



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

Articles & Other Documents:

Featured Article: [Congress, Pentagon Battle over ICBM Study](#)

1. [Netanyahu Says Israel Won't Let Iran Get Nuclear Arms](#)
2. [Iran Elected as UN First Committee Rapporteur](#)
3. [No Real Progress in 'Constructive' Iran-IAEA Talks: Diplomats](#)
4. [EU Minister: West may Drop Demand for Iran to Halt all Nuclear Work](#)
5. [Iran Will Be Judged By its Actions, Kerry Tells Israel](#)
6. [Most Israelis 'Support Iran Strike'](#)
7. [S. Korea, U.S. to Preemptively Respond to Signs of DPRK's Nuclear Threats](#)
8. [U.S., N. Korea Hold Two Days of Informal Nuclear Talks in London](#)
9. [North Korea Reactivates Nuclear Plant, Satellite Photos Indicate](#)
10. [N. Korea Warns 'Imbecile' Park of Confrontation](#)
11. [Former US Official: S. Korean Technology Could Set Back Denuclearization](#)
12. [Pakistani Amb. Denies Nuke Ties with NK](#)
13. [Russia—New ICBM Set For Testing \(Launch\)](#)
14. [Congress, Pentagon Battle over ICBM Study](#)
15. [US Increases Deployed Nuclear Forces – Scientists](#)
16. [Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System Completes Successful Intercept Flight Tests](#)
17. [Man who Brought al Qaeda to Afghanistan, to Now Run for Country's President](#)
18. [Obama's Doomed Reset](#)
19. [ANALYSIS: China's Nuke Buildup is a Concern, but a Nuclear-Armed Japan is Not the Answer](#)
20. [Deterrence Is Not a Fantasy](#)
21. [India's Missile Modernization Beyond Minimum Deterrence](#)

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

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

Issue No.1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Arab News – Jeddah, Saudi Arabia

Netanyahu Says Israel Won't Let Iran Get Nuclear Arms

By EDITH M. LEDERER, Associated Press (AP)

Tuesday, 1 October 2013

UNITED NATIONS: Israel's prime minister declared Tuesday that his country will never allow Iran to get nuclear weapons, even if it has to act alone, and dismissed Iranian President Hassan Rouhani's "charm offensive" as a ruse to get relief from sanctions.

Benjamin Netanyahu told the UN General Assembly that Israel's future is threatened by a "nuclear-armed" Iran seeking its destruction and urged the international community to keep up pressure on Tehran through sanctions. He said the greater the pressure, the greater the chance for diplomacy to succeed.

He called Rouhani "a loyal servant of the regime" and asserted that he must have known about the murder of 85 people in a terror attack on the Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires and the killing of 19 American soldiers in Saudi Arabia in 1996 because he was head Iran's Supreme National Security Council from 1989-2003.

The US has also accused Iran of sponsoring acts of terrorism around the world throughout the 1990s. Iran and its proxy Hezbollah were blamed for a 1992 attack on the Israeli Embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina, that killed 29 people, and the attack on a Jewish community center there two years later.

Some analysts linked Iran's Quds Force to helping direct the 1996 bombings of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia that killed 19 American military personnel.

Netanyahu said Rouhani condemned the "violent scourge of terrorism" and added: "Yet in the last three years alone, Iran has ordered, planned or perpetrated terrorist attacks in 25 countries on five continents," he charged, without providing any details.

Netanyahu accused Rouhani of masterminding Iran's strategy to advance the country's nuclear weapons program and said his goal was the same as his hard-line predecessor, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

"Ahmadinejad was a wolf in wolf's clothing. Rouhani is a wolf in sheep's clothing, a wolf who thinks he can pull the wool over the eyes of the international community," Netanyahu said.

He stressed that all Iranian presidents serve the same "unforgiving regime" where the supreme leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, is a dictator and the real power.

Iran's UN Ambassador Mohammad Khazaei shot back: "Unlike Israel, Iran would not and did not attack any country."

"It is not due to its inability, but due to its principled policy in rejecting any use of force..." he told the assembly, exercising Iran's right of reply. "Therefore the Israeli prime minister had better not even think about attacking Iran let alone planning for that."

Netanyahu also accused Iran of lamenting the human tragedy in Syria, but at the same time directly participating in President Bashar Assad's murder and massacre of tens of thousands of innocent men, women and children. He said Iran's regime is propping up the Syrian regime that just used chemical weapons against its own people.

Netanyahu took apart Rouhani's speech to the General Assembly last week, saying he wished he could believe the Iranian president's words "but we must focus on Iran's actions — and it's the brazen contrast, this extraordinary contradiction between Rouhani's words and Iran's actions that is so startling."

Netanyahu said Iran has not crossed the "red line" that he set at last year's General Assembly but claimed Rouhani has done nothing to stop the country's uranium enrichment program or its development of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) "whose sole purpose is to deliver nuclear warheads."

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“And Iran is building now ICBMs that the United States says could reach this city (New York) in three or four years,” Netanyahu said.

Associated Press Peter James Spielmann and Marjorie Olster contributed to this report.

<http://www.arabnews.com/news/466408>

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

Press TV – Iran

Iran Elected as UN First Committee Rapporteur

Wednesday, October 2, 2013

Iran has been elected as the rapporteur of the UN First Committee on Disarmament and International Security shortly after Israeli Premier Benjamin Netanyahu’s inflammatory speech against Tehran.

The First Committee includes all 193 UN member states, and a new rapporteur is elected for each annual session of the UN General Assembly.

The UN committee deals with all disarmament and international security issues, cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, and principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments.

The election came on Tuesday shortly after Netanyahu addressing the 68th Session of the UN General Assembly once again accused Iran of seeking to develop an atomic bomb and demanded Tehran dismantle its entire nuclear program.

Netanyahu added that a "nuclear-armed" Iran would be a threat to Israel’s future and called on the international community to keep up pressure on Tehran through sanctions.

Netanyahu's salvo of threats and accusations against Iran comes as Tehran has categorically rejected allegations leveled by the US, Israel and some of their allies against its nuclear energy program, arguing that the program geared to peaceful purposes only.

On July 30, a spokesman for the Iranian UN mission announced Tehran’s bid to apply for the position of the rapporteur of the First Committee.

In 2012, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to hold a high-level meeting on global nuclear disarmament for the first time upon a request by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) member states.

As the head of NAM, Iran’s President Hassan Rouhani was one of the speakers at the meeting which was held on September 26 in the UN headquarters in New York.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/2013/10/02/327151/iran-named-un-committee-rapporteur/>

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

The Daily Star – Lebanon

No Real Progress in 'Constructive' Iran-IAEA Talks: Diplomats

By Fredrik Dahl, Reuters

October 02, 2013

VIENNA: The U.N. atomic watchdog and Iran appeared to make little real headway in talks last week and it is uncertain whether Tehran's more positive attitude will help yield a long-sought breakthrough, diplomats said on Wednesday.

Iran told the International Atomic Energy Agency in Friday's meeting it wanted to achieve substantive results within months in the talks on a stalled IAEA inquiry into suspected atomic bomb research by the Islamic state, one envoy said.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

But he and others briefed on the closed-door discussions stressed that hopes had been raised before in Iran-IAEA meetings since early 2012, only to be dashed by what Western states saw as Iranian stonewalling. Iran denies any nuclear weapon aims.

The first talks between Iran and the IAEA since Hassan Rouhani took office as Iranian president were watched in the West for any sign of a shift by Tehran from the defiance of his hardline predecessor, Mahmoud Ahmadinejad.

The election in June of Rouhani, a relative moderate who has pledged to try to end the decade-old nuclear dispute with the West, has fuelled hopes of a peaceful resolution to a protracted row that could otherwise flare into a new Middle East war.

One Western diplomat said he had the impression that Iran and the IAEA were relatively "optimistic" after the meeting in Vienna, where the U.N. agency is based. Another envoy said the discussions had been focused and the atmosphere positive.

Both sides, including the new head of Iran's delegation, described their discussions as "constructive" and said the next meeting would be held on Oct. 28 but gave no detail.

The IAEA talks are distinct from Iran's meetings with world powers, but both diplomatic tracks centre on suspicions that Iran may be seeking the capability to assemble nuclear bombs behind the facade of a civilian atomic energy programme.

Iran says its nuclear programme is a peaceful bid to generate electricity, and not aimed at building weapons. But its refusal to curb sensitive nuclear work and lack of full openness with the IAEA has drawn increasingly harsh Western sanctions.

The Iran-IAEA meeting was a "good harbinger of better relations", said Mark Fitzpatrick of the International Institute for Strategic Studies, a London-based think tank.

"There is a new mood of optimism in Vienna that finally there is a way forward," Fitzpatrick said.

The IAEA wants access to sites and officials for its probe into what it calls the possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear programme. Iran has dismissed allegations that it may have worked on designing a nuclear bomb as forged or baseless.

Eleven meetings since January last year have failed to end the deadlock over how the IAEA should conduct the investigation.

But Iran has pledged, since Rouhani took office in August, to increase its cooperation with the IAEA and it appointed a new envoy to the U.N. agency in August.

The next IAEA talks will take place about two weeks after Iran meets six world powers in Geneva in mid-October.

