

Introduction

“It is perhaps instructive that the last military action in the Second World War demonstrated that as devastating as the war had been, the limits of destruction which modern technology could achieve had not yet been reached.” (Gilbert and Large, p. 346) Two atomic bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 caused horrible destruction and took thousands of lives away. They have changed the idea of warfare for the next 50 years and forced people to fear the power of a nucleus. However, nobody has expected that the so-called “weapons of mass destruction” will determine the development of international relations in the future. Atomic bombs were meant to stay a terrifying reality as well as a working tool of the power politics¹. They became a defining feature of authority in the postwar years. Fortunately, a military capabilities show-off was enough to keep the thin protective shield around a shaking idea of world peace. Nevertheless, the Cold War had its consequences. Even the fall of the Berlin Wall could not cover up the fears of the past. It was a significant event, though. Sign of a new world order emerging on the eyes of billions. Democratic ‘break-through’ in the 1990s and the growing popularity of the ‘western ideas’² all around the globe aimed to change the order on the international arena. A hope that the peaceful economic and cultural cooperation between the states would slowly overcome the security distrust and nuclear competitions was there in the air during the last decade of the 20th century. However, people did not enjoy breathing the wind of changes for a long time.

Soon after the breakdown of the Soviet Union, the notion of one state dominating the international relations became nothing else than a warning of the new military contest. UN Security Council could barely keep the disputes among the states on the peaceful track. One has not to forget the emerged international organizations which were helping to maintain the global scales in balance. The created order of “checks and balances” seemed to work and that game, played on the global arena, became even interesting.

¹ **Power politics** – “realism”, a belief that states are primarily motivated by the desire for military and economic power, rather than ideals or ethics. (www.wikipedia.org)

² **Western ideas:** democracy, free-market economy and human rights.

Nonetheless, international organizations have not gone far from being only clubs where the states could openly give their opinion without having to fear the threatening-to-their-sovereignty consequences. Even though, the world was significantly transformed by the globalization and international cooperation, states remained in the power and security seeking mood.

The Gulf War in the Near East, the Balkan Wars and the military conflict in Rwanda only strengthened the idea of self-dependence and mistrust. There was no second power to contain the actions of the USA anymore. That is why the nuclear materials came back to the black market. And the atomic security became a solution again. After the Soviet Union fell apart and the strong military hand could not hold the security lock in the post-Soviet space anymore, a huge warehouse full of nuclear materials was opened to the international publics. Economic stagnation of the former USSR member-states forced people to get the dangerous stock out to the black markets. In this regard, a huge responsibility was put on the shoulders of the IAEA³. And the game “democracy”, played on the international stage, was updated with the new rules. States that officially possess the nuclear arsenal are constantly crying for the world without a military nucleus, forcing others to give up their research on the weapons of mass destruction while hiding themselves behind own nuclear stockpiles. Rules also allow the use of a peaceful atomic power to generate energy which is actually a positive feature. In this way the huge stocks of the war material can be transformed to the so much needed electricity or warmth.

In order not to have a pessimistic introduction, I would say that there is a positive side in this very much confusing nuclear story. Concrete actions are done by the world community to prevent any atomic conflict, such as: constant checks of the unsecured nuclear facilities, advanced customs control, intensive spread of information which makes people aware of the problem, etc. One of the causes of such voluntary cooperation among the states is a newly emerged common threat – terrorism. Not so long ago, countries were the major players on the international arena and it was relatively easy to distinguish between “enemies” and “friends”. Nowadays, individuals and international

³ **IAEA** – International Atomic Energy Agency seeks to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to inhibit its use for military purposes. (www.wikipedia.com)

organizations have joined the game, making it more complex. However, as an old proverb says: “There is no good, without evil.” And a common threat has created a unity which was so hard to achieve throughout the history. It has already a name: “Universal Compliance”. This regime is still based on the will and any deep breath can destroy it. That is why let us not breathe for a little while and see if the universal compliance can work in today’s world.

Historical discourse

If one would look deeper into the history, an invention of a new weapon was certainly followed by a significant military conflict or an event of a global scale and meaning. Progress often depended on wars, invasions and conquering. Since the prehistoric times, a basic human need for food and shelter has been quickly overwhelmed with the concerns for security and self-defense. Knives and spears made out of stone, bones and wood came as a result of fear for personal survival.

Centuries went slowly by and people get settled. Nevertheless, agriculture was not the only evolutionary “break-through” of those times as the warfare became a profession, moreover, a way of life. Tribal unity was creating some sort of security among its members. It raised the chances of people surviving the attacks of wild animals as well as other tribes. Cynic as it is, there was always someone not attracted to the hard work on the fields but skilled in warfare and fighting. Looking for easy bread, tribes went against other tribes, bringing the issue of security up again and again. One did not have to be a philosopher-king to understand that a great power can be contained only by an even greater force. That is how the military race came about.

