



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

CUWS Outreach Journal 1241

10 November 2016

Feature Item: *“AN EVOLVING NARRATIVE: A Report on the Role and Value of U.S. Nuclear Weapons, 1989-Today.”* Authored by Rebecca Hersman, Clark Murdock, and Shanelle Van; A report of the CSIS International Security Program; Published by the Center for Strategic & International Studies (CSIS); October 2016; 76 pages.

<https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/publication/Evolving-US-Nuclear-Narrative.pdf>

This study aims to create a dialogue with the nation’s nuclear personnel about the rationales for the U.S. nuclear arsenal that already exist—some of which have been stated at the highest levels of leadership—to ask what the nuclear forces actually hear, what works and what does not, and what motivates them on a daily basis.

Over the last few years, many observers, including key Department of Defense (DoD) officials, have commented on the need for DoD to better communicate a more compelling rationale for why the U.S. nuclear arsenal remains essential to the post-Cold War strategy of the United States and to the security of the American people. Those airmen and sailors who comprise the nuclear workforce, and who are asked to dedicate their lives in service of their mission, deserve a persuasive explanation as to why their unwavering stewardship of the U.S. nuclear arsenal will matter as long as these weapons exist in the world. In the assessment of some, including this study’s authors, a coherent narrative about the fundamental role of U.S. nuclear weapons has not been sufficiently stated and promulgated across the force. This is to the detriment of efforts to respond to the broader challenges facing the nuclear enterprise, as a compelling rationale contributes to a healthier, more vibrant, and better motivated nuclear workforce. Recognizing this need, the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (DASD) for Nuclear Matters endorsed the three objectives of this study:

THREE OBJECTIVES

Track the changing historical narrative for U.S. nuclear weapons as it has evolved from 1989 to the present.

Evaluate the current narrative’s strengths and weaknesses.

Articulate a rationale that better meets the needs of the U.S. Air Force and Navy forces responsible for supporting and executing the U.S. nuclear mission, inclusive of the mid-level commanders, the junior officers, and the enlisted.

To be clear, this study does not make new nuclear policy. At its core, this study aims to create a dialogue with the nation’s nuclear personnel about the rationales for the U.S. nuclear arsenal that already exist—some of which have been stated at the highest levels of leadership—to ask what the nuclear forces actually hear, what works and what does not, and what motivates them on a daily basis. Over the course of the research effort, however, it also became evident that, while the message matters, the individuals who deliver the rationale, the means by which it is communicated, and the context in which it is received are also important.



U.S. Nuclear Weapons

1. [Air Force 3-Star: Nuclear-Armed Cruise Missile, LRSO, Essential to Saving US Lives & Preventing Major Power War](#)
2. [Labor Costs, Data Questions Driving ICBM Replacement Cost Estimate](#)
3. [Air Force Reviews Vendor Bids to Build New ICBMs Engineered with High-Tech Upgrades](#)
4. [Diver Finds Object that Could Be 'Lost Nuke' Missing Since Cold War](#)
5. [Air Force to Strengthen Nuclear Arsenal IT](#)

U.S. Counter-WMD

1. [USFK Commander Says THAAD to Be Deployed within 8-10 Months](#)
2. [THAAD Deployment 'Must Be Stopped'](#)
3. [THAAD Deployment Halts all S. Korea-China High-Level Defense Talks](#)

U.S. Arms Control

1. [Russia Speeds Up Strategic Missile Upgrade](#)

Asia/Pacific

1. [N.K. Nuclear Test Possible at Any Time, but Long-Range Rocket Launch Unlikely in Near Future: 38 North](#)
2. [China Flexing its Military Muscle](#)
3. [Gallucci: U.S. Shouldn't Accept Anything Short of N. Korea's Denuclearization](#)
4. [N.K. Vows Not to Give Up Nuclear Weapons as Trump Elected New U.S. President](#)

Middle East

1. [AEOI Chief: Iran to Become ITER Member by Yearend](#)
2. [Industrial Sabotage Helped Iran Boost Nuclear Security Expertise: Official](#)
3. [Parl. JCPOA Supervising Cmte. Releases Report](#)
4. [Iran Navy Fleet Heading for Atlantic Ocean for First Time](#)
5. [President Rouhani: Iran's Policies to Remain Unaffected by US Election Results](#)
6. [In Reaction to Trump's Win; New US President Must Comply with JCPOA: Zarif](#)
7. [IAEA Spots Nuke Deal Violation as Iran's Heavy Water Level Exceeds Limit](#)
8. [Envoy: Amano's Report Shows Iran's Commitment to Nuclear Deal](#)
9. [Top General Highlights Iran's Missile Power](#)

India/Pakistan

1. [Pak Cannot Be Admitted to NSG, its Nuclear Programme Unethical: Report](#)



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Commentary

1. [More than Words: Why Secretary Carter's Affirmation of the Nuclear Enterprise Matters](#)
2. [The Scariest Thing North Korea Could Ever Do: Sell a Nuclear Weapon](#)
3. [China's Sole Ally in Asia Might Get More than it Wished For](#)
4. [The Prompt Launch Scare](#)

[Return to Top](#)

Scout Warrior.com – U.S.

Air Force 3-Star: Nuclear-Armed Cruise Missile, LRSO, Essential to Saving US Lives & Preventing Major Power War

The new Air Force long-range nuclear-armed cruise missile is designed to threaten enemy targets in vital areas potentially unreachable by other weapons.

By KRIS OSBORN

Friday, November 4, 2016

The safety and survival of American civilians along with countless US military assets hinges, to some extent, upon the existence of a nuclear-armed, air-launched long-range stealthy cruise missile able to elude sophisticated enemy air defenses and threaten or strike targets deeply lodged in enemy territory, senior Air Force officials said.

At first glance, this concept could resonate as somewhat extreme or exaggerated -- given the existing US "Triad" of nuclear weapons to include ICBMs, air-dropped bombs and submarine launched nuclear firepower.

However, in an exclusive interview with Scout Warrior, Lt. Gen. Jack Weinstein, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration, said that the emerging Long-Range Stand-Off weapon, or LRSO, is intended to function as a critical element of the US military nuclear arsenal.

Along these lines, senior Air Force leaders continue to argue that engineering a new, modern Long-Range Standoff Missile with nuclear capability may be one of a very few assets, weapons or platforms able to penetrate emerging high-tech air defenses. Such an ability is, as a result, deemed crucial to nuclear deterrence and the commensurate need to prevent major-power warfare.

Therefore, in the event of major nuclear attack on the US, a stand-off air-launched nuclear cruise missile may be among the few weapons able to retaliate and, as a result, function as an essential deterrent against a first-strike nuclear attack.

The Long Range Stand-Off, or LRSO, weapon will be developed to replace the aging AGM-86B Air Launched Cruise Missile or ALCM, currently able to fire from a B-52. The AGM-86B has far exceeded its intended life span, having emerged in the early 1980s with a 10-year design life, Air Force statements said.

Unlike the ALCM which fires from the B-52, the LRSO will be configured to fire from B-2 and B-21 bombers as well, service officials said; both the ALCM and LRSO are designed to fire both conventional and nuclear weapons.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



While Air Force officials say that the current ALCM remains safe, secure and effective, it is facing sustainment and operational challenges against evolving threats, service officials also acknowledge.

“We've had cruise missiles for a very long time. The first cruise missile was the hound dog, so we've had cruise missiles since the 1970's and what we're doing now is developing a long-range standoff weapon for a modern A2-AD (defensed Anti-Access/Area Denial) environment. People write articles that say these weapons are destabilizing, but I don't understand that. They're not destabilizing when they're protecting your nation,” Weinstein said.

In effect, the rapid evolution of better networked, longer-range, digital air-defenses using much faster computer processing power will continue to make even stealth attack platforms more vulnerable; current and emerging air defenses, such as Russian-built S-300s and S-400s are able to be cued by lower-frequency “surveillance radar” -- which can simply detect that an enemy aircraft is in the vicinity -- and higher-frequency “engagement radar” capability. This technology enables air defenses to detect targets at much farther ranges on a much larger number of frequencies including UHF, L-band and X-band.

Furthermore, Dave Majumdar from The National Interest writes that Russia is now developing a next-generation S-500 air-defense system able to destroy enemy aircraft at distances up to 125 miles.

Russian officials and press reports have repeatedly claimed its air-defenses can detect and target many stealth aircraft, however some US observers believe Russia often exaggerates its military capabilities. Nonetheless, many US developers of weapons and stealth platforms take Russian-built air defenses very seriously. Many maintain the existence of these systems has greatly impact US weapons development strategy.

Accordingly, some analysts have made the point that there may be some potential targets which, due to the aforementioned superbly high-tech air defenses, platforms such as a B-2 stealth bomber or services now-in-development next-generation bomber, the B-21, might be challenged to attack without detection.

A stealthy, high-tech nuclear armed cruise missile, such as an LRSO, may indeed in some cases be one of a very few weapons able to hold certain heavily defended or hard-to-reach targets at risk.

The U.S. Air Force has released a request for proposals, RFP, to industry for its Long Range Standoff, or LRSO, nuclear cruise missile program. Up to two contract awards are expected in 4th quarter fiscal year 2017, a service statement said.

A report in “Inside Defense” says the service intends to buy 1,000 new cruise missiles and expects the LRSO program could cost about \$17 billion for the missile and its nuclear-capable warhead.

Along these lines, a report from “War is Boring” explains that the Air Force’s budget request for fiscal year 2016 calls for around \$1.8 billion in spending on the missile during the next five years.

“There will be two versions—one to carry an updated W80 thermonuclear warhead, and another packed with conventional explosives for non-nuclear attacks,” the War is Boring report states.

The Air Force plans to start fielding LRSO by 2030.

LRSO to Keep the Peace

Weinstein made the argument that if, for example, the Russian military believed having an advanced nuclear cruise missile would give them a distinct advantage – they would be likely to pursue it. As a result, US deterrence strategy needs to ensure its offensive nuclear fire power can



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

match or exceed that of any potential rival. This conceptual framework provides the foundation for why many US military leaders believe it is vital for the Air Force to have an operational LRSO.

"If another nation believes they can have an advantage by using a nuclear weapon, that is really dangerous. What you want to do is have such a strong deterrent force that any desire to attack with nuclear weapons will easily be outweighed by the response they get from the other side. That's the value of what the deterrent force provides," he said.

However, several reports have cited a group of US Senators who are making the case against development of LRSO, claiming it would both be redundant, too costly and too "destabilizing." The concern, grounded in nuclear non-proliferation sensibilities, maintains it could further inspire nuclear arms-race type provocations and introduce new, more threatening elements into the air-triad of the nuclear arsenal.

In addition, a report in *The National Interest* cites the Federation of American Scientists as saying that LRSO would be redundant, expensive and not necessary.

"The FAS believes that a new, stealthy and conventionally armed cruise missile, the Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile-Extended Range (JASSM-ER) is a better and cheaper choice. "The new nuclear cruise missile will not be able to threaten targets that cannot be threatened with other existing nuclear weapons," writes Hans Kristensen, director of the FAS's Nuclear Information Project, according to the report from Mike Peck of *The National Interest*.

At the same time, the FAS statement does not seem to address the concern from Air Force leaders that a longer-range nuclear threat may, in fact, be necessary in today's high-tech threat environment. The LRSO, naturally, is being engineered to launch both nuclear and conventional attacks. While many details and plans for the weapon are, quite naturally, not available for public discussion, it takes little imagination to point out that the LRSO is being designed to be much more capable than both the ALCM and JASSM-ER in terms of range, command and control technology and stealth characteristics.

Weinstein also reiterated that the existence of an LRSO will not destabilize decision-making regarding the potential employment of nuclear weapons. He emphasized that, despite the presence of an LRSO, nuclear weapons will only be fired by the President of the United States.

"The actual truism when it comes to nuclear weapons is that no one in the United States military releases nuclear weapons - nobody. The President of the United States releases nuclear weapons, therefore when we develop new capability based on the environment we're in, based on defensive systems that other nations have, it doesn't make us able to use them any quicker or any faster," Weinstein explained.

LRSO & B-52

The historic and somewhat iconic B-52, which is now bombing ISIS, will be among the platforms to be armed with the emerging LRSO; the idea is to equip the large bomber with long-range conventional and nuclear attack potential. The Air Force is now upgrading the platform with new radios, data links, avionics and weapons capability to ensure the older aircraft remains relevant and function for at least several more decades.

"You have to look at the history of it. We needed something that would go high and fast and penetrate to say - 'well the world has changed.' It goes low and we use it in conventional conflicts, and then we use it to fight ISIS and we use it to defend on a nuclear standpoint, and it's a great platform that has many years left in it," Weinstein said.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



Air Force Statement: LRSO Acquisition

“The RFP identifies the contract requirements and proposal instructions for the LRSO’s Technology Maturation and Risk Reduction, or TMRR, phase. After receipt of industry proposals, the Air Force will conduct a source selection and award contracts to up to two prime contractors. The prime contractors will execute a 54-month effort to complete a preliminary design with demonstrated reliability and manufacturability, which will be followed by a competitive down-select to a single contractor.”

<http://www.scout.com/military/warrior/story/1694776-air-force-defends-nuclear-cruise-missile>

[Return to Top](#)

Defense News – Springfield, VA

Labor Costs, Data Questions Driving ICBM Replacement Cost Estimate

By Aaron Mehta

November 4, 2016

WASHINGTON – As the US Air Force seeks to replace the Minuteman III ICBMs with a new wave of nuclear weapons that will last until 2075, the Pentagon is struggling to get a handle on just how much the new Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD) will cost.