Western diplomats have long suspected that Iran might only agree to provide the IAEA with the access it wants as part of a broader settlement that wins it significant sanctions easing in return for scaling back its nuclear programme.

The six powers - the United States, France, Britain, Germany, China and Russia - "have to make sure that their desire to solve this crisis once and for all doesn't sacrifice" the IAEA's investigation, nuclear expert Mark Hibbs of the Carnegie Endowment think tank said.

"The IAEA can't simply ignore what Iran has done in the past because it is politically expedient," Hibbs said.

<http://www.dailystar.com.lb/News/Middle-East/2013/Oct-02/233306-no-real-progress-in-constructive-iran-iaea-talks-diplomats.ashx#axzz2gAM20YTm>

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

Ha'aretz Daily News – Israel

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



EU Minister: West may Drop Demand for Iran to Halt all Nuclear Work

Iran may be able to persist with its nuclear program if it can prove it is peaceful, says Lithuanian Foreign Minister Linas Linkevicius.

By Reuters

October 2, 2013

Western governments are considering allowing Iran to continue some uranium enrichment, as part of a possible deal to resolve a decade-old dispute that Tehran says it wants to reach within six months, a senior EU diplomat said.

The new stance - a reaction to President Hassan Rohani's overtures to the West - would mean easing a long-standing demand that Iran suspend all enrichment, due to concerns Tehran could be developing nuclear weapons.

In an interview with Reuters, Lithuanian Foreign Minister Linas Linkevicius said: "I believe part of the game is that if the Iranians prove that whatever they are doing is peaceful, it will, as I understand, be possible for them to conduct it."

"It's conditional. It is not a done deal, but nevertheless it is a possibility to explore," he said. "Thanks to this rapprochement. How it will look, we don't know."

Lithuania holds the rotating presidency of the European Union until the end of this year, giving Linkevicius a closer insight into many internal policy debates.

A series of UN Security Council resolutions call on Iran to halt enrichment. One of them demands "full and sustained suspension of all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities."

Iran has refused to comply, saying its membership of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty (NPT) gives it the right to pursue peaceful nuclear technology. That refusal has drawn several rounds of UN and Western sanctions.

Rohani, a relative moderate elected in June, has reiterated Iran's insistence that it does not seek nuclear weapons, but has promised to clear up international concerns, hoping for an easing of sanctions that have hit its ability to export oil.

Western diplomats are cautious about the rapprochement, saying Iran has yet to offer any concrete proposals.

But, privately, many acknowledge that Tehran would likely need to be allowed to keep some lower-level enrichment activity as part of a broader political settlement, as long as UN inspectors were allowed sufficient oversight powers.

Israel, which says the prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to its existence, is insistent that nothing short of an end to enrichment is acceptable.

In a series of negotiations since April last year, six world powers have told Iran to stop enriching uranium to 20 percent fissile purity - a level that closes an important technological gap towards making weapons-grade material.

That demand will not change, diplomats say. But, in theory, Iran could be allowed to continue lower-level enrichment, up to 5 percent, to produce fuel suitable for nuclear power plants.

The next round of the talks between Iran and the six world powers, will be held in Geneva on October 15-16.

<http://www.haaretz.com/news/middle-east/1.550163>

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

The Express Tribune – Pakistan

Iran Will Be Judged By its Actions, Kerry Tells Israel

By Agence France-Presse (AFP)

October 3, 2013

TOKYO: The United States will not take Iran at its word over pledges of openness on a believed nuclear weapons programme, Secretary of State John Kerry said Thursday, after Israel threatened to act against Tehran.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The top US diplomat said the new mood of co-operation that was on display around the United Nations General Assembly in New York had to be backed up by quantifiable deeds.

"I assure (Prime Minister Benjamin) Netanyahu and the people of Israel that nothing that we do is going to be based on trust," Kerry told reporters in Tokyo.

"This is going to be based on a series of steps to guarantee to all of us that we have certainty on what's happening."

Kerry, in Tokyo for talks on the US-Japan security alliance, was speaking after Netanyahu told a UN summit Israel was ready to go it alone to stop Iran from making a atomic bomb.

"Israel will not allow Iran to get nuclear weapons. If Israel is forced to stand alone, Israel will stand alone," he said after days of overtures by Iranian President Hassan Rouhani, which included a number of US television interviews.

Western negotiators are to hold new talks with Iranian representatives in Geneva this month in a first test of the overtures.

International sanctions over what the West says is a nuclear weapons programme have badly hit Iran's economy and its leaders have made it clear they are looking for relief.

Kerry on Thursday moved to reassure Israel, saying no-one in the US administration would be won over solely by the change in tone since Iran's new leader came to power, a period that has been marked by a huge upswing in diplomacy from the pariah state.

"We're going to look very, very carefully at this. We hope it could work because we think the world will be better off, the Middle East will be better off, Iran will be better off, Israel will be better off, if there is a way to achieve a verified, certainty to the elimination of a nuclear programme for weapons purposes in Iran," Kerry said.

"The test we face now over these next weeks and months, not a long period of time, over a short period of time, is to determine whether or not that is in fact what Iran intends."

Kerry praised Rouhani for "reaching out" and said there were voices in the Iranian administration who wanted to go down "different roads", but he said US President Barack Obama was clear that he wanted results, and not just rhetoric.

"The president has said, and I have said, that it's not words that will make a difference, it's actions.

"The actions clearly are going to have to be sufficient that the world will understand that not only will they not be able to be on the road to get a weapon but there's no ability to suddenly break up that," he said.

Last year Netanyahu used a cartoon drawing of a bomb to illustrate his warning at the UN that Iran was close to being able to build a deployable nuclear weapon.

There were no similar theatrics this time, but Iran hit back, warning Netanyahu that military action against it would be a "miscalculation".

After a cabinet meeting in Tehran on Wednesday, Rouhani, who took office in June on a pledge to repair strained relations with the international community, dismissed Netanyahu's comments as bluster.

"We don't expect anything else from the Zionist regime," Rouhani told reporters.

Israel is "upset and angry because it sees that its blunted sword is being replaced with logic as the governing force in the world, and because the Iranian nation's message of peace is being heard better," the moderate cleric said.

Rouhani's UN charm offensive culminated in a landmark 15-minute phone call with Obama, the first president-to-president contact between the two countries in more than three decades.

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/612966/iran-will-be-judged-by-its-actions-kerry-tells-israel/>

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

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



France 24/7.com – France

Most Israelis 'Support Iran Strike'

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

October 4, 2013

AFP - A majority of Israelis would support unilateral military action against Iran, according to a poll published Friday after Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu said his government was ready to act alone.

Some 65.6 percent of 500 Jewish Israelis surveyed by the pro-government Israel HaYom newspaper said they would support military strikes to halt Iran's nuclear programme, and 84 percent believed the Islamic republic had no intention of reining in its alleged drive to build a bomb.

Israel and many Western countries accuse Tehran of trying to develop a nuclear warhead, a charge Iran denies.

Netanyahu in a speech to the UN General Assembly on Tuesday said Israel was ready to act alone to stop Iran making a bomb, in a warning against rushing into deals with Tehran's new leaders.

"Israel will not allow Iran to get nuclear weapons. If Israel is forced to stand alone, Israel will stand alone," Netanyahu told a UN summit, in an attack on overtures made by Iran's President Hassan Rouhani.

Israel has repeatedly advocated military force and has threatened unilateral strikes against the Islamic republic.

A nuclear-armed Iran would be a bigger threat than North Korea, Netanyahu added, in an alarmist speech designed to counter Rouhani's recent diplomatic offensive, which has included a direct phone call with US President Barack Obama.

"As dangerous as a nuclear-armed North Korea is, it pales in comparison to the danger of a nuclear-armed Iran," he said.

"A nuclear-armed Iran in the Middle East wouldn't be another North Korea -- it would be another 50 North Koreas."

North Korea, which like Iran faces wide-ranging UN sanctions over its nuclear program, is believed to have several nuclear bombs and to have shared technology with Iran.

Some 51.4 percent of respondents in HaYom survey said Netanyahu had given a "good speech" at the UN, with only 10.9 percent disagreeing.

HaYom conducted the opinion poll on Wednesday. The margin of error was 4.4 percent.

<http://www.france24.com/en/20131004-most-israelis-support-iran-strike>

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

Xinhua News – China

S. Korea, U.S. to Preemptively Respond to Signs of DPRK's Nuclear Threats

October 2, 2013

SEOUL, Oct. 2 (Xinhua) -- South Korea and the United States agreed on Wednesday to take preemptive measures with all military capabilities available if signs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK)'s nuclear strikes are detected.

South Korean Defense Minister Kim Kwan-jin and his U.S. counterpart Chuck Hagel signed the so-called "Tailored Deterrence Strategy" against possible threats of the DPRK's nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) during their annual Security Consultative Meeting (SCM).



The strategy outlined tailored deterrence against three possible scenarios of the DPRK's nuclear threats, including threatening, impending usage and usage of nuclear weapons, by mobilizing both diplomatic and military tools.

At the second stage of impending usage, Seoul and Washington may preemptively take military actions such as the American nuclear umbrella, conventional strikes and missile defense capabilities.

