country will face a very real military threat emerging from Afghanistan. President Vladimir Putin recently made a somewhat unsuccessful attempt to induce his Central Asian allies to start preparations for confronting that impending threat. Of course, those efforts would be more effective if they were undertaken in cooperation with Washington, but Moscow is too busy spending time and money preparing for an attack by martians.

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

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/enemies-from-outer-space/481411.html>

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

Al-Ahram Weekly – Cairo, Egypt
OPINION/Interview Article

Should Egypt Go Nuclear?

The imbalance in strategic arms between Israel and Egypt is well known, but should be redressed, experts tell Ahmed Eleiba

11 June 2013

By Ahmed Eleiba

A recent report from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI) estimates that Israel possesses 80 strategic level nuclear weapons, 50 of which are warheads that can be fitted onto medium range missiles, and the other 30 of which are gravity bombs to be dropped from airplanes. Israel's arsenal could also contain a range of "tactical" nuclear weapons, such as short-range missiles and mines, the report added.

Egyptian military and intelligence experts are sceptical. Although SIPRI acknowledges that its figures are purely "educated guesses" in view of the fog surrounding Israel's semi-secret nuclear programme, Egyptian experts that Al-Ahram Weekly spoke to believe that SIPRI estimates are way off. Already in 2006, intelligence and military agencies believed that Israel's arsenal of nuclear warheads topped 400, which is to say four times as many as the figure that the Israeli nuclear technician Mordechai Vanunu leaked to the British press in 1986. In September 1986, Vanunu told The Sunday Times that Israel had over 100 nuclear warheads.

Professor Yousri Abu Shadi, a chief inspector for the International Atomic Energy Agency, is equally dubious about the figures in the Swedish institute's report. In interview with the Weekly, he said that Israel would have certainly increased its nuclear arsenal beyond the more than 100 warheads it was known to possess in spite of the mystery surrounding its secretive programme. Israel has long evaded pressure to sign the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty, including the campaign on the part of Middle Eastern governments to compel it to do so.

"In any case, we in Egypt don't have the luxury to quibble about these estimates, as the Israeli arsenal poses a threat to us regardless of its size. We have to move quickly, regardless of the challenges," said professor Abu Shadi. Referring to the Egyptian nuclear programme, which has been on hold for a long time, he said: "There are problems with the Egyptian project, but they can be overcome. But it all hinges on a political decision that should be taken. We should neither underestimate the dangers nor overestimate the problems that hamper our Egyptian programme. For example, the project can be located away from water sources (there are technical means to handle this) and it does not require as large an area of land as previously thought. What's important is to act. We know that Israel can use this weapon. It is



not just a question of deterrence. There's a nuclear arms race in the region. In the October 1973 War, Israel had mounted nuclear bombs on to its planes and it would have used them against Egypt had international parties not intervened. To claim that it did not really intend to use them is out of the question."

Long an ardent campaigner for reviving the Egyptian nuclear energy programme, Abu Shadi has sought to produce solutions that alleviate the anxieties of people in the vicinity of the proposed Dabgha plant and persuade authorities to act. The nuclear technician fears that time is running out for Egypt. He therefore developed a small-scale model of a nuclear powered electricity generator, which he believes will be essential to meet Egypt's chronic and mounting electricity needs, especially in summer. The concept is all the more pertinent in view of the crisis over Ethiopia's Renaissance Dam project, which appears likely to affect water-generated electricity production in Egypt.

By odd coincidence, the Weekly's interview with Abu Shadi took place by candlelight in his home in the northern Cairo district of Heliopolis — an area more or less free of electricity cuts until then. He spoke at length on how important it was that Egypt had its own national nuclear project, as opposed to an imported one, even if it costs over LE50 billion in these times of dire economic straits, and even if it took at least seven to 10 years to construct and put into operation, not counting possible delays due to domestic or foreign political obstacles or the demands of international inspection teams.

Former presidential advisor Mohamed Seif Al-Dawla finds some inspiration in Abu Shadi's vision in light of regional power balances that are strongly in favour of Israel. Speaking to the Weekly, he pointed out that not even peace treaties would alleviate Egypt's anxieties with respect to Israel's "suspicious" nuclear programme. "There are no guarantees when it comes to an entity that holds nuclear warheads in its hands and that speaks about 'peace' while terrorising everyone around it. Egypt has changed and this change should presumably entail new strategic calculations that serve its national security. There is nothing to ensure that current situations will remain constant."

