

Herzlia Conference

Nuclear proliferation & arms control

4 Feb. 2009

David Danieli, IAEC

A short chronology of battered nuclear order

- The contemporary nuclear order has been with us since 1945. The formation of the NPT has brought with it a dichotomy between nuclear and non-nuclear weapon states.
In the words of our Chairman* the nuclear order has gone from learning through crises to apparent managing capacity and stability, before it has been put under great strain and troubles since Mid. 90's.
- What was it that turned great hopes at the end of the Cold War, for a consolidated, globally shared nuclear order, to a widespread bitter sense of disillusionment and pessimism.

* Ariel Levite "Heading for the Fourth Nuclear Age". Proliferation Papers, Ifri (France) Winter 2009.

- Let us take stock, once again, at what was unfolding before our eyes since we were applauding China and France's accession to the NPT (1992), the signing of the "Agreed Framework" between U.S and DPRK (1994) and the launching of CTBT negotiations (1994).
- DPRK has gone astray before the ink dried on the above mentioned document. Iran has shown early signs of an aspiring nuclear weapon state. Iraq nuclear ambitions has gone underground. Middle East ACRS process has been brought to a grinding halt (1995). India and Pakistan emerged nuclear states (1998), while in Pakistan A.Q Khan & associates were busily working extra hours. Libya was one of the network's eager customers, on a turn-key basis. Sep. 11 2001, has highlighted the threat of radioactive & nuclear terrorism. DPRK, was reportedly searching for willing nuclear partners in the Middle East.

Arms control in relations to national and International Security: Reflections of a representative of a small state in the Middle East

- National security policies and doctrines, as well as arms races, are mostly the mirror image of geo-political setting, rather than the root cause of political conflicts. (“States do not suspect each other because they are arming. They are arming because they suspect each other”).
- Arms control measures are more likely to generate support when they address peripheral national security aspects, of a limited implications on national security.

- The big powers possess a better leverage “to export” to the international domain the non-critical elements of their national security postures.
- Administration change may bring a different view of the value of arms control measures to national and international security (ABM Treaty, CTBT, Verifiable FMCT).
- Has the decline of arms control as a kingpin of super-powers’ relations, diminished the prospects of regional arms control processes?

- Arms control regimes are viewed by some to benefit the “privileged”. Security for all is transformed to flat disarming of the possessors.
- The P-5 are often blamed for arms control policies which are designed to keep the “club” intact. A politically correct argument which equally sounds as a noble cause for proliferation.
- Do zealots of arms control and disarmament tend to sacrifice others’ national security for the sake of the regime?

- Is the “nuclear renaissance” competing with non-proliferation?
- Is the “Global zero option” and its offshoots a healthy sign of realism, an utopia, or of a sign of deep despair?

Partial conclusions

- The historical evolution of the nuclear order is making the future course of arms control and nuclear proliferation unpredictable.
- Global economy and the spread of technology put arms control regimes under heavy strain and may change their nature.
- No arms control regime can survive constant challenge from outside or encroachment from inside.
- Arms control regimes are susceptible to abuse by non-democratic regimes.
- No lasting arms control mechanism without proper enforcement.
- Conflicts resolution is the more healthy pillar of arms control.
- Traditional security interests tend to dictate arms control policies.