Hagel reaffirmed the U.S. commitment to offer extended deterrence to South Korea by mobilizing a full-range of military capabilities, including the U.S. nuclear umbrella, conventional strikes and missile defense, according to the joint communique of the 45th SCM meeting.

Among the U.S. nuclear umbrella were B-2 stealth bombers and B-52 strategic heavy bombers with nuclear strike capabilities, which were sent to South Korea in March to participate in war games and led to the DPRK's threats of a "state of war" with Seoul, along with nuclear-powered submarines and intercontinental ballistic missiles, on the top of which nuclear warhead can be loaded.

Conventional strikes included South Korea's homemade missiles and Aegis destroyers as well as the U.S. nuclear-powered aircraft carriers. The U.S. aircraft carrier USS George Washington was conducting joint military drills with South Korea and Japan on the southern coast of the Korean Peninsula, before carrying out separate joint exercises with South Korean warships next week, said a military official cited by the Yonhap News Agency.

South Korea first made public its homemade missiles targeting the DPRK the previous day. The 300 kilometer-range Hyunmoo2 and the long-range cruise missile Hyunmoo3 with a range of as many as 1,500 kilometers were designed to help South Korea secure anti-weapon capabilities such as the kill chain system, which preemptively detects and intercepts missile and nuclear threats from the DPRK.

Seoul planned to spend almost 1 trillion won (930 million U.S. dollars) next year on the kill chain system, and some 120 billion won of the budget was assigned to the anti-missile defense program, including the purchase of PAC-2 missiles and an upgrade to the PAC-3 system.

Amid mounting fears over the DPRK's nuclear threats, defense chiefs of Seoul and Washington shared views over the delaying of transition of South Korea's wartime operational control slated for Dec. 1, 2015, agreeing to make a final conclusion on the transfer timing within the first half of 2014.

South Korea handed over its wartime command of troops to Washington during the 1950-53 Korean War. Seoul regained its peacetime operational control in 1994.

Seoul initially agreed to retrieve its operational control in time of war in April 2012, but it called for a delay after the deadly sinking of a South Korean warship in 2010.

South Korea offered again in May to postpone the wartime command transfer amid escalating tensions on the Korean Peninsula following the DPRK's third nuclear test in February and its long-range rocket launch in December 2012.

Hagel told reporters at a joint press conference with his South Korean counterpart Kim Kwan-jin that the DPRK's provocations posed threats on global security as well as the Korean peninsula, noting that Pyongyang's use of WMD and chemical weapons cannot be acceptable.

The Pentagon chief said that he seriously saw Seoul's request to delay the transition of the country's wartime operational control, adding that discussions on the issue were anticipated to last down the road.

Seoul's Defense Minister said that the DPRK's third nuclear test clearly changed the current security circumstances on the Korean Peninsula from those in 2007 when South Korea agreed to take back the wartime control from the U.S.

Meanwhile, if the wartime operational control goes back to the hands of South Korea, a new command would be established to control both South Korean armed forces and U.S. Forces Korea. Around 28,500 U.S. servicemen are stationed here in the country.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

The new command will be led by a four-star South Korean general, changing from the current Combined Forces Command that has been controlled by the commander of the U.S. Forces Korea.

http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/world/2013-10/02/c_132768634.htm

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

Global Post – Boston, MA

U.S., N. Korea Hold Two Days of Informal Nuclear Talks in London

Kyodo News International

October 2, 2013

North Korean officials and U.S. civilian experts on Korean issues completed a two-day informal meeting Wednesday in London to discuss the current impasse surrounding Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions.

Stephen Bosworth, who served as special envoy to North Korea under the first Obama administration, said the meeting was "cordial and respectful" without mentioning specifics.

North Korean participants included Ri Yong Ho, the country's vice foreign minister and chief envoy to the stalled six-party nuclear talks.

Bosworth also met with Ri at an informal meeting held in Berlin in late last month. American participants in London included Leon Sigal, a Korean Peninsula expert at the U.S. think tank Social Sciences Research Council.

<http://www.globalpost.com/dispatch/news/kyodo-news-international/131002/us-n-korea-hold-two-days-informal-nuclear-talks-london>

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

Wall Street Journal – Asia

October 3, 2013

North Korea Reactivates Nuclear Plant, Satellite Photos Indicate

By Kwanwoo Jun

Recent satellite images strongly indicate North Korea has reactivated its mothballed nuclear reactor to produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The U.S.-Korea Institute at Johns Hopkins University said Wednesday that the satellite imagery dated Sept. 19 showed the North's Yongbyon nuclear plant, north of Pyongyang, releasing hot water into a nearby river—compelling evidence that "that the facility is becoming operational."

Previous satellite photos in July and August lacked such strong evidence, though some steam was spotted in those images, the think tank said on its website.

Hot water is usually discharged after high-pressure steam passes through a turbine at the plant and condenses into liquid, which is pumped into a drainpipe that flows into a river or ocean.

The U.S.-Korea Institute said previously that the North had completed a new, underground cooling system this summer after demolishing an 18-meter (60-foot) cooling tower in 2008 at the site.

The Yongbyon reactor, built in the 1980s with the Soviet Union's help, is North Korea's only source of plutonium for its weapons program. It has been shut and restarted repeatedly over the past few decades: typically shut after the latest aid-for-disarmament deal with the U.S. and other countries and restarted after the North perceives it has been slighted.

North Korea is believed to have collected enough plutonium-based fissile material from Yongbyon to arm five to 10 small bombs. It has conducted three atomic-bomb tests, the last in February. Two months later, it said it would restart

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

all Yongbyon facilities, including a five-megawatt plutonium reactor, as it aims to boost its nuclear stockpile as a deterrent against any invasion by the U.S. and South Korea.

Analysts have said that even after the aging reactor has been restarted, it will take a few years to produce plutonium for additional bombs.

In 2010, North Korea revealed a facility at Yongbyon for enriching uranium—a second path to making nuclear weapons. A U.S. study said last month that Pyongyang appeared to be able to enrich uranium to weapons-grade levels without importing the main components it needs for that purpose. This means international sanctions aimed at stopping shipments of such components into the country may be superfluous.

Satellite images from July suggest North Korea doubled the floor space of the building that houses uranium operations since March, according to the Institute for Science and International Security.

<http://blogs.wsj.com/korearealtime/2013/10/03/north-korea-restarts-nuclear-plant-photos-show/>

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

South China Morning Post – Hong Kong, China

N. Korea Warns 'Imbecile' Park of Confrontation

Agence France-Presse (AFP)

October 04, 2013

Seoul -- North Korea's top military body launched a blistering personal attack Friday on South Korean President Park Geun-Hye and vowed to push ahead with the country's nuclear weapons programme.

The harsh tone of the attack, attributed to a spokesman from the National Defence Commission (NDC), echoed the bellicose rhetoric employed by Pyongyang when military tensions soared following the North's nuclear test in February.

Referencing Park by name, rather than using the more neutral "chief executive" moniker, the spokesman warned the president that she was steering the Korean peninsula back into a period of dangerous "confrontation".

The commentary, carried by the North's official KCNA news agency, was largely a response to a speech by Park on Tuesday urging Pyongyang to give up its nuclear ambitions.

The president had also talked up the development of a military deterrent capability that would render the North's nuclear weapons "useless".

A day later, visiting US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and his South Korean counterpart Kim Kwan-Jin signed a new strategic plan to counter the growing threat of a North Korean nuclear or chemical weapons attack.

"If Park and her group conspire with outsiders under the pretext of leading (North Korea) to 'change'... and force it to dismantle nuclear weapons, it will be little short of digging their own graves," the NDC spokesman said.

"There will be no bigger fool and poorer imbecile than the one who schemes to side with a nuclear-wielding robber and urge one's own kinsmen to lower a knife first," he added.

South Korea is protected by the US nuclear umbrella and there are currently nearly 30,000 US troops stationed in the country.

The NDC spokesman said North Korea would "invariably advance" its development of nuclear weapons, saying they were a vital deterrent to prevent a US nuclear strike.

Pyongyang has called for a resumption of six-party talks on its nuclear programme, but Washington and Seoul insist that it must first take tangible steps to demonstrate its commitment to denuclearisation.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Analysis of recent satellite images suggests the North has made good on promises to restart a mothballed plutonium reactor and may have doubled its uranium enrichment capacity.

The military tensions in March and April that triggered apocalyptic threats of nuclear war had seemed to ease significantly in recent months.

But a rapprochement signalled by the reopening of a joint industrial zone now appears to have run out of steam.

A scheduled reunion last month for family members separated by the 1950-53 Korean War was cancelled at the last minute by Pyongyang, citing South Korean "hostility".

"The hard-won atmosphere of dialogue and peace is turning into that of confrontation and tension," the NDC spokesman warned Park.

"Park should open her mouth to suit her capacity.

"It is said that a tongue wagged thoughtlessly will become a knife cutting one's own head," he said, adding that the North Korean military stood ready to respond to verbal provocation with a "shower of fire".

<http://www.scmp.com/news/asia/article/1324406/north-korea-warns-imbecile-park-geun-hye-confrontation>

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

Stars and Stripes

Former US Official: S. Korean Technology Could Set Back Denuclearization

By Ashley Rowland, *Stars and Stripes*

October 4, 2013

SEOUL — A former Obama administration official cautioned Friday that South Korea's pursuit of what the U.S. believes is still an experimental nuclear reprocessing technology could set back efforts to denuclearize the peninsula.