The Weekly also solicited the response of General Hossam Kheirallah, former deputy director of the General Intelligence Service, on the SIPRI report. He said: "We shouldn't dwell too much on the numbers or on whether the nuclear device is a warhead carried by a ballistic missile or a gravity bomb delivered by plane. Such details have to do with long distances. Remember, that Hiroshima and Nagasaki, for example, were levelled by bombs dropped from airplanes. Rather, we should be more concerned by two aspects of the Israeli arsenal. The first is the ambiguity of the Israeli position on this matter, which it markets as a form of 'deterrent' against countries that are not in a state of peace with it. However, this is not sufficient in the framework of the regional balance we need. Egypt still relies solely on the 'chemical deterrent' and should not wait until the emergence of other regional nuclear powers to counter Israel. This brings us to the other aspect, which involves the concept of the 'rational enemy'. This supposes that even if Israel possesses that weapon, it would not use it against Egypt. There is nothing certain about this theory, which has been rattled on many occasions..."

General Kheirallah lays blame for Egypt's lag in nuclear technology on Hosni Mubarak. In 1982-3, shortly after coming to power, Mubarak halted all activities related to the Kanto nuclear reactor. It was one of the steps he took in order to ensure his perpetuation in power. However, as Kheirallah points out, the plant operated on light water. It had been equipped to go into operation for civilian purposes, even if it could have been developed for military use.

In his opinion, the conflict with Israel is unlikely to be of a military nature in the foreseeable future. "However, we should at least do something to reassure ourselves. For example, we should encourage promising experiments of the sort that Professor Abu Shadi is currently engaged in."

Returning to the subject of the SIPRI report, Kheirallah said: "To me what is worrisome are those other types of [tactical] weapons that can be used on field artillery." He explained that Israel had many types of artillery that could be equipped with a nuclear weapon and used in conventional combat.

"It has 155mm rapid action self-propelled howitzers capable of firing eight types of artillery shells, one of which is an eight-tonne tactical bomb. It has 203mm self-propelled howitzers that can carry a nine-tonne bomb. With this type of technology, it can counter a ground force deployed in the field by picking off a unit and creating a breach between the other units. Israel also has five modern submarines that can fire missiles from under water."



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Kheirallah added: "Here, too, it is pointless to dwell on ballistic missilery, or F-35s, that have not gone into service. The imbalance is obvious and Egypt is late in taking the decision to redress it."

<http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/News/2956/19/Should-Egypt-go-nuclear-.aspx>

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

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

4 Myths about Nuclear Deterrence

By Peter Huessy
June 11, 2013

Opponents of U.S. nuclear modernization are operating under a slew of false assumptions. That is the message of Major General Garrett Harencak, the top nuclear advisor to the U.S. Air Force's Chief of Staff, who spoke recently to a hundred top military and civilian experts at a seminar in Washington. And it is one that is worth heeding.

Since the end of the Cold War, successive administrations in Washington have wrestled with maintaining, sustaining and modernizing our nuclear deterrent. But, in effect, the country has gone on an extended procurement and intellectual holiday. We have put off modernization of every element of the strategic nuclear triad (although we did do an important service life extension of the country's 500 land-based Minuteman missiles).

We also stopped thinking seriously about nuclear deterrence. In the posture statements and national security strategy documents of the U.S. government, nuclear deterrence was mentioned in the margins, old doctrine was not updated and the proverbial "nuclear policy can was kicked down the road" repeatedly. As a result, the general points out, at least four prevailing myths about nuclear deterrence have become mainstream.

Nuclear weapons are no longer needed. Totally wrong. Although such weapons have not been used since August 1945, they play an important strategic role nonetheless. Just a few weeks ago, the United States deployed "nuclear capable bomber aircraft" to the Korean Peninsula to deter any aggressive moves by the North Korean regime, which had recently tested both a long range ballistic missile and a nuclear weapon. Indeed, for nearly 70 years now, nuclear deterrent forces have been on alert daily. They are used to send deterrent signals to our adversaries that the U.S. will defend itself. In other words, nuclear weapons are used every day to keep the peace.