The program is still years away from production, with Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman and Boeing having just submitted their proposals to win a pair of 36-month technology maturation and risk-reduction contracts that would be awarded at end of 2017.

But with the Pentagon staring down a massive “bow-wave” of program costs in the early 2020s, much of it driven by the recapitalization of the nuclear triad, getting a handle on GBSD’s cost early could prove key to keeping the department’s modernization priorities on track.

And right now, there are disagreements about just what that program will cost.

The Air Force has set an initial cost estimate of \$62.3 billion for the GBSD program, but news reports pegged the estimate from the Pentagon’s office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation (CAPE) as coming in between \$85-\$100 billion. That \$85 billion figure is reportedly what Frank Kendall, the Pentagon’s top acquisition official, set as the baseline cost for the program.

In an exclusive interview with Defense News, CAPE head Jamie Morin said his office had access to “different data” than the Air Force, including additional production information from the Ground Based Interceptor program.

“They used a blended model that looked at strategic launch vehicles from 1960 to I think about 1990. So capturing Peacekeeper and capturing Minuteman and capturing Poseidon for the Navy, Trident for the Navy, and the initial Trident II, I believe,” Morin explained Oct. 18. “So a lot of data, but very old. The newest data is 25 years old. So it turns out there has been cost increases in a lot of the segments, a lot of the industries that we are talking about here from the 1990s to present. So we are introducing some of the more current stuff tended to push our estimate up.

“The CAPE and the Air Force estimates are pretty close on a lot of the supporting infrastructure. I wouldn’t describe either the CAPE or the Air Force estimates for the supporting structure as high confidence, but they are comparatively a smaller share of the cost,” Morin added. “The biggest differences are in production and development of the space system, of the launch system in terms



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

(CUWS) Outreach Journal

of absolute dollars. There are some areas of high percentage difference, but they tend to be on smaller dollar things. They don't move the aggregate."

Labor Cost Uncertainty

Morin said the reported range of \$85-\$100 billion is "not widely off" from CAPE's estimate. Asked why that estimate has such wiggle room, Morin again pointed to the question of labor rates as the "biggest single driver" of that range. Labor rates have grown significantly above inflation in the satellite and space industry in the last few decades. As a result, costs might shoot up on the program in the coming years.

Byron Callan, an industry analyst with Capital Alpha Partners, said that labor argument makes sense to him, noting "it's an aging workforce and it may entail new hires. That green labor could explain a lot. The people who last built Minuteman, M/X or Trident are retired or dead."

However, any estimate made now comes with a lot of uncertainty, given the early stage the program is at, as well as the fact that there is "very, very little" information available on production of rocket systems thanks to a decision in the late 1990s not collect certain streams of data from contractors, Morin cautioned.

"With a system like GBSD where we are going to be buying several hundred missiles, not having good insight into production costs is very disadvantageous for the government," Morin said. "So I would characterize all of the estimates in this area as lower fidelity than we would like. It's unavoidable now because we just didn't make those choices to collect that data ten or 20 years ago."

Throughout the interview, Morin stressed that the program is still so early that changes in the program's cost are inevitable.

"We are not going to get a lot of insight near term because of what we are out with a [request for proposal] for is development and different kind of work than the ultimate construction," he said. "We will continually reassess the program, but people shouldn't expect that in 12 months or some modest period of time like that, you are actually going to have the answers to questions like 'how are you going to construct the missiles that you haven't even designed yet?'"

And some costs will come down due to quantity, Morin said, noting that "you are talking several hundred [missiles] which is a much bigger number for procurement than GBI. So there should be efficiencies there. We modeled those. Hopefully, we modeled them too conservatively. We can do better than that. All of those will have to be worked in execution of the programs over the next decade."

Those in the nonproliferation community opposed to the ICBM replacement have pointed to the cost uncertainty as a sign that the GBSD program needs to be rethought. Kingston Reif of the Arms Control Association calls the ICBM the "least valuable triad leg" and sees the price tag as a potential weakness for the program's future.

"The GBSD program is unsustainable, given the projected costs and other service and Pentagon priorities, and unnecessary given the United States has and is planning to retain more nuclear weapons than it needs for its security," Reif said. "The high end of the CAPE estimate for GBSD is in B-21 and Columbia class cost territory. At that price tag I think it is unlikely that there will be a GBSD program. Even \$85 billion will be a major challenge."



Commonality Request

Savings can come from another focus area for the program – commonality with other missile programs.

Kendall told reporters Oct. 22 that the Pentagon is “looking for some commonality between that system and the weapon system that the Navy's developed for the SSBNs. It's not going to be 100 percent. We've looked – that's not practical.”

Where commonality can be used will be driven, in part, by the three companies competing to produce the GBSD program, he added.

“Where they have a case for that, they'll propose it, but where there is a case to do something new that might be less expensive or even more capable, then they can propose that,” Kendall said. “So we use a competitive process to try to get that, to get the right balance between commonality and a distinct, different product.”

In September, two top nuclear officials – Vice Adm. Terry Benedict, director of the Navy Strategic Systems Programs (SSP), and the Air Force's Lt. Gen. Jack Weinstein, deputy chief of staff for strategic deterrence and nuclear integration – offered some clarity on what those commonality efforts may entail.

Benedict said the two services ran a series of efforts over the last 12-18 months to find potential commonalities, including with the Trident weapon, while Weinstein said the Air Force is looking to find “smart commonality” that makes sense for the long-term of GBSD.

“We also have to look at the ground based interceptors and the commonality that can come from the ground based interceptors, and also the commonality that can come from space systems,” Weinstein said. “What we need to do is, we need to deliver a system that meets requirements, reducing risk in the program, and is cost effective for the American taxpayers. We believe as we laid out our smart commonality approach, we look across the breadth that is provided in strategic system at large, we are definitely in line in supporting that commonality approach.”

Requirements for Industry

Lockheed Martin, Boeing and Northrop Grumman all submitted their applications for the GBSD TMMR competition by the Oct. 12 deadline. While the competitors have largely declined to go into major detail about their offerings (although all three cite previous experience working on various aspects of the Minuteman III program as a selling point), some details have emerged.

One aspect is that the Air Force is open to mobile command and control solution. John Karas, Lockheed Martin vice president and GBSD program manager, told reporters Oct. 13 that factors into the survivability analysis the company did when putting together its bid.

“We traded off the [concept of operations] for mobile sites. I think the main driver is the survivability analysis, which was rather lengthy and complex, so we're trying to provide the right blend of fixed sites and reduce the number of sites to help reduce the [operation and sustainment] costs but maintain all the survivability.”

Carol Erikson, vice president and GBSD program manager for Northrop Grumman, confirmed that mobile command and control is an option they looked at, although like Lockheed, declined to go into detail about how much mobile was included in their proposal.

Another survivability area of focus is in cyber hardening, said Andy Healy, Boeing's manager of business development and strategy for GBSD. And he adds another area of interest – the



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

government wants to own the technical baseline, in order to “control and, essentially, compete industry to get the best value for the taxpayer’s dollars.”

Just how much the Air Force will own is somewhat up to the companies, Erikson noted.

“They did not prescribe a specific level. Our proposal basically gives our recommendation for the appropriate level. They’ve been pretty clear on why they want to own the technical baseline – they do not want to be dependent on a single vendor going forward,” she said. “The Air Force doesn’t want to get into a situation where they are dependent on any single vendor for 50 years, so making sure that they have sufficient insight into the interfaces and are able to maintain the system without having that specific vendor dependency going forward.”

When it comes to industry, another intriguing detail has emerged- that the Air Force is not willing to allow any of the competitors to lock in an engine manufacturer as their sole partner.

In a statement to Defense News, Col. Heath Collins, GBSD system program manager at the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center, said “as part of our Request for Proposal, we put in non-exclusion language that the prime contractors cannot set up any binding contracts or relationships with key subcontractors that keep them from being able to team on other efforts.”

That appears to apply in particular with potential engine companies, meaning firms such as Aerojet Rocketdyne and Orbital ATK are available for all three competitors.

As to the other partnerships, only Lockheed has revealed its teaming, which features General Dynamics, which will focus on weapon system command and control; Draper Laboratories, which will help develop the guidance navigation and control systems; Moog, to provide the cross-vector control systems; and Bechtel, to help develop the launch facilities.

Both Boeing and Northrop have confirmed they have teams in place, but declined to say with which companies.

<http://www.defensenews.com/articles/labor-costs-data-questions-driving-icbm-replacement-cost-estimate>

[Return to Top](#)

Scout Warrior.com – U.S.

Air Force Reviews Vendor Bids to Build New ICBMs Engineered with High-Tech Upgrades

Air Force plans to build at least 400 new high-tech ICBMs intended to preserve millions of lives by ensuring annihilation of anyone choosing to launch a nuclear attack. The idea is to prevent major power wars.

By KRIS OSBORN

Sunday, November 6, 2016

The Air Force is now evaluating formal proposals from three vendors competing to build hundreds of new, next-generation Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles designed to protect the US homeland well into the 2070s and beyond, service officials said.



Submissions from Northrop, Boeing and Lockheed are now being reviewed by Air Force weapons developers looking to modernize the US land-based nuclear missile arsenal and replace the 1970s-era Boeing-built Minuteman IIIs.

If one were to passively reflect upon the seemingly limitless explosive power to instantly destroy, vaporize or incinerate cities, countries and massive swaths of territory or people -- images of quiet, flowing green meadows, peaceful celebratory gatherings or melodious sounds of chirping birds might not immediately come to mind.

After all, lethal destructive weaponry does not, by any means, appear to be synonymous with peace, tranquility and collective happiness. However, it is precisely the prospect of massive violence which engenders the possibility of peace. Nuclear weapons therefore, in some unambiguous sense, can be interpreted as being the antithesis of themselves; simply put – potential for mass violence creates peace – thus the conceptual thrust of nuclear deterrence.

It is within this conceptual framework, designed to save millions of lives, prevent major great-power war and ensure the safety of entire populations, that the U.S. Air Force is now vigorously pursuing a new arsenal of land-fired, Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, or ICBMs

In an interview with Scout Warrior several months ago, Lt. Gen. Jack Weinstein, Deputy Chief of Staff for Strategic Deterrence and Nuclear Integration, cited famous nuclear strategist Bernard Brodie as a way to articulate the seismic shift in thinking and tactics made manifest by the emergence of nuclear weapons.

Considered to be among the key architects of strategic nuclear deterrence, and referred to by many as an “American Clausewitz,” Brodie expressed how the advent of the nuclear era changes the paradigm regarding the broadly configured role or purpose of weaponry in war.

Weinstein referred to Brodie’s famous quote from his 1940s work “The Absolute Weapon: Atomic Power and World Order.” --- “Thus far the chief purpose of our military establishment has been to win wars. From now on, its chief purpose must be to avert them. It can have almost no other useful purpose.”

The success of this strategy hinges upon the near certainty of total annihilation, should nuclear weapons be used. ICBMs are engineered to fly through space on a total flight of about 30 mins before detonating with enormous destructive power upon targets.

“If another nation believes they can have an advantage by using a nuclear weapon, that is really dangerous. What you want to do is have such a strong deterrent force that any desire to attack with nuclear weapons will easily be outweighed by the response they get from the other side. That’s the value of what the deterrent force provides,” Weinstein said in an exclusive interview with Scout Warrior.

Although Weinstein did not take a position on current administration considerations about having the U.S. adopt a No First Use, or NFU, nuclear weapons policy, Air Force Secretary Deborah James has expressed concern about the possibility, in a news report published by Defense News. Limiting the U.S. scope of deterrence, many argue, might wrongly encourage potential adversaries to think they could succeed with a limited first nuclear strike of some kind.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Ground-Based Strategic Deterrence - New ICBMs

It is within the context of these ideas, informing military decision-makers for decades now, that the Air Force is in the early stages of building, acquiring and deploying a higher-tech replacement for the existing arsenal of Minuteman III ICBMs.

Weinstein pointed out that, since the dawn of the nuclear age decades ago, there has not been a catastrophic major power war on the scale of WWI or WWII.

“When you look at the amount of people who died in WWI and then the number of people who died in WWII, you're talking about anywhere between 65 and 75 million people. WWI killed about 1.8 percent of the world's population. WWII killed 2.8 percent of the world's population. “What you want is to have a really strong capability so that they're used every day to prevent conflict. If you use one, then you've failed,” Weinstein said.

Weinstein added that, in total, as many as 45 million people died during WWII.

“All you need to do is look at pictures of what Dresden looked like and what Stalingrad looked like. These are major powers fighting major powers,” he said.

Nevertheless, despite clear evidence in favor of deploying nuclear weapons, modernizing the US arsenal has long been a cost concern and strategic liability for US strategic planners. In fact, Weinstein said there is concern that both Russian and Chinese nuclear arsenals are now more modern and advanced than existing U.S. Minuteman IIIs.

The new effort to build ICBMs, what the Air Force calls “Ground Based Strategic Deterrence,” aims to construct durable, high-tech nuclear-armed missiles able to serve until 2075.

The new weapons will be engineered with improved guidance technology, boosters, flight systems and command and control systems, compared to the existing Minuteman III missiles. The weapon will also have upgraded circuitry and be built with a mind to long-term maintenance and sustainability.

“Solid rocket fuel ages out after a period of time. You need to have an upgraded guidance package for sustainability and warfighting requirements. Looking at the current technology, it has moved faster than when these were first developed. Civilian industry has leapfrogged so we want the ability to use components that have already been developed,” Weinstein added.