Robert Einhorn, a former special adviser to the secretary of state on nonproliferation and arms control, said Seoul's pursuit of pyroprocessing technology could be used by the North as a reason to maintain its nuclear development program.

"We both also want to press North Korea to give up its nuclear weapons capabilities...given the present attitude of the (North Korean) regime, we know this will be very difficult and could take a long time," he told the Asan Institute for Policy Studies in Seoul.

"But as long as we are committed to the complete denuclearization of North Korea — and we are and will remain so — we know that this difficult task will be made even more difficult if the North Koreans can cite active fuel programs in the South."

South Korea believes pyroprocessing is a proliferation-resistant technology that would allow it to further its civil nuclear energy goals. However, the U.S. believes the products of pyroprocessing can, with extra work, be turned into pure plutonium and used for nuclear weapons purposes.

Einhorn, now a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, said he does not believe South Korea has any intention of developing nuclear weapons. President Park Geun-hye has prioritized elements of the country's nuclear program, such as making its nuclear industry competitive globally and dealing with the problem of spent fuel storage.

The U.S. and South Korea are in negotiations over the "123 agreement" that governs what South Korea can and can't do with nuclear technology and material provided by the U.S. The four-decade-old nuclear cooperation pact was set to expire in 2014 but has been extended for another two years.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

Any new agreement must conform to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Act of 1978, which tightened restrictions for nuclear trade with countries that did not yet possess atomic bombs. Its intent was to keep enriched uranium from being used in weapons.

The stumbling block in the negotiations has been South Korea's insistence it be given "advanced consent" to enrich uranium and reprocess spent nuclear fuel. Washington wants the current restrictions to stand, and many in South Korea view those efforts as a lack of respect for its status as a developed nation and a partner with the U.S.

Einhorn noted that the disagreement over enrichment and reprocessing "does have the potential to disrupt our nuclear cooperation and become a substantial irritant in our bilateral relationship," but said he is optimistic the two will reach an agreement.

In the meantime, the U.S. wants to continue studying the issues and defer a decision on consent, he said.

Einhorn was a chief negotiator on the 123 agreement issue and has been involved in negotiations with Iran and North Korea, as well as developing sanctions policy. He served as assistant secretary of state for nonproliferation under former President Bill Clinton and was a chief negotiator with North Korea during that time.

Wyatt Olson contributed to this report.

<http://www.stripes.com/news/pacific/former-us-official-s-korean-technology-could-set-back-denuclearization-1.245047>

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

The Korea Times – South Korea
October 3, 2013

Pakistani Amb. Denies Nuke Ties with NK

By Chung Min-uck

Pakistani Ambassador to Seoul Shaukat Ali Mukadam said his country has never been involved in any nuclear activities with North Korea.

"There has never been and never will be nuclear cooperation with North Korea" said Mukadam in an interview.

Concerning Islamabad's current relations with Pyongyang, he said they are "at a low-ebb" and that "there is not much activity going on between the two nations."

Pakistan is one of the few countries that have diplomatic relations with the communist country.

Although the nuclear-weapons state has an official embassy in the North, Mukadam said, the ambassador's position has remained vacant for more than a year, indicating that their bilateral ties suffered a major setback in the intervening years.

At present, in Pyongyang, there is only one second secretary-level officer from Pakistan running the embassy with two staff members and one local driver, he said.

"We don't know whether an ambassador will be appointed or not," said Mukadam. "So it is just for presentation and there are hardly any people-to-people exchanges or high-level government exchanges taking place."

Islamabad officially condemned North Korea's latest nuclear test conducted on Feb. 12, saying that it "regrets" the move and "supports a nuclear weapons free Korean Peninsula."

The Pakistani ambassador said he was irritated to see "incorrect" local media reports that South Korea and India have established an intelligence-sharing relationship in monitoring Pyongyang-Islamabad ties regarding possible nuclear proliferation during a visit by a high-ranking Indian security official to Seoul in July.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

“We were upset about the press report,” he said. “We checked with Cheong Wa Dae and Ministry of Foreign Affairs and they said they did not discuss it.”

There is military tension between India and Pakistan along their disputed borderline in Kashmir and they have fought three wars previously.

Meanwhile, the ambassador also said his country wants cooperation with South Korea in all areas including industry, trade, education and the military.

Investment-wise, he said Pakistan wants to seek maximum benefits from South Korea’s capabilities in the power sector and infrastructure development.

“Pakistan is currently facing a power shortage due to a surge in demand in the power sector,” Mukadam said. “South Korean companies have the capacity and know-how to revamp the power sector in our country.”

At present, many South Korean conglomerates are investing in Pakistan in hydro power plant, roads, infrastructure and chemicals plants, according to the Pakistani embassy in Seoul, with direct and indirect investment in the last 3 years at \$3 billion.

Mukadam will complete his three-year tenure as Pakistani ambassador to Seoul and proceed to his new post in Astana, Kazakhstan, this month.

http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2013/10/120_143687.html

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

SatNews Daily.com

Russia—New ICBM Set For Testing (Launch)

October 2, 2013

[SatNews] The test launch of Russia’s newest intercontinental ballistic missile, codenamed Rubezh, could occur prior to the end of the year, a high-ranking defense industry official told RIA Novosti.

The RS-26, a solid-propellant ICBM, will supplement the Yars and Topol-M missiles that are currently in service with Russia’s Strategic Missile Forces, the official said. RS-26 specifications are currently classified, but an unnamed missile industry expert cited by Vedomosti newspaper said the new missile would most likely be equipped with a new warhead and system to override missile defenses.

The expert cited by Vedomosti also played down speculation that RS-26 was designed in violation of the 1987 Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty, which prohibits the United States and Russia from owning ballistic missiles with ranges between 500 kilometers and 5,500 kilometers.

In June, Russia tested elements of a new ICBM that Deputy Prime Minister Dmitry Rogozin, who oversees the defense industry, hailed as a “missile defense killer.” The Defense Ministry was more reserved in its appraisal of the test, carried out at the Kapustin Yar facility, between Volgograd and Astrakhan, saying only “the [simulated] warhead hit a designated target within the set time frame.”

The missile is to be manufactured at the Votkinsk plant in the Urals republic of Udmurtia, where all solid-propellant missiles are made, the official said.

<http://www.satnews.com/story.php?number=58888056&menu=1>

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

Great Falls Tribune – Great Falls, MT

Congress, Pentagon Battle over ICBM Study

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

By Jenn Rowell, Tribune Staff Writer
October 2, 2013

Defense and congressional officials exchanged letters over the last week regarding an environmental study related to the intercontinental ballistic missile force.

Sens. Jon Tester and Max Baucus sent a letter to Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel telling him to drop an environmental impact study related to ICBMs that the Montana congressional delegation and congressmen from other nuclear states say is an attempt to reduce the nation's ICBM force.

Both the Senate and House versions of defense appropriations bills prohibited the DOD from conducting the study with fiscal year 2014 funds. That fiscal year started Tuesday.

The Montana congressional delegation has been involved in passing legislation requiring the DOD to maintain the current level of 450 ICBMs for fiscal year 2014.

The \$1.5 million study was included in the Air Force budget and was tucked into the \$14.7 million budget line for intercontinental ballistic missile elimination required by the New START Treaty.

The funding was listed for "engineering and design work for intercontinental ballistic missiles silo elimination."

Rep. Steve Daines, R-Mont. said that the study was "widely seen as a backdoor attempt to reduce our ICBM fleet."

Recently, congressmen heard the Air Force was moving forward with the study using different monies, and that's what prompted the letter to Hagel last week.

"Given the Defense Department's perceived intention to disregard Congressional will and move forward on the EIS, and considering the implications such a decision could have on national security, we request an immediate response, and an assurance that such a premature and unnecessary move will not be carried out," Tester and Baucus wrote Hagel.

Other members of the Senate ICBM Coalition who signed the letter to Hagel are Sens. Heidi Heitkamp, D-N.D., John Barrasso, R-Wyo., John Hoeven, R-N.D., Mary Landrieu, D-La., Mike Johanns, R-Neb., Deb Fischer, R-Neb., and Orrin Hatch, R-Utah.

In response to the Tribune's questions about the scope of the study, funding and the timeline of the study, officials at Air Force headquarters at the Pentagon said, "the Department of Defense is assessing the appropriate force structure under New START. While we don't know what the final force structure will be at this time, the Air Force remains committed to maintaining safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrence capabilities that include the ICBM leg of the nation's nuclear triad. Conducting an environmental assessment does not necessarily mean a change to ICBM missions or operations. However, the information is needed by national security leaders to fully assess all options that meet New START limits. Funding and timelines have yet to be determined."

This week, Tester and Baucus received a response from the Air Force indicating that the Air Force would not reprogram fiscal year 2013 funds for the study, according to Tester's staff.

Air Force officials have a baseline plan to retain 420 ICBMs across three missile wings. Currently, the U.S. has 450 ICBMs operated and maintained by the missile wings at Malmstrom Air Force Base, F.E. Warren AFB in Wyoming and Minot AFB in North Dakota.

