



# **USAF COUNTERPROLIFERATION CENTER**

# **CPC OUTREACH JOURNAL**

*Maxwell AFB, Alabama*

---

---

Issue No. 877, 1 February 2011

## **Articles & Other Documents:**

[New START, Result of Gamble-Game Between Russia, U.S.](#)

[U.N. Urged to Tighten Grip on North Korea Atomic Program](#)

[Russia Says Too Early to Talk Tactical Nuclear Weapons with United States](#)

[Pak Has 110 N-Weapons to Edge Ahead of India: US Report](#)

[Sen. Kyl Demands Clarification of START Treaty with Russia](#)

[Don't Worry, India's Deterrence is Robust: Pokhran II Scientist](#)

[U.S. and Russia to Finalize Nuclear Deal on Saturday](#)

[Nuclear-Attack on India will Finish Pakistan: Ex-NSA](#)

[Iran to Unveil Missile, Satellite Projects](#)

[Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal is Estimated at More than 100: WP](#)

[Assad Says No Extra Access to Nuclear Inspectors](#)

[At 100, Pak Ahead in N-Arsenal](#)

[Liam Fox: Iran could have Nuclear Weapons Next Year](#)

[Pak Overtakes UK in Nuclear Capability: Report](#)

[Iran Slams Fox over Nuclear Warning](#)

[Pakistan Dismisses 'Alarmist Reporting' on Nuclear Programme](#)

[China Drags Feet on Reining in the North's Nukes](#)

[Russian Navy to Receive New Nuclear Attack Submarine by Yearend](#)

[S. Korea to Press N. Korea to Honor 1992 Denuclearization Pact: Official](#)

[UN Report Verifies NK's Uranium Enrichment Program](#)

[Kashmir Has Become a Dangerous Nuclear Flashpoint](#)

[Q+A - Is North Korea's Nuclear Programme a Threat?](#)

[Tehran Must Know We'll Strike Back](#)

[A Treaty on Fissile Materials](#)

---

*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.*

Xinhua News – China

## **New START, Result of Gamble-Game Between Russia, U.S.**

January 29, 2011

by Zheng Haoning, Wei Lianglei

MOSCOW, Jan. 29 (Xinhua) -- Russian President Dmitry Medvedev has signed the new strategic arms reduction treaty with the United States and after an exchange of documents, the agreement will officially enter into force.

Russian experts believe ratification of the treaty, known as New START, is the strategic key to the "reset" of Russian-U.S. relations, as it could boost nuclear safety between the two countries and further their bilateral relations.

However, additional clauses respectively approved by the two countries left a subtle situation, which revealed that a gamble-game between the two would surely continue.

### **CRUCIAL FOR RELATIONS RESET**

Ratifying the treaty, Medvedev sighed with the feeling that "Americans are through their journey... We also completed these procedures."

After the Cold War, the United States and Russia have held rounds of talks on strategic disarmament and signed several treaties.

The New START treaty, which replaces the START I treaty that expired in 2009, was concluded after years of negotiations and has sparked hot debates in both countries since the very beginning.

U.S. missile defense plans in eastern Europe have become a major sticking point in nuclear disarmament negotiations, apart from counting methods and verification procedures.

To reach the pact, the two countries made compromises. U.S. President Barack Obama adjusted the missile defense plan in Europe and canceled projects in the Czech Republic and Poland.

In April, Medvedev and Obama signed in Prague the new START, which has been widely seen as an effort for Russia and the United States to "reset" their relations. The ratification of both sides also showed the two countries' positive gestures on pragmatic cooperation in nuclear disarmament.

The new START limits each country to 1,550 strategic warheads, down from the current ceiling of 2,200, and also re-establishes a system for monitoring.

"In general, it determines a balance of strategic cooperation, a power balance in the short-term prospect," Medvedev said.

Russian reports also believed the treaty, which stipulates the mutual verification procedures, would contribute to the transparency of both countries' nuclear armament and to the potential bilateral cooperation in various fields.

Analysts stressed the "reset" of the bilateral relations had been plagued by the issues of Georgia, missile defense weapon, European safety, among others. With the ratification of the new START by both sides, the United States and Russia would seek new breakthroughs and growth points for the future of "reset."

### **GAMBLE-GAME CONTINUES**

Although the United States and Russia devoted their efforts to the "nuclear-free world" by ratification of the treaty, the New START won't weaken their strategic nuclear power at all, experts said.

Even though the two countries slashed their deployed nuclear weapons by a third under the treaty, their arsenals are the largest among other major nuclear states.

Media reports warned that after the cut of arms, the two countries still have enough weapons to destroy each other several times over.

Meanwhile, inveterate mistrust and divergence left over by history has been shadowing Russia-U.S. relations.

The U.S. Senate ratified the pact in December, along with one resolution that has raised concerns from Moscow.

The resolution claimed that the New START did not apply to new kinds of non-nuclear strategic weapons that could be developed in the future, and the link between offensive and defensive weapons was not legally binding.

As a response, Russian deputies also approved amendments, demanding to sustain Russia's strategic capabilities, not providing the United States with information about new types of strategic missiles, a right to leave the treaty in certain circumstances and a right to keep testing, production and deployment of new types of offensive arms.

The divergence in lines of the treaty exposed the deep mistrust between the two and buried foreshadowing for potential disputes.

Russia warned that if it, the United States, and NATO failed to reach a missile defense weapons agreement, the world could see embrace another arms race and that it would implement new offensive weapons.

In recent years, Russia has been positively gesturing goodwill to the United States, hoping that the latter helps its modernization. However, strategic and security interests are the bottom lines of Russia.

The Russian geopolitics research institute said in a report that whether the new START treaty exists or not, the Americans will implement the missile defense weapons and the Russians will adopt countermeasures.

Huge gaps between the two countries will remain, it added.

[http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/indepth/2011-01/29/c\\_13712790.htm](http://news.xinhuanet.com/english2010/indepth/2011-01/29/c_13712790.htm)

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russia Says Too Early to Talk Tactical Nuclear Weapons with United States**

29 January 2011

It is too early to discuss limiting tactical nuclear weapons (TNW) with the United States, Russian Deputy Foreign Minister Sergei Ryabkov said.

When ratifying the New START arms deal with Russia in December, the United States Senate adopted a resolution obligating the government to start bilateral talks on cutting the TNW stockpiles - landmines, artillery shells and short-range missiles. Washington says Moscow has a larger number of these systems.

"We are not even close to discussing the prospect of concluding any agreement in this sphere, the more so as we don't know yet how the [new] ratified arms reduction treaty will be implemented," Ryabkov told Russian journalists Friday.

"Until we see the way commitments undertaken within its framework are fulfilled and to what extent the sides are acting in line with the treaty's letter and spirit, this issue will be premature for us," he said.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev signed off on the new pact ratification documents on Friday. The Russian parliament's upper house ratified the new START treaty on Wednesday. The lower house, the State Duma, ratified the pact Tuesday, adding some provisions to the ratification document and issuing two supplementary statements to the resolution on the treaty ratification.

The ratification document provides a legally-binding clause that links strategic offensive and strategic defensive weapons.

The first supplementary statement addresses the current state and the future of Russia's nuclear deterrent, while the second outlines the State Duma's position on the reduction and limitations of strategic offensive armaments.

The new deal, replacing START 1, which expired in December 2009, was signed by Medvedev and U.S. President Barack Obama in Prague in April 2010. The document slashes the Russian and U.S. nuclear arsenals to a maximum of 1,550 nuclear warheads, down from the current ceiling of 2,200.

The U.S. Senate ratified the deal on December 22, 2010, but added several amendments to the resolution on ratification, including a demand to build up U.S. global missile defenses.

Medvedev said the treaty will formally enter into force after the exchange of ratification documents, which is due to take place at the upcoming meeting between Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov and State Secretary Hillary Clinton.

The meeting could take place in Munich on February 4-5.

