CHAPTER ONE: WHY A NEW STRATEGY?

We raced from threat to threat to threat….There was not a system in place to say, “You’ve got to go back and do this and this and this.”…The moral of the story is, if you’d taken those measures systemically over the course of time…you might have had a better chance of succeeding.

—Director of Central Intelligence George Tenet
Before the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States, March 24, 2004

Perhaps the most ambitious attempt ever made to extend the civilizing reach of the rule of law has been the international effort to constrain the acquisition and use of nuclear weapons, the greatest physical force created by humankind. The United States, the Soviet Union, and other states laid the foundation for this mission in the 1960s with the negotiation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). In the decades since, states have evolved rules and institutions to govern nuclear exports, safeguard and account for nuclear materials, and control and even reduce the number of nuclear weapons.

The rules are not self-enforcing, as painful experience in Iraq, North Korea, Libya, Iran, and elsewhere has shown. Moreover, states and international agencies must struggle to mobilize the power needed to enforce and adapt the rules as conditions change. Doing so involves difficult trade-offs as states seek benefits commensurate with the options they forgo and the costs they bear.
In 1995, in perhaps the single greatest strengthening of the regime since its founding, the signatories to the Non-Proliferation Treaty agreed to transform its original twenty-five-year term into an open-ended commitment. In doing so, they committed themselves to a stringent bargain. One hundred seventy-three states reaffirmed their renunciation of nuclear weapons in return for an explicitly reaffirmed commitment by the United States, China, France, Russia, and the United Kingdom to eventually eliminate their nuclear arsenals. All states did so with the understanding that while the treaty was demonstrably imperfect, it nonetheless made them all safer—individually and collectively.

At the time, there was good reason for optimism. The Cold War was over. The number of states possessing nuclear weapons had declined, and the number of weapons was falling. But soon, the picture turned much darker. Almost overnight, it seemed that the elaborate nonproliferation system built around the NPT was in danger of failing.

In May 1998, India announced that it had exploded five nuclear devices. Two weeks later, Pakistan boasted of five nuclear explosions of its own. Neither country had signed the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Pakistan had received vital nuclear weapon design and production assistance from China and from private actors based in NPT member states in the West. Suddenly, the prospect loomed of a nuclear war in South Asia that could kill millions and irradiate a quarter of the globe. Neither the NPT nor the broader nonproliferation regime had stopped two major countries from crossing the nuclear threshold.

The events of September 11, 2001, forced a recognition that shadowy movements, not under the control of any state, were able to commit sophisticated attacks of mass terror.
to come into possession of nuclear weapons, they would presumably be willing to use them. After September 11, what had been an important problem—the transfer and proliferation of nuclear technology—suddenly became an urgent one.

Then, in 2003, news emerged that a network of scientists, engineers, and middlemen from Pakistan, Dubai, the United Kingdom, Germany, Malaysia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, and Turkey had for years been selling nuclear bomb designs and equipment necessary to produce nuclear weapons. Buyers included North Korea, Iran, Libya, and perhaps others. Existing laws and export control enforcement practices had proved manifestly inadequate to block these transfers of equipment and know-how.

The regime whose weaknesses were so exposed by these events had been designed for a world in which threats came from states. It was not built to deal with terrorist groups bent on mass destruction or nuclear black marketers with murky connections to governments. Many of the activities of the clandestine Pakistani network headed by A. Q. Khan violated no existing laws. The fact that the network was based in Pakistan also highlights the challenge of persuading the states that have not joined the NPT—India, Pakistan, and Israel—to nevertheless accept rigorous nonproliferation obligations. These three countries broke no covenant in acquiring nuclear weapons, but in varying degrees their status beyond its boundaries undermines the entire NPT-based regime.

Among the existing rules, today’s greatest threat stems from the wide availability they allow to highly enriched uranium (HEU) and plutonium, the fissile materials that are the fuel of nuclear weapons.¹ These materials have become more accessible to terrorists because of the collapse of the Soviet Union and poor security
at nuclear stockpiles in the former Soviet republics and in dozens of other countries. There is also danger that new nations could acquire nuclear weapons by exploiting the NPT’s failure to define specifically what constitutes the “peaceful” application of nuclear capabilities to which non–nuclear-weapon states commit themselves. As the treaty has been interpreted, countries can acquire technologies that bring them to the very brink of nuclear weapon capability without explicitly violating the agreement and can then leave the treaty without penalty.