No further details about where the 30 ICBM reduction will come from have been released by the Pentagon.

According to the treaty terms, the United States and Russia must reduce nuclear armaments to no more than 1,550 deployed warheads; 800 deployed and nondeployed intercontinental ballistic missile launchers, submarine-launched ballistic missile launchers and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments; and to have reduced their deployed ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers equipped for nuclear armaments to no more than 700.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

State Department figures released Oct. 1 indicate that the U.S. nuclear arsenal has increased since March, while Russia's has decreased in all areas affected by New Start.

The figures now show that the U.S. has 809 deployed ICBMs, heavy bombers and submarine launched ballistic missiles, up from 792 in March.

Russia now has 473, down from 492 in March. The U.S. has 1,688 warheads on deployed ICBMs, heavy bombers or SLBMs, up from 1,654 in March. Russia has 1,400, down from 1,480.

The U.S. has 1,015 deployed and nondeployed launchers of ICBMs, SLBMs and heavy bombers, down from 1,028. Russia has 894, down from 900.

<http://www.greatfalls Tribune.com/article/20131002/NEWS01/310020040>

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

Azerbaijan Press Agency (APA) – Azerbaijan

US Increases Deployed Nuclear Forces – Scientists

03 October 2013

Baku - APA. The United States has in the past six months increased its deployed nuclear forces and is moving slowly to implement the New START nuclear disarmament treaty even as Russia cuts its own forces well beyond treaty limits, according to fresh official data and experts, APA reports quoting RIA Novosti.

It is the first time the United States increased its deployed forces in a six-month counting period since the new treaty went into effect in Feb. 2011 and helps illustrate slow US implementation of the pact, the respected Federation of American Scientists (FAS) said in a blog post this week on its website.

“In a truly bizarre twist, US lawmakers and others opposing additional nuclear reductions by the Obama administration could end up help providing [sic] the excuse for the very Russia nuclear modernization they warn against,” the article stated.

The New START Treaty was signed by US President Barack Obama and former Russian President Dmitry Medvedev in April 2010 and was held up by both sides as the centerpiece of their vaunted campaign to “reset” rocky US-Russian relations. Hawkish US lawmakers have criticized Obama for signing the pact.

The US increase in deployed nuclear forces for the latest six-month counting period was an “anomaly” probably due to fluctuations in the number of missiles onboard ballistic missile submarines and does not mean the United States has begun building up its nuclear forces, the FAS article noted.

But the disparity in the way the two sides are implementing the New START Treaty points to a glaring gap in their deployed air-, land- and sea-based nuclear weapons and is in itself a cause of concern, it said.

Based on the latest data, the United States is currently counted with 336 deployed nuclear launchers more than Russia, while Russia is already 227 deployed missiles and bombers below the 700 limit established by the treaty for 2018, the article stated.

“For most people this might not matter much and even sound a little Cold War’ish. But for military planners who have to entertain potential worst-case threat scenarios, the growing missile-warhead disparity between the two countries is of increasing concern,” it added.

The Federation of American Scientists describes itself as a nonprofit organization that was founded in 1945 by many of the scientists involved in the Manhattan Project of research and development that resulted in production of the world's first nuclear bomb.

http://en.apa.az/xeber_us_increases_deployed_nuclear_forces_s_200524.html

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

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

OfficialWire.com

Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense System Completes Successful Intercept Flight Tests

Official Wire

October 4, 2013

Washington, D.C. (United States) (OFFICIAL WIRE) -- The Missile Defense Agency (MDA), U.S. Pacific Command, and U.S. Navy sailors aboard the USS Lake Erie (CG 70) successfully conducted an operational flight test of the Aegis Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) system, resulting in the intercept of a medium-range ballistic missile target over the Pacific Ocean by the Aegis BMD 4.0 Weapon System and a Standard Missile-3 (SM-3) Block IB guided missile.

At approximately 7:33 p.m. Hawaii Standard Time, Oct. 3 (1:33 a.m. EDT, Oct.4), a medium-range ballistic missile target was launched from the Pacific Missile Range Facility on Kauai, Hawaii. The target flew northwest towards a broad ocean area of the Pacific Ocean. Following target launch, the USS Lake Erie detected and tracked the missile with its onboard AN/SPY-1 radar. The ship, equipped with the second-generation Aegis BMD weapon system, developed a fire control solution and launched the SM-3 Block IB guided missile to engage the target. The SM-3 maneuvered to a point in space and released its kinetic warhead. The kinetic warhead acquired the target reentry vehicle, diverted into its path, and, using only the force of a direct impact, engaged and destroyed the target.

Program officials will assess and evaluate system performance based upon telemetry and other data obtained during the test.

This test exercised the latest version of the second-generation Aegis BMD Weapon System, capable of engaging longer range and more sophisticated ballistic missiles.

Today's event, designated Flight Test – Standard Missile-22 (FTM-22), was the fifth consecutive successful intercept test of the SM-3 Block IB guided missile with the Aegis BMD 4.0 Weapon System. Findings of operational tests, FTM-21 and 22 will support follow-on production decisions for the SM-3 Block IB guided missile.

FTM-22 is the 28th successful intercept in 34 flight test attempts for the Aegis BMD program since flight testing began in 2002. Across all Ballistic Missile Defense System programs, this is the 64th successful hit-to-kill intercept in 80 flight test attempts since 2001.

Aegis BMD is the naval component of the MDA's Ballistic Missile Defense System. The Aegis BMD engagement capability defeats short- to intermediate-range, unitary and separating, midcourse-phase ballistic missile threats with the SM-3, as well as short-range ballistic missiles in the terminal phase with the Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IV missile. The MDA and the U.S. Navy cooperatively manage the Aegis BMD program.

<http://www.officialwire.com/pr/aegis-ballistic-missile-defense-system-completes-successful-intercept-flight-tests/>

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

The Express Tribune – Pakistan

Man who Brought al Qaeda to Afghanistan, to Now Run for Country's President

Abdul Rassoul Sayyaf says he nominates himself to "stand alongside the true servants of Afghanistan".

By Reuters / Agence France-Presse (AFP)

October 3, 2013

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

KABUL: The man said to be responsible for bringing al Qaeda to Afghanistan announced he was running for president on Thursday, triggering alarm among Western diplomats.

Abdul Rasul Sayyaf registered his papers at the Independent Election Commission offices in Kabul and vowed to serve the nation as US-led NATO troops prepare to withdraw after 12 years of war.

"Today I nominate myself in order to serve my countrymen and my nation – I want to stand alongside the true servants of Afghanistan," Abdul Rassoul Sayyaf said minutes before he registered at the offices of Kabul's Independent Election Commission.

Sayyaf was named in the 9/11 commission report as the "mentor" of Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, the mastermind of the 2001 attacks on New York and Washington.

President Hamid Karzai is barred from running by the constitution, and the new government is seen as an opportunity to push the country away from years of damaging allegations of corruption and maladministration.

Next year, millions of Afghans will vote in what is being hailed as the most important election since the United States-led war against the Afghan Taliban began 12 years ago.

NATO and the US are also pushing for a credible vote ahead of the exit of tens of thousands of foreign combat troops by the end of the next year.

Western diplomats have previously spoken of their concerns regarding Sayyaf's nomination, given his deeply conservative views regarding women's rights and social freedoms, and his deep ties to militant Islam.

A conservative Islamic scholar, Sayyaf ran paramilitary training camps in Afghanistan and Pakistan in the 1980s and 1990s, and it was there he met al Qaeda leader Osama bin Laden.

In 1996, Sayyaf helped bin Laden return to Afghanistan after he was ejected from Sudan. Bin Laden stayed in the country under the protection of the Taliban until the American-led invasion of late 2001.

But Sayyaf fought against the Taliban and later emerged as a close ally of President Hamid Karzai.

Sayyaf's nominee for first vice president, Ismail Khan, will also worry the country's Western backers.

Khan, from the country's west, is a warlord turned politician who has been accused of seeking to re-arm ahead of the NATO withdrawal.

Sayyaf's nomination comes two days after the first of the serious contenders, former Northern Alliance leader Abdullah Abdullah, announced his candidacy.

Other likely front runners, including foreign minister Zalmay Rassoul, Western-leaning liberal Ashraf Ghani and Karzai's brother, Qayum, are likely to register over the next few days, with nominations closing on Sunday.

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/613055/man-who-brought-al-qaeda-to-afghanistan-to-now-runs-for-countrys-president/>

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

The Moscow Times – Russia
OPINION/Commentary

Obama's Doomed Reset

02 October 2013 | Issue 5226

By Sergei Karaganov

When he canceled his scheduled summit in Moscow in early September with President Vladimir Putin, U.S. President Barack Obama effectively terminated his four-year effort to "reset" the bilateral relationship. The meeting of the two

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

presidents at the recent Group of 20 summit in St. Petersburg was civil but did not change the situation. The exchange of rhetorical barbs has continued, despite Russia's new initiative on Syria's chemical weapons.

The failure of the "reset" should come as no surprise, owing to its deeply flawed foundations. The bilateral relationship had been faltering long before Russia gave former U.S. Intelligence leaker Edward Snowden temporary asylum in early August. In 2011, after the U.S. and its allies convinced then-President Dmitry Medvedev not to block a United Nations resolution to impose a no-fly zone over Libya, they launched a full-scale military bombardment of Libya that helped to bring down the regime, a move that Russian officials called "deceptive."