WASHINGTON, January 29 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20110129/162362622.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20110129/162362622.html)

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

The Hill

## **Sen. Kyl Demands Clarification of START Treaty with Russia**

By Pete Kasperowicz  
January 31, 2011

The Obama administration must resolve several apparent disputes with Russia over New START's interpretation, Sen. Jon Kyl said.

Sen. Jon Kyl (R-Ariz.) on Monday called on the Obama administration to work with the Russian government to resolve several apparent disputes over how to interpret last year's New START treaty.

Speaking on the Senate floor, Kyl said Russia has implemented the treaty in several ways that are at odds with the U.S. interpretation and that failure to resolve these issues could have serious consequences down the road.

"[B]ecause there is no meeting of the minds on these matters, the potential for disputes and increasing tension between the two sides is likely," Kyl said in his prepared statement. "What was to serve as a vehicle for 'reset' may, in fact, serve to promote increasing discord."

New START extends the arms-reduction treaty signed in 1991, and includes new caps on weapons and a monitoring mechanism.

The Senate approved the treaty in December during the lame-duck session over Kyl's opposition. Kyl was the lead GOP negotiator between the administration and opponents to the deal after Sen. Richard Lugar (R-Ind.) offered his support. Kyl said the Senate should not have approved the treaty and that more time should have been given for the Senate debate.

Kyl's top issue is how Russia has interpreted the preamble of the treaty, which links the development of missile defense systems to offensive forces. Kyl said today that this language was a "clear attempt" by Russia to prevent improvements to U.S. and allied missile defense capabilities, by arguing that these improvements would impinge on offensive capabilities.

The Senate last year adopted an amendment saying the preamble "does not impose a legal obligation on the Parties," which the Senate takes to mean that the United States is free to develop missile defense without consequence. However, Kyl noted that Russia's implementing law for the treaty goes against this and said Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov has confirmed this in recent remarks.

Lavrov has said that either party can withdraw from the treaty in the event of an emergency. "We are convinced that the implementation of the full-scale global missile defense by the U.S. will be precisely such an emergency," Kyl quoted him as saying.

Kyl said this is a "fundamentally incompatible" interpretation because it allows Russia to withdraw from the treaty if the United States, as planned, expands its missile defenses in Europe. He also cited a portion of Russia's law that defends its interpretation based on "understandings" that are held, and said he is writing the State Department to ask if there are any such understandings that would give merit to the Russian interpretation.

"What 'understandings' are there?" Kyl asked, noting that the Senate was denied access to the negotiations. "There is the potential here of a major confrontation between the Senate and the administration if the administration does not immediately make a full disclosure to the Senate on these matters."

Kyl cited other inconsistencies today, including that Russia believes New START reductions apply to non-nuclear strategic weapons, while the United States believes otherwise. He also said that while both sides agreed to exchange missile flight data, Russia's law prohibits exchanging this information.

"I am not aware of an example when the U.S. has ratified a bilateral treaty in the face of clear evidence that there is no meeting of the minds on key treaty terms," Kyl said. He added that while the treaty was seen as part of the "reset" with Russia, "this can be the case ... only if the parties actually agree on the fundamentals of the treaty's meaning."

<http://thehill.com/blogs/floor-action/senate/141305-kyl-demands-clarification-of-new-start-treaty-with-russians>

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

Reuters

## **U.S. and Russia to Finalize Nuclear Deal on Saturday**

Washington, Tuesday, February 01, 2011

(Reuters) - The United States and Russia will formally inaugurate their new START nuclear arms pact on Saturday, launching a deal that commits the two former Cold War foes to cutting their atomic arsenals.

Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and Russian Foreign Minister Sergei Lavrov will exchange the final ratification papers for the START treaty in Munich, where both will be attending an annual security conference, the State Department said on Tuesday.

"With new START, the United States and Russia have reached another milestone in our bilateral relationship," a State Department statement said.

Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and U.S. President Barack Obama signed the deal in April after a year of tough negotiations, a move that both sides cited as proof of their efforts to "reset" the relationship after several years of tension.

The U.S. Senate approved ratification last month in a victory for Obama, and Russia's parliament gave its final approval in a unanimous upper house vote last week.

The treaty commits the nations with 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons to ceilings of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads in seven years, up to 30 percent lower than in the 2002 Moscow treaty.

It will limit each side to 700 deployed strategic missiles and bombers and establish verification rules, absent since the U.S.-Soviet Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I) expired in 2009, enabling them to keep tabs on each other's arsenals.

Once the treaty takes effect, the two nations are to begin exchanging information about the status of their nuclear forces and, within weeks, hold the first on-site inspections of each other's nuclear arsenals in nearly two years.

*Reporting by Andrew Quinn; Editing by Doina Chiacu*

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2011/02/01/us-usa-russia-start-idUSTRE7104SI20110201>

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

Press TV – Iran

## **Iran to Unveil Missile, Satellite Projects**

Sunday, January 30, 2011

Iran's Defense Minister General Ahmad Vahidi says Tehran plans to unveil a new range of missile and satellite projects during the Ten Days of Dawn celebrations.

"Fajr (dawn) is the first satellite with the ability to change from the elliptical orbit of 300-450 kilometers to a circular orbit of 450 kilometers which increases the life expectancy of the satellite by one year and a half," Vahidi said on Sunday.

The Rasad (observation) satellite is the country's first satellite for photography, Vahidi said at the inauguration ceremony of the Middle East's biggest center of laboratories for testing space structures and systems.

"The thrust of the Safir (ambassador) 1-B rocket engine has been increased from 32 to 37, and it can carry a satellite weighing 50 kilogram's into an elliptical orbit of 300 to 450 kilometers," IRNA quoted the Iranian defense minister as saying.

The other rocket, Kavoshgar (explorer) 4, has the ability to carry space laboratories containing biologic cargos within a range of 120 kilometers, Vahidi added.

In recent years, Iran has made important breakthroughs in its defense sector and attained self-sufficiency in producing important military equipment and systems.

Earlier this month, the Iranian Defense Ministry delivered new naval cruise missile systems to the Navy in yet another move to boost the nation's defense capabilities.

The Navy has successfully test-fired a range of powerful missiles mounted with laser technology, which display high precision and have a range of 45km (28 miles) to 300km (186 miles).

Iran also unveiled its first domestically-manufactured long-range Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) in 2010.

The Karrar UAV is capable of carrying a military payload of rockets to carry out bombing missions against ground targets. It is also capable of flying long distances at high speeds.

The Islamic Republic also unveiled its first major space center in 2008 by launching the first Iranian rocket, Explorer-1, into space.

Iran is one of the 24 founding members of the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, which was set up in 1959. To date, only eight countries have put domestically-made satellites into orbit.

<http://www.presstv.ir/detail/162764.html>

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

Khaleej Times – U.A.E.

## **Assad Says No Extra Access to Nuclear Inspectors**

By Reuters

31 January 2011

DAMASCUS - Syria will not grant International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors unrestricted access to possible nuclear sites because it would amount to a violation of sovereignty, President Bashar al-Assad said.

The IAEA has said uranium particles found at a Syrian complex destroyed by an Israeli air raid in 2007 suggested possible covert nuclear activity, and asked Syria to agree to unfettered inspections.

“This time they asked Syria to sign the additional protocol — that they can come any time,” Assad told the Wall Street Journal in an interview published on Monday.

“No, we are not going to sign... Nobody will accept to sign it. This is something about sovereignty — to come any time to check anything under the title of checking nuclear activities, you can check anything,” he said.

“We have many secret things like any other country and nobody will allow them (to be searched),” Assad said. Granting the inspectors unrestricted access “will definitely be misused”.

U.S. intelligence reports said the Deir al-Zor site bombed by Israel in 2007 had been a North Korean-designed nuclear reactor under construction, geared for atomic bomb fuel.

Syria, an ally of Iran which is under IAEA investigation over its own nuclear programme, has denied ever having an atom bomb programme and says the intelligence suggesting it had is fabricated.

It allowed the IAEA to inspect Deir al-Zor in June 2008 but has not allowed the agency to revisit since then.