There are also newer concerns. Fifteen years after the end of the Cold War, the majority of countries feel that the five original nuclear weapon states (the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China) do not intend to fulfill their end of the NPT bargain—the pledge to eliminate nuclear weapons. That growing conviction erodes the willingness among members of this majority to live up to their side of the bargain—much less to agree to strengthen the regime. Moreover, those same five original members of the so-called nuclear club, who are also the veto-wielding members of the United Nations Security Council, are divided on how to respond to today’s challenges, and thus raise widespread doubts about the capacity for action of the only international body with the legal writ to enforce nonproliferation commitments.

For all these reasons, there are rising doubts about the sustainability of the nonproliferation regime. Nations with ample technological ability to develop nuclear weapons may be reconsidering their political decisions not to do so. Recently, some Brazilian and Japanese political leaders, for example, have openly suggested that their countries should reweigh their nuclear weapon options. South Korea recently had to admit that its engineers had produced
HEU and weapon-grade plutonium outside of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, contrary to NPT requirements. The discovery rekindled a debate in South Korea about why it is restricted from possessing a complete set of fuel cycle capabilities when its neighbors are not.

All of these developments cast a heavy shadow over international security. They show that in spite of major successes the threat from nuclear proliferation remains all too real, and that the prospect of nuclear war did not disappear with the end of the Cold War. Together with what has occurred in Iraq, Iran, and North Korea, they underlie how much more needs to be done to reduce the possibility of nuclear catastrophe to an acceptable level. All nations—including the three unwilling to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty—need to be covered. Access to weapons fuel and the means of producing it needs to be far more tightly limited everywhere. Nonproliferation rules must be extended to individuals and corporations.

Some of the failures to contain proliferation result from these and other flaws in the regime itself. Many others stem from the unwillingness of leaders around the world to enforce commitments and resolutions earnestly passed. The United States’ share of these failures has involved both Democratic and Republican administrations and Congresses led by both parties.

**THE GOOD NEWS**

The news is by no means all bleak, however. There are positive trends to build upon. Since the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, many more countries have given up nuclear weapon programs than have begun them.\(^2\) There are fewer nuclear weapons in the world and fewer nations with nuclear
weapon programs than there were twenty years ago. The United States and Russia continue to work cooperatively to dismantle and secure nuclear weapons and materials left over from the Cold War. Libya is an important success story and a model for other nations to follow as it verifiably dismantles its clandestine nuclear and chemical weapon capabilities. Iraq is a model of a different type, but it, too, no longer poses a nuclear weapon threat to its neighbors. The United States’ use of force in Iraq to address this threat, while mismanaged, has heightened international awareness of the dangers posed by proliferation. The results are particularly evident in the European Union (EU), which, forging a new resolve, has intervened to curb programs in Libya and Iran and has adopted a unified nonproliferation strategy that includes requirements for full compliance with nonproliferation norms in all future trade and cooperation agreements. Significantly, the EU now also asserts its willingness to use force against proliferation threats.

International cooperation has grown, with more than one dozen nations having formally joined the U.S.-led Proliferation Security Initiative to interdict illegal transfers of weapons and materials. In April 2004, the UN Security Council agreed on a resolution requiring states to increase security for weapons and materials and to enact stricter export controls and laws to criminalize proliferation activities by individuals and corporations. President George W. Bush, IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei, and other leaders have proposed new plans to restrict the acquisition of nuclear technology for the production of enriched uranium and separated plutonium.
The question remains: Which trend will predominate—the positive or the negative? The world has arrived at a nuclear tipping point. Policy decisions in the next few years will determine whether the global cooperation that has shrunk the arsenals of chemical, biological, and nuclear weapons and missile systems over the past decades will continue, or if a dangerous new wave of proliferation will engulf the world.

Figure 1.1. Countries with Nuclear Weapons or Programs

Notes:
1960s: Twenty-three countries had weapons, were conducting weapons-related research, or were discussing the pursuit of weapons: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Egypt, France, India, Israel, Italy, Japan, Norway, Romania, South Africa, the Soviet Union, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, the United States, West Germany, and Yugoslavia.