Nuclear weapons are not affordable. On the contrary, the general says, they're "a great bargain." The total USAF budget for strategic bombers and ICBMs was \$5.1 billion in the fiscal year that ended last September. That is roughly 1 percent of the overall U.S. defense budget and approximately 0.14 percent of the federal budget. When the submarine element of the U.S. Triad is added, the sum rises to roughly \$10 billion – what ordinary Americans spend on movie tickets annually and \$5 billion less than what the U.S. Postal Service lost last year alone!

Nuclear weapons are old-fashioned. Again, incorrect. Although we are no longer concerned about deterring the Soviet Union, we face numerous nuclear armed states, many of them potential adversaries. Arms control agreements, meanwhile, have cut our deployed forces from over 12,000 nuclear weapons to the current level of 1,550. That is a huge change. But the forces that remain have to be ready and strong in order to preserve their deterrent value. This formula is working: since the advent of the nuclear age, there has been a dramatic reduction in the casualties of war – a decline of some 95 percent, when compared to annual fatalities due to conflict prior to 1945.

Nuclear weapons are a thing of the past. Hardly. Speaking in the Czech Republic back in 2009, President Obama called for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons worldwide. That's certainly a future we can all aspire to, but as long as nuclear weapons remain, the U.S. will need to maintain a strong deterrent. And today, our adversaries are modernizing and increasing their nuclear arsenals with road mobile and fixed ICBMs, new submarines and bombers with cruise missiles. They have not joined us in calling for the elimination of such weapons. As such, the United States can hardly eliminate its nuclear deterrent on the unsubstantiated belief that our adversaries will follow suit.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

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

<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2013/06/11/4-myths-nuclear-deterrence>

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

The Diplomat – Japan
OPINION/Flashpoints

US Tests Iran “Bunker Buster” Bomb...So What?

By Zachary Keck
June 12, 2013

The U.S. tested its new Iran “bunker buster” bomb for the first time last year, Israeli media reported this week, citing officials who were briefed by their American counterparts on the test.

According to media reports, last year the U.S. conducted the first test of its newly minted GBU-57B massive ordnance penetrator against a nuclear facility replica. The *Jerusalem Post* reported that the replica “cost millions of dollars to build, was made of concrete and buried under dozens of feet of dirt and rocks.” The MOP successfully destroyed the nuclear facility.

The massive, 30,000 pound GBU-57A/B MOP cost somewhere between US\$400 million and US\$500 million to develop and each bomb costs around US\$3.5 million to manufacture. It would be carried and dropped by America’s B-2 stealth bombers.

It was developed after U.S. officials began to doubt that their existing conventional bombs could destroy Iran’s underground nuclear facility, Fordow, located near the holy city of Qom.

The *Wall Street Journal* reported last month that the MOP was recently upgraded to ensure its viability to destroy the Fordow nuclear site. This upgrade included adjustments to the detonator fuse to ensure it could withstand the impact of penetrating the granite and steel that the Fordow nuclear site is buried under. The WSJ also reported that the bomb’s guidance system had been improved to increase accuracy as has its evasion capabilities to ensure it got through Iran’s air defense system.

U.S. officials reportedly decided to share the result of the test with allies like Israel to demonstrate Washington’s resolve to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities should negotiations fail, thus reducing the likelihood that Israel would launch unilateral attacks against Iran. U.S. officials also reportedly hope that the MOP’s existence will increase their leverage in negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program.

Although the MOP could give negotiators more time to reach a compromise, ultimately it cannot solve the Iran nuclear conundrum, which at this time is a political not a military problem. The MOP’s development and a recent poll highlighted by *Think Progress* underscore Washington’s inability to grasp this fundamental reality.

In many ways, attacking Iran’s nuclear facilities would increase the likelihood that Iran would acquire an actual nuclear arsenal, rather than a breakout nuclear capability which would be the likely outcome if the current course of action is continued without any agreement being reached. Iranian leaders are almost certain to use such an attack to justify withdrawing from the nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT) and to revoke Ayatollah Khamenei’s fatwa against building nuclear weapons. After all, every government’s most sacred responsibility is the protection of its people and its sovereignty.