Assad said the fact that Syria allowed the inspection showed it had nothing to hide, and questioned why radioactive particles would be found in a nuclear site still under construction. He also said it was months after the Israeli strike before any public claim was made that the site was a nuclear plant.

“It is clear to everyone that it was not nuclear, but the question is: why they waited for eight months (before saying it was)?” he said.

The agency’s chief Yukiya Amano said in November Syria was blocking nuclear inspectors from visiting numerous suspect sites, and had provided scant or inconsistent information about its atomic activities.

Washington has said the IAEA may need to consider invoking its “special inspection” mechanism to give it the authority to look anywhere necessary in Syria at short notice.

But diplomats believe the IAEA will refrain from escalating the dispute at a time of rising tension with Iran, which the West suspects of seeking nuclear weapons.

[http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?xfile=/data/middleeast/2011/January/middleeast\\_January708.xml&section=middleeast](http://www.khaleejtimes.com/DisplayArticleNew.asp?xfile=/data/middleeast/2011/January/middleeast_January708.xml&section=middleeast)

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

Daily Telegraph – U.K.

## **Liam Fox: Iran could have Nuclear Weapons Next Year**

*The West should assume the Islamic Republic will be nuclear-armed by 2012 and “act in accordance” with that timetable, the Defence Secretary has said.*

By James Kirkup, Political Correspondent

31 January 2011

In the House of Commons, Dr Fox was asked about the assessment of Meir Dagan, the former Israeli intelligence chief, that Iran will be unable to develop a working nuclear weapon until 2015.

Dr Fox, a hawk who has repeatedly raised public concerns about Iran’s nuclear programme, told MPs that he thought Mr Dagan’s assessment could be too optimistic.

Instead, the West should plan on the basis that Tehran is much closer to developing a working nuclear weapon, he said.

“We know from previous experience, not least from what happened in North Korea, that the international community can be caught out, assuming that things are more rosy than they are,” Dr Fox said.

“We should therefore be entirely clear that it is entirely possible that Iran may be on the 2012 end of that spectrum, and act in accordance with that warning.”

Dr Fox’s suggested timetable for the Iranian nuclear programme is in line with that set out last year by Leon Panetta, the head of the US Central Intelligence Agency.

However, the pessimistic British analysis comes days after international talks in Turkey on the Iranian programme once again failed to make significant progress.

With the US, Russia, China, France and Germany, Britain is part of the P5+1 group negotiating with Iran over its nuclear technology, trying to ensure Tehran does not develop a nuclear weapons.

A stalemate in talks in Istanbul last month drew renewed warnings from Western diplomats that military action may be taken against Iran’s nuclear sites.

Iran is investing heavily in nuclear technology it claims will be used for civilian power generation. Most other countries believe Iran, the second largest oil producer in the world, is actually trying to develop a nuclear weapon.

Documents revealed last year by the Wikileaks website showed that leaders of Arab states including Saudia Arabia, Bahrain and Abu Dhabi have urged Washington to consider a military strike on Iran’s nuclear programme.

Dr Fox said that Britain did not believe the Iranian regime has yet given full information about its nuclear work.

“Iran does not yet have nuclear weapons as assessed. However, it does continue to pursue uranium enrichment and the construction of a heavy water reactor, both of which have military potential,” he said.

“We share the very serious concerns of the International Atomic Energy Agency that Iran has not adequately explained evidence of possible military dimensions to its nuclear programme.”

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/middleeast/iran/8293568/Liam-Fox-Iran-could-have-nuclear-weapons-next-year.html>

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

Belfast Telegraph – U.K.

## **Iran Slams Fox over Nuclear Warning**

Tuesday, 1 February 2011

Iran has criticised Defence Secretary Liam Fox for saying Tehran may be capable of developing a nuclear weapon by next year.

Dr Fox's remarks go "against reality" and aim to create an "environment detrimental to Iran", said foreign ministry spokesman Ramin Mehmanparast.

In talks last month, the United States, Britain, France, Germany, Russia and China failed to persuade Iran to open its atomic programme to more scrutiny.

Tehran claims its nuclear programme is limited to peaceful purposes, such as electricity production.

The US and its allies insist Iran is working on the covert development of nuclear weapons.

Dr Fox told the House of Commons on Monday that it is "entirely possible" that Iran might develop a nuclear weapon by next year.

He said Tehran was continuing to pursue uranium enrichment as well as the construction of a heavy water reactor, both of which had "military potential".

And he cautioned the West not to be "caught out" and assume "things are more rosy than they are", as had happened with North Korea.

<http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/world-news/iran-slams-fox-over-nuclear-warning-15070009.html>

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

Joong Ang Daily – South Korea

# China Drags Feet on Reining in the North's Nukes

January 31, 2011

By Christine Kim

Despite pressure from the U.S. and South Korea, China is refusing to help rein in North Korea's nuclear program.

As North Korea's biggest ally, China has been urged repeatedly over the last few months to restrain its neighbor after the shelling of South Korea's Yeonpyeong Island last November. North Korea also showed a visiting American scientist a uranium enrichment facility in Yongbyon that month, provoking alarm among the U.S. and its allies over North Korea's expanding nuclear program.

"China expressed concern over North Korea's uranium enrichment during summit talks with the U.S. in Washington, but it isn't showing any interest in taking this issue to the U.N. Security Council," said a South Korean government official yesterday. "If China absolutely refuses to take this issue up with the U.N. Security Council then it should at least take other actions, such as stopping North Korea's nuclear activities."

Chinese President Hu Jintao expressed concern about North Korea's uranium enrichment program in a joint statement with U.S. President Obama during a visit to Washington Jan. 20. However, Hu did not directly address North Korea's recent attacks on South Korea.

"Measures should be taken by the international society regarding North Korea's uranium enrichment program, including taking it to the U.N. Security Council," a U.S. government source told the JoongAng Ilbo yesterday.

James Steinberg, U.S. deputy secretary of state, was expected to have conveyed these opinions to China Friday during a visit to Beijing. Steinberg was reported to have met with Chinese State Councilor Dai Bingguo on his visit, which wraps up a tour to South Korea, Japan and China.

Steinberg said Jan. 26 it was imperative for the international community to send a message to North Korea that its uranium program is against U.N. Security Council Resolutions and the September 19, 2005 agreement in which North Korea agreed to abandon its nuclear weapons programs.

<http://joongangdaily.joins.com/article/view.asp?aid=2931689>

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

Yonhap News – South Korea

January 31, 2011

## S. Korea to Press N. Korea to Honor 1992 Denuclearization Pact: Official

By Sam Kim

SEOUL, Jan. 31 (Yonhap) -- South Korea plans to press North Korea to abide by their 1992 denuclearization pact that bans the two sides from having facilities used to enrich uranium, a senior official here said Monday, as they prepare to hold their first defense talks in months.

The agreement prohibits the two Koreas from making, introducing or stockpiling nuclear weapons. It specifically bans the Koreas from building reprocessing or highly enriched uranium (HEU) facilities.

North Korea announced last year it was operating a modern facility to perform low-level enrichment of uranium for peaceful energy use. Uranium, if highly enriched, can be used to create arms.

U.S. and South Korean officials have dismissed the North Korean announcement as a thinly veiled effort to have a second track to building nuclear bombs in addition to its plutonium-based one.

Citing the 1992 agreement that bans uranium enrichment plants, a senior South Korean Unification Ministry official said Monday the North should "display determination and actions that show that it will substantially follow through with the denuclearization pledge."

His comments indicate the grounds on which Seoul will press Pyongyang to abandon its nuclear arms when they resume their talks later this year. Inter-Korean dialogue had come to a halt after a multinational investigation found Pyongyang responsible for sinking a South Korean warship in March and the North bombarded a South Korean island in November last year.

The planned defense talks, which the North proposed first earlier this month as part of its renewed peace offensive, are seen as a crucial step toward resuming stalled six-nation denuclearization talks.



The talks, which group the Koreans, the U.S., Russia, China and Japan, have not been held since late 2008. Since then, North Korea has conducted its second nuclear test and conducted a rocket launch considered as an effort to advance its arms delivery capabilities.