1980s: Nineteen countries had weapons or were conducting weapons-related research: Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, France, India, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Libya, North Korea, Pakistan, South Africa, South Korea, the Soviet Union, Taiwan, the United Kingdom, the United States, and Yugoslavia.

2004: In addition to the eight states with nuclear weapons, Iran and North Korea were suspected of having active nuclear weapon programs.
Table 1.1. Countries with Nuclear Weapons or Programs, Past and Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NPT NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES</th>
<th>RECENTLY TERMINATED PROGRAMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-NPT NUCLEAR WEAPON STATES</th>
<th>GAVE UP INHERITED WEAPONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Ukraine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUSPECTED PROGRAMS</th>
<th>PROGRAMS OR CONSIDERATION ENDED AFTER 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Argentina^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>South Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Australia^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spain^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Switzerland^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTENTIONS SUSPECTED BUT NO WEAPONS PROGRAM IDENTIFIED</th>
<th>PROGRAMS OR CONSIDERATION ENDED BEFORE 1970</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>Norway^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Italy^c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japan^d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>West Germany^d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Thirty-five countries in total.

a Country had an active nuclear program, but intent to produce weapons is unconfirmed.
b A program for nuclear weapons was debated, but active nuclear programs were civilian in nature.
c Canada had between 250 and 450 U.S.-supplied nuclear weapons deployed on Canadian delivery systems until the early 1980s. In 1978, Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau declared that Canada was “the first nuclear-armed country to have chosen to divest itself of nuclear weapons.” See Duane Bratt, “Canada’s Nuclear Schizophrenia,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, March/April 2002, 58, no. 2, pp. 44–50.
d Though West Germany never went beyond consideration of an indigenous nuclear weapon program, Bonn did possess U.S.-supplied nuclear weapons. These weapons required the explicit approval of the American president before they could be used.
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U.S. POLICY TODAY

The Bush administration arrived in office determined to combat nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons proliferation in fundamentally new ways. In two key documents, *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (September 2002) and *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (December 2002), the administration stated its view that the threat from weapons of mass destruction emanated from a small number of outlaw states and from the nexus of these states, nuclear weapons and materials, and terrorists.5

This assessment did not, at first, appear dramatically different from those of previous administrations, which also acknowledged growing dangers. However, previous presidents had treated the weapons themselves as the problem. As long as they existed, there was a great danger that they would be used. “We must abolish the weapons of war,” President John F. Kennedy had said, “before they abolish us.” Thus, Presidents Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, and Richard M. Nixon negotiated and implemented the Non-Proliferation Treaty as a means of stopping the spread of and eliminating nuclear weapons.6 President Nixon negotiated the Biological Weapons Convention, which banned biological weapons; President Ronald Reagan negotiated the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which banned U.S. and Russian intermediate-range missiles. President George H. W. Bush negotiated the Chemical Weapons Convention, which banned chemical weapons; President Bill Clinton negotiated the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Each of these agreements codified a new global norm and provided the international legal framework for ending existing weapons programs and preventing the initiation of new ones.
By contrast, the Bush administration has spurned treaties that demand painstaking verification, and instead has shifted the focus from eliminating weapons to eliminating regimes. Whereas President Clinton spoke in 1998 of “the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security…of the United States posed by the proliferation of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons and the means of delivering such weapons,” President Bush, in his January 2003 State of the Union address, framed the issue very differently: “The gravest danger facing America and the world is outlaw regimes that seek and possess nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons” [emphasis added]. In effect, the Bush administration changed the focus from “what” to “who.”

Following this targeted approach, the administration highlighted the necessity of regime change to remove threats posed by irredeemable governments seeking these weapons, particularly the “axis of evil” states of Iraq, North Korea, and Iran. The Iraq War focused media and public attention on the tactic of preventive war to accomplish regime change, but regime change itself was the strategic innovation.