Northrop Grumman and Boeing are among the major vendors planning to compete for the opportunity to build the new weapons; the Air Force released a formal Request For Proposal to industry at the end of last month.

Citing a Congressional Research Service report, a story in National Defense Magazine says the GBSD the program is expected to cost \$62 billion from 2015 through fiscal year 2044. That breaks down to about \$14 billion for upgrades to command-and-control systems and launch centers, and \$48.5 billion for new missiles, the report says.

In keeping with the NEW START Treaty, the US plans to field 400 new missiles designed to replace the aging 1960s-era Minuteman IIIs.

The new ICBMs will be deployed roughly within the same geographical expanse in which the current weapons are stationed. In total, dispersed areas across three different sites span 33,600 miles, including missiles in Cheyenne, Wyoming, Minot, North Dakota and Great Falls, Montana.



“If you look at the ICBM field, it's 33,600 square miles. That's how big it is. We sometimes say it's the size of the state of Georgia. It was developed that way for a specific reason. You didn't want them too close together. You wanted it so if the adversary were to attack at one time, you'd still have ones that would survive,” Weinstein explained.

<http://www.scout.com/military/warrior/story/1693945-air-force-weighs-new-bids-for-future-icbms>

The Independent – London, U.K.

Diver Finds Object that Could Be 'Lost Nuke' Missing Since Cold War

A device was ditched into the sea in 1950 by a US Air Force plane just before it crash landed

By Will Worley

Saturday, 5 November 2016

The Royal Canadian Navy is to investigate an object found by a diver, which could be a “lost nuke” missing off the coast of Canada since 1950.

Sean Smyrichinsky discovered it while he was out looking for fish near Haida Gwaii, British Columbia.

It is believed it could be a dummy nuclear weapon – but potentially still loaded with TNT – lost after a training flight crashed in the area, ditching its deadly cargo into the sea.

“I found something that I'd never ever seen before,” Mr Smyrichinsky told the CBC. “It resembled, like, a bagel cut in half, and then around the bagel these balls all cut into it, moulded into it... It was the strangest thing that I had ever seen.”

Mr Smyrichinsky was baffled by his find, which he sketched on a napkin, and initially speculated it could have been a UFO. However, when he mentioned it to an old fisherman from the area, he said it could be a bomb missing for over half a century.

On 13 February 1950, three of the engines of a US Air Force B-36 bomber aircraft caught fire while travelling from Alaska to Texas. The plane was on a training mission, with the intention of carrying out a simulated nuclear attack on San Francisco.

Its payload was a Mark IV nuclear bomb, weighing nearly five tonnes. While it had a lead core instead of plutonium, and was therefore unable to cause a nuclear explosion, it was still a real device loaded with explosives.

A 1998 interview with the co-pilot of the flight explained why this was done: “Without a real bomb the support systems could not be tested. There were some dummy bombs made of concrete that were used for load testing, but we weren't carrying one of those.

“This mission was to be as real as it gets short of war...The large amount of TNT in the bomb could have caused major damage where it would have impacted.”

The decision was made by the crew to drop the bomb into the Pacific Ocean before bailing out as they were unsure of how close they were to populated areas.

On Mr Smyrichinsky's return to land, he researched the story of the downed B-36 and nuclear weapons of the time. In particular, he saw one photo of the 'Fat Man' bomb, a similar blimp type weapon, in several pieces before being assembled.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

"It was a piece that looked very much like what I saw," he told the broadcaster. "The plane that was carrying the bomb, it crashed 50 miles south of where I found that object."

Mr Smyrichinsky contacted the Department of National Defence, who said the discovery had their "collective attention".

Defence officials confirmed they wanted to investigate the object and would be sending a ship carrying a specialist team to the area in November.

<http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/diver-lost-nuke-canada-cold-war-fat-man-mark-4-nuclear-bomb-us-air-force-a7399311.html>

[Return to Top](#)

Defense Systems – Vienna, VA

Air Force to Strengthen Nuclear Arsenal IT

By KRIS OSBORN

November 08, 2016

The Air Force is seeking more interactions with private sector firms to build better networks for securing nuclear weapons computer systems, service officials said.

Air Force engineers say protection of computer networks is well established in many ways, but that the service needs to widen its scope with greater focus on IT dimensions to its nuclear arsenal's command and control apparatus.

"Information technology that touches weapons systems needs to be cyber secure, updated and patched. Worldwide nuclear systems are one example of where we need to get an overhaul," Peter Kim, Air Force Chief Information Security Officer, told *Defense Systems* in an interview.

The need to adjust nuclear arsenal computer systems was further emphasized in a recently announced U.S. Air Force Scientific Advisory Board Study on the topic that will be released in 2017.

"Today's dependences on cyber systems were not prevalent when legacy nuclear systems were fielded, nor were today's cyber threats, including supply chain concerns," the study's outline states.

Modernizing computer networks for the nuclear arsenal is part of the services' current plan to build as many as 400 new Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, or ICBMs, to serve through the 2070s. The Air Force is now assessing industry proposals to build the new ICBMs, from Northrop Grumman, Boeing and Lockheed Martin.

The study preview goes on to indicate that the Air Force will benefit from a clearer understanding of how nuclear weapons' security can be achieved in today's increasingly digital environment.

Initiatives to look at securing computer networks for nuclear weapons comprise a key part of an Air Force program aimed at better connecting with private sector innovators.

The Air Force effort, which involves strengthening email encryption and computer-virus protections, is operating within part of a broader Defense Department effort referred to as Defense Innovation Unit – Experimental, or DIUx, Kim said.

Thus far, DIUx centers have been announced by Defense Secretary Ashton Carter in Silicon Valley, Austin, Texas and Boston, Mass., Kim added.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



“There needs to be innovative technologies that can help us be more productive, safe and secure with cyber security,” he explained.

Among other things, the Air Force is seeking partnerships designed to address potential vulnerabilities with operating systems, infrastructure and various computer networks.

<https://defensesystems.com/articles/2016/11/08/cyber.aspx?m=2>

[Return to Top](#)

The Hankyoreh – Seoul, South Korea

USFK Commander Says THAAD to Be Deployed within 8-10 Months

US may be rushing to move ahead with the deployment amid uncertain political situation in South Korea

By Lee Je-hun, staff reporter

November 5, 2016

The commander of the Republic of Korea-US Combined Forces Command and US Forces Korea predicted on Nov. 4 that the South Korean deployment of a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) antimissile battery would come within the next eight to ten months.

Speaking at a breakfast talk organized that morning by the Association of the Republic of Korea Army at Seoul’s Koreana Hotel, Gen. Vincent Brooks said the THAAD battery deployment was “an alliance decision” and would be pursued with a firm commitment.

Brooks’s remarks echoed US Secretary of State John Kerry’s promise at a 2+2 bilateral foreign and defense ministers’ meeting in Washington on Oct. 19 that the THAAD battery would be “deploy[ed] as soon as possible . . . to our Korean ally.”

With his remarks, Brooks stressed that the THAAD battery would be set up at a Lotte golf course in Seongju County, North Gyeongsang Province, within the time frame planned by the South Korean and US governments. It also hints at a sense of urgency from Washington amid the serious chaos in South Korean domestic politics and a loss of momentum for the administration of President Park Geun-hye, whose approval rating has plummeted to 5% - an all-time low for a sitting South Korean head of state.

But the US’s attitude could spur further opposition to THAAD - and provoke anti-American sentiments - depending on how the South Korean political situation unfolds.

Brooks also said the THAAD battery in South Korea would be “a larger configuration” than the current one in Guam. A typical THAAD battery consists of one control center, one radar set-up, one power facility, and one to nine launch pads. The battery at the US base in Guam has two launch pads - suggesting the battery in Seongju could have three to nine.

Brooks also showed resistance to the idea of South Korea arming itself with nuclear weapons and the redeployment of US strategic nuclear weapons to the Korean Peninsula. His remarks echoed the official position of the US government.

He went to say that a close look at US strategic assets in Guam with Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Lee Soon-jin on Nov. 1 indicated that nuclear weapons were not needed in South Korea.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

He added that both South Korea and the US are firmly committed to denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, and that redeployment of tactical nuclear weapons could endanger that commitment.

http://english.hani.co.kr/arti/english_edition/e_international/768916.html

[Return to Top](#)

China Daily – Beijing, China

THAAD Deployment 'Must Be Stopped'

By MO JINGXI and AN BAIJIE, China Daily

November 5, 2016

The process of deploying an advanced US missile-defense system on the Korean Peninsula "must be stopped immediately", and China will "take necessary measures resolutely" to safeguard its security interests, a Foreign Ministry spokeswoman said on Friday.

"We urge relevant parties to take China's reasonable concerns into consideration and stop the deployment process immediately," ministry spokeswoman Hua Chunying told a regular news conference.

Her comments came in response to remarks by General Vincent K. Brooks, United States Forces in Korea commander, who said on Friday that the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system will be deployed to the Republic of Korea within eight to 10 months.

According to the Seoul-based Yonhap news agency, the commander said that the size of the THAAD battery, which Seoul and Washington agreed in early July to install in the southeast of the ROK, would be bigger than the one deployed on the US island of Guam.

The deployment of THAAD on the Korean Peninsula will gravely upset the regional strategic balance and seriously harm the strategic security interests of countries in the region, including China, Hua said.

The deployment of the anti-missile system also goes against efforts to maintain peace and stability on the Korean Peninsula, she added.

Amid strong opposition from local residents, the ROK military announced a plan in late September to put the US missile defense system in Seongju county in North Gyeongsang province.

ROK President Park Geun-hye, who has been mired in a scandal involving her longtime confidante Choi Soon-sil, may face strong headwinds amid the growing public furor over the scandal that saw her approval rating plunge to the lowest of her four years in office.

Hao Qunhuan, a researcher of international political studies at the Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences, said that the scandal might lead to a delay in the THAAD deployment, because the ROK government needed more time to tackle the scandal's fallout.

He added that China and the ROK should enhance communications over the issue.

http://www.chinadaily.com.cn/world/2016-11/05/content_27281072.htm

[Return to Top](#)

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



The Korea Times – Seoul, South Korea

THAAD Deployment Halts all S. Korea-China High-Level Defense Talks

November 6, 2016

South Korea's decision to deploy advanced missile defense systems on its soil has led to the suspension of all high-level defense talks with China, sources said Sunday.

An official here said the planned meeting between Seoul's Defense Minister Han Min-koo and his Chinese counterpart Chang Wanquan has been put on hold. He said the military strategy policy talks chaired by vice defense minister level officials that have been held every year since 2011 has also be suspended, hinting that China has been lukewarm about talks. The conference allowed the two neighbors to discuss topics like personnel exchange, communications through a military hotline in case of unforeseen crises and deliberations about air defense identification zones that both countries maintain.

Seoul agreed to station the U.S. Terminal High Altitude Area Defense in July to better cope with North Korea's evolving nuclear and missile threats. Seoul views the deployment as a way to better defend the country, but Beijing has stringently opposed THAAD, claiming it undermines its national interests and destabilizes the balance of power in Northeast Asia.

"China has not extended an invitation to Han, and our government has not asked," the defense ministry source, who did not wish to be identified, said.

He pointed out that senior Chinese officials have persistently warned that THAAD will hurt government-to-government and military ties that have been expanding in scope and depth in recent years.

Some military experts said that weakening of military ties could adversely affect Seoul's ability to deal with future North Korean missile and nuclear provocations.

Pyongyang detonated two nuclear devices this year alone and fired off a series of missiles in defiance of the global communities calls to desist from cranking up tensions. (Yonhap)

http://koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2016/11/113_217593.html

[Return to Top](#)

China Military.com – Beijing, China

Russia Speeds Up Strategic Missile Upgrade

Source: China Military

November 8, 2016

BEIJING, Nov. 8 (ChinaMil) -- Russia's Makeyev State Missile Center recently released the first image of the new RS-28 Sarmat intercontinental ballistic missile on its website, making a big splash among western media, which claimed that the new missile is so powerfully destructive that one is enough to destroy a country the size of France.

The publication of Sarmat's image indicates that Russia's R&D of the new-generation strategic missile is well under way. What kind of weapon is Sarmat? Is it as powerful as the media guesses? Why did Russia publish the image of the new strategic missile and why did it speed up its R&D?



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Consolidating Russia's position as a major nuclear power

Russia began to develop the new heavy liquid-propellant intercontinental missile in 2009 to replace the R-36M2 Voevoda (NATO reporting name SS-19 Satan) and UR-100N UTTH (NATO reporting name Stiletto) to be decommissioned soon.

According to public information, Sarmat has a dead load of 100 tons, uses liquid-propellant engine, and can carry 10-15 independently targetable nuclear warheads that adopt advanced penetration technology and can allegedly penetrate all existing anti-missile systems and identify and strike multiple targets in different directions. With a shooting range of 17,000km, the missile can fly over the South Pole or North Pole and accurately hit any target on earth.

According to military expert, once Sarmat is deployed, it will be the new trump card in Russia's nuclear arsenal and pose an immense deterrent on the US. The accelerated development of this missile drew close attention from western media, and the Russian military released news that Sarmat will be commissioned in its Strategic Missile Force in 2018-2019.

Russia is developing the new strategic missile and accelerating the upgrade of nuclear weapons mainly to preserve national security and maintain its position as a major nuclear power.

Russian President Putin made it clear that nuclear weapon will remain a key element to prevent nuclear and conventional military conflicts, and Russia's main task is to "maintain sufficient potential of nuclear containment".