A 2005 six-party agreement specifies that the Koreans observe and implement their 1992 joint declaration, while leaving room for the North to have "the right to peaceful uses of nuclear energy."

"None of the two can replace the other," the South Korean official said, referring to the landmark deals and calling them the most effective avenues to removing the threat of nuclear war on the peninsula.

<http://english.yonhapnews.co.kr/northkorea/2011/01/31/40/0401000000AEN20110131008000315F.HTML>

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

Korea Times – South Korea

## **UN Report Verifies NK's Uranium Enrichment Program**

January 31, 2011

By Kim Young-jin

A report verifying North Korea's recently-disclosed uranium enrichment program has been submitted to a U.N. Security Council committee overseeing sanctions on Pyongyang, sources said.

A source within the Security Council told Yonhap News Agency, "The report, among other things, says that North Korea's uranium enrichment program is more advanced than Iran's, and that it has been carrying out the program for a significant period of time."

The source said the report verifies what the North told U.S. scientist Siegfried Hecker in November when it showed him a uranium enrichment program at its Yongbyon facility some 90 kilometers North of Pyongyang. Hecker said North Korean authorities told him that 2,000 centrifuges were already operating.

Other news reports, citing sources, said the committee will take up the issue this week.

The North claims the program is strictly for civilian purposes, but officials fear the facility could be upgraded to produce nuclear weapons.

The committee is made up of experts from the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council — Britain, China, France, Russia and the United States — along with Japan and South Korea.

[http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/01/116\\_80679.html](http://www.koreatimes.co.kr/www/news/nation/2011/01/116_80679.html)

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

The Star – Malaysia

Monday January 31, 2011

## **Q+A - Is North Korea's Nuclear Programme a Threat?**

By Jeremy Laurence, Reuters

SEOUL (Reuters) - South Korea has proposed bilateral nuclear talks with the isolated North, as Seoul seeks to gauge Pyongyang's sincerity about giving up its nuclear weapons programme in line with past international agreements.

The North has yet to respond to Seoul's request.

Pyongyang has said it wants to restart aid-for-disarmament talks, despite walking out of the forum in 2009 and declaring the six-party format dead.

Seoul says it will sound out if the North Koreans are genuine about denuclearisation and will report back to the other six-party members: the United States, China, Japan and Russia.

Here is look at the North's nuclear arms programme.

### **HOW ADVANCED IS THE NORTH'S PLUTONIUM PROGRAMME?**

The North Korean nuclear weapons programme dates back to the 1980s when it began construction of its Yongbyon complex, about 100 km (60 miles) north of Pyongyang. It consists of a five-megawatt reactor, a fuel fabrication facility and a plutonium reprocessing plant, where weapons-grade material is extracted from spent fuel rods.

The North tested nuclear devices in 2006 and 2009, but still has not shown it has a working nuclear bomb. Proliferation experts say it has enough fissile material for up to 10 nuclear weapons.

Under the terms of a previous aid-for-disarmament agreement, North Korea dismantled the main reactor, and despite restoring parts of the plant, it is still not operational.

#### WHERE IS THE URANIUM ENRICHMENT PROGRAMME AT?

Last November, North Korea unveiled its uranium enrichment programme, which would give it another path to make atomic weapons, to the outside world. Uranium enrichment can be conducted away from the prying eyes of satellites, and the North can fuel it with its ample supplies of natural uranium.

Although, it was widely known that North Korea had such a programme, foreign experts who saw the facility said they were stunned by its sophistication.

The foreign experts said they were not able to establish whether the plant was designed to produce only low-enriched uranium needed to make fuel for a power plant or the highly enriched uranium for bombs. It is easier to design a nuclear bomb with highly enriched uranium (HEU) than plutonium, but harder to make a nuclear warhead with HEU to mount on a missile.

#### BUT CAN THE NORTH DELIVER A NUCLEAR BOMB?

Experts say they do not believe the North can miniaturise an atomic weapon to place on a missile, but it is trying to develop such a warhead. It needs more nuclear testing to build one.

North Korea's ageing fleet of Soviet-era bombers would also have difficulty evading the advanced air forces of regional powers to deliver a nuclear bomb outside the country.

But, Washington says the North's long-range ballistic missile programme is moving ahead fast, and that the American mainland could itself come under threat within five years.

The nuclear threat, however, could be delivered by other unconventional means such as aboard a civilian aircraft, boat or van to the target.

Experts agree, however, no nation would dare use a nuclear device against a nuclear-armed state, because the certainty of retribution would far outweigh whatever benefit might be gained. Non-nuclear armed states such as South Korea and Japan fall under Washington's nuclear umbrella.

#### HOW DOES THE NORTH JUSTIFY ITS NUCLEAR ARMS PROGRAMME?

The North says the world has got it all wrong about its hostile intentions, and that it is only pursuing uranium enrichment for peaceful energy purposes.

As for its plutonium programme, Pyongyang says it was cornered into pursuing nuclear weapons because of the United States' nuclear threat. It says it is as entitled to a deterrent as the Americans, and that when Washington denuclearises it will do the same.

#### COULD IT SELL THE NUCLEAR TECHNOLOGY?

Apart from the direct threat of a nuclear weapon, the next biggest concern is the proliferation risk Pyongyang poses. Much of the North's income in the past has been generated through arms sales.

Last year, a U.N. report suggested the North may have supplied Syria, Iran and Myanmar with banned nuclear technology. Equally, experts worry about the potential for subsequent proliferation to terrorists.

*Editing by Miral Fahmy*

[http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2011/1/31/worldupdates/2011-01-31T144616Z\\_01\\_NOOTR\\_RTRMDNC\\_0\\_-545286-1&sec=Worldupdates](http://thestar.com.my/news/story.asp?file=/2011/1/31/worldupdates/2011-01-31T144616Z_01_NOOTR_RTRMDNC_0_-545286-1&sec=Worldupdates)

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

Daily News

## **U.N. Urged to Tighten Grip on North Korea Atomic Program**

By Louis Charbonneau  
January 31, 2011

UNITED NATIONS, Jan. 31, 2011 (Reuters) — A U.N. panel reported to the Security Council that North Korea may have further secret atomic facilities and called for better implementation of sanctions against Pyongyang, U.N. diplomats said on Monday.

The diplomats told Reuters on condition of anonymity that the assessment and recommendations were included in a confidential report prepared by the so-called U.N. Panel of Experts, a group that monitors compliance with two rounds of U.N. sanctions against North Korea over its nuclear arms program.

The report to the U.N. North Korea sanctions committee was based on conversations with a U.S. nuclear scientist, Siegfried Hecker, who saw hundreds of centrifuges used to enrich uranium during a rare visit to North Korea last year, as well as the panel's own investigations and analysis, the diplomats said.

"What the report says is that it's not operational," one of the envoys said about North Korea's uranium enrichment program. "They (the panel) are also mentioning other secret facilities."

Envoys said the panel endorsed Hecker's view that there had to be additional secret sites in North Korea, in addition to the facility where Hecker said he saw "hundreds and hundreds" of centrifuges in November. Hecker visited a former fuel fabrication plant that was virtually empty several years ago.

"There's no way they could have outfitted the centrifuge facility between 2009 and now without there being additional secret sites," a diplomat said.

The panel's report says North Korea's uranium enrichment work -- which is in addition to its plutonium-based nuclear arms program that is a subject of international concern -- started back in the 1990s, the diplomats said.

#### EXCHANGE OF KNOW-HOW WITH IRAN?

Much of what is known publicly about North Korean nuclear activities is based on information about the Yongbyon nuclear complex. But the United States and its allies have long suspected that North Korea has other sites around the country.

A South Korean intelligence official said last month that North Korea has been secretly enriching uranium that could be used to build nuclear weapons at three or four undisclosed locations.

Uranium enrichment could give North Korea a second pathway to fissile material for bombs in addition to its plutonium-based program, which had been frozen under an earlier disarmament-for-aid deal.

North Korea expelled U.N. inspectors from Yongbyon in late 2002 and withdrew from the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, a global pact banning the spread of atomic weapons, several months later.