The Bush administration also highlighted “new methods of deterrence” to make clear that the United States “reserves the right to respond with overwhelming force—including through resort to all of our options—to the use of WMD [weapons of mass destruction] against the United States, our forces abroad, and friends and allies.” In the belief that an antimissile program would not only protect against an attack but would in itself deter enemies from seeking nuclear weapons, the administration doubled the budget for a national antimissile system. It also has begun research on new, more usable types of nuclear weapons for counterproliferation missions.
The Bush administration was right to draw international attention to the need for serious enforcement. For many years, too much attention had been paid to obtaining signatures on treaties, and not enough to achieving compliance with them. The absence of a collective political will to stop bad actors, by force if necessary, undermined deterrence. The United States itself had routinely made proliferation concerns secondary to other strategic and economic issues in relations with key states such as Pakistan, Israel, and Iraq. Too many dangerous activities were—and are—not encompassed by existing agreements and were therefore tolerated. In contrast, the Bush administration’s resolve helped motivate others to strengthen nonmilitary, and military, means of enforcement. The strong belief that some actors cannot be reformed helped sharpen international threat assessments and made governments in proliferant states think harder about changing their behavior, lest they be removed.

However, the new strategy, like the one it replaced, has proven insufficient. While stopping the spread of nuclear weapons requires more international resolve than previous administrations could muster, it also demands more international teamwork than the Bush administration recognizes. Nuclear weapons and fissile materials are problems wherever they are, not just in a handful of “evil” states. The threat cannot be eliminated by removing whichever foreign governments the United States finds most threatening at any given time. History has shown again and again that today’s ally can become tomorrow’s “rogue” state. Moreover, terrorists will seek nuclear weapons and materials wherever they can be found, irrespective of a state’s geopolitical orientation.

On February 11, 2004, the president proposed initiatives that, if implemented, would improve international capacity to stem the spread of nuclear weapons. These initiatives include making all
exports from the forty-member Nuclear Suppliers Group conditional on recipients’ adopting new, tougher inspections by the IAEA and banning all enrichment and reprocessing technology exports to states that do not already have such plants in operation; expanding the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which finances the elimination of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in the former Soviet Union; and enhancing the IAEA’s capability to detect cheating and respond to treaty violations.

Unfortunately, however, the administration has not put sufficient money or political effort behind these proposals. Its proposed budget for fiscal year (FY) 2005 cut rather than increased funding for the Nunn-Lugar program and failed to provide any increase in the U.S. contribution to the IAEA—an agency whose budget has stayed flat for years even as its responsibilities have greatly increased.8

The United States cannot defeat the nuclear threat alone, or even with small coalitions of the willing. It needs sustained cooperation from dozens of diverse nations—including China, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, and leading states that have forsworn nuclear weapons, such as Argentina, Brazil, Germany, Japan, South Africa, and Sweden—in order to broaden, toughen, and stringently enforce nonproliferation rules. In exchange, many states, especially those that have given up nuclear weapons, will want to know that burdensome new rules and costly enforcement will ultimately enhance their security. Put differently, the nuclear weapon states must show that tougher nonproliferation rules not only benefit the powerful but constrain them as well. Nonproliferation is a set of bargains whose fairness must be self-evident if the majority of countries is to support their enforcement.
Success will depend on the United States’ ability to marshal legitimate authority that motivates others to follow. As Francis Fukuyama notes, “Legitimacy is important not simply because we want to feel good about ourselves, but because it’s useful. Other people will follow the American lead if they believe it is legitimate; if they do not, they will resist, complain, obstruct, or actively oppose what we do. In this respect, it matters not what we believe to be legitimate, but rather what other people believe is legitimate.”

Recent events, most dramatically the war in Iraq, have undermined that legitimacy. Many feel that the United States has not followed Thomas Jefferson’s admonition to have a “decent respect to the opinions of mankind,” preferring the unilateral exercise of power to the often-cumbersome operation of rule-based international institutions. With societies bristling at U.S. government rhetoric and action, elected leaders in key countries such as Brazil, Germany, France, India, South Africa, South Korea, and Turkey, and elsewhere, distance themselves from U.S. initiatives. This challenged legitimacy is one reason why few states have welcomed President Bush’s February 11, 2004, nonproliferation initiatives and have resisted the U.S. push to isolate Iran.