Besides, the possession of cutting-edge nuclear weapon is one of the symbols for Russia's major power status. Therefore, it has done its best to keep up the nuclear arsenal inherited from the Soviet Union despite economic ups and downs, in a bid to keep the general nuclear balance with the US.

Replacing old nuclear missiles

Owing to the implementation of nuclear weapon downsizing treaty, backwardness of nuclear weapon and poor economic conditions, Russia's strategic nuclear force has been shrinking for many years.

Documents show that after the Soviet Union disintegrated, Russia inherited more than 2,000 strategic nuclear weapon carrier vehicles and more than 10,000 nuclear warheads. Although the specific data is unavailable, the number of intercontinental missiles and nuclear warheads equipped in the Russian Strategic Missile Force today must be much smaller than it was in the Soviet Union age.

Many strategic missiles commissioned in the Soviet Union age are coming to the end of their service life now and some have already served longer than they should.

The R-36M2 Voevoda and UR-100N UTTH missiles in service now were deployed from the late 1970s to the early 1990s, and the RS-12M Topol was deployed in 1985. They were decommissioned from combat successively from the beginning of this century.

Russia has taken all kinds of measures in the past decade to modify and maintain them in hopes of extending their service life, but the old missiles will be unable to serve any more around 2020.

Russia's efforts to preserve its position as a major nuclear power are focused on developing new land-based strategic missiles.



According to its weapon upgrade plan before 2020, Russia will invest about \$700 billion in upgrading its weapons and equipment, 10 percent of which is for strategic nuclear force. This includes the research and development of new land-based strategic missile that can carry nuclear warheads, equipping the navy with new-generation Borei-class strategic nuclear submarine, and deploying the new Bulava submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM).

Dealing with new situation

Speeding up the upgrade of strategic missile is a necessary step for Russia to deal with the missile defense program deployed by the US and other NATO members in East Europe and the new geopolitical situation.

Chinese military expert Ge Lide held that in the strategic contention between Russia and NATO, Russia is upgrading its "tripartite" strategic nuclear system, which is a trump card for maintaining its major power status and a critical bargaining chip against the US.

Putin stressed that Russia's new strategic weapons will be able to "penetrate any anti-missile defense system", and its development of new strategic missiles in recent years is focused on such penetration capability. Its Topol-M, Yars strategic missile and the Sarmat to be deployed soon boast powerful strike capability, high speed and strong penetration capability.

Besides, Russia is also working on the localization of strategic missile research, development and manufacturing.

For example, strategic missiles such as R-36M2 Voevoda are designed by Ukraine's Yuzhnoye State Design Office and many production links are carried out in Ukraine and other countries. Russian media reported that Sarmat will be developed and manufactured completely by Russian research institutes and manufacturers.

However, since Russia lags far behind the US in economic strength, developing new strategic missiles and keeping up a nuclear arsenal commensurate to that of the US will be an arduous task for it in the long term.

There are different opinions within Russia as to how it should develop the strategic nuclear force. But fostering such a force that its national strength can bear and preserving national security and global strategic equilibrium will be doubtlessly in Russia's fundamental interest in the future.

http://english.chinamil.com.cn/view/2016-11/08/content_7348866.htm

[Return to Top](#)

The Korea Herald – Seoul, South Korea

N.K. Nuclear Test Possible at Any Time, but Long-Range Rocket Launch Unlikely in Near Future: 38 North

November 5, 2016

North Korea could carry out another nuclear test with little notice at any time, but is unlikely to conduct a long-range rocket launch in the near future, a U.S. website monitoring the communist nation said Friday.

“While there has been speculation of a North Korean satellite launch or nuclear test occurring during the run-up to the US Presidential election, the evidence from commercial satellite imagery of the Sohae Satellite Launching Station and the Punggye-ri nuclear test site suggests it’s possible but unlikely,” 38 North said.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Recent satellite imagery shows continued activity at the North Portal of the nuclear test site, where September's fifth test took place, 38 North said, adding that the activity could be to collect post-test data or to prepare for another test.

"While there does not appear to be activity at other areas around the test complex, the presence of tunnels at the West and South Portals also means that North Korea could possibly conduct another test at these sites with little notice," it said.

Conducting a satellite launch seems less likely in the near future as satellite imagery indicates little activity at the launch site during the month of October since the large liquid-fuel engine test in September, 38 North said.

"While it is impossible to observe whether a space launch vehicle is hidden within the gantry tower's environmental cover, imagery suggests that the launch pad is clear," it said.

"The movable environmental shed at the vertical engine test stand has remained in place since September indicating that the North could either be preparing for another engine test or simply cleaning up after the previous test," it said. (Yonhap)

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20161105000024>

[Return to Top](#)

Asia Times – Hong Kong, China

China Flexing its Military Muscle

The Chinese military is developing ships, submarines, aircraft, intelligence systems and foreign bases in a bid to be a global military power: report

By BILL GERTZ for Asia Times

November 6, 2016

China's military is developing ships, submarines, aircraft, intelligence systems and foreign bases in a bid to become a global military power, according to a forthcoming congressional China commission report.

The late draft of the annual report by the US-China Economic and Security Review Commission contains a chapter on Beijing's power projection development and warns that once fully developed, the weapons and forces could contribute to a regional conflict in places like the South China and East China seas.

"China is building military capabilities to deal with hostile air, surface, and subsurface operational environments in the 'far seas,'" the report states, noting that the operations expand the focus beyond the two island chains off China's eastern and southern coasts.

The new military capabilities will "expand or improve the ability of the

People's Liberation Army to conduct a range of externally focused operations, to include combat insertion, island landing operations, humanitarian assistance/disaster relief operations, noncombatant evacuation operations, and peacekeeping missions," states the report.

The report also warns that expanded military power projection capabilities could "also strengthen China's traditional war-fighting capabilities against weaker neighbors."

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

“Given its enhanced strategic lift capability, strengthened employment of special operations forces, increasing capabilities of surface vessels and aircraft, and more frequent and sophisticated experience operating abroad, China may also be more inclined to use force to protect its core interests,” the report says.

The final report will be released Nov. 16. A commission spokeswoman described the chapter as a late draft.

Expeditionary warfare capabilities outlined in the chapter include six large amphibious transport docks and a new class of amphibious assault ships, new aircraft carriers, and advanced guided missile warships as escorts for far seas operations by China.

The naval expeditionary forces will also be bolstered by three types of attack submarines, including nuclear-powered, diesel electric and air-independent powered submarines. All three types were recently deployed to the Indian Ocean to support Chinese anti-piracy operations in the Gulf of Aden.

Its six nuclear-powered Type-093 submarines are being augmented by two even more advanced nuclear submarines that by 2020 will make China the third most powerful state for attack submarines, behind the United States and Russia.

New aircraft also are being added to the PLA for long-range operations. China is deploying a new Y-20 transport that is similar to the US C-17 and Beijing will co-produce a version of the Russian An-225 transport, the largest cargo aircraft in the world.

To fill out its logistics network, China’s military is building new fueling ships and will have 10 oilers by 2020.

Overseas bases will also contribute to the power projection capability, including a new military base in Djibouti, on the Horn of Africa. Civilian ports constructed by China in Sri Lanka and Pakistan also will provide for strategic power projection.

To keep tabs on threats to long-distance forces and provide them with intelligence, China is also developing global intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance capabilities. They include long-range drone aircraft, space-based sensors, and shore-based radar and intelligence-gathering ships.

The commission suggests that China’s deployments for international peacekeeping operations – 27,000 troops were sent on UN missions over the past 15 years – will provide valuable experience for future long-range combat, as well as for internal security.

In a section on implications for the United States, the report states that the pursuit of long-distance warfare capabilities “coupled with the aggressive trends that have been displayed in both the East and South China seas, are compounding existing concerns about China’s rise among US allies and partners in the greater Asia,” the report states.

Despite the development of far seas capabilities, the Chinese war planning will remain devoted to preparing for regional conflicts with Taiwan or over maritime disputes in the South China and East China seas.

Analysts say the commission’s focus on PLA expeditionary warfare is welcome – after years of intelligence analysis that incorrectly argued China had no interest in long-range power projection.

“While the Obama Administration has been overwhelmed trying to respond to Chinese aggression growing almost daily in the Asia-Pacific region, the US China Commission is correct in its most recent annual report to highlight the future threats to US interests in the coming decades from China’s ambitions for global power projection,” said Richard Fisher, a China military analyst.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

“Early in the last decade, there were many PLA analysts who derided the idea that the PLA would develop global power projection capabilities, but these have been well described by the latest US China Commission report,” said Fisher, a senior fellow at the International Assessment and Strategy Center.

Fisher urged greater American investment in new high-technology and asymmetric warfare capabilities to meet the emerging Chinese threats.

“Continued American global leadership for the future will also depend on much large US investment in power projection capabilities to stay ahead of China,” Fisher added.

Among the recommendations of the commission are to fund greater Pentagon and US intelligence analysis of PLA power projection capabilities, and for the US Navy and Marine Corps to conduct more joint exercises with Japan, Philippines and Vietnam focused on countering amphibious landing operations, like those anticipated by China.

The commission also recommended that the Pentagon conduct an assessment of Chinese long-range warfare capabilities with the goal of developing “non-kinetic options for the department to pursue that counter the emerging PLA expeditionary logistics capabilities in peacetime.” This is aimed at eroding “the effectiveness of PLA expeditionary logistics capabilities in support of Chinese offensive operations in the Indo Pacific in the future.”

Greater Chinese far seas military deployments will increase the risk of US-China naval and other confrontations. The report included a list of Chinese harassments of US Navy ships and aircraft since 2001, when a Chinese jet collided with an EP-3 spy plane.

In the South China Sea, the 3,200 acres of new Chinese islands will give Beijing “persistent civil-military bases to enhance its long-term presence in the South China Sea significantly,” the report said.

<http://www.atimes.com/article/china-expands-military-projection-capabilities/>

[Return to Top](#)

Yonhap News Agency – Seoul, South Korea

Gallucci: U.S. Shouldn't Accept Anything Short of N. Korea's Denuclearization

November 9, 2016

WASHINGTON, Nov. 8 (Yonhap) -- The United States should not accept anything short of complete denuclearization of North Korea, a former nuclear negotiator said Tuesday, rejecting the U.S. intelligence chief's suggestion that capping the North's nuclear capabilities might be the best option.

"We should not, repeat, not settle for a freeze on their nuclear weapons program unless the freeze were simply a step to denuclearization," Robert Gallucci, who negotiated a 1994 nuclear freeze deal with Pyongyang, said during a seminar hosted by the Institute for Corean-American Studies.

"To put this another way, I am opposed to talks with the DPRK if they take their nuclear weapons program off the table," he said, adding that such talks where denuclearization is not the goal would "legitimize" the North's nuclear weapons.



Last month, Director of National Intelligence James Clapper said that North Korea's denuclearization may be a "lost cause" and that the best possible solution to the problem may be "a cap" on the regime's nuclear capabilities. The remark spurred speculation that the U.S. might have given up on the North's denuclearization.

But the State Department immediately rejected the suggestion, saying denuclearization remains the U.S. goal.

Gallucci also said that the North's acquisition of the capability of making a nuclear-tipped intercontinental ballistic missile capable of reaching the continental U.S. would end up hurting the country's own security, rather than enhancing it.

"What will change is the DPRK's vulnerability. Ladies and gentlemen, even those of us who are opposed to preventive war would support a pre-emptive strike if we judge a North Korean strike against the ROK, Japan or the U.S. as being imminent," Gallucci said.

"What the North Koreans will achieve is that they will create a vulnerability that they do not now have when they get that capability. I'm arguing here that the DPRK's security may be fatally compromised, rather than enhanced by this capability that they are so dedicated to achieve," he said.

The former negotiator also said that the next U.S. administration should seek "talks about talks with the DPRK with only one condition: that is that while they're talking, there will be no tests or ballistic missiles or nuclear weapons even at the very preliminary stage."

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2016/11/09/0401000000AEN20161109000200315.html>

[Return to Top](#)

The Korea Herald – Seoul, South Korea

N.K. Vows Not to Give Up Nuclear Weapons as Trump Elected New U.S. President

November 10, 2016

Pyongyang warned Thursday the incoming Donald Trump administration will face a bigger challenge of dealing with a "nuclear-armed" North Korea.

In a commentary released a day after Trump was elected president, the North's official media reaffirmed the communist country will not give up its nuclear weapons program.

"Washington's hope for North Korea's denuclearization is an outdated illusion," the Rodong Sinmun, the official newspaper of the ruling Workers' Party, said.

The newspaper condemned U.S. President Barack Obama's "strategic patience" policy with North Korea, saying the policy has only left bigger burdens to his successor as Pyongyang has become a nuclear state.

The U.S. focuses on applying pressure and sanctions against North Korea for its nuclear and missile provocations, saying that Pyongyang should first show sincere commitment to denuclearization if dialogue is to proceed.

North Korea has claimed that it needs to develop and maintain a nuclear arsenal as a deterrence against what it calls Washington's hostile policy toward Pyongyang.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

(CUWS) Outreach Journal

Trump has not clearly unveiled his vision for the North Korean policy, but he expressed his willingness to hold talks with North Korean leader Kim Jong-un during his election campaign period.

In June, North Korea's propaganda website hailed Trump's claim that South Korea should pay more for the upkeep of American troops on its soil.

Experts said that North Korea may refrain from conducting another nuclear test or launching a long-range rocket until it can gauge the direction of Trump's North Korea policy.

"North Korea would seek to have dialogue with Washington as long as the next U.S. administration does not take a hawkish stance toward the North's nuclear issue," said Kim Dong-yup, a professor at the Institute for Far East Studies of Kyungnam University.