An attack on Iran would also likely lead to the collapse or substantial fracturing of the Western-led international economic campaign against Iran. This, along with the Iranian regime’s ability to mobilize more resources for the nuclear program owing to the greater national demand for doing so, would increase the amount of resources the Islamic Republic would have available to rebuild its nuclear program.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

At the same time, an attack on Iran would commit the U.S. to conduct follow-up attacks on Iran's nuclear facilities every couple of years for the indefinite future. In other words, the U.S. would have committed to pursuing the policy that Israeli leaders calling "mowing the grass." There has been significant discontent in Tel Aviv about this policy, which is why many Israel experts assess that its operations against its enemies are often tactical successes but strategic failures.

In the case of the U.S. attacking Iran ever couple of years, ultimately there would almost certainly be a failure of some sort that would result in Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon.

One possibility is a lapse in intelligence whereby the U.S. failed to accurately identify all of Iran's nuclear activities. Another could be a major event in the U.S. or elsewhere in the world—such as a presidential election, natural disaster, economic crisis, or war in another theater—that saps Washington's willingness to conduct a follow-on nuclear attack at a future date. In the meantime, the continuous attacks on Iran would frustrate the United States' ability to advance its interests in the Middle East and elsewhere in the world—notably, in the Asia-Pacific.

The inevitability of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon if it is attacked is illustrated nicely by its construction of a heavy water reactor at Arak. Once this facility goes critical (Iran claims early 2014), it will be nearly invulnerable to attack unless the U.S. is willing to expose Iranians to dangerous nuclear materials. At any point, Iran could reinstate plans to build a plutonium separation plant and therefore have a clear route to build a nuclear weapon even without Fordow or any other uranium enrichment plant.

In this way, the successful test of the MOP does little to change the Iranian nuclear equation.

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

<http://thediplomat.com/flashpoints-blog/2013/06/12/us-tests-iran-bunker-buster-bombso-what/>

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

Investor's Business Daily (IBD)
OPINION/IBD Editorials

'Decimated' Al-Qaida Could Shoot Down Passenger Jets

June 12, 2013

War On Terror: Bin Laden is dead and Barack Obama claims al-Qaida is "decimated." So what are these defeated terrorists doing with shoulder-fired surface-to-air missiles?

Reports of al-Qaida's death have been greatly exaggerated. A major theme of Obama's re-election was that "al-Qaida is on the path to defeat and Osama bin Laden is dead," as he said at the Democratic convention last year. Last month, Obama claimed their "remaining operatives" are more often "thinking about their own safety than plotting against us."

The president characterized "the emergence of various al-Qaida affiliates" in northern Africa, Iraq, Somalia, Yemen and elsewhere as the good news that "the threat today is more diffuse."

Someone obviously forgot to send the "we lost" memo to al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghreb in Timbuktu in West Africa.

In a building that was under the control of that al-Qaida affiliate, the Associated Press just found a detailed, 26-page Arabic manual, featuring photos and diagrams, on how to operate the SA-7 portable surface-to-air missile. Why, if they're only "thinking about their own safety," are al-Qaida terrorists learning how to shoot down commercial airliners and military jets?

The manual "strongly suggests the group now possesses the SA-7," which the Pentagon calls "the Grail." "And it confirms that the al-Qaida cell is actively training its fighters to use these . . . man-portable air-defense systems, or MANPADS," according to the AP.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 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

Anyone inclined to underestimate the significance of the discovery might want to notice that French forces in Mali over the past five months have already taken precautions against al-Qaida's SA-7s, leaning more toward using fighter jets than helicopters and steepening the takeoffs and landings of cargo planes to guard against portable, surface-to-air attacks.

If al-Qaida could manage to smuggle this weapon to a sleeper agent in the U.S., it's hard to imagine how the shooting down of a packed jumbo jet could be prevented. Even outside America, the destruction of a commercial jetliner or military transport belonging to a Western nation could be a 9/11-like blow.

If such a thing happens, bin Laden's demise is suddenly rendered meaningless. The new "diffuseness" of the al-Qaida threat and the "decimation" of its leaders instantly look wildly optimistic.