Settlements grew to towns, towns to cities. People started to give part of their wealth and sovereignty to warriors who were expected to protect them against the outside aggressors. In this way, a grounding stone in the development of the professional armies was put. Soon enough, people realized that the best defense would be a preemptive attack. Nonetheless, the concept of “greater power” happened to become already outdated. Therefore, numbers were often contained by the tactics and superior weapons. Abstractly

speaking, knives were substituted by swords, copper by steel, stones by arrows and so on. An ancient state possessing the innovative arms had always the last word in the emerging political and long-existing trade relations. In this regard, conventional armies had to share the state's wealth with the scientists and alchemists who were spending years by working on the new inventions. Fortunately, the innovations often happened to be not of a military origin, giving a chance of a brighter future to humanity. Knowledge seemed to overcome the possession. It forced people to question their existence and made them uncontrolled. There had to be a common cause invented in order to keep overall attention away from the science and a military conflict was a perfect tool to do this. Catholic Crusades – a common resistance against the Muslims in the Near East – became that cause. European knights and warriors had a difficult time to fight the climate there as well as the unseen before innovative weapon, called “Chinese snow⁴”. Nowadays we know it under the name of “gunpowder”. Technology of its production was eventually brought back to Europe by the survived soldiers.

The gunpowder played one of its major roles later, on the beginning of the 16th century when the first conquistadors had reached the coast of America. Native armies did not stand a chance against the rifles and pistols used by Spaniards. American gold shipped back to the Old Continent, fueled the cultural and intellectual development there. Middle Ages in Europe slowly turned to Renaissance. Rebirth came to all the spheres of at that time existing societies. Weapon technology was not excluded...

I like history very much and I can talk about it for days. Nevertheless, a boring research paper is not my purpose. That is why I would jump to the Second Industrial Revolution because it was the time of tremendous changes and inventions. “Advancements in the fields of steel production, electricity, and chemistry all contributed to the invention of what must be considered the most characteristic phenomenon of the Second Industrial Revolution: the internal-combustion engine. The automobile and later the airplane were the most dramatic evidence of the coming of a new age widely different from the world of the nineteenth century.” (Gilbert and Large, p. 13) However, not so many history books talk about the introduction of the internal-combustion engine in the British Royal

⁴ **Chinese snow** – saltpeter, a substance used in making gunpowder and matches. (Longman Dictionary)

Navy. It was a clever action if one would not take its consequences into consideration. The engines were mainly put on the battleships in order to keep Great Britain one step ahead of emerging military power of Germany. In this regard, armament competitions between the neighbors led to the First World War. There is a second part to this story, too. British warships had to get fuel for their engines from somewhere and it was not coal that set them into motion. Great Britain had to secure a constant supply of crude oil for its ships. That is how colonialism came about.

Both World Wars left a painful and deep print in our history. Destruction brought by the conflicts pushed people to thinking about their future, future of their children. Idea of the World War Three was often a nightmare during the quiet postwar nights. There had to be something done in order to prevent another conflict. And the USA, entering the WWII almost at the conflict's end brought a possible solution to the postwar peace. New technology happened again to cause the reconstruction of the world order. "The explosion of atomic bombs over Hiroshima and Nagasaki is usually viewed as the beginning of the nuclear age. The harnessing of atomic energy was so dramatic an event that the fact has often been overlooked that in a variety of other fields the war gave a powerful impetus on scientific discoveries and technological inventions. The importance, for the conduct of war, of transportation and communication brought about – as in the First World War – new inventions and discoveries which resulted in great changes in these areas after the war." (Gilbert and Large, p. 374)

As horrible as it was, answer to the world peace was found. The following 50 years of Cold War and arms races between the USA and the USSR often forced the international community to sweat. Nonetheless, those power games kept the globe focused on one cause. Any state in the world had three choices: to join the "Western Club", to stay neutral (it was almost impossible) or to get into the "Red Squad". As to the weapons of mass destruction, they became the determinant feature of security. Fortunately enough, representatives of both clubs soon got to understanding that the quantity does not usually mean quality. Abstractly speaking, hundred nuclear bombs in the arsenals of the USA and the Soviet Union would be enough to destroy the life on Earth anyway. That is why, many of the contemporary English dictionaries and encyclopedias became updated with

the words like disarmament or arms control and the concepts, such as SALT I⁵, SALT II⁶, START I⁷ and START II⁸.

The nuclear age meant to continue, though. The USSR fell apart and the members of the “Read Squad” had to take care of their security by themselves. Huge stocks of nuclear armament were left on the both sides after the end of the Cold War. That is why concrete actions had to be made in order to prevent the spread of the nuclear material all around the world. Some countries, such as Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus voluntary agreed to give up their atomic arms. Others⁹ – received a chance to speak up on the international arena by demonstrating their nuclear capability. Ironically but the weapons of mass destruction became the only tool to stay secure in the present world of the flourishing democracy.