There had been speculation that the North could conduct nuclear or missile tests around U.S. Election Day, but the repressive regime did not take such a step.

But some analysts said that North Korea would push ahead with nuclear and missile provocations around its key anniversaries in December.

Dec. 17 marked the fifth anniversary of the death of Kim Jong-il, father of the current leader Kim Jong-un. The country's incumbent leader will also mark the fifth anniversary of him assuming the supreme commandship of the military on Dec. 30.

"North Korea may conduct a nuclear or missile test around Kim Jong-un's 33rd birthday, which falls on Jan. 8," said Cheong Seong-chang, a senior researcher at the Sejong Institute.

A source familiar with North Korean affairs said that North Korea is likely to make provocative acts as it will need to hone nuclear and missile technology, and wants to take an upper hand ahead of possible talks with Washington.

"Next year will be the prime time for the North's leader to maximize the personality cult of his family lineage," the source said. "The climate is favorable to the North's provocations."

North Korea conducted two nuclear tests this year alone following its detonation of nuke devices in 2006, 2009 and 2013.

Pyongyang also launched a long-range rocket in February, which outside experts viewed as a covert test to check its long-range ballistic missile technology.

An official at Seoul's unification ministry said Tuesday that North Korea would not feel safe about the results of the U.S. election as Washington is surely to place top priority on its security whoever wins the White House. (Yonhap)

<http://www.koreaherald.com/view.php?ud=20161110000748>

[Return to Top](#)



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

FARS News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Saturday, 5 November 2016

AEOI Chief: Iran to Become ITER Member by Yearend

TEHRAN (FNA) - Head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) Ali Akbar Salehi underlined Iran's resolve to become a member of France's International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) before the end of 2016.

"The grounds are now ready for Iran to be admitted as the 36th member of International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor in France," Salehi told reporters on Saturday, on the sidelines of his meeting with ITER Director General Bernard Bigot in Tehran.

He underlined that Iran will become the first and only country in West Asia to be admitted to as ITER member.

Earlier on Saturday, Salehi announced that the AEOI and ITER have signed a memorandum of understanding (MoU) to expand their cooperation in the nuclear fields.

"According to the MoU, Iran and ITER are obliged to keep information of the two sides as confidential," Salehi told reporters.

Iran's nuclear chief also expressed hope that his country could join the ITER project by end of 2016.

Bigot is on a two-day visit to Tehran to hold talks with Iran's nuclear fusion experts.

Salehi, heading a high-ranking nuclear delegation, recently visited International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER) in France.

In early July, AEOI Spokesman Behrouz Kamalvandi announced that Tehran and Paris have agreed to develop their relations in nuclear fusion.

"Based on the general understanding between Iran and France the two countries are going to cooperate in setting up Iran's first thermonuclear experimental reactor that is expected to produce 500 megawatts of electricity," Kamalvandi said.

The AEOI spokesman also said that the joint project has been launched ten years ago and by 2030 Iran will have its first thermonuclear experimental reactor while by 2040 the Islamic Republic is going to operate its first reactor of this type.

In mid-September 2015, Iranian and French officials in a meeting on the sidelines of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference in Vienna reviewed avenues to boost mutual nuclear cooperation.

Salehi held a meeting with the French delegation to the IAEA meeting on September 15 to discuss ways to start nuclear cooperation after the nuclear agreement clinched between Tehran and the world powers in Vienna on July 14 comes into practice.

During the meeting, they also negotiated on the ITER project (an international project to design and build an experimental fusion reactor based on the 'tokamak' concept), and decided to continue contacts in the future.

The French side described the nuclear agreement, called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), as a good ground for the expansion of relations between the two countries, specially in the nuclear field.

Iran and the world powers reached a final agreement in Vienna on July 14 to end a 13-year-old nuclear standoff.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

A week later, the UNSC unanimously endorsed a draft resolution turning into international law the JCPOA reached between Iran and the Group 5+1 (the US, Russia, China, Britain and France) over the Islamic Republic's nuclear program.

Now the US Congress and the Iranian parliament have less than one month to review the deal to approve or reject its practice.

<http://en.farsnews.com/newstext.aspx?nn=13950815001299>

[Return to Top](#)

Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Industrial Sabotage Helped Iran Boost Nuclear Security Expertise: Official

November 05, 2016

TEHRAN (Tasnim) – The West's cyberattack against Iran's nuclear facilities raised the country's awareness and made its nuclear scientists embark on a new field to ward off more acts of industrial sabotage, Head of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran (AEOI) Ali Akbar Salehi said.

Speaking to the Tasnim News Agency, Salehi said the AEOI owes gratitude to the US and Israel for cyberattacks on Iran's nuclear industry, saying the country was not as vigilant as it is now before the Stuxnet virus attacked its facilities.

In 2012, The New York Times revealed that Stuxnet was part of a wave of sophisticated digital attacks codenamed "Olympic Games," which US President Barack Obama had ordered against the computer systems that run Iran's main nuclear enrichment facilities.

The paper also confirmed that the Stuxnet virus was created with the help of a secret Israeli intelligence unit.

Iranian experts, however, detected and neutralized the malware in time, averting an extensive damage to the country's industrial sites and facilities.

Elsewhere in his remarks, Salehi said the cyberattack helped Iran enter into a new field of science for testing various equipment to detect any industrial sabotage.

He further made it clear that the AEOI is pursuing legal action against perpetrators of the cyberattack on the country's nuclear centers.

<http://www.tasnimnews.com/en/news/2016/11/05/1231430/industrial-sabotage-helped-iran-boost-nuclear-security-expertise-official>

[Return to Top](#)

Mehr News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Parl. JCPOA Supervising Cmte. Releases Report

Sunday, 6 November 2016

TEHRAN, Nov. 06 (MNA) – Seyed Hossein Naghavi Hosseini of Parliament National Security and Foreign Policy Commission read the full text of Report by JCPOA Supervising Committee on Parliament open session on Sunday 30 October.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The report, a 15-page document, and drafted in several parts and sub-sections, is a report of the latest developments in JCPOA implementation by Iran and 5+1 countries. Iran's section enumerates the achievements secured by the nuclear negotiators. It also lists the cases where concessions had been made; the report on EU addresses EU's share of commitments where there has been some progress. However, in the US part, it criticizes the country for breaching promises.

Iran's commitment include the following, where Iran had been fully complied with the obligations JCPOA stipulates:

Measures to prove transparency; including but not limited to preparing and communicating to the IAEA of long-term statement of enrichment and Research and Development activities, statement of country's 8 nuclear sites and facilities, statements of construction and production of any sort in nuclear industry, statement of construction and production activities of the Additional Protocol; statements of mines and manufacturing activities of enrichment, data on storing material, complementary data on nuclear material exempted by the JCPOA of Additional Protocol provisions, a statement of a 10-year plan and other current private sector research and development;

Removing of calandria of Arak heavy water 40-mW power plant and filling with concrete to rule out further development;

Cutting the number of active centrifuges in Natanz facility of 19,000 centrifuges to current 5060 centrifuges, with SWU of IR1 in 30 cascades of 168 centrifuges each; dismantling of surplus number of centrifuges, stipulating that if any single centrifuge stops working, new centrifuges would replace;

Fully stopping of enrichment of uranium above 3.67 per cent purity;

Decreasing in Fordow facility of 3,000 centrifuges to 1044 centrifuges in 6 cascades in one wing and removing additional centrifuges from the facility;

Ending injection of UF₆ gas to remaining 1044 centrifuges and keeping centrifuges in standby position without further activity;

Changing the application of Fordow facility to R&D center to produce stable isotopes with cooperation of Russia;

Exchanging or selling of the uranium enriched with yellow cake and to receive the same amount of yellow cake;

Volunteer Implementation of Additional Protocol;

The report then turns to achievements by Iran during the implementation of the JCPOA:

Securing the accord of the 5+1 in redesigning of Arak heavy water facility and converting it to a 20-mW heavy water reactor according to the latest international standards of safety and storing of fuel rods of metallic uranium of the past activities, under the supervision of the IAEA;

Keeping active heavy water production in Arak facility and selling of surplus heavy water in global markets;

Continuing to enrich uranium up to purity of 3.67 per cent with limitation that it should not exceed 300kg per annum;

Keeping R&D program and extending of mechanical testing of IR2, IR4, IR5, IR6, IR7, and IR8 machines, with single machine of IR5 receiving injection of UF₆ along with 10 centrifuge chain of IR6;

Fully addressing and solving the Possible Military Dimensions and its international consequences;

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Preparing the international mentality for broader and more recognized nuclear cooperation with international participation.

The report admits that during the implementation of JCPOA, some part of the 5+1 commitments had been realized including notably cancelling UN seven mandatory resolutions, namely, 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), 1835 (2008), 1929 (2010) and 2224 (2015), with sanctions panel and committee having been resolved (which provisioned by Article 18 of the JCPOA).

It also says that the sanctions related to IAEA had been resolved, along with US secondary sanctions.

According to the report, the US has issued general permissions in line with its commitments in the JCPOA which made possible participation and investment by Iranian nationals in American firms; however, this permission is stalled in more technical glitches, as it interfere with the workings of primary nuclear-related sanctions, thus depriving it from full usefulness for Iranian entrepreneurs. The US also permits selling of foods and fruits by Iranian nationals to American importers and making payment accordingly.

On the EU part of the sanctions, the report states that the EU had approved Decision 37 on the day of the JCPOA implementation, which officially puts into effect the removal of financial and economic sanctions according to Decision 1863. According to the Decision, the EU financial and economic sanctions on Iran would remove articles of Council Regulation (EU) 2015/1861 amending Regulation (EU) No 267/2012 concerning restrictive measures against Iran.

The report also accounts for other sanctions targeting private citizens and institutions related to Iran's nuclear program; 606 individuals and firms along with 303 planes, oil tankers, and ships had been removed from the US and the EU lists of sanctions. It also adds that the Islamic Republic of Iran had held sessions with France, Switzerland, Spain, Russia, Hungary, and Czech Republic on nuclear safety and other issues.

On oil and gas, Iran's economy had been enjoying more easing of the sanctions according to the report; Iran's oil in the global market has increasingly found customers; its exports reached 2 million barrels per day ten months after the implementation day from ludicrously low 970,000 barrels per day in which was a record low in the second quarter of 2013. On marine and shipping industries, Iran's fleet and shipping and oil tanker companies were also removed from the list of sanctions and found opportunities to normal activities. They had been receiving legal permits for ships and international insurance companies had started to provide insurance coverage, with Iranian ports now frequented with international cargo ships.

The EU has contributed to Iran's oil and energy industry through removing sanctions. These include: 1. Improved oil production and export capacities and improvements in gas condensate and other petrochemical production; 2. A general movement forward to addressing country's issues in marine transportation; 3. Reduced risk in Iran's credit conditions; 4. Receiving of overdue debts from international partners and improved economic conditions; 5. Cancellation of the US resolutions under Chapter 7 of the Charter; 6. Resolving of PMD of Iran's nuclear program; and 7. International recognition of Iran's nuclear rights.

In insurance sector, notably Iran's oil tankers enjoyed services by P&I Club of Risk Managers in the US (a prestigious insurance holding). Now, risk inherent to oil and energy, and air industries are covered by European insurance companies.



In banking sector however, the progress has been slow, with small banks pioneering opening transactions with Iran's financial sector, with larger bank hesitatingly awaiting further inspection of the situation. Iran's frozen assets have largely been transferable to domestic banks; however, problems still persist in currency change and sanctions not related to nuclear program still restrict Iran's financial transactions with the world.

In an important part, the report turns to the US breach of promise in keeping its sanctions and adding to previous sanctions which the report believed was in line with the US animosity toward the Islamic Establishment; according to the report, the US has been waging efforts to keep sanctions, through its dominance over international financial systems and the fear that US supervisory and punitive measures would be a nemesis for any banks cooperating with Iran. On international insurance, the coverage still has to be completed. The US, the report reads, "has continued and perpetuated sanctions on Iran's abilities to transfer money and has deprived Iran of capacity to trade in dollar, with subsequent problems hitting the financial sector."

The report laments that still sanctions bite Iran's banking and financial sector, where the effectiveness of the JCPOA implementation has been subject to public suspicion as well as government officials voicing discontent that JCPOA has not brought concrete outcomes to the general public. Despite the alleviations of some sanctions by *Office of Foreign Assets Control (OFAC)*, the general emphasis on documents is on 'strict compliance with sanctions against Iran.' This poses challenges which the international banking system and individual banks should deal with. The European banks are largely reluctant to work with Iranian financial sector, with US punitive measures looming around. Even if they receive guarantees from the US Treasury, there remains the fear that the elites in financial sector of the US provide very different interpretations of the law, thus implicating the EU banks in illicit financial activities with Iran which are subject to sanctions. OFAC is the major body to issue necessary financial permits, however, it has largely avoided issuing more comprehensive permits and usually has been terse on questions posed by the EU banks. The overall situation is far from satisfactory.

The report also states that in areas where removal of sanctions provided modicum of hope, yet other sorts of sanction under diverse pretexts had persisted to bite Iran's economy. On the day of implementation of JCPOA, the US added some 11 Iranian legal and real individuals. Most controversial of the new restrictions was Visa Waiver Program Improvement and Terrorist Travel Prevention Act by the US congress which largely restricts entry to the US of individuals visiting Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Sudan beginning March 2011, and these individuals should apply for US visa to come to the country. It largely affects EU individuals swarming Iran as tourists or trade delegations and is in line with Iranophobic sentiments promoted in the US to hit the influx of investments to Iran. In April 20, 2016, the US Supreme Court approved the court verdict that the victims of terrorists where Iran had been implicated, would file for reimbursements provided by Iran's frozen assets in the US banks. This is outright expropriation of Iranian assets and was condemned by Tehran as a hostile measure which would exacerbate the already tense relations.