And look where these portable missile launchers apparently come from: "the arms depots of ex-Libyan strongman Col. Moammar Gadhafi," according to AP. Presumably, if the Gadhafi regime — neutralized as a nuclear weapons threat by the George W. Bush administration — were still around, it would not have let its SA-7s slip into the hands of al-Qaida.

But the foreign policy ideology of the Obama administration (sure to be intensified if Samantha Powers becomes U.N. ambassador) demands the kind of destabilization that took place in Libya in 2011, in the name of "human rights."

We can't just declare the global war on terror over without making sure the enemy gets the message.

<http://news.investors.com/ibd-editorials/061213-659752-al-qaida-demise-greatly-exaggerated.htm?ref=HPLNews>

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

Strategy Page.com

OPINION/Article

June 13, 2013

New Nukes

June 13, 2013: The great nuclear disarmament that began in the 1990s continues. While China, Pakistan, India and North Korea together added 40-50 warheads, the U.S. and Russia continued to reduce their huge Cold War era nuclear stockpiles by some 1,800 warheads. It was only three years ago that the major powers confirmed how many warheads they had. The holdings were; Britain- 225, France- 300 and the U.S.- 5,113. Unofficially China was believed to have 300, Israel 80, India 70 and Pakistan 75. The U.S. and Russia each had about 2,200 usable warheads and a new treaty in 2010 pledges to reduce that to at least 1,550. The U.S. has 7,700 and Russia 8,500 warheads but most are disassembled or partially disabled. Recycling the nuclear material as power plant fuel takes time.

At the end of the Cold War, the U.S. still had over 20,000 warheads. This is way down from its Cold War peak (in 1967) of 31,225. Since 1945, the U.S. has built over 70,000 nuclear warheads. Only 1,054 were detonated, all but two of them in tests. Detonations ceased, because of a treaty, in 1992. Over the last two decades most of these Cold War era warheads have been demilitarized, and their nuclear material recycled as power plant fuel. This was one of the more successful nuclear disarmament efforts since the Cold War ended. It was a joint effort by the United States, Russia and the successor states of the Soviet Union to round up and secure or destroy thousands of nuclear weapons. It worked. In particular, the smaller weapons (nuclear artillery shells and "backpack" nukes) never fell into terrorist hands. By the end of the 1990s, Russia reported that it had accounted for, and dismantled all its nuclear armed rocket warheads and artillery shells.

All this was accomplished by an agreement between the United States and Russia to account for all Soviet nuclear weapons, and dismantle most of them. The U.S. would provide funding and technical assistance, but the hard work would be carried out by Russian experts and diplomats. Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine inherited nuclear weapons when the Soviet Union dissolved in 1991 (and everyone agreed that whatever Soviet assets were on the territory of the 14 new nations created from parts of the Soviet Union, were the property of the new country.) Russia, with the financial and diplomatic help of Western nations, bought and dismantled the nukes owned by those three nations.

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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



Russia was quick getting rid of their smaller nuclear warheads because they had fewer of them (than the U.S.) and wanted to rid themselves of a serious security threat. These small weapons were ideal for terrorists, and if the bad ahold of one and used, it could be traced back to the manufacturer (via analysis of the radioactive residue). It took the U.S. another three years to get rid of their small nukes. By the early 1970s, the United States had over 7,000 nuclear warheads stored in Europe, most of them 8 inch and 155mm artillery shells. The last of these was finally dismantled in 2003.

Meanwhile, the Russians had other, uniquely Russian, problems. They had a lot (tons) of other highly radioactive material in circulation, much of it in power form, and largely used for medical and industrial purposes. Particularly worrisome are the hundreds of Radiothermal Generators (RTGs) Russia set up in remote parts of the country during the Soviet era. The RTGs were similar to the power supplies found on some space satellites, using radioactive material to generate heat, and thus electricity, for radio beacons and signal repeaters in remote areas. In the early 1990s, the Russians weren't even sure where some of these RTGs were, and there were cases of civilians finding them, cracking them open and being injured, or killed, from the radiation. The Russians noted that there have been many attempts to steal radioactive material in Russia, but none, so far as is known, have succeeded. All of the RTGs were eventually found and destroyed.