The panel also warned the Security Council's sanctions committee that North Korea continues exchanges of expertise in the nuclear field. Although it does not name any countries, diplomats said the panel clearly had Iran in mind.

Iran denies pursuing atomic weapons, but Western diplomats and intelligence officials say that North Korea and Iran have been cooperating on missile-related issues and possibly in the nuclear field as well.

The panel urged the council to increase the number of individuals and companies on a U.N. blacklist for supplying North Korea's nuclear and missile companies. The individuals it suggested blacklisting are connected to Pyongyang's "military industrial complex" or procurement, the envoys said.

The report makes other recommendations aimed at improving compliance with the U.N. sanctions imposed on North Korea after its two nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009.

<http://www.newsdaily.com/stories/tre70u6qg-us-korea-north-un/#>

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

Economic News – India

31 January 2011

## **Pak Has 110 N-Weapons to Edge Ahead of India: US Report**

WASHINGTON: Pakistan has doubled its nuclear arms stockpile to 110 warheads, developing new weapons to deliver them and significantly accelerating production of uranium and plutonium for bombs to edge ahead of India.

Islamabad's nuclear weapons stockpile now totals more than 110 deployed weapons in a sharp jump from an estimated 30-80 weapons four years ago, 'Washington Post' reported.

"Pakistan has expanded its nuclear weapons production capability rapidly", the Post quoted David Albright President of the Institute for Science and International Security as saying.

Albright said that based on accelerated production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, Pakistan may now have an arsenal up to 110 weapons.

The non-government US analyst said that while continuing to produce weapons-grade uranium at two sites, Islamabad has sharply increased its production of plutonium, enabling it to make lighter warheads for more mobile delivery system.

Pakistan's has developed a new missile Shaheen II, with a range of 1,500 miles which is about to go into operation deployment. The country has also developed nuclear capable land and air launched cruise missiles, the Institute said in a new report.

"The Pakistanis have significantly accelerated production of uranium and plutonium for bombs and developed new weapons to deliver them. After years of approximate weapons parity, experts said, Pakistan has now edged ahead of India, its nuclear-armed rival", Washington Post said.

The paper said while Pakistan has produced more nuclear-armed weapons, India is believed to have larger existing stockpiles of such fissile material for future weapons.

Dubbing Pakistan as one of the world's most unstable region, Post said an escalation of nuclear arms race in South Asia possess a dilemma for Obama Administration.

It said in politically fragile Pakistan, the Administration is caught between fears of proliferation or possible terrorist attempts to seize nuclear materials and Pakistani suspicions that the US aims to control or limit its weapons programme and favours India.

Quoting Pakistan's Defense attache at its embassy in Washington, Post said the number of Pakistani nuclear weapons are heavily deployed near its border with India.

The paper said that in December 2008, Peter Lavoie, US national intelligence officer for South Asia, told NATO officials that "despite pending economic catastrophe, Pakistan is producing nuclear weapons at a faster rate than in any other country in the world".

<http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics/nation/pak-has-110-n-weapons-to-edge-ahead-of-india-us-report/articleshow/7396411.cms>

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

Sify News – India

## **Don't Worry, India's Deterrence is Robust: Pokhran II Scientist**

Indo-Asian News Service (IANS)

January 31, 2011

New Delhi, Jan 31 (IANS) Allaying apprehensions about reports of Pakistan doubling its nuclear arsenal, a veteran Indian scientist who played a key role in India's second nuclear test has said India need not be alarmed as its credible minimum deterrence was robust and it can produce more than 100 weapons.

'Our credible minimum deterrent is robust and strong. There is no cause for undue alarm,' K. Santhanam, a former scientist with the Defence Research and Development (DRDO) and the chief pointsman for the weaponisation programme for India's second nuclear test, told IANS.

'Our plutonium-based nuclear programme is stronger and the plutonium produced can help make more than 100 weapons.

'The numbers are not the only thing that matter. Our nuclear programme is completely indigenous and stronger,' he said.

Santhanam was reacting to disclosures by a US daily that Pakistan has doubled its nuclear arsenal over the last several years and now has more than 100 deployed weapons.

The Pakistanis have significantly accelerated production of uranium and plutonium for bombs and developed new weapons to deliver them, the influential US daily, the Washington Post, reported Monday citing estimates by non-government analysts.

<http://www.sify.com/news/don-t-worry-india-s-deterrence-is-robust-pokhran-ii-scientist-news-national-lb5u4kebgfa.html>

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

India Today – India

## **Nuclear-Attack on India will Finish Pakistan: Ex-NSA**

Mail Today Bureau  
New Delhi, January 31, 2011

If Pakistan ever uses nuclear weapons against India, it will be finished, says former national security adviser Brajesh Mishra, who has held the office under the Atal Bihari Vajpayee government.

Mishra, awarded Padma Vibhushan last week, was talking to M. J. Akbar, editorial director, *India Today* on Aaj Tak's *Seedhi Baat*. He said Pakistan's army, which plays a central role in formulating the country's policies on issues such as Afghanistan, nuclear weapons and India, will never permit peaceful coexistence with India.

On the Pakistan- China relationship, Mishra said the two countries are strategic partners.

"As China changed its stance on Kashmir, I said in next two- three years, we have to be careful on both the fronts. While China, like India, will adhere to the policy of no- first use of nuclear weapons, this cannot be said of Pakistan, but they will be finished if they use weapons against India," he said.

Asked why Vajpayee held talks with Pakistan, including the Agra Summit, if he was aware of such hostility, Mishra said: " I was against the Agra Summit. It was a political decision and I was kept out of it I had then remarked it will not succeed." He added all Indian PMs have wanted to hold talks with Pakistan.

Akbar then referred to former Pakistan president Pervez Musharraf's statement that some people in the Indian government were out to sabotage the talks. "When there was no agreement, how can there be sabotage? The cabinet had decided against the terms of the agreement," Mishra said.

To a question concerning speculations that the former NSA M. K. Narayanan's term was not extended owing to his differences with Prime Minister Manmohan Singh over Pakistan, Mishra said: " Maybe what you are saying is right."

<http://indiatoday.intoday.in/site/Story/128236/india/nuclear-attack-on-india-will-finish-pakistan-former-nsa-brajesh-mishra.html>

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

The Nation – Pakistan

## **Pakistan's Nuclear Arsenal is Estimated at More than 100: WP**

By: Special Correspondent  
January 31, 2011

Pakistan has overtaken India in the atomic field, with more than 100 deployed nuclear weapons, a doubling of its stockpile over the past several years, The Washington Post reported Monday, citing US non-government analysts. In a front page dispatch, the newspaper said that only four years ago, the Pakistani nuclear arsenal was estimated at 30 to 60 weapons.

The report, citing experts, added, "The Pakistanis have significantly accelerated production of uranium and plutonium for bombs and developed new weapons to deliver them. After years of approximate weapons parity ... Pakistan has now edged ahead of India, its nuclear-armed rival."

But Brig. Nazir Butt, defence attache at the Pakistan Embassy in Washington, neither confirmed nor denied the Post dispatch, saying the number of Pakistan's weapons and the status of its production facilities were confidential.

"Pakistan lives in a tough neighborhood and will never be oblivious to its security needs," Brig. Butt was quoted as saying by the Post. "As a nuclear power, we are very confident of our deterrent capabilities."

"David Albright, president of the Institute for Science and International Security, was quoted as saying, "They (the Pakistanis) have been expanding pretty rapidly."

Based on recently accelerated production of plutonium and highly enriched uranium, Pakistan may now have an arsenal of up to 110 weapons, Albright said. India is estimated to have 60 to 100 weapons.

"It's hard to say how much the U.S. knows," Hans Kristensen, director of the nuclear information project at the Federation of American Scientists and author of the annual global nuclear weapons inventory published in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, was quoted as saying. "Probably a fair amount. But it's a mixed bag - Pakistan is an ally, and they can't undercut it with a statement of concern in public."

But, according to the Post, the administration's determination to bring the fissile materials ban to completion this year may compel it to confront more directly the issue of proliferation in South Asia.