Barack Obama signed Continuation of the National Emergency with respect to Iran on March 9, 2016 which extended sanctions approved in March 15, 1995. This was in great contradiction with implementation of the JCPOA in January 16, 2016. In April 2016, Mark Toner, the Deputy Department Spokesperson told reporters about a decision by the Administration not to allow Iran to trade in dollar. In April 14, 2016, the US government presented the Congress with its 40th Human Rights Report, which as usual, had levelled unfounded human rights charges on Iran. Josh Earnest, the White House spokesperson accused Iran of supporting terrorism. The US government has delayed issuing permissions for Boeing and Airbus in selling planes to Iran which violates the JCPOA provisions.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

The report concludes with some recommendations to the government which includes reconstruction of the Arak heavy water facility. “The government is responsible to strictly watch any violations of the JCPOA provisions in returning sanctions or putting new sanctions by any member of the 5+1 to initiate possible retaliatory measures or to stop volunteer cooperation and implementation of the Additional Protocol and to return to situation before sanctions as rapidly as possible,” it reads. “During 3 years, such retaliatory measures should increase the enrichment capacity to 190,000 SWO (predicted by the Leader during negotiations); the Supreme National Security Council will be responsible to pursue the issue; the government also would provide the Council with a 4-month plan for approval.”

“The IAEA inspections should comply with the international regulations and country’s expediencies set by the SNSC; the government should closely watch the process to strictly protect the classified information and nuclear secrets especially in military and security grounds; the amount of cooperation with the IAEA should hinge upon the protective measures to protect Iran’s information from third-party access; any access for the IAEA to military individuals and centers is not allowed. Exceptions are where the SNSC approves such isolated cases requested by the IAEA,” it concludes.

<http://en.mehrnews.com/news/120932/Parl-JCPOA-Supervising-Cmte-releases-report>

[Return to Top](#)

Press TV – Tehran, Iran

Iran Navy Fleet Heading for Atlantic Ocean for First Time

Monday, November 7, 2016

Iran's Navy Commander Rear Admiral Habibollah Sayyari says an Iranian naval fleet is planning to head for the Atlantic Ocean for the first time after a port call in South Africa.

The 44th flotilla of the Iranian Navy, consisting of the Alvand destroyer and the Bushehr logistic vessel, embarked on a voyage for the high seas on October 5 to safeguard maritime routes used by the country's vessels and oil tankers against pirates.

Speaking to reporters on Monday, Sayyari said the flotilla first crossed the Gulf of Aden and then docked at Tanzanian port city of Dar es Salaam on October 29 and remained there for three days.

The Iranian Navy commander added that the fleet is currently close to Mozambique's maritime border and plans to head for South Africa's territorial waters to call at a South African port if conditions of the sea allow it.

“The dispatched fleet of the Iranian Navy will continue to sail toward the Atlantic Ocean after South Africa if the conditions are suitable,” the commander said.

He emphasized that the presence of the 44th flotilla on the high seas displays the might and strength of the Iranian Navy.

“When a fleet establishes its presence in an ocean and the high seas, it shows the capabilities of the Iranian Army’s naval forces, which can hoist Iran’s flag on the high seas,” Sayyari said.

This can strengthen Iran’s ties with regional countries, prevent Iranophobia and convey Iran’s message of peace and friendship to other countries, he added.



The commander said Iranian naval fleets conduct a very important mission on the high seas and the Gulf of Aden by maintaining maritime security.

The 44th Navy flotilla also has a mission to ensure security for Iranian ships in the Indian Ocean, Sayyari added.

The flotilla successfully saved two Iranian ships from three pirate attacks on October 17 in the Gulf of Aden.

Gulf of Aden pirates, who mainly come from Somali coasts, attacked an Iranian merchant ship in a bid to hijack it but they were forced to flee after a heavy exchange of fire by the Iranian fleet.

The pirates also conducted two attacks on another Iranian merchant ship. They initially attacked the vessel with eight speedboats 46 miles south of the Yemeni city of Aden and later with 13 well-equipped boats 55 miles south of the port city.

However, the two attacks were repelled by the Iranian naval forces and the pirates were forced to retreat when they came under heavy fire.

In recent years, Iran's Navy has increased its presence in international waters to protect naval routes and provide security for merchant vessels and tankers.

In line with international efforts against piracy, the Iranian Navy has been conducting patrols in the Gulf of Aden since November 2008, safeguarding merchant containers and oil tankers owned or leased by Iran or other countries.

Iran's Navy has managed to foil several attacks on both Iranian and foreign tankers during its missions in international waters.

<http://www.presstv.com/Detail/2016/11/07/492583/Iran-Navy-Habibollah-Sayyari-Atlantic-Ocean-South-Africa>

[Return to Top](#)

Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran

President Rouhani: Iran's Policies to Remain Unaffected by US Election Results

November 09, 2016

TEHRAN (Tasnim) – Iran's President Hassan Rouhani rejected any change in the country's policies in the wake of election of Donald Trump as the next US president.

"Results of the US (presidential) election have no impact on the Islamic Republic of Iran's policies," President Rouhani said at a cabinet session on Wednesday morning, after Republican candidate Donald Trump emerged victorious in the US presidential elections.

Iran's dignity and independence stem from the fact that its policies are based only upon "people's will and determination" and won't change with changes in the foreign administrations, the president underlined.

He further pointed to Washington's declining position in the international community and in the world public opinion, saying the US growing rift with the international community and Europe will exacerbate its standing.

The result of US election is a symptom of tumults, and lack of internal stability in the US will persist for a long time, President Rouhani pointed out, adding that it will take a long time for the US internal problems and conflicts to be resolved.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

He further pointed to US inability to foment Iranophobia and unite the world against Iran anymore, saying Iran's policy of constructive interaction with the world and termination of the nuclear-related sanctions have put the Islamic Republic's economic ties with all countries on a "growing and irreversible path."

As regards the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), a lasting nuclear agreement between Tehran and the Group 5+1 (Russia, China, the US, Britain, France and Germany), President Rouhani said the accord will not be affected by decision of a single country, because Iran intelligently managed to reach the deal within the framework of a United Nations Security Council resolution, not as an accord with a certain country or government.

Republican Donald Trump stunned the world by defeating Hillary Clinton in the race for the White House on Wednesday, ending eight years of Democratic rule.

<http://www.tasnimnews.com/en/news/2016/11/09/1236077/president-rouhani-iran-s-policies-to-remain-unaffected-by-us-election-results>

[Return to Top](#)

Mehr News Agency – Tehran, Iran

In Reaction to Trump's Win; New US President Must Comply with JCPOA: Zarif

Wednesday, 9 November 2016

TEHRAN, Nov. 09 (MNA) – Iran's FM Zarif in response to Donald Trump's winning the US presidential election early this morning said the new president has a duty to stay committed to US obligations under the nuclear deal.

"We do not interfere in the internal affairs of other countries," Iranian Foreign Minister Mohammad Javad Zarif who is on a tour to three Eastern European countries, told reporters on Wednesday in Romanian capital Bucharest, in regard to Donald Trump's success at winning the US presidential election this morning.

"This is the choice of the American people," he continued, "but whoever sits at the White House must face the developments in the world and region with a realistic approach."

He went on to stress that Iran and the US have no political relations; "however, the US president is obliged to implement whatever his country has agreed to as an international, multilateral commitment under the nuclear deal."

Republican candidate Donald Trump was declared the victor in the US presidential election on Wednesday by having won 276 electoral votes. His democrat rival Hilary Clinton only managed to win 218 electoral votes, despite many western media predictions.

Foreign Minister Zarif heading a politico-economic delegation will depart Romania for Czech Republic and Slovakia as the last two legs of his Eastern European tour.

<http://en.mehrnews.com/news/121212/New-US-president-must-comply-with-JCPOA-Zarif>

[Return to Top](#)



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The Japan Times – Tokyo, Japan

IAEA Spots Nuke Deal Violation as Iran's Heavy Water Level Exceeds Limit

Associated Press (AP), Kyodo

November 10, 2016

VIENNA – The United Nations agency monitoring the nuclear pact between Iran and six world powers said Wednesday that Iran is in violation of the deal meant to curb its ability to make atomic arms by storing marginally more heavy water than the agreement allows.

Heavy water is a concern because it is used to cool reactors that can produce substantial amounts of plutonium. That, in turn, can be applied to making the fissile core of nuclear warheads.

The U.N.'s International Atomic Energy Agency said in a confidential report obtained by The Associated Press that Iran had exceeded the heavy water allotment of 130 metric tons (143.3 tons) only slightly — by 100 kg (220 pounds.) The report also noted that Iran had served notice it would resolve the issue by exporting 5 metric tons, substantially over the excess amount.

Wednesday's report said the agency verified the overhang on Tuesday, just days after IAEA chief Yukiya Amano "expressed concerns" to top Iranian officials.

A senior diplomat familiar with the issue said the Iranians had told the IAEA that the shipment would be leaving their country within the next few days. The diplomat requested anonymity because he was not authorized to speak on the record about Iran's nuclear program.

Still, with both sides closely watching for violations, the breach was sensitive even beyond the technical uses of heavy water, especially since it was the second such breach since implementation of the deal curbing Iran's nuclear program in exchange for sanctions relief.

In February, a month after the deal went into effect, the agency noted for the first time that Iran had exceeded its allotted limit of heavy water. The amount was greater in that case and some of the excess was exported to the United States under an arrangement criticized by U.S. congressional opponents as facilitating Iranian violations of the deal.

Wednesday's report did not specify to which country or countries the exports would be going to this time.

As of Tuesday, Tehran's heavy water stock came to 130.1 tons. It was the second time the stock has surpassed the limit following 130.9 tons registered in February. In July last year, Iran and six major powers — Britain, China, France, Germany, Russia and the United States — struck a deal formally called the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in which Iran pledged to curb activities such as uranium enrichment.

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2016/11/10/world/iaea-spots-nuke-deal-violation-irans-heavy-water-level-exceeds-limit/#.WCOqNrRh1mA>

[Return to Top](#)

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Islamic Republic News Agency (IRNA) – Tehran, Iran

November 10, 2016

Envoy: Amano's Report Shows Iran's Commitment to Nuclear Deal

Tehran, Nov 10, IRNA -- Iran's Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Reza Najafi underlined that the new report published by IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano on Iran's nuclear activities verifies Iran's commitment to the nuclear deal.

'This report once again endorsed full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA),' Najafi told reporters on Wednesday.

He said that Amano's new report once again endorses Iran's nuclear activities in different areas, including nuclear enrichment, research and development, redesign of Arak heavy water reactor and production of heavy water within JCPOA framework.

'The IAEA will also continue to its supervision over Iran's activities based on safeguards regulations, temporary implementation of additional protocol and JCPOA,' Najafi added.

<http://www.irna.ir/en/News/82302191/>

[Return to Top](#)

Tasnim News Agency – Tehran, Iran

Top General Highlights Iran's Missile Power

November 10, 2016

TEHRAN (Tasnim) – Chief of Staff of the Iranian Armed Forces Major General Mohammad Hossein Baqeri said Iran has gained such great missile capabilities that enemies would not begin to contemplate attacking the country.

“Our missile power has reached a point that the enemies cannot decide to invade,” the senior officer said at a cultural ceremony on Thursday, held in commemoration of Brigadier General Hassan Tehrani-Moqaddam, known as the father of Iran's missile program, who was martyred in 2011.

Highlighting Iran's success to acquire the technical expertise to produce missiles with solid fuel, Major General Baqeri said Iran's progress in the missile industry was so rapid that none of the modern anti-missile systems could defeat the Iranian projectiles in terms of speed, power and precision.

He also warned the “insane” Zionist regime of Israel that a war against the Islamic Republic of Iran will not have an end, until the enemies concede defeat in a humiliated manner.

The top commander further pointed to Iran's assistance to its allies in the region, saying Syria, which once refused to supply more missiles to Iran during the Iraqi imposed war in the 1980s, enjoyed the missile industries that Iran set up in the city of Aleppo later.

The missiles manufactured in Aleppo were used against the Tel Aviv regime in the 33-day war, the general added, referring to an Israeli war against Lebanon in the summer of 2006.

Elsewhere, he assured neighboring countries that Iran's missile power is only for defending its interests, saying Tehran takes pride in helping the oppressed in the face of terrorist groups and the global arrogance.

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



Iran's help for Lebanon's Hezbollah, as in the missile industry, is part of that strategy, he explained.

Iranian military technicians have in recent years made great headways in manufacturing a broad range of indigenous equipment, making the armed forces self-sufficient in the arms sphere.

Tehran has always assured other nations that its military might poses no threat to the regional countries and is entirely based on deterrence.

<http://www.tasnimnews.com/en/news/2016/11/10/1236654/top-general-highlights-iran-s-missile-power>

[Return to Top](#)

The Deccan Chronicle – Hyderabad, India

Pak Cannot Be Admitted to NSG, its Nuclear Programme Unethical: Report

The report also indicts China for being fully complicit in developing Pakistan's nuclear programme in various ways.

By DECCAN CHRONICLE

November 8, 2016

New Delhi: Pakistan cannot be welcomed into the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) because it uses front companies and other deceptive methods to obtain dual-use goods for its nuclear programme, a UK report has said.