There was one last problem. Russian officials admitted that, during the 1990s, 5-10 pounds of enriched uranium and several ounces of weapons grade of plutonium had been stolen from their nuclear power facilities. Some of this stuff was later discovered, in small quantities, in Western Europe, Turkey and Russia as the thieves sought to sell it. The amount the Russians admit to losing is not enough to make a bomb, and much of the missing stuff could be accounting and handling errors (both common in the Russian bureaucracy.)

In the last two decades, the only radioactive material smuggled out of Russia was small quantities, and usually low-level stuff unsuitable for a bomb. Most Russian nukes have been disassembled and their nuclear material turned into power-plant fuel. The remaining nukes are under very tight security and most of their nuclear scientists were given financial and career incentives (paid for by the U.S.) to leave nuclear weapons work behind. Nevertheless, for two decades, breathless new stories of Russian "loose nukes" were a media staple on slow news days.

<http://www.strategypage.com/htmw/htchem/articles/20130613.aspx>

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

International Business Times (IBT)

OPINION

Iran: Much More Than Nukes

By Lawrence J. Haas

June 13, 2013

Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Martin Dempsey's acknowledgment this week that Iran "is a threat to U.S. national security in many ways," and not just in its pursuit of nuclear weapons, is both welcome and timely.

In highlighting Iran's nuclear pursuit, U.S. policymakers and pundits have cast insufficient light on Tehran's other activities in the region and beyond that dog U.S. security interests and make its potential nuclear capacity so frightening.

Those activities include Tehran's efforts to achieve regional hegemony (and drive the U.S. from the region), to destabilize Sunni-dominated Islamic states across the Middle East, to finance and arm Hezbollah and other groups in its long-time role as the world's most aggressive state sponsor of terrorism, to weaken if not destroy Israel, to launch cyber warfare against both Washington and Jerusalem, and to expand its beachhead south of America's border.



Indeed, Dempsey's statement to the Senate Appropriations Defense Subcommittee comes as Iran is edging closer to a nuclear breakout and, in collaboration with Hezbollah (and with Russia's help), is tipping the proxy war that Syria has become toward Bashar al-Assad's survival and, consequently, America's defeat.

On the nuclear front, Tehran is pursuing a multi-pronged strategy toward the technology and know-how of nuclear weaponry while, for the moment, remaining below the "red line" that Jerusalem has warned would trigger an Israeli military response to prevent Iran from going nuclear.

Specifically, Iranian officials announced over the weekend that Iran installed a reactor vessel at its heavy water reactor in Arak that could enable it to reprocess plutonium for a nuclear weapon. Iran also told the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA, that its Arak facility will become operational in late 2014.

Meanwhile, the IAEA said in late May that Iran has installed almost 700 advanced centrifuges at its uranium enrichment site in Natanz, compared to just 180 in February, and it plans to install 3,000 in total.

Thus, with technological improvements at Arak and Natanz, Iran is making progress on uranium as well as plutonium enrichment -- both of which are paths to highly enriched fuel for nuclear weapons.

The uranium path is creating more urgency at the moment, with Israeli Intelligence Minister Yuval Steinitz telling the Foreign Press Association that Iran has 190 kilos of fuel enriched to 20 percent and that, once it has about 250 kilos, it can move within weeks to enrich its stockpile to the weapons-grade 90 percent level.

Also, as the Middle East Media Research Institute, or MEMRI, wrote this week, Iran has used its recent talks with the five permanent U.N. Security Council members and Germany over its nuclear program to make further progress on that very program.

"Iran is turning these talks into a tool that serves its own interests," MEMRI wrote. "It is complying with the West's demands by holding pointless talks with the 5+1 and the IAEA while avoiding reaching [an] agreement" and refusing to let IAEA inspectors visit another key facility, that one at Parchin.

In a sense, Iran's progress on the nuclear front parallels its progress on the battlefield and, in turn, its growing influence in the region. With the assistance of about 5,000 Hezbollah fighters as well as fighters from its own elite Al-Quds force, Iran is playing a major role in shifting momentum in Syria's brutal civil war toward the defiant Assad, making his survival more likely.