Even when others share U.S. views of the nuclear threat, they may balk at following U.S. policies because they do not see Washington acting on their priorities, be those the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the International Criminal Court, actions to minimize climate change, or other measures affecting global security. The United States naturally and wisely will use its power to induce others to accept and follow nonproliferation rules it values, but success also depends on its willingness to give greater weight to the views and interests of others. In Robert Kagan’s
words, “The United States can neither appear to be acting only in its self-interest, nor can it in fact act as if its own national interest were all that mattered.”

The new proliferation challenges make it clear beyond denial that “racing from threat to threat” does not suffice. The present nonproliferation regime needs fixing. Nor can the United States prevent and resolve proliferation crises without greater international support. This is a time that demands systemic change: a new strategy to defeat old and new threats before they become catastrophes.

**A GLOBAL NUCLEAR THREAT ASSESSMENT**

Nuclear threats lie along four axes, though development along one axis often influences developments along the others. The four categories of threat are nuclear terrorism, new nuclear weapon states and regional conflict, existing nuclear arsenals, and regime collapse. The greatest concerns are outlined here.

**Nuclear Terrorism: The Most Serious**

While states can be deterred from using nuclear weapons by fear of retaliation, terrorists, who have neither land, people, nor national futures to protect, may not be deterrable. Terrorist acquisition of nuclear weapons therefore poses the greatest single nuclear threat. The gravest danger arises from terrorists’ access to state stockpiles of nuclear weapons and fissile materials, because acquiring a supply of nuclear material (as opposed to making the weapon itself) remains the most difficult

Continued on page 27
A GLOBAL NUCLEAR THREAT ASSESSMENT (continued)

challenge for a terrorist group. So-called outlaw states are not the most likely source. Their stockpiles are small and exceedingly precious, and hence well guarded. (Nor are these states likely to give away what they see as the crown jewels in their security crowns.) Rather, the most likely sources of nuclear weapons and materials for terrorists are storage areas in the former states of the Soviet Union and in Pakistan, and fissile material kept at dozens of civilian sites around the world.

Russia and other former Soviet states possess thousands of nuclear weapons and hundreds of tons of inadequately secured nuclear material. Terrorist organizations and radical fundamentalist groups operate within Pakistan’s borders. National instability or a radical change in government could lead to the collapse of state control over nuclear weapons and materials and to the migration of nuclear scientists to the service of other nations or groups.

There is also a substantial risk of terrorist theft from the nuclear stockpiles in more than forty countries around the world. Many of these caches of materials consist of HEU that could be directly used in nuclear weapons, or further enriched to weapons grade. There are also significant stockpiles of plutonium that can be used in a weapon, though with more difficulty. (See chapter 4 for a more complete treatment of this issue.)

New Nuclear Nations and Regional Conflicts

The danger posed by the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran or North Korea is not that either country would likely use these
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weapons to attack the United States, the nations of Europe, or other countries. States are and will continue to be deterred from such attacks by the certainty of swift and massive retaliation. The greater danger is the reactions of other states in the region. A nuclear reaction chain could ripple through a region and across the globe, triggering weapon decisions in several, perhaps many, other states. With these rapid developments and the collapse of existing norms could come increased regional tensions, possibly leading to regional wars and to nuclear catastrophe.ª

New nuclear weapon states might also constrain the United States and others, weakening their ability to intervene to avoid conflict in dangerous regions, as well as, of course, emboldening Tehran, Pyongyang, or other new possessors.

Existing regional nuclear tensions already pose serious risks. The decades-long conflict between India and Pakistan has made South Asia for many years the region most likely to witness the first use of nuclear weapons since World War II. There is an active missile race underway between the two nations, even as India and China continue their rivalry. In Northeast Asia, North Korea's nuclear capabilities remain shrouded in uncertainty but presumably continue to advance. Miscalculation or misunderstanding could bring nuclear war to the Korean peninsula. Tensions between China, Taiwan, and the United States also hold the potential for nuclear crisis.

In the Middle East, Iran's quest for nuclear weapons, together with Israel's nuclear arsenal and the chemical weapons of other Middle Eastern states, adds grave volatility to an already conflict-
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prone region. If Iran were to acquire nuclear weapons, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, or others might initiate or revive nuclear weapon programs. It is possible that the Middle East could go from a region with one nuclear weapon state, to one with two, three, or five such states within a decade—with existing political and territorial disputes still unresolved. This is a recipe for disaster.