Since Putin's return to the presidency last year, the relationship has deteriorated further, owing to disagreements over arms control, missile defense and human rights. For example, late last year the U.S. Congress imposed sanctions against Russian officials implicated in human rights abuses, prompting Russia to institute a ban on adoptions of Russian children by U.S. families.

Moreover, while Obama and Putin may come to terms over the removal of chemical weapons from Syria, U.S. policy still backs Syrian President Bashar Assad's removal, whereas Russia continues to support the regime, owing to the fear that its collapse would usher in a radical Sunni-led government — or chaos. Farther east, the U.S. and Russia are not cooperating as expected on Afghanistan's postwar transition.

But while disagreement on these issues has undoubtedly weakened U.S.-Russian ties, the real reason that the bilateral relationship is crumbling is more fundamental. Instead of acknowledging geopolitical shifts and adjusting their relationship accordingly, U.S. and Russian officials remain committed to an obsolete post-Cold War dynamic.

While Russia and the U.S. remain capable of destroying each other many times over, they have had no intention of doing so for a long time. But admitting that there was no longer any threat of direct attack would have been politically impossible in the aftermath of the Cold War, when the bilateral standoff still seemed to be a cornerstone of international stability.

Today, the prospect of either country launching a nuclear attack against the other seems almost ridiculous. Given this, the legacy of the Cold War should give way to issues like ensuring that China's rise remains peaceful, preventing the current chaos in the Arab world from spreading beyond the region, limiting the scope of nuclear weapons proliferation, and contributing to global efforts to address climate change, water scarcity, food security and cybercrime.

But rather than pursuing joint initiatives aimed at advancing the two countries' shared interests in these areas, the U.S. proposed nuclear weapons reductions as the primary mechanism of the diplomatic reset. Russian diplomats, whose outlook also remains largely shaped by the Cold War, seized on the proposal. And just like that, the old disarmament dynamic was renewed, as if by nostalgic old friends.

The subsequent negotiations produced the much vaunted New START, which, despite doing little to advance disarmament, provided a political boost to both sides and bolstered the bilateral relationship. But progress soon stalled with Russia rejecting U.S. proposals for further reductions — especially of tactical nuclear weapons, an area in which Russia dominates.

Russia, whose nuclear arsenal represents one of the last remaining pillars of its "great power" status, declared that it would agree to further cuts only after the U.S. offered a legally binding agreement that its proposed missile defense shield in Europe would not be aimed at Russia. In Russia's view, which is probably fanciful, such a shield could intercept its intercontinental ballistic missiles, or ICBMs, thereby posing a strategic threat.

In the hope of breaking the deadlock, Obama signaled his willingness to compromise. But Putin had little reason to reciprocate, not least because agreement on the issue would have opened the way to further nuclear arms reductions. Moreover, members of Russia's military and political elite hoped to use some of the country's oil revenues to deploy a new generation of ICBMs. And it seems that some Russians began to believe their own propaganda about the danger posed by a European-based missile defense shield.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

By focusing on nuclear disarmament and New START, Obama's reset strategy remilitarized the U.S.-Russia relationship while marginalizing issues that could have reoriented bilateral ties toward the future. In this sense, the initiative was doomed from the start, and the whole world has suffered as a result.

Both countries' leaders should acknowledge what should now be obvious: Nuclear weapons reduction can no longer serve as a reliable basis for bilateral relations.

Either the U.S. and Russia resort to undercutting each other whenever or wherever they can, or they can use the current break in their relationship to devise a new, future-oriented agenda for cooperation that focuses on global problems, such as the ongoing chaos in the Middle East. Neither Russia nor the U.S. can resolve global problems alone. But together, and with China, they could lead the world toward a more stable and prosperous future.

Sergei Karaganov is dean of the School of International Economics and Foreign Affairs of the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

<http://www.themoscowtimes.com/opinion/article/obamas-doomed-reset/486998.html>

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

The Asahi Shimbun – Japan
OPINION/Analysis

ANALYSIS: China's Nuke Buildup is a Concern, but a Nuclear-Armed Japan is Not the Answer

By JON HARPER
October 3, 2013

WASHINGTON--As China grows increasingly assertive on the world stage, the country is also aggressively expanding its nuclear forces. But this disturbing trend is being overshadowed by other issues.

Most officials, analysts and media in the United States and its allies are focused on the Chinese military's growing arsenal of sophisticated conventional weapons, such as stealth fighters, aircraft carriers, submarines, anti-ship missiles, anti-satellite missiles and cyber-attack capabilities.

A recent report by the U.S. National Air and Space Intelligence Center tells us: "China has the most active and diverse ballistic missile development program in the world. It is developing and testing offensive missiles, forming additional missile units, qualitatively upgrading missile systems, and developing methods to counter ballistic missile defenses."

And according to the U.S. Defense Department, China is also developing and deploying new types of nuclear platforms, including road-mobile missile launchers and possibly "MIRV" technology that will enable China to put many nuclear warheads on a single missile.

In 2012, the Chinese tested a new JL-2 ballistic missile that could be placed on submarines as early as this year--a step that will give the Chinese navy its first credible sea-based nuclear deterrent.

The Chinese leaders' motivation for these actions is more important than the actions themselves.

So why is Beijing pushing nuclear modernization at a time when the United States and Russia are significantly reducing their respective arsenals?

One possible explanation is that China wants to be seen as a superpower, and achieving closer nuclear parity with the United States would help it reach that goal. Chinese leaders may believe that being in the same atomic league as America will facilitate their efforts to establish the "new type of great power relations" that they are seeking.

Jeffrey Lewis, director of the East Asia Non-Proliferation Program at the Center for Non-Proliferation Studies, believes there's some validity to that argument.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



"I don't think that there's any evidence that they're tremendously interested in (numerical) parity as a goal," he told The Asahi Shimbun. "(But) if you think about the increasingly implausible argument for why the Communist Party should run China, you know, it has a lot to do with making China a strong and prosperous country. ... I think there is a general tendency on the part of the Chinese leadership to seek the same advanced military capabilities that other big powers have."

Another possibility is that Beijing fears that its current deterrent force is insufficient as the militaries of the United States and other countries improve their precision-attack capabilities.

"China is in the middle of a development of several new quick-launch ICBMs specifically to get away from the increased targeting capabilities of U.S. and Russian ... forces," Hans Kristensen, the director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists, said in an interview with The Asahi Shimbun.

If Kristensen's view is correct, China's nuclear buildup could be seen simply as a defensive deterrence measure. But given the country's recent history of undertaking actions that many consider provocative and hostile, China's new nukes will not be welcomed by most countries in the region, including the United States.

"The United States ... is watching closely the modernization and growth of China's nuclear arsenal. The lack of transparency surrounding its nuclear programs, specifically their pace and scope, as well as the strategy and doctrine that guides them, raises questions about China's long-term intentions," the Defense Department said in a nuclear strategy report released in June.

Beijing's atomic trajectory has two major implications for global nuclear arms control.

One is that it could make it more difficult for the United States and Russia to continue reducing the size of their arsenals without China's participation in multilateral negotiations. The exact size of the Chinese nuclear arsenal is unknown, but most estimates put it in the low hundreds. If that stockpile expands, it will raise the floor for how low the United States is willing to go.

At a defense industry conference in July, U.S. Undersecretary of Defense for Policy Jim Miller said that reducing the number of deployed American nukes to 1,000, as the Obama administration has proposed, "does not raise issues of multipolarity (with China). But I think if you were to go substantially below the levels that we have talked about ... then we would get into those questions."

According to Lewis, domestic politics in Washington and Moscow also play into these decisions.

"The fact that the Chinese are increasing the size of their arsenal at a time when other people are coming down, that politically is a barrier (to further reductions) even if the overall Chinese numbers are not particularly high," he said.

Another major concern elicited by China's nuclear program is the possibility that it will spur nuclear proliferation, particularly in Japan, as Beijing and Tokyo are locked in disputes over the Senkaku Islands and other issues.

U.S. officials frequently reiterate their commitment to defend their Japanese friends, including through extended nuclear deterrence.

And the Obama administration has also undertaken a strategic rebalance to Asia, largely to reassure Tokyo and other governments that are concerned about a rising China. Washington understands that the consequences of Japan going nuclear could be dire.

"It is difficult to see how or why the U.S.-Japan alliance would survive a Japanese decision to acquire nuclear weapons," warned Brad Roberts, the former deputy assistant secretary of defense for nuclear and missile defense policy in the Obama administration.

And on a regional level, Roberts believes that Japan's acquisition of nuclear weapons would generate "significantly adverse reactions" in Asia.

Nuclear experts also believe that getting The Bomb would be counterproductive for Tokyo.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

"I don't think there's any circumstance in which it would make sense for Japan to build nuclear weapons," Lewis said. "Ultimately, the only realistic security policy for Japan is one of close alliance with the United States, and that precludes a nuclear weapons program."

Darryl Kimball, executive director of the Arms Control Association, believes that even discussing the possibility of getting nukes is problematic for Tokyo.