"In politically fragile Pakistan, the administration is caught between fears of proliferation or possible terrorist attempts to seize nuclear materials and Pakistani suspicions that the United States aims to control or limit its weapons program and favours India," the newspaper said.

<http://nation.com.pk/pakistan-news-newspaper-daily-english-online/Politics/31-Jan-2011/Pakistans-nuclear-arsenal-tops-100-WP>

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

Times of India – India

## **At 100, Pak Ahead in N-Arsenal**

By Chidanand Rajghatta, Tamil News Network (TNN)  
February 1, 2011

WASHINGTON: How many nuclear weapons does Pakistan need to feel secure? Not enough. Islamabad has doubled its nuclear weapons to more than 100 in the last few years, overtaking India's tally in the process, and is adding more bombs to its arsenal, according to new estimates by proliferation gurus.

Four years ago, Pakistan's nuclear arsenal was estimated to contain between 30 to 60 weapons, about the same as India's. Since then, the country has rapidly accelerated its program. Current estimates by western nuclear pundits cited in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists and other journals put the number between 100 and 110 — and growing.

The reports are not new. As far back as December 2008, Peter Lavoie, the U.S. national intelligence officer for South Asia, told NATO officials that "despite pending economic catastrophe, Pakistan is producing nuclear weapons at a faster rate than any other country in the world," according to a classified State Department cable released late last year by WikiLeaks.

The ostensible reason cited by Pakistan for cranking up production of nuclear weapons is the U.S-India nuclear deal, which Islamabad believes frees up India's domestic fissile material for bomb-making purposes because it allows New Delhi to purchase nuclear fuel for civilian purposes.

But nuclear theologians believe Pakistan believes it has to have more weapons because it India is bigger, has greater land mass, more cities, and hence more targets. By contrast, Pakistan is smaller, has fewer cities and fewer targets, and is more vulnerable. There is also the psychological factor.

As Pakistan sees India becoming a great power, "nuclear weapons become a very attractive psychological equalizer," George Perkovich, a nonproliferation specialist at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, was quoted as saying in the Washington Post, which revisited the story of Pakistan's growing arsenal on Monday.

Some analysts scoffed at reports of expanding Pakistani nuclear arsenal, which has been making the rounds since Lavoie's assertion, suggesting it was aimed at extracting a nuclear deal for Pakistan similar to the one India has arrived at with the U.S and the international nuclear club.

"If Pakistan is stockpiling nukes, it's the west that needs to be scared. India cannot be scared more than it has been since 1985 (when Pakistan first weaponized)," said Nitin Pai, who edits Pragati, the Indian National Interest Review, and is a Fellow at the Takshashila Institution. "We stopped counting after Pakistan's first one." Most Indian analysts believe Washington has generally winked at Pakistan's egregious nuclear build-up because of other strategic concerns.

The United States, which according to these critics indirectly funds and underwrites Pakistan's nuclear weapons program (because the country generates no revenues beyond its bare survival) continues to be blasé in public about Islamabad's growing arsenal, even though it is coming at the expense of a proposed international treaty to stop production of fissile material. Pakistan has blocked progress on the so-called Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty in Geneva and remains the lone hold-out, despite living on American hand-outs, as it accelerates expansion of its arsenal.

There are no signs Washington is doing much to budge its ally or restrain its production of nuclear weapons, despite the \$ 7.5 billion U.S aid through Kerry-Lugar bill being conditioned on regular assessments of whether any of the money "directly or indirectly aided the expansion of Pakistan's nuclear weapons program."

<http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/world/us/At-100-Pak-ahead-in-N-arsenal/articleshow/7400356.cms>

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

Economic Times – India

## **Pak Overtakes UK in Nuclear Capability: Report**

1 February 2011  
Press Trust of India (PTI)

WASHINGTON/NEW YORK: Pakistan is steadily building up its nuclear arsenal since President Barack Obama took office in 2009, and the country is on its way to overtake Britain as well as France, as the fifth largest nuclear weapon power.

"New American intelligence assessments have concluded that Pakistan has steadily expanded its nuclear arsenal since President Obama came to office, and that it is building the capability to surge ahead in the production of nuclear-weapons material, putting it on a path to overtake Britain as the world's fifth largest nuclear weapons power," The New York Times reported.

"The country already has more than enough weapons for an effective deterrent against India," an official said speaking on condition of anonymity.

The US, Russia and China are currently the three largest nuclear weapons states.

"If those estimates are correct -- and some government officials regard them as high -- it would put Pakistan on a par with long-established nuclear powers," the paper said.

The New York Times' report comes a day after 'The Washington Post' reported that Pakistan has doubled its nuclear and arms stockpile to 110 warheads. The State Department, however, refused to comment on all such reports.

"These are estimates attributed to a non-governmental organization. We do not comment on nuclear issues, particularly the size of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal," State Department spokesman P J Crowley, told reporters at his daily news conference.

According to 'The New York Times', the new American military assistance poses a direct challenge to a central element of the Obama's national security strategy, the reduction of nuclear stockpiles around the world.

"Pakistan's determination to add considerably to its arsenal -- mostly to deter India-- has also become yet another irritant in its often testy relationship with Washington, particularly as Pakistan seeks to block Obama's renewed efforts to negotiate a global treaty that would ban the production of new nuclear material," it said.

"When Obama came to office, his aides were told that the arsenal "was in the mid-to-high 70s," according to one official who had been briefed at the time, though estimates ranged from 60 to 90," the daily said adding that the number of deployed weapons now ranges from the mid-90s to more than 110.

"We've seen a consistent, constant buildup in their inventory, but it hasn't been a sudden rapid rise. We're very, very well aware of what they're doing," a senior American military official was quoted as saying.

White House officials share the assessment that the increase in actual weapons has been what one termed "slow and steady," it said.

<http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics/nation/pak-overtakes-uk-in-nuclear-capability-report/articleshow/7403728.cms>

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

The Express Tribune – Pakistan

## **Pakistan Dismisses 'Alarmist Reporting' on Nuclear Programme**

By Pakistan Press International (PPI)

February 1, 2011

ISLAMABAD: Pakistan on Tuesday dismissed reports that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal had doubled to edge past a stockpile of 100 deployed weapons as "unnecessary alarmist reporting".

Responding to reports that Pakistan was increasing its stockpile of nuclear weapons, the Foreign Office said it would continue to follow a responsible policy of maintaining credible minimum deterrence.

"Pakistan is mindful of the need to avoid arms race with India but would never compromise on its national security," a Foreign Office spokesman said while responding to an article in New York Times titled "Pakistani Nuclear Arms Pose Challenge to US Policy."

The Washington Post also reported yesterday that according to estimates by nongovernment analysts, Pakistan had significantly accelerated production of uranium and plutonium for bombs and developed new weapons to deliver them,

It also said that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal had "now edged ahead of India, its nuclear-armed rival."

A statement by the Foreign Office said that “In the nuclearized environment of South Asia, Pakistan continues to attach importance to ensuring peace, security and stability in South Asia and was mindful of the adverse implications of ‘selectivity and exceptionalism in evidence on issues of nuclear non-proliferation.’”

It said that Pakistan had consistently advocated the need to resume the stalled Pakistan-India Dialogue, including on issues of peace and security.

“In this context, Pakistan’s proposal for strategic restraint regime in South Asia, including nuclear and conventional forces as well as resolution of all issues and disputes, is of extreme importance.”

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/112542/pakistan-dismisses-alarmist-reporting-on-nuclear-programme/>

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

RIA Novosti – Russian Information Agency

## **Russian Navy to Receive New Nuclear Attack Submarine by Yearend**

31 January 2011

The Russian Navy will receive a new Graney class nuclear-powered multipurpose attack submarine by the end of 2011, a spokesman for the Malakhit design bureau said on Monday.

Construction of the Severodvinsk submarine began in 1993 at the Sevmash Shipyard in the northern Russian city of Severodvinsk but has since been dogged by financial setbacks. It was floated out in June last year.