That is how the term universal compliance came about. States all around the world were so busy in trying to secure themselves that they have missed the new players entering the game of international relations. Terrorist groups happened to be among the newcomers. The attack on the World Trade Center, explosions in London and Madrid forced independent states to give up parts of their internal and external security in order to prevent the fatal outcome of terrorists building an atomic weapon. And the seeds of international security cooperation were seeded. Global community makes a step forward everyday, leaving less and less space for the development of a new weapon of mass destruction. The idea of the universal compliance seems to me still very theoretical as many solutions to the nuclear issue are given but the old sovereignty concern keeps states away from the quick and concrete actions. Do not be confused, though. As long as the international community is willing to improve its mistakes from the past, any action can be counted as positive.

⁵ **SALT I** – Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, talks between the US and the former Soviet Union, which aimed to reach agreement about limiting the number of nuclear weapons that each country kept. SALT I was signed in 1972. (Longman Dictionary)

⁶ **SALT II** – Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the second treaty signed in 1979. (Longman Dictionary)

⁷ **START I** – Strategic Arms Reduction Talks, talks between the US and the former Soviet Union, which aimed to reach agreement about reducing the number of nuclear weapons that each country kept. START I treaty was signed in 1991. (Longman Dictionary)

⁸ **START II** – Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, the second treaty signed in 1993. (Longman Dictionary)

⁹ **Others:** India, Pakistan and North Korea

Universal compliance

Universal means “involving everyone in the world or in particular group.” (Longman Dictionary) Compliance, in its turn, is a situation “when someone obeys a rule, agreement or demand.” (Longman Dictionary) “Compliance means more than signatures on treaties, or declarations of good intent – it means actual performance. Universal means that all actors must comply with the norms and rules that apply to them. This includes states that have not joined the NPT, as well as those that have. It also includes nonstate actors, corporations and individuals. The burden of compliance extends not only to states obtaining nuclear weapon capabilities through dual-use fuel cycle programs or those abetting proliferation through technology transfers; it applies equally to nuclear weapon states that are failing to honor their own nonproliferation pledges.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 33)

Universal compliance – it is a new strategy or regime in which nonstate actors have equal opportunities to participate in the common decision making process. It is, actually, a significant innovation as the nation-states were the only players on the international arena several decades ago. The new strategy again and again underlines the importance of the overall cooperation. There has a certain criteria been made according to which the universal compliance might work. First of all, the strategy has to be **beneficial and fair to everyone**. Meaning that the “advantaged majority”, in this case the non-nuclear states, has to fully participate in cooperative actions of securing the nuclear materials, producing peaceful atomic energy and supporting any initiatives of the international community in the field of nuclear coexistence. In return for their involvement in the nuclear non-proliferation process the access to the technological know-how as well as the technical assistance, together with the needed raw materials will be granted to them by the states with the weapons of mass destruction in their arsenals. In the same way, the “nuclear minority” should comply with all the obligations of the new strategy as well as the treaties established before. Otherwise, any attempt by those nuclear states of using their atomic possessions in order to manipulate the decision making process of the

international community should be punished, disregarding the authority and status of the violators.

The new strategy has to grant the **balance of obligations** where “each tactical step done by the international community will build a system which all the states will be committed and willing to contribute to.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 35) It means that any player on the global stage, being a party to the universal compliance regime, will have some obligations to fulfill and work to do. Everyone has to be involved in the process of the nuclear non-proliferation in order to abolish the authority and prestige stratification within the international community.

Success of the universal compliance strategy also depends on the **defense in depth** conducted by all the participants to the new regime. In this regard, the existing NPT treaty emphasizes on the test bans, commitment not to acquire an atomic weapon, pause in production of the HEU¹⁰ and Pu¹¹, export controls, military actions, security of the existing nuclear facilities, etc. As to the new compliance strategy, it states that “defense in depth is further strengthened by employing all of the state’s tools – diplomatic and technical, financial and political, coercive and attractive.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 36) However, that is not the only feature of the deepened security. “Defense in depth requires extending the regime’s compass beyond states to individuals and the corporate sector. A number of business sectors – banking, finance, certain manufacturers, as well as the nuclear industry itself – have key roles to play.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 36) And finally, the concept of defense in depth proposes to organize multiple lines of protection. For example, treaties and agreements will provide security on the international level, advanced customs control – the state line, awareness about the problem and voluntary participation of the citizens will form the lowest but the most important individual level of protection. “Multiple lines of defense offer the best protection against breakouts from proliferation restraints, and enable the regime to survive the failure of any one instrument.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 36)

¹⁰ HEU – highly enriched uranium, a heavy white metal that is radioactive and is used to produce nuclear weapons. (Longman Dictionary)

¹¹ Pu – plutonium, it is a radioactive, metallic and toxic chemical element used in most modern nuclear weapons. (www.wikipedia.org)

Getting deeper into the universal compliance strategy, there are **six major obligations** which form the core of the regime. They propose many of the institutionalized, policy and legal changes as well as voluntary participation and will of overcoming stereotypes and old customs. It is expected that the compliance with the obligations will finally solve the nuclear non proliferation issue.

Obligation one: make non proliferation irreversible. The existing facilities for uranium enrichment and plutonium separation create a possibility of state attempting to build an atomic bomb. Such action cannot be prevented by the international safeguards, unless it will be impossible for the non nuclear states to acquire any of the enrichment facilities. That is why