According to Project Alpha, established in 2011 with British government funding, China is either complicit in supplying Pakistan's nuclear programmes, or negligent in monitoring its state-owned companies.

This is so given the massive scale of Islamabad's procurement of sensitive material from Beijing, the report says.

Pakistan also maintains a network of at least 20 trading companies in mainland China, Hong Kong, Dubai and Singapore that it uses to "covertly funnel dual-use goods to its strategic programmes", the report alleged.

This in turn undermines Pakistan's claim that it is a responsible nuclear power and thus deserves entry into the NSG.

"Pakistan cannot expect to be welcomed into the NSG when it continues to secretly and systematically undermine NSG members' national export control systems by targeting companies through the use of front companies and other deceptive techniques," the report says.

China is the most important supplier of all forms of goods to Pakistan's nuclear and missile programmes, and most procurements from China are "probably from unwitting private suppliers", the report by Project Alpha added.

The revelations of the report are significant given how China has repeatedly blocked India's entry into the NSG, making Pakistan's admission to the group a precondition for India to join it.

<http://www.deccanchronicle.com/nation/current-affairs/081116/pak-cannot-be-admitted-to-nsg-its-nuclear-programme-uses-unethical-means-report.html>

[Return to Top](#)



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

War on the Rocks.com – U.S.

OPINION/Commentary

More than Words: Why Secretary Carter’s Affirmation of the Nuclear Enterprise Matters

By REBECCA HERSMAN, CLARK MURDOCK AND SHANELLE VAN

November 4, 2016

By speaking last month about the importance of the U.S. nuclear mission to a crowd of airmen at the home to two legs of the nuclear triad, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter reinforced a subtle but important shift in the way our leaders have been talking about the nation’s nuclear deterrent.

Carter thanked the audience at Minot Air Force Base in North Dakota for their constant stewardship of the U.S. nuclear arsenal, saying

The knowledge that every part of this enterprise is working as smoothly as it should be is what makes you effective, for it’s that which deters... It’s a mission that demands unparalleled excellence, excellence that you define. We count on you for that.

His remarks launched a three-day tour of the nuclear enterprise – which started at Minot and included stops at Kirtland Air Force Base, Sandia National Laboratories, and Los Alamos National Laboratories – during which he recognized, on every visit, the central place of the U.S. nuclear enterprise in U.S. national security. “The nuclear mission is the bedrock of American security,” Carter said at Kirtland. “We understand that every day. It is...what everything else rests upon. And I know that and the rest of our leadership knows that and the president knows that and I think the country knows that.”

Carter has evoked this notion of the U.S. nuclear arsenal as “the bedrock of our security” before, and, like his predecessor and other senior leaders, he has also stated that nuclear deterrence is “the highest priority mission of the Department of Defense.” Yet these speeches go further by openly and plainly describing the important things that our nuclear weapons do for our national security. When he stated at Minot, point by point, the essential functions of nuclear weapons – that they “deter large-scale nuclear attack against the United States and our allies,” “convince potential adversaries that they can’t escalate their way out of a failed conventional aggression,” “assure allies that our extended deterrence guarantees are credible,” and “enable...conventional missions around the world” – he broke from past tendencies to gloss over in jargon and overly-caveated language the reasons why we continue to have nuclear weapons. Moreover, he delivered those speeches at the bases and laboratories that serve the nuclear mission, and he said them directly to those who operate our nuclear weapons. What he said, where he said it, and whom he said it to are all consequential – in part because, in the past quarter-century, our leaders have not consistently affirmed the nuclear mission in this way.

As we discuss in our report released this week, *The Evolving U.S. Nuclear Narrative: Communicating the Rationale for the Role and Value of U.S. Nuclear Weapons, 1989 to Today*, the precipitous reduction in nuclear threats to the United States that accompanied the fall of the ideologically-opposed, nuclear-armed Soviet Union left the United States the world’s only superpower based on its conventional military superiority. These shifts immediately and irrevocably changed the way U.S. policymakers thought and spoke about our own nuclear arsenal. Various U.S. government officials at the time welcomed the reduction of the nuclear arsenal in both numbers and prominence: though the United States would continue to have nuclear weapons to hedge against an

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



uncertain future, they stated, the U.S. arsenal had not played so small a role in U.S. security strategy “at any time since their inception.”

Even as the international security environment has been reshaped in the last two decades, our leaders, Democratic and Republican administrations alike, have maintained the view that the United States can and will rely less on nuclear weapons to ensure our national security. This view is most prominently and recently associated with President Obama’s Prague speech of 2009, but the core message traces its roots back more than 25 years to the end of the Cold War. In 2002, Secretary Rumsfeld signaled a proactive shifting away from nuclear-dependent deterrence towards conventional capabilities, pointing to “the terrorists who struck us on September 11th [who] were clearly not deterred by doing so from the massive U.S. nuclear arsenal.” Eight years later, the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review similarly outlined a more limited place for nuclear weapons, stating, “As the role of nuclear weapons is reduced in U.S. national security strategy, these non-nuclear elements will take on a greater share of the deterrence burden.” The public record shows the same refrains repeated, nearly verbatim, across two decades: the role and salience of U.S. nuclear weapons is declining, even as they remain critical to deterring the most dangerous current and imagined nuclear threats. So long as these weapons exist in the world, the United States must retain its arsenal safely, securely, reliably, and effectively.

The rationale for U.S. nuclear weapons has long been dominated by descriptions of decline, reduction, and diminishment that have sought to delineate a circumscribed role for the arsenal – and rightly so. These themes reflected both the security environment of the time, which saw nuclear threats receding from the high-water mark of the Cold War, and the United States’ continual commitment to disarmament, responsible stewardship, and the further reduction of nuclear dangers. For many U.S. policymakers, nuclear terrorism became the foremost “nuclear danger,” and the risks associated with nuclear proliferation were given greater priority, because both seemed more likely than a nuclear war.

We must recognize, however, that while the perceived role and salience of the nuclear mission has diminished following the end of the Cold War, the operational demands required to sustain our nuclear forces have not. The men and women who sustain, secure, and operate the world’s most destructive weapons do so in highly challenging environments and under exacting requirements, ready to execute the nuclear mission on a moment’s notice. Those men and women are charged with an awesome responsibility and a vital mission. These members of our nuclear enterprise share the yearning for a world free of nuclear weapons and safe from nuclear dangers, but until that day the arsenal they steward serves as the critical foundation for U.S. power and influence and underwrites the United States’ national survivability against the greatest, most existential threats. This vital role in our national security remains regardless of the size and dimensions of our nuclear arsenal. They deserve a more persuasive explanation as to why the U.S. nuclear arsenal, regardless of its size or shape, is critical here and now and in the foreseeable future.

Such a coherent rationale has not been sufficiently stated and promulgated across the force. We are far from the first to argue that a healthy, vibrant, and highly motivated nuclear workforce requires a compelling rationale about the essential role and importance of U.S. nuclear weapons in our national security strategy. This rationale must account for an uncertain and increasingly complex threat environment, frame the role of nuclear weapons as limited but essential in coping with 21st century security threats, and signal U.S. resolve in preserving stability while flatly rejecting any impression of a renewed arms race or a return to the Cold War.

That is why Carter’s words, and the context in which they were said, are important. They demonstrate the continued commitment at the highest levels of leadership to publicly affirm the nuclear mission, speaking plainly to what the nuclear arsenal actually does to protect Americans,



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

(CUWS) Outreach Journal

our allies, and our most vital interests. They attest to the department's determination to invest the time, resources, and attention appropriate for its "highest priority mission." And, importantly, they open a dialogue with the people who comprise our nuclear workforce about why their mission is so crucial.

We must continue the conversation, through this administration and the next, where Carter left off. But even that is not enough. Pentagon leadership must inspire a climate of strategic thinking and inquiry, promote more effective deterrence education and exercises across both the nuclear and conventional force, and always ensure that its words of priority are consistently matched with the meaningful needs necessary for a healthy enterprise. Central to this effort are the re-communicators – the junior and mid-grade officers – who must every day translate the strategic necessity of the mission into practical terms for the thousands of young military personnel under their command. These officers need the opportunity to cultivate strategic and policy knowledge through education and training, so that they better understand their mission earlier in their careers and translate it to others more effectively. In addition, the benefits of and responsibilities for nuclear deterrence fall to the entire U.S. military, not just our nuclear operators, and basic literacy regarding the purpose and function of U.S. nuclear weapons is essential to all. The Department of Defense must sustain the essential progress of the last couple of years by continuing to invest in the nuclear workforce's developmental and promotional opportunities, and their maintenance and mission support, so that they see the Secretary's message reflected in their quality of life.

The challenges that we face in articulating the strongest, most enduring themes of a rationale for our nuclear weapons are nuanced. But we must continue this dialogue and think deeply about these issues, because the airmen and sailors who carry out the nuclear mission every day on behalf of the American people deserve no less.

Our report, *The Evolving U.S. Nuclear Narrative: Communicating the Rationale for the Role and Value of U.S. Nuclear Weapons, 1989 to Today*, and [its accompanying website](#) are available now through the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Rebecca Hersman is director of the Project on Nuclear Issues and senior adviser with the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). Ms. Hersman joined CSIS in April 2015 from the Department of Defense, where she served as deputy assistant secretary of defense for countering weapons of mass destruction. **Clark Murdock** is a non-resident senior adviser of the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and the former director of the Project on Nuclear Issues. Prior to joining CSIS in January 2001, Murdock taught at the National War College and served in a variety of positions in the Office of the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, and the House Armed Services Committee. **Shanelle Van** is a research assistant with the Project on Nuclear Issues (PONI) at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS). She graduated with a B.A. in public policy and a minor in economics from Duke University.

<http://warontherocks.com/2016/11/more-than-words-why-secretary-carters-affirmation-of-the-nuclear-enterprise-matters/>

[Return to Top](#)



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies
CUWS Outreach Journal
Maxwell AFB, Alabama

The National Interest – Washington, D.C.

OPINION/The Buzz

The Scariest Thing North Korea Could Ever Do: Sell a Nuclear Weapon

By June Park and J. Berkshire Miller

November 6, 2016

As North Korea's economic position worsens, the risk that it sells its nuclear weapons technology grows. Pyongyang conducted its fifth nuclear test on 9 September, accompanied by claims it has developed a warhead that can be mounted onto rockets. This test is estimated to have been at a yield of 25–30 kilotons — significantly larger than previous tests.

While the magnitude of the test alarmed some US policymakers, Washington's foreign policy remains focused on the Middle East. Similarly, North Korea's subsequent missile tests that ended in failure on 15 and 20 October gained little attention.

There appears to be a de facto acceptance by some in the Obama administration that North Korea will not agree to denuclearize — regardless of the concessions. Earlier this month, Obama's top intelligence chief, James Clapper, remarked at an event hosted by the Council on Foreign Relations that “the notion of getting the North Koreans to denuclearize is probably a lost cause.” Despite Clapper's remarks, the Obama administration as a whole continues to insist that a nuclear North Korea is not an option regardless of their unwillingness to disarm.

Meanwhile, concerns remain about the possible transfer of North Korea's nuclear technology and knowledge to non-state actors. Hillary Clinton considers their “quest for a nuclear weapon” a grave threat because “the greatest threat of all would be terrorists getting their hands on loose nuclear material.” So how likely is North Korea to engage in a nuclear arms sale with a terrorist group?

Up until this point, proliferation of North Korea's weapons of mass destruction seemed to be restricted to sovereign states. But this has not stopped apprehension from some in the intelligence community — spurred by Pyongyang's connections to Libya's Gaddafi regime and ties to Syria's failed nuclear weapons program.

Over the years North Korea has created a web of foreign connections to peddle its missiles and components. As talks on denuclearization remain non-existent and foreign sanctions against the regime tighten, there are startling concerns that a cash-strapped Pyongyang may resort to dealing with its finances through the black-market with terrorist groups or organized crime syndicates.

While the threat may seem fanciful — even for a state as repugnant to international rules as North Korea — the risks are real. The official and unofficial transfer of nuclear technology has always been a method of global outreach for North Korea. Nuclear proliferation to non-state actors is a viable option for this regime when it feels threatened, economically cornered and politically unstable. Pyongyang is strapped for funds despite China's less than ideal compliance of UN sanctions — which has kept the little trade they have alive and enabled the state to continue to obtain materials and funds for missile tests.

As tougher sanctions are imposed, North Korea will be pressured into securing funds via alternative channels. When the state's cash flows and resources dry up, selling nuclear technology to the highest bidder may become a tantalizing option for the Kim regime.

In order to prevent such a possibility, the current counter proliferation instruments in place — such as the Proliferation Security Initiative — need to be bolstered by further actions. First, the international community should urge China to fully implement sanctions on North Korea with close

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

observation on the movement of fissile materials across the Sino–North Korean border. An example of this initiative would look like the joint Sino–US probe on the case of Liaoning Hongxiang Group’s extensive trade that allegedly included materials that could be used in the production of nuclear weapons.

Second, the global intelligence community should collaborate and share information regarding the North Korean migrant workers that are spread out across the world — particularly in Russia and the Middle East. They may be the ones who can be incentivized to act as intermediaries for the exchange of North Korea’s nuclear secrets for money. Tracing the potential roots of North Korea’s nuclear transactions through their migrant workers would be the easiest method of detection.

Adequate attention should be given to the potential transfer of weapons of mass destruction technology. This should be in conjunction with information sharing in the intelligence community about Pyongyang’s connections to terrorist groups in order to ensure North Korea does not head down an even more dangerous path.