"It's absolutely not in Japan's interest in talking about declaring a nuclear arsenal. I mean, that would make Japan more vulnerable, less secure in the future," he told The Asahi Shimbun. "That kind of talk only would give China reason to accelerate its nuclear weapons modernization programs. It would only give the North Koreans yet another cynical excuse to build up their nuclear arsenal against their, you know, former colonial occupiers."

The author is a defense staff reporter at The Asahi Shimbun's American General Bureau in Washington.

<http://ajw.asahi.com/article/views/opinion/AJ201310030013>

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

The Indian Express – India

OPINION/Columnists

Deterrence Is Not a Fantasy

By Sheel Kant Sharma and Shyam Saran

Thursday, October, 03 2013

There is a relentless campaign to depict India's nuclear weapons programme as motivated by prestige rather than a necessary means to meet real security threats. Despite all evidence to the contrary, such criticism continues to find votaries even among Indian analysts ('Nuclear weapons, costs and myths', C. Gharekhan, IE, August 27). There are also more recent questions about India's nuclear posture. Developments in delivery capabilities are portrayed as destabilising and leading to a nuclear arms race ('Five myths about India's nuclear posture', Vipin Narang, The Washington Quarterly, Summer 2013).

India's nuclear posture has evolved in the context of both regional and global nuclear threats. Nuclear weapons by their very nature are weapons of mass destruction (WMD), which recognise no national or regional boundaries. The interactive web of multiple nuclear-weapon capable states also creates a dynamic far more complex and unpredictable than that which prevailed during the Cold War, with an essentially binary nuclear equation between the two superpowers. India's nuclear posture not only takes account of an adverse nuclearised threat environment regionally, it also takes cognisance of the impact on its security of global developments in this regard. To frame India's nuclear posture in relation to Pakistan and/ or China and then to pick holes in it, is to miss the strategic calculus that underlies it.

India's nuclear weapons are for deterring a WMD attack against India. It has never been argued in this country that acquiring nuclear weapons would save money by substituting conventional capabilities with nuclear assets. The contention that India has neutralised its conventional superiority vis-a-vis Pakistan by going overtly nuclear has no basis in fact. India's conventional superiority did not deter Pakistan from repeated acts of aggression against India in 1947, 1965 and 1971, when nuclear weapons were not a factor. Even later misadventures like Kargil, as revealed in Benazir Bhutto's memoirs, were planned years before the overt nuclear transition of 1998. India will require capabilities to meet both conventional and nuclear threats from Pakistan.

Given the multiple dimensions of the nuclear threat, a limited nuclear weapons freeze between India and Pakistan will not enhance India's security. India is the only nuclear weapon state to categorically declare that a world free of nuclear weapons would enhance and not diminish its security. However, as long as nuclear weapons remain, India's security requires that it maintain a "credible minimum deterrent". This posture is not specific only to Pakistan and China.

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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



Additionally, India's development imperatives and its commitment to rapid socio-economic transformation require an enabling security environment free from nuclear threat or blackmail.

With respect to credible minimum deterrence, it is not necessary to specify the "minimum" in numbers. This will be determined in the light of a continually evolving nuclear security environment, both in India's own neighbourhood and globally. India does not have one minimum for Pakistan and another for China. Our nuclear planning does not take place in such tightly separate compartments.

Concerning China, India does not need a matching nuclear arsenal or delivery capability. A "credible minimum deterrent" is adequate vis-a-vis China or any other nuclear-armed adversary. We will need a "vastly enhanced conventional capability in terms of weapon systems, infrastructure, etc" in addition to prevent a possible war with China, major or minor. This is sought to be addressed by successive Indian governments, but regrettably at a pace not commensurate with what is required.

When its nuclear weapons and delivery capabilities were in a nascent stage, soon after the 1998 tests, the criticism against India was that its force posture did not match the requirements of its nuclear doctrine and hence lacked credibility. Now, when the force is being modernised and upgraded, the argument is that such developments are destabilising and even contrary to India's declared no-first-use doctrine.

India's nuclear force modernisation is to enhance the credibility of its nuclear doctrine, which requires a triad of land-based, air-launched and submarine-based nuclear assets and delivery systems. The survivability of these assets is a necessary condition for assured retaliation. The acquisition of additional assets, the upgrade of technological capabilities and associated command and control systems must be evaluated in that context.

The pursuit of R&D in Ballistic Missile Defence and MIRVing of delivery vehicles are not inconsistent with a no-first-use posture. It could be argued that both enhance the survivability of assets and the credibility of India's nuclear doctrine. Official thinking in this respect remains to be ascertained.

The development and deployment of dual-use delivery assets is not peculiar to India. This is a challenge that all nuclear-weapon states confront. This does add to uncertainty and unpredictability in relations among such states, which are best addressed through multilateral negotiations, focusing on confidence-building measures (CBMs) in the first instance. India and Pakistan have bilaterally concluded several nuclear CBMs, including non-attack on each other's nuclear facilities, requiring annual exchange of lists of such facilities; the advance reporting of missile launches within a certain range of each other's territories and a mutually declared commitment to a moratorium on further nuclear tests. India has advocated and is willing to join in the negotiation of nuclear restraints and CBMs at the multilateral level. These include an international convention on prohibition of the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons and formal agreement among nuclear-weapon states on global no-first-use of nuclear weapons.

Questions have been raised about the safety and security of India's nuclear assets. This is a classic case of equating the absence of information — so-called opacity — with the absence of systems and procedures to deal with such critical issues. India should be more transparent about and welcome public debate on its nuclear deterrent. There ought to be an annual nuclear posture review. However, the nuclear domain is a sensitive one and more transparency may not necessarily enhance deterrence stability. The criticism of the DRDO's alleged penchant of overpromising and underdelivering is well taken for this reason. In this case, a little less transparency and more modesty would be welcome.

Sheel Kant Sharma and Shyam Saran are columnists and members of the Indian Express Group.

<http://www.indianexpress.com/news/deterrence-is-not-a-fantasy/1177440/0>

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

Federation of American Scientist (FAS)
OPINION/FAS Strategic Security Blog



India's Missile Modernization Beyond Minimum Deterrence

By Hans M. Kristensen
October 4, 2013

Every time India test-launches a new ballistic missile, officials from the defense industry go giddy about the next missile, which they say will be bigger, more accurate, fly longer, and carry more nuclear warheads.

Until now, all Indian ballistic missile types have carried only one warhead each, an important feature that has helped constrain India's so-called minimum deterrence posture.

But the newest missile, the 5000+ kilometer-range Agni V, had not even completed its second test launch last month, before senior officials from India's Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO) declared that the next Agni variant will be equipped to carry multiple warheads.

While the single-warhead Agni V is a major defense weapon, the multiple-warhead Agni VI will be a "force multiplier," declared the former head of DRDO.

Moreover, the DRDO chief said that all future missiles will be deployed in large canisters on a road- or rail-mobile launchers to get "drastically" shorter response time with an ability to launch in "just a few minutes."

It still remains to be seen if these are just the dreams of excited weapons designers or if the Indian government has actually authorized design, development, and deployment of longer-range missiles with multiple warheads and quick-launch capability.

If so, it is bad news for South Asia. The combination of multiple warheads, increased accuracy, and drastically reduced launch time would indicate that India is gradually designing its way out of its so-called minimum deterrence doctrine towards a more capable nuclear posture.

This would almost certainly trigger counter-steps in Pakistan and China, developments that would *decrease* Indian security. And if China were to deploy multiple warheads on its missiles, it could even impede future reductions of U.S. and Russian nuclear forces.

MIRVforia

Indian defense contractors, engineers, analysts and news media reports have for years described efforts to develop multiple-warhead capability for India's ballistic missiles. Some have even claimed – incorrectly – that some current ballistic missiles are capable of delivering MIRV. A couple of definitions will help:

- Multiple warhead (MRV – Multiple Reentry Vehicles) missiles deliver two or more warheads against *the same target*. The warheads all impact within a circle of a few kilometers around the target in order to destroy it more effectively.
- Multiple Independently Targetable Reentry Vehicle (MIRV) missiles deliver two or more warheads against *different targets*. This requires a Post-Boost Vehicle, or bus, that can maneuver in space to release the reentry vehicles individually so that they follow different trajectories, allowing them to hit separate targets. Some MIRVs can hit targets separated by over 1,500 kilometers.

MRV is relatively simple to deploy but MIRV is a much more complex and expensive technology. News reports and private web sites rarely differentiate between the two but automatically equate multiple warheads with MIRV. Similarly, multiple payloads don't necessarily mean *warheads* but can involve penetration aids such as decoys or chaff. MRV might involve 2-3 warheads but 4 or more warheads imply MIRV.

For reasons that are still unclear, Indian defense industry officials have for several years described development of multiple warheads for future Agni variants. In 2007, about a year after Agni III failed its first test launch and before Agni V had even left the launch pad, Avinash Chander, who has since been appointed to head the DRDO, said the next Agni



variant would have a range of over 5,000 kilometers and “be a multiple warhead missile with a capacity to carry four to 12 warheads.”