The Risk from Existing Arsenals

There are grave dangers inherent in the maintenance of thousands of nuclear weapons by the United States and Russia and the hundreds of weapons held by China, France, the United Kingdom, Israel, India, and Pakistan. While each state regards its nuclear weapons as safe, secure, and essential to its security, each views others’ arsenals with suspicion.

Though the Cold War has been over for more than a dozen years, Washington and Moscow maintain thousands of warheads on hair-trigger alert, ready to launch within fifteen minutes. This greatly increases the risk of an unauthorized launch. Because there is no time buffer built into each state’s decision-making process, this extreme level of readiness also enhances the possibility that either side’s president could prematurely order a nuclear strike based on flawed intelligence.

Recent advocacy by some in the United States of new battlefield uses for nuclear weapons could lead to new nuclear tests. The five NPT nuclear weapon states have not tested since the signing of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996, and no state has tested since India and Pakistan did in May 1998. New U.S. tests
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would trigger tests by other nations, collapsing the CTBT, which is widely regarded as a pillar of the nonproliferation regime.

To the extent that the leaders of a given state are contemplating acceding to U.S. or international nonproliferation demands, these leaders may feel a strong need for equity so that they can show their publics that giving up nuclear aspirations is fair and in their interest. It is difficult, if not impossible, to demonstrate either when immensely powerful nuclear weapon states reassert the importance of nuclear weapons to their own security.

The Risk of Regime Collapse

If U.S. and Russian nuclear arsenals remain at Cold War levels, many nations will conclude that the weapon states’ promise to reduce and eventually eliminate these arsenals has been broken. Non-nuclear states may therefore feel released from their pledge not to acquire nuclear arms.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is already severely threatened by the development in several states of facilities for the enrichment of uranium and the reprocessing of plutonium. Although each state asserts that these are for civilian use only, supplies of these materials potentially put each of these countries “a screwdriver’s turn” away from weapons capability. This greatly erodes the confidence that states can have in a neighbor’s non-nuclear pledge.

Additionally, there appears to be growing acceptance of the nuclear status of Pakistan and India, with each country accruing prestige and increased attention from leading nuclear weapon states, including the United States. Some now argue that a nuclear
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Iran or North Korea could also be absorbed into the international system without serious consequence.

If the number of states with nuclear weapons increases, the original nuclear weapon states fail to comply with their disarmament obligations, and states such as India gain status for having nuclear weapons, it is possible that Japan, Brazil, and other major non-nuclear nations will reconsider their nuclear choices. Most nations would continue to eschew nuclear weapons, if only for technological and economic reasons, but others would decide that nuclear weapons were necessary to improving their security or status. There is a real possibility, under these conditions, of a systemwide collapse.

Notes

a  This is the danger President Kennedy warned of in 1963. “I ask you to stop and think for a moment what it would mean to have nuclear weapons in so many hands, in the hands of countries large and small, stable and unstable, responsible and irresponsible, scattered throughout the world,” he said. “There would be no rest for anyone then, no stability, no real security, and no chance of effective disarmament. There would only be the increased chance of accidental war, and an increased necessity for the great powers to involve themselves in what otherwise would be local conflicts.” John F. Kennedy, “Radio and Television Address to the American People on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty,” July 26, 1963, available at www.jfklibrary.org/jfk_test_ban_speech.html (accessed December 10, 2004).

b  Several countries in the Middle East are capable of pursuing nuclear weapon programs or otherwise acquiring nuclear weapons, including Saudi Arabia, Egypt, and Turkey. Saudi Arabia might seek to purchase nuclear weapons from Pakistan, or invite Pakistan to station nuclear weapons on its territory. Other countries have at least the basic facilities and capabilities to mount a nuclear weapon program, albeit not without significant political and economic consequences. Egypt
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and Turkey could probably acquire enough nuclear material to produce a nuclear weapon within a decade of launching such an effort.

c  Former U.S. Senator Sam Nunn argues, “The more time the United States and Russia build into our process for ordering a nuclear strike the more time is available to gather data, to exchange information, to gain perspective, to discover an error, to avoid an accidental or unauthorized launch.” Speech to the Carnegie International Non-Proliferation Conference, June 21, 2004, available at www.ProliferationNews.org.