"The submarine is undergoing harbor trials at the Sevmash Shipyard and is getting ready for sea trials in May," the official said. "It should enter service with the Russian Navy by the end of this year."

Graney class nuclear submarines are designed to launch a variety of long-range cruise missiles (up to 3,100 miles or 5,000 km), with conventional or nuclear warheads, and effectively engage submarines, surface warships and land-based targets.

The submarine's armament includes 24 cruise missiles and eight torpedo launchers, as well as mines and anti-ship missiles.

In 2009, work started on the second sub of the Graney class, the Kazan, which will feature more advanced equipment and weaponry.

MOSCOW, January 31 (RIA Novosti)

[http://en.rian.ru/military\\_news/20110131/162394984.html](http://en.rian.ru/military_news/20110131/162394984.html)

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

Pak Tribune – Pakistan

OPINION

## **Kashmir Has Become a Dangerous Nuclear Flashpoint**

Monday, January 31, 2011

By Asif Haroon Raja

Sixty three years have lapsed but Kashmir dispute remains unresolved. During this period, besides several military standoffs, two full fledged Indo-Pak wars and two localised conflicts in April 1965 and in summer of 1999 took place on account of Kashmir issue. India has been defying UN Resolutions on Kashmir and playing monkey tricks all these years to avoid resolving the dispute. Indian security forces have kept the people of Kashmir suppressed through use of brute force and has hid its gross human rights abuses under the cover of blatant lies and deceit. Today Kashmir has turned into a dangerous nuclear flashpoint.

The peace loving and docile Kashmiris patiently waited for 43 long years in the hope that India would fulfil its solemn commitment and hold a fair plebiscite but when they found that India will never give them their just right, they ultimately decided to pick up arms and push out Indian Security Forces (ISF) illegally occupying their land since 1947. Armed uprising in Indian Occupied Kashmir (IOK) in end 1988 added fuel to fire to militancy in Pakistan, which had intensified during the eight-year Afghan Jihad.

Tens of die-hard Jihadi groups cropped up to assist the Kashmiri struggle. Large amount of funds were collected for the cause of Kashmir. The people of Pakistan who have always regarded IOK as part of Pakistan and an unfinished agenda of partition left behind by scheming British were deeply pained over the atrocities committed by ISF upon



hapless Kashmiris. The ISF had been given a licence to kill and to use rape as a weapon to break the will of freedom fighters. The world took no notice of worst human rights abuses by ISF nor made any effort to find a political solution on the basis of UN Resolutions.

The US which had drawn closer to India after 1990 started changing its stance by undervaluing UN Resolutions and terming them as outdated. Israel which had also forged special ties with India imparted training to Black Cats Commandoes of India in specialised counter insurgency operations and taught them new methods of torturing detainees so as to break the back of movement. Indo-Israel propaganda machinery supplemented by western media started projecting Kashmiri freedom fighters as terrorists and Pakistan as an abettor of terrorism. Full throttle was given to the theme of cross border terrorism. Efforts were geared to get Pakistan branded as a terrorist state.

The religious right in Pakistan sympathised with Kashmir cause and took out rallies in their support and also took practical steps to alleviate their sufferings by providing financial and material assistance. The general public filled up money boxes placed in front of each mosque wholeheartedly. The seculars particularly the liberal elite by and large took least interest in the plight of Kashmiris. Rather, they subscribed to Indo-western propaganda and pressed the government to rein in Jihadists to appease India.

Reign of terror unleashed in IOK by over 700,000 ISF, Indian intelligence agencies and Hindu extremist groups have turned the vale of Kashmir into hell. The whole valley is drenched in human blood but the conscience of the international comity is dead. Shrieks and cries of ill-fated Kashmiri men, women and children get drowned under the din of gunfire, one-sided propaganda and patronage of USA and civilised west. Instead of cautioning India to restrain from human rights abuses, the entire pressure was exerted on Pakistan and held solely responsible for worsening security situation in IOK. Despite use of excessive force and worst form of torture, the flame of liberty lit by handful of Kashmiri fighters kept burning vigorously. No amount of brutality could weaken their resolve to keep fighting till the accomplishment of their due right of self determination as provided for in UN Resolutions.

Indian inhuman cruelty alienated the Kashmiris and their hatred for India touched new heights. Except for insignificant number of Indian toadies enjoying fruits of power at the cost of enslavement of five million Kashmiris, each and every Kashmiri yearns to get rid of India. Having seen the ugly face of India and miserable plight of Indian Muslims, they have lost all trust in duplicitous Indian leaders. Conversely, their love for Pakistanis growing by leaps and bounds. They want to be part of Muslim Pakistan and not of Hindu India where Muslims are treated as second rated citizens. They know that secularism in India is a big farce since Hindu extremist forces are far more powerful than Hindu secularists who are too weak to question them.

Takeover of power by Gen Musharraf in October 1999 brought smiles on the faces of depressed seculars particularly when he came out with his concept of enlightened moderation. The fortunes of Kashmiri resistance forces that were giving a real tough time to 700,000 ISF as well as Jihadi forces in Pakistan plummeted in the aftermath of 9/11. New laws framed by USA on terrorism changed the complexion of freedom movements within Muslim world overnight and freedom fighters were branded as terrorists. This rule was applied in IOK as well which impelled India to apply full pressure on Musharraf to change its policy on Kashmir.

Ten month military standoff in 2002 followed by the US pressure forced him to ban six Kashmir oriented Jihadi groups and to freeze their accounts. Besides allowing India to fence the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir, he took stringent measures to control cross LoC movement and also started hounding extremists. He also took on board moderate leaders of All Parties Hurriat Conference promising them an out of box solution to the dispute falling outside the ambit of UN Resolutions. These measures favoured India but went against the interest of Pakistan and resultantly rolled back the momentum of liberation movement. Indian military hastened to claim that it had succeeded in crushing insurgency in Kashmir. Pakistan thus lost the lone card of Kashmir which it could play against India which held several cards.

As a consequent to blocking Jihadi groups from assisting Kashmiris, these groups in revenge joined hands with Tehrik-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and TNSM and started fighting Pak security forces, thus compounding Pakistan's security problems. These groups facilitated TTP in launching suicide and group attacks within cities. Kashmiris saved the day for Pakistan when they bounced back in the valley in 2008 in the form of violent strikes and protest marches which flabbergasted India. Mumbai attacks were hastily engineered in November 2008 to distract the attention of the world from Kashmir, to put off Indo-Pak composite dialogue which was in advanced stages and to exert pressure on Pakistan to stay away from Kashmir.

Kashmiri movement took a new turn in 2010 when the teenagers with stones in their fists came in the forefront and kept raising anti-India and "freedom from India" slogans despite being ruthlessly killed and tortured by ISF. Unarmed movement of tender age boys captured the attention of the world and for the first time India found itself short of lame excuses. It could not possibly dub unarmed small boys as young as 8-15 years as terrorists. Nor could it justify its brutal actions against them. Apart from many in western countries, several intellectuals and human rights activists within India have started to sympathize with Kashmiris and are condemning ISF brutalities.

Arundhati Roy has taken the lead and has not minced her words in saying that Kashmir is not part of India as claimed by Brahman Indian leaders and that justice should be meted to the people of Kashmir.

In a seminar recently organized in British Parliament, the parliamentarians lent unflinching support to the right of self determination of Kashmiris and have stressed upon their government to use its good offices to solve this chronic dispute. They also called upon India to withdraw its forces from IOK and to facilitate granting right of self determination to Kashmiris. Black day was organized by Kashmiris on both sides of the divide on 27 January and also in Pakistan and other parts of the world reminding India to prevent its forces from massacring innocent Kashmiris and to grant right of self determination to Kashmiris. Rumbling within India for a solution is getting louder.

Indian leadership will never risk holding a plebiscite since it knows that the result would be to its disfavor. It will keep dragging its feet until it is forced to give up its obduracy. The US must play its role to solve this dispute to avoid a nuclear holocaust in the future.