June Park is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Centre on Asia & Globalisation of the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy at the National University of Singapore. Jonathan Berkshire Miller is an International Affairs Fellow with the Council on Foreign Relations based in Tokyo.

This first appeared in East Asia Forum.

<http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-buzz/the-scariest-thing-north-korea-could-ever-do-sell-nuclear-18313>

[Return to Top](#)

The Japan Times – Tokyo, Japan

OPINION/Commentary

China’s Sole Ally in Asia Might Get More than it Wished For

BY BRAHMA CHELLANEY

November 7, 2016

BERLIN – When China joined hands with the United States earlier this year at the United Nations Security Council to approve the toughest new international sanctions in two decades against North Korea, it implicitly highlighted that Beijing now is left with just one real ally in Asia — Pakistan. Indeed, China has forged with Pakistan one of the closest and most-enduring relationships in international diplomacy.

Mao Zedong famously said China and North Korea were as close as lips are to teeth. Similarly, Beijing now compares its strategic nexus with Pakistan to the closeness between lips and teeth, calling that country its “irreplaceable all-weather friend” and boasting of an “iron brotherhood” with it.

In reality, this is largely a one-sided relationship that is turning Pakistan into China’s client and guinea pig.

For example, Beijing has sold Pakistan outdated or untested nuclear power reactors and prototype weapon systems not deployed by the Chinese military. The two AC-1000 reactors currently under



construction near the southern Pakistani port city of Karachi represent a model China has adapted from French designs but not built at home.

According to a recent Pentagon report, Pakistan is not just “China’s primary customer for conventional weapons,” but also is likely to host a Chinese naval hub geared toward power projection in the Indian Ocean region. It is well documented that China helped build Pakistan’s arsenal of nuclear weapons, with covert Chinese nuclear and missile assistance still persisting.

Pakistan is the linchpin of Chinese President Xi Jinping’s dual Silk Road projects, officially known as “One Belt, One Road.”

By launching work on a \$46 billion “economic corridor” stretching from Xinjiang to Pakistan’s Chinese-built and-run Gwadar port, Xi has made that country the central link between the twin Silk Road initiatives, which aim to employ geoeconomic tools to create a “Sinosphere” of trade, communications, transportation and security links. The corridor will link up Beijing’s maritime and overland Silk Roads, thereby shortening China’s route to the Middle East by 12,000 km and giving it access to the Indian Ocean, where it would be able to challenge India in its own maritime backyard.

Not surprisingly, Xi has gone out of his way to shield Pakistan, including from accusations that its intelligence service was behind recent grisly terrorist attacks in Afghanistan, Bangladesh and India. For example, Xi ensured that the final communique issued at the end of the Oct. 14-15 summit of the five BRICS countries — Brazil, China, India, Russia and South Africa — omitted any reference to state sponsorship of terror or to any Pakistan-based terrorist group, even as it mentioned organizations like the Islamic State and al-Nusra.

A more potent reminder of such support was China’s action last month in blocking proposed U.N. sanctions on a Pakistan-based terrorist leader Masood Azhar, who heads Jaish-e-Mohammed, a covert front organization for Pakistani intelligence service. It was the sixth time since September 2014 that China single-handedly thwarted sanctions against Azhar, despite support for the move by all other members of the Security Council’s Resolution 1267 committee, including the United States, Britain and France. Resolution 1267 mandates U.N. sanctions on the Islamic State, al-Qaida and associated individuals and entities.

The Security Council proscribed Jaish-e-Mohammed way back in 2001, yet the group operates openly from its base in Pakistan’s largest province of Punjab. The need for U.N. sanctions against the group’s chief has been underscored by evidence linking him and his group to two terrorist attacks this year on Indian military bases that killed 27 soldiers.

Despite repeatedly vetoing U.N. action against Azhar, China seems unconcerned that it could be seen as complicit in the killing of the Indian soldiers.

Previously, China also blocked U.N. action against some other Pakistan-based terrorist entities or individuals. For example, it came in the way of the U.N. proscribing United Jihad Council chief Syed Salahuddin and probing how U.N.-designated terrorist Hafiz Saeed is still able to raise funds and organize large public rallies in major Pakistani cities. With China’s help, Pakistan escaped U.N. censure for freeing on bail Zaki-ur Rehman Lakhvi, the mastermind of the 2008 Mumbai terrorist strikes.

In fact, with China boosting its strategic investments in Pakistan, Beijing is stepping up its diplomatic, economic and military support to that country. In the process, it is seeking to cement Pakistan’s status as its client.

For example, China has already secured exclusive rights for the next 40 years to run Gwadar, which could become a hub for Chinese naval operations in the Indian Ocean. The Shanghai Stock Exchange, for its part, is poised to take a 40 percent stake in Pakistan’s bourse.



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

Some analysts like the American author Gordon G. Chang believe that the tide of new Chinese strategic projects, including in divided and disputed Kashmir, is turning Pakistan into China's "newest colony."

Indeed, Beijing has persuaded internally torn Pakistan to set up special security forces, including a new 13,000-strong army division, to protect the Chinese projects. Still, the growing security costs of the "economic corridor" to the Indian Ocean prompted a Chinese state paper in September to warn that China "be prepared for potential setbacks," adding that "it would be unwise to put all its eggs in one basket."

The fact is that the corridor will cement Pakistan's status as Beijing's economic and security client. By tightening China's grip over the country, it will preclude Pakistan from possibly emulating the example of Myanmar or North Korea to escape Beijing's clutches.

Indeed, several years before China unveiled its plan to build the corridor, it started stationing its own troops in the Pakistan-held part of Kashmir, ostensibly to shield its ongoing highway, dam and other projects in the mountainous region.

The implications of China's growing strategic penetration of Pakistan are ominous for the region and for Pakistan's own future. Concern is increasing in Pakistan that, thanks to the Chinese projects, the country is slipping into a massive debt trap that could compromise its sovereignty and future.

Brahma Chellaney, a professor of strategic studies at the New Delhi-based Center for Policy Research and a fellow at the Robert Bosch Academy in Berlin, is the author of nine books, including "Asian Juggernaut," "Water: Asia's New Battleground," and "Water, Peace, and War: Confronting the Global Water Crisis." He is a long-standing contributor to The Japan Times.

<http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2016/11/07/commentary/world-commentary/chinas-sole-ally-asia-might-get-wished/#.WCOVNrRh1mA>

[Return to Top](#)

Real Clear Defense – Chicago, IL

OPINION/Commentary

The Prompt Launch Scare

By Peter Huessy

November 09, 2016

There is little doubt that using nuclear weapons is the most awesome decision an American president would have to make.

But recent news stories about how, in a crisis, a president would have to quickly launch nuclear-armed missiles are dead wrong.

For many years we have heard concerns our nuclear weapons are on a "hair trigger" status, ready to be launched upon computer warning of an enemy attack. It has even been claimed that our nuclear systems are required by policy to launch in just minutes from the time our warning systems detect a nuclear attack on the United States.



Now public and government literature contain a number of references on how long it would take our missiles to be launched once an authentic launch order is received from the president. Without expressing a view as to what the exact number is, suffice to say a president's order could be executed in an extremely timely manner.

However, if there is confirmation the United States is under attack from missiles from Russia or another adversary, the idea has taken hold that since a president *could* launch our nuclear missiles in a matter of minutes, somehow a president *has to* launch our nuclear-armed missiles in such a manner in order to effectively deter our adversaries.

If true, this would certainly place any American president under intense pressure to order a launch quickly once informed an attack is imminent. And if we assume our nuclear posture requires a "prompt" launch response, it is also assumed a president could recklessly launch our nuclear missiles accidentally or by miscalculation.

None of these assumptions are valid. The prompt launch of our nuclear missiles is not required nor is it U.S. policy. There is also no U.S. policy to launch our missiles upon receipt of computer warning or even receipt of a confirmation of an attack. And it has been this way for decades.

Not only that, we now have alternatives to retaliation. As President Reagan argued three decades ago, "Would it not be better to save lives than avenge them?" Thus, since 2004 we have had the capability to stop a limited nuclear missile attack using either our current national missile defenses in Alaska and California or the new regional missile defenses we are building in such countries as Poland and Romania. To emphasize, retaliation is not our only option.

For decades, U.S. strategic deterrent policy has been designed to provide an American president, during a crisis, considerable time for consultations with military and civilian commanders. Since the establishment of the Triad and in the 35 million minutes during which our land and sea-based missiles have been on alert, no American president has ever ordered these missiles to be fired, despite the myriad serious crises we have encountered, including those involving our nuclear-armed adversaries. Additionally, there have been only a few times the United States has even gone on a higher nuclear alert level during a crisis.

Our nuclear Triad of bombers, submarines, and land-based ICBMs are deployed in a manner that makes the expeditious use of nuclear weapons unnecessary. Although these missiles can be launched by a presidential order in a matter of minutes, we spend many tens of billions of dollars annually to make our nuclear systems *highly survivable*. *Thus there is no imperative requiring the president to launch on warning.*

For example, the design of our Triad also means an enemy attack on our submarine, bomber, and ICBM assets are impossible to execute in a way that would disarm the United States. Consequently, there is no rush for an American president to launch "promptly" because our nuclear deterrent forces will survive an initial attack in sufficient numbers to be able to effectively retaliate. In short, there is no fear of "Use 'em or lose 'em." At least 400 land-based missiles will survive. Our submarines in transit to their patrol area and those in their patrol "box" will be fully able to retaliate. And our bombers that get airborne during a crisis are available.

Consequently, there is no "inevitability" of use, as during a crisis we can take prudent measures to expand the airborne deployment of our bombers, put more of our submarines to sea, or put more ICBMs on alert.

Ironically, many of the same critics who worry about the supposed unstable "hair trigger" status of our nuclear forces, are simultaneously proposing to eliminate upwards of 80% of our nuclear deterrent assets, all in the name of "stability."



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies (CUWS) Outreach Journal

But such a reduced force would have the ironic effect of making it easier for an attacker to disarm the United States. Such cuts would reduce our nuclear forces to roughly 10 targets, a dangerously small number which might very well tempt our adversaries to attack us first in a crisis, putting their forces on a “hair trigger”. Ultimately such a small force makes it more difficult for the United States to maintain a secure, survivable second strike retaliatory nuclear deterrent capability.

This all should be well understood. Much of today’s deterrent strategy was laid out by President Reagan in his detailed plan for nuclear deterrence and nuclear reductions in late 1981. The National Security Defense Directives issued by the administration at that time are examined in detail in Sven Kraemer’s new book “Inside the Cold War from Marx to Reagan.”

Kraemer explains the Reagan administration laid out five key principles that guided our strategic nuclear deterrent strategy then and still do today. First, nuclear modernization is the critical partner with arms control reductions. Second, arms control counting rules favor strategic bombers, enhancing stability as these forces are recallable and man operated. Third, land-based missiles are limited to one warhead, further diminishing the temptation to use them as first strike weapons. Fourth, a significant percentage of our nuclear deterrent goes to sea, also increasing crisis stability and emphasizing the retaliatory nature of nuclear deterrence. And fifth, missile defenses are deployed in a robust fashion to deal with small scale nuclear attacks for which massive retaliation makes no sense.

The U.S. has followed these principles in every area, but to varying degrees. Russia and China have not. That resulting strategic imbalance—where Russia has a huge inventory of multiple warhead land-based missiles—requires the U.S. to continue its strategic modernization effort that this administration and Congress, on a bi-partisan basis, have repeatedly endorsed.

Some critics support killing key parts of this modernization effort, specifically the cruise missile carrying bomber, or have said the nuclear modernization effort—at 4% of the defense budget—is too expensive.

Incongruously, these same critics have worried about a nuclear deterrent that once fired cannot be called back—but the manned bomber, the one weapon leg of the Triad which may be recalled, is the very weapon system they wish to truncate.

We know Russia has repeatedly threatened the U.S. and its allies with nuclear weapons, particularly those of a regional nature. We also know the previous “reset” strategy didn’t work with Russia.

But despite that, the current overall nuclear modernization strategy is the right one. And we should also emphasize our strategy relies on a modernized credible retaliatory response and not on any kind of unnecessary “quick launch” strategy.

Thus, during the 70 years of the nuclear age, no adversary has attacked the U.S. with nuclear weapons. Why? Well, our nuclear strategy works, and has worked perfectly. Every adversary knows we have the capability and the will to retaliate with devastating force to any attack on our country.

In addition, no president has ever been put in a position where we had to launch our nuclear weapons in a crisis because we did not have the time to carefully consider our security options.

No use has been the best use. No launch has been the best launch.

Because of the complementary legs of the American Triad—more than 500 highly survivable multiple platforms spread out over land, sea, and air—a modernized force would ensure that during a crisis, no immediate decision to launch would be required. Our deterrent force and



USAF Center for Unconventional Weapons Studies

CUWS Outreach Journal

Maxwell AFB, Alabama

strategy are thus jointly designed precisely to avoid any prompt launch pressures. That is why the system works. As General Larry Welch, former SAC Commander has noted, "It has worked perfectly—for 70 years."

Peter R. Huessy is President of Geostrategic Analysis and a guest lecturer at the U.S. Naval Academy. He was formerly Senior Fellow in National Security at the American Foreign Policy Council.

http://www.realcleardefense.com/articles/2016/11/09/the_prompt_launch_scare_110326.html

[Return to Top](#)

ABOUT THE USAF CUWS

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

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

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

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

Issue No.1241, 10 November 2016

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

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

Phone: 334.953.7538