

“Do As I Say, Not As I Do”: International Perspectives on RRW

Panel discussion sponsored by UNM OPST, WIIS and Sandia
September 29, 2006

Elizabeth A. Stanley, Ph.D.

Security Studies Program, Walsh School of Foreign Service
and Department of Government
Georgetown University

1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

- “Balance of Obligations”
 - 5 nuclear weapons states (NWS): US, UK, France, Russia, China
 - 182 non-nuclear weapons states (NNWS)
 - India, Pakistan, Israel never signed; North Korea withdrew
- NNWS Obligations:
 - Article II: non-acquisition of nuclear weapons
 - Article III: accepting full-scope IAEA “safeguards” on their nuclear activities
- NWS Obligations:
 - Article I: non-transfer of nuclear weapons
 - Article IV: sharing for “the peaceful uses of nuclear energy”
 - Article VI: work “in good faith” towards “cessation of nuclear arms race” and “complete disarmament”

Additional NPT Commitments

- 1995 Review Conference (Rev Con)
 - NWS agree not to target NNWS with nuclear weapons
- 2000 Rev Con: US Committed to 13 Practical Steps
 - Ratification of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
 - Full implementation of START II, conclusion of START III, and strengthening of Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty
 - Unilateral and irreversible reduction in nuclear arsenals
 - Increased transparency regarding nuclear weapons as a voluntary confidence-building measure
 - Unilateral reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons
 - Reduction of the operational status of nuclear weapons
 - A diminishing role for nuclear weapons in security policies

What the world sees: US Nuclear Policy since 2000

- US has not ratified the CTBT
- US abrogated ABM Treaty in 2002, to build a national missile defense program
- US and Russia signed Moscow Treaty in 2002
 - But it does not require destruction of any nuclear weapons, only limits deployed delivery systems
 - Contradicts “irreversibility” principle
- 2001 Nuclear Posture Review/2002 National Security Strategy
- In 2005, US announced decision to produce plutonium again “for national security reasons”

What the world sees: US Nonproliferation Policy

- **If you are a friend....**
 - Three states outside NPT are US allies: Israel, Pakistan and India
 - US puts no pressure on them to join NPT
 - US offered to provide civilian nuclear energy (including 2006 US-India civilian nuclear deal)
- **And if you aren't....**
 - 2003 invasion of Iraq because of alleged WMD
 - Sanctions on North Korea for building weapons, leaving NPT and proliferating to other actors
 - On-going negotiations with UN Security Council – and rumors of military strikes – to sanction Iran for alleged weapons program

What the world sees: US behavior in other policy areas

- Subsidizing US agricultural sector but limiting free market for others
- Supporting Big Pharma's attempts to block generic anti-retroviral drugs from being marketed around the world
- Protested authoritarian leaders but ignoring behavior of those who support the GWOT
- Maltreating detainees at Guantanamo Bay and in secret prisons throughout Eastern Europe, but claiming we value human rights

International Perspectives on RRW: “Near-Peer Competitors”

- China:
 - Purpose of RRW is to advance US ability to implement preemption strategy
 - “will probably lead to a new round of the arms race”
 - “experiments will have to be carried out for testing before the warheads are loaded”
 - “nuclear weapons are playing an increasingly significant role in US security strategy”
 - “threshold of using nuclear weapons will be lowered”
- Russia:
 - “many of the tasks initially set for the Advanced Concepts Initiative evidently will be accomplished one way or another”

International Perspectives on RRW: “Rogue States”

- North Korea:
 - US “talked about someone’s ‘failure to carry out obligations’” but then broke its own
 - “trying to replace their existing nuclear warheads with more powerful and effective ones”
 - “US does not hide the fact that the RRW targets our military strategic points”
- Iran:
 - Developing low-yield nuclear weapons will “shift the balance of power in the world”
 - US “intends to mass produce such weapons” and “will most likely use them in a limited nuclear war in the future”

International Perspectives on RRW: Allies

- Germany:
 - RRW and other US nuclear policies adopted without any consultation with allies
 - “One gets the impression these projects are primarily designed to find new tasks for the nuclear military-industrial complex.”
- United Kingdom (designing its own RRW):
 - Outcry over Feb. 2006 Nevada “sub-critical” test
 - UK is “secretly designing new warhead with the Americans” without consulting parliament or informing the public
 - “What are these weapons for and what is the message they send to non-nuclear countries?”
 - “In helping to wreck the [NPT] treaty, we are only keeping up with our friends across the water.”

International Implications of RRW

- US sends messages through many media:
 - Official US policy (not just nuclear)
 - News sources
 - Speeches given for domestic audiences
 - US actions abroad, even unrelated to the target country!
- The rest of the world pays attention to “hypocritical” US actions that demonstrate double standards – “do as I say, not as I (or my allies) do”
- This hypocrisy has eroded US soft power and the legitimacy of US global leadership

Why is “soft power” important?

- **Maintaining global leadership requires keeping the moral high ground.**
- **Moral high ground matters:**
 - **With potential adversaries:** to keep them from gaining international support and winning moderates over to their cause(s)
 - **With neutrals/developing states:** These states are often dismissed, yet their powerlessness is precisely what gives them an international voice on issues of legitimacy
 - **With allies:** US needs their support to share international security burden
 - Most threats US faces today cannot be solved alone

The Good News

- The international community does not look at RRW (or even US nuclear policy) in a vacuum
- In fact, our nuclear policy is a relatively small component to most of our international relationships
- Thus, we have plenty of issue areas where we can shape international opinion
- If there are some areas where we are uncomfortable complying with obligations, then can we to make a special effort in others?