<http://www.paktribune.com/news/index.shtml?235977>

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

The Australian – Australia

OPINION

## Tehran Must Know We'll Strike Back

Dina Esfandiary and Harry White, *The Australian*

January 31, 2011

TALKS with Iran failed last week in Istanbul in another sign that within a few years the international community is likely to be faced with a nuclear-armed Iran.

Now is the time to work out how we plan to deal with it. Iran has never officially declared an ambition to develop nuclear weapons, but there is a very real possibility it could go down that path. How should the rest of the world respond? Delaying tactics should not be discounted; after all, buying time is useful. And breaking off talks would be a rash decision. But if there ever was a window of opportunity in which the rest of the world could prevent a determined Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons, it has almost certainly closed.

Slowing Iran's progress towards a nuclear weapons capability is an important way of dealing with the problem. A few weeks ago, former Mossad chief Meir Dagan said Iran's nuclear program had been set back and would not produce a bomb until 2015. This timeline is a testament to the success of the current mix of sanctions and sabotage - including assassinations, and industrial and cyber-sabotage -- in slowing Iranian progress.

Limited air strikes, most likely by Israel, on the main Iranian nuclear installations will have the same effect, although there would also be some serious risks.

But lack of intelligence about the number and location of covert facilities would make targeting the program difficult, and strikes will lead Iran to double efforts to overcome the damage and resume development. None of the options can stop Iran developing nuclear weapons. All they can do is buy time.

In a perfect world, delaying tactics would give the international community some time to figure out how to convince Iran to forgo its nuclear program, but the problem with coming to a negotiated solution is that it is difficult to imagine what the rest of the world would offer that would entice Iran to give up its uranium enrichment program.

The real subject of these talks is not the domestic nuclear program, but the potential it has to be used as the basis for developing nuclear weapons. Iran clearly wants to retain the option. But who can blame them? The advantages to Iran of having a minimum nuclear deterrent may well outweigh the disadvantages.

If Iranians cannot be prevented from developing nuclear weapons, and if we are unlikely to change their minds about whether they want them, then, like it or not, the international community might just have to learn to live with a nuclear Iran.

Instead of trying to figure out how to stop Iran getting nuclear weapons, we now have to figure out how to stop them being used. The most obvious answer is deterrence, and probably nuclear deterrence. It will have to be clear to Iran that the consequences of using of nuclear weapons will far outweigh the benefits. Security provided by deterrence is more frightening than security provided by accord, but it may be the best option we have.

*Dina Esfandiary is research assistant and project co-ordinator in non-proliferation and disarmament at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, and Harry White is editor of Pnyx blog*

<http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/world/tehran-must-know-well-strike-back/story-e6frg6ux-1225997061228>

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

The Express Tribune – Pakistan

OPINION

## **A Treaty on Fissile Materials**

By Zahir Kazmi

January 31, 2011

Does blocking negotiations over the vaunted fissile material treaty serve any purpose for Pakistan? The international community blames Islamabad for the impasse at the Conference on Disarmament (CD). Things may change as the states that keep a poker face at the negotiating table will break cover if Islamabad runs out of aces. Pakistan will face added economic, political and media pressure. The UN secretary-general's veiled indication to shift the issue to the UN Security Council and the US-based Council on Foreign Relations' December forecast, that Pakistan may disintegrate in four to six years, are the two ends of this blitz. Why did Pakistan prefer to stand in splendid isolation on the proposed fissile materials 'cut-off' treaty (FMCT) at Geneva? A brief pause to explain the term fissile material is essential.

Disagreement on the definition of fissile material is one of the reasons for stalemate at the CD. Risking oversimplification, highly-enriched uranium and weapon-grade plutonium are the fissile materials that form the cores of nuclear bombs and some states want to include other materials in this category. If we were to destroy all existing stocks of fissile material and promise not to produce them in future, we would be talking of disarmament. Consider the following to understand the magnitude of the threat the world faces today. Countries that have nuclear weapons possess enough fissile material stockpiles to destroy the world many times over. Likewise, enough potentially weapon-usable plutonium has been produced in their civil nuclear power reactors to make tens of thousands of weapons. Hence, it's easy to conclude that a treaty must take stock of all fissile materials produced to-date.

There are three things that the world can do with fissile materials. A complete elimination is ideal to attain the UN's long-standing universal disarmament agenda. A complete and verifiable stocktaking of all fissile materials and halting future production is another option. Readers can judge the merit of this proposed mechanism which seeks to halt the production of a few fissile materials but without a verification regime. Such measures carry the risk that as long as there is enough fissile material for even one bomb, the possibility exists of its use by a rational state or an equally 'rational' non-state actor.

The idea of the FMCT emerged in the 1950s and is mired, ostensibly, amongst two major camps with competing interests. The first camp desires a halt in future production with a verification mechanism. America initially opposed verification but is now amenable to the idea. Keeping old stocks and halting future production makes President Obama's 'Nuclear Zero' pledge a pipe dream. Non-nuclear weapon states muddle blankly in this arms control camp due to their politico-economic interests. They don't realise that the risks of exposing their people as the 'nuclear-haves' gives no assurance that they won't use nuclear weapons.

The second camp is a complex mix that prefers a complete and verifiable stocktaking of fissile materials while it decides to go for complete disarmament or otherwise. Many states conveniently hide behind Pakistan and side with the first camp because Islamabad is blocking the FMCT for them and they otherwise retain the option of moving the goalposts. Brazil, South Africa, some European and Arab states, and even India will leave their comfort zone once the chips are down. Hence, Islamabad is not as isolated as it appears to be.

Pakistan wants a fissile material treaty but disagrees on its projected scope. Merely a halt in future production will freeze its stocks asymmetries with India. Unlike Pakistan, India has the advantage of getting fuel for its nuclear reactors from the P-5 dominated nuclear suppliers group and using its domestic resources for making weapons at a fast pace. This exceptionalism is a function of common economic-politico-strategic interests. Conversely, Pakistan is under layers of onion-like export control sanctions. Hence it shouts 'foul play' against this neo-nuclear apartheid.

What does the future hold? As the stand-off continues, the states with smaller stocks of fissile materials will be inclined to address fissile material stock asymmetries. The nuclear-haves will try to shift the FMCT agenda to the UN Security Council because they don't have to worry about consensus. States content with their stocks will bargain on other geopolitical issues before they negotiate a treaty. Russia and China link negotiating the FMCT to progress on the Paros (Prevent Arms Race in Outer Space) concept.

Why would new nuclear powers need more stocks for weapons, as only a few bombs can cause serious damage and deter any adversary? This is a tough question. One can look to old nuclear proliferators for answers as they chose to retain weapons and stocks. The reality is that this is a power maximisation game and a measure to achieve security

— some obtain it with weapons and economy, and others with economy or by allying with those countries in the first group.

The consensus-based CD faces three bigger and older challenges than the FMCT. These include nuclear disarmament, Paros and negative security assurances by nuclear weapon states. Progress on the latter three doesn't fit in the power maximisation agenda. On April 5, 2009, Obama pledged Nuclear Zero and resolved to control all fissile material in four years, yet his administration pursues an arms control treaty on fissile materials. US domestic politics offers an explanation for this volte-face. Any progress on the FMCT augments the Democrats' domestic political fortune. Success in breaking the logjam at the CD negotiations will improve Obama's approval ratings as his Nuclear Zero and global peace initiatives won him a Nobel.

Islamabad may coalesce on the FMCT if existing fissile material stocks are included in the scope, if there is a promised verification mechanism or if layers of its sanctions-laden-onion are peeled off. Ostracising Pakistan and comparing it to a nuclear armed Congo will bring it under undue pressure and complicate the achievement of universal stability.

The proposed FMCT does not suit a silent majority that will step into the fray if Pakistan is singled more. Pakistan will have to walk the tightrope for the sake of others. Islamabad developed its nuclear programme under great duress but does it have any levers now? Time will tell.

*The writer is a master's student at the Strategic and Nuclear Studies Department of the National Defence University, Islamabad*

<http://tribune.com.pk/story/111589/a-treaty-on-fissile-materials/>

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