The strongman's fate has enormous long-term implications for the region and, in particular, for Iran and the United States. With Iran sending arms and fighters to Syria and the U.S. pursuing diplomacy to achieve Assad's departure, Tehran and Washington are essentially fighting a proxy war in Syria.

"This is an Iranian fight," the Gulf Research Council's Mustafa Alani told the Washington Post. "It is no longer a Syrian one. The issue is hegemony in the region... If Iran wins this conflict and the Syrian regime survives, Iran's interventionist policy will become wider and its credibility will be enhanced.

Iran's gain is America's loss, as Martin Indyk, the former U.S. Ambassador to Israel, explained to The Times of Israel. "The essence of the conflict," he said, "is that any victory for Iran and Assad is a defeat for those who aspire to a more liberal reality [in Syria] that is backed by the United States."

Thus, while nothing is inevitable, Iran is on its way to a victory that will enhance its prestige and broaden its aspirations, while the U.S. is headed for a defeat that will greatly damage its regional credibility.

Tehran is doing all that -- and lots more in the region and beyond -- without nuclear weaponry. That's what makes a nuclear Iran, and the protection it could give itself and its terrorist clients, so potentially dangerous.

Lawrence J. Haas, former communications director for Vice President Al Gore, is a senior fellow at the American Foreign Policy Council and author of "Sound the Trumpet: The United States and Human Rights Promotion."

<http://www.ibtimes.com/iran-much-more-nukes-1305437>



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

The Hill
OPINION/Congress Blog

The Modern Costs of the Yesteryear Bomb

By Connie Pillich
June 13, 2013

Even in a dysfunctional Washington, it will still come as a surprise that billions of dollars are on the brink of being spent on a weapon no American military commander can imagine using. That's the case of the bomb from yesteryear known as the B61. As the budget debate continues in the days ahead, Congress is faced with a choice: to continue to spend money hand over fist for a nuclear bomb unneeded and unwanted by our military or to use that savings to invest in programs that support our troops and combat modern 21st century threats.

The B61 is a rock in the shoe of our national security establishment. General James Cartwright, former vice chair of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, noted of these bombs, "Their military utility is practically nil." He added, "They do not have assigned missions as a part of any war plan." The United States maintains about 180 B61 nuclear bombs in Europe, initially deployed to prevent a land invasion by the Soviet Union, a threat that has long since disappeared. Two decades after the Berlin Wall fell, America has been left footing the bill for overhauling these weapons that fight the ghosts of Khrushchev but have no strategic value to our troops in harm's way.

At the same time, many defense programs -- programs that are critical to national security -- are facing severe budget cuts and competing for dollars. As former Secretary of State Colin Powell has said, "[Nuclear weapons] are expensive. They take away from soldier pay... They take away from lots of things. There is no incentive to keep more than you believe you need for the security of the nation."

For the cost of upgrading the B61 this year alone, we could avoid cutting back pay raises for our troops and still have money to spare. We'd be wise to use some of that savings to support the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, which has a track record of locking down loose nuclear materials worldwide so they do not fall into the wrong hands. Down the road, we can use savings to alleviate the automatic budget cuts that affect the services provided to our troops and veterans.

Sadly, while important programs that support our troops continue to be slashed, the B61's budget has grown. Two years ago, the program was estimated to cost about \$4 billion. Since then, the estimate has increased to over \$10 billion.

As the defense budget bill moves through Congress in the coming days, Rep. Marcy Kaptur (D- Ohio) can ensure that taxpayer dollars are well spent. Kaptur should continue her strong commitment to national security by asking tough questions about the B61 and ensuring that the spending bills her committee approves eliminate this unnecessary nuclear program.

The world has moved on since the end of the Cold War. So has the American public -- and so should Congress. In tight budget times, there are modern costs to supporting the unnecessary weapons of yesteryear. Eliminating Cold War relics like the B61 and investing instead in tools that support our troops and address 21st century security challenges are vital steps to ensure America's strength in a new age. Not doing so would be a terrible and disappointing failure of leadership.

Pillich (D) is an Ohio State Representative and a former Air Force officer. She is the ranking member on the Ohio House Military and Veterans Affairs Committee.

<http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/305375-the-modern-costs-of-the-yesteryear-bomb>

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

Issue No. 1062, 14 June 2013

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