So far that hasn’t happened and DRDO leaders have been unclear about what Agni version would receive the MIRV they are so busy working on. Vijay Kumar Saraswat, for example, made the following statement to *NDTV* shortly before he retired in May 2013 as DRDO chief:

Saraswat: Agni Series of missiles are in an advanced stage of production. Today, as you remember, we have completed development of Agni I, Agni II, and Agni III. Agni IV and Agni V are in an advanced stage of development. And this year, you will see two more launches of Agni V, which will culminate its complete developmental activity and it will be led to production. Agni IV is already getting into production mode. So with this – Agni I, Agni II, Agni III, Agni IV, Agni V – getting into production mode, *the next logical corollary as far as the long-range ballistic missile deterrents capability of this country is concerned, we will switch over to force multiplication.* Force multiplication in the case of ballistic missiles will be by way of multiple independently manoeuvrable [sic] re-entry vehicles (MIRV).

NDTV: Meaning one missile which can carry many warheads?

Saraswat: Carry multiple warheads. Our design activity on the development and production of MIRV is at an advanced stage today. We are designing the MIRVs, *we are integrating it with Agni IV and Agni V missiles, and that would also give us the capability to cover a vast area plus deliver in the event any activity requires a number of payloads at a required place.*

NDTV: So will the next test be with a multiple warheads system or...

Saraswat: No. The present task, as I was mentioning, will be only with the normal configuration of Agni V. But *there will be an experimental test in which we will be testing the MIRV capability.*

NDTV: So that would be what? Agni VI or...

Saraswat: *No we are not naming it Agni VI... it will be Agni V missile with MIRVs.*

NDTV: So Agni V plus?

Saraswat: You can name it Agni V plus or Agni VI, but certainly it is not Agni VI.

NDTV: It is not Agni VI but Agni V will have multiple warheads so we can have a single missile going and hitting several targets at the same time?

Saraswat: Yes it will be in that category.”

But only three months earlier, Saraswat was quoted by numerous newspapers as explicitly crediting the Agni VI, not the Agni V, with multiple warhead capability: “Agni-V is a major strategic defence weapon. Now, we want to make Agni-VI, which will be a force multiplier.” The new Agni variant “will have force multiplier capability by the MIRV approach which would enable us to deliver many payloads at the same time using only one missile. Work is on in this area and designs have been completed. We are now in the hardware realisation phase,” he said.



Indian Nuclear-Capable Ballistic Missile Programs					
Missile Type	Year Operational*	Stages	Range (km)	Payload (RV x kg)	Status
<i>Land-based</i>					
Prithvi I/II/III	(1998)	1	150/350	1 x 800/500	Fewer than 50 launchers; nuclear role declining
Agni I	2007	1	700	1 x 1000	Fewer than 25 launchers
Agni II	2011	2	2000+	1 x 1000	Fewer than 10 launchers
Agni III	(2014)	2	3200+	1 x 1500	Introduction underway
Agni IV	(2015)	2	3500+	1 x 800	Introduction underway
Agni V	(2016)	3	5000+	1 x 1000	In development
Agni VI	?	3 ?	6000+ ?	4-6 x 2000+ ?	In early design
<i>Sea-based</i>					
Dhanush	(2013)	1	400	1 x 500	In development
Sagarika K-15	(2015)	2	700	1 x 500+ ?	In development

* Operational capability is not achieved until a few years after a missile is "inducted" into the armed forces and requires several successful operational test launches in addition to the development tests conducted prior to induction. Parentheses indicate possible future operational years. FAS 2013

ZeeNews quoted an unnamed "top scientists from DRDO" saying "Agni-VI missiles will carry four or six warheads depending upon their weight."

After Agni IV and Agni V are handed over to the armed forces, DRDO's "two major focus areas will be maneuvering warheads or reentry vehicles to defeat enemy ballistic missile defence systems and MIRVs (multiple independently targetable reentry vehicles)," Chander said.

Shorter Launch Time

Ignore for the moment that none of India's potential adversaries have missile defense systems that can intercept Indian missiles, DRDO is also working on making the missiles more mobile and quicker to launch by deploying them in "canistered" Transportable Erector Launchers (TEL).



DRDO's prototype missile canister-launcher, which looks similar to China's DF-21 and DF-31 launchers, is intended to "drastically" shorten the launch-time of India's nuclear missiles. Credit: DRDO.

The new canister-launchers "will reduce the reaction time drastically...just a few minutes from 'stop-to-launch'," according to Chander. "We are committed to making [the missiles] much more agile, much more fast-reacting, much more stable so that the response can be within minutes," he said. In an interview with *India Today*, Chander explained: "In the second strike capability, the most important thing is how fast we can react," he claimed and said: "All future strategic missiles will be canisterised," with the first canister Agni V launch scheduled for early 2014.

Contrary to the DRDO chief's claim, however, "the most important thing" in a second-strike posture is not how fast India can react but simply that it can retaliate. The ability to launch quickly is only relevant for two scenarios: One, if India's adversaries have military forces that are capable of destroying Indian missile launchers on the ground before they can be used. China faces such a capability from the United States and Russia but neither China nor Pakistan has a capability to conduct a disarming first strike against India's nuclear forces.



The second scenario where a quick-strike capability could be relevant is if India planned to conduct a first strike against its adversaries, but only if the adversaries were able to detect preparations to strike. But planning for first strike would contradict India's no-first-use policy.

Nor is a quick-launch capability necessarily "more stable," as Chander asserts. On the contrary, it could significantly decrease stability both in peacetime – by stimulating Chinese and Pakistani planners to further increase the responsiveness of their nuclear missiles – and in a crisis by shortening decision time and increasing risk of overreaction and escalation.

In addition to increasing warhead loading and responsiveness, DRDO is also working on improving the accuracy of warheads delivered by the missiles, although media reports about "pinpoint accuracy" are probably greatly exaggerated. Even the statement by the Ministry of Defense that the payload from the recent Agni V test reached the target area "within a few meters of accuracy" seems over the top. In contrast, back in 2007 when the Agni V was being designed, Chander said: "We are trying to attain an accuracy level of 100 metres."

There is probably some overlap with conventional missions (the Agni missiles are dual-capable), but accuracy of 100 meters (300 feet) would bring Agni V well within range of the accuracy of the best U.S. and Russian ballistic missiles (in itself a reason to be skeptical). But their accuracy was pursued in support of highly offensive counterforce strategies designed to target and destroy each other's ICBM silos, missions that are incompatible with India's minimum deterrence doctrine.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Statements made by Indian defense officials over the past few years about increasing the payload, responsiveness, and accuracy of nuclear ballistic missiles are worrisome signs that India may be designing its way out of its minimum deterrence posture towards one with more warfighting-like capabilities.

This includes development of multiple-warhead capability to move India's nuclear missiles beyond "a defense weapon" to "a force multiplier" that can strike more targets with each missile. It includes upgrading launchers to "drastically" shorten the launch-time to "minutes." And it includes increasing the accuracy of the reentry vehicles to more effectively strike their targets.

Where these requirements come from and who sets them is anyone's guess, but they demonstrate a need for the Indian government to constrain its weapons designers and more clearly reaffirm its adherence to a minimum deterrence doctrine. Not only does the combination of multiple warheads, increased accuracy, and quick-launch capability challenge the credibility of minimum deterrence. It also sends all the wrong signals about India's intentions and will almost inevitably trigger weapons developments in the nuclear postures of India's neighbors – developments that would decrease Indian security and that of the whole region.

India is, to be fair, not alone in taking worrisome nuclear steps in the region. Pakistan is developing short-range nuclear missiles envisioned for tactical use below the strategic level that appears to envision potential use of nuclear weapons sooner in a conflict. China is mixing nuclear and conventional missiles that could trigger misunderstandings in a crisis and researching MIRV capability that may well be motivating Indian planners to follow now rather than catch up later.

Together, India, Pakistan and China have embarked upon extensive nuclear arms development and deployment programs with no apparent or declared end in sight. They seem to be making many of the same decisions (and mistakes) as the United States, Russia, Britain and France did during their Cold War. Now it is necessary to complement the nuclear postures with nuclear arms control measures for the region to constrain the forces.

A first step could be to block deployment of multiple warheads on ballistic missiles to prevent what otherwise appears to be a dangerous new phase of the nuclear arms competition in the region.

For its part, the Indian government should make a pledge not to deploy multiple warheads on its missiles a formal part of its minimum deterrence doctrine. Pakistan could easily join such an initiative.



USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER
CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL
MAXWELL AFB, ALABAMA

China should join its southern neighbor in a no-multiple-warhead pledge, which would reaffirm its existing minimum deterrence posture and also help reduce India's interest in multiple warheads. Moreover, a Chinese pledge not to deploy multiple warheads on its missiles would ease U.S. and Russian concerns about China's potential to "sprint to parity" and therefore help ease the way for further U.S. and Russian reductions – something that both Beijing and Delhi favor.

All sides would seem to benefit from banning multiple warheads on ballistic missiles and India could take the first and honorable step toward a safer future.

This publication was made possible by grants from the New-Land Foundation and Ploughshares Fund. The statements made and views expressed are solely the responsibility of the author.

Hans M. Kristensen is director of the Nuclear Information Project at the Federation of American Scientists where he provides the public with analysis and background information about the status of nuclear forces and the role of nuclear weapons.

<http://blogs.fas.org/security/2013/10/indianmirv/>

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

Issue No. 1083, 04 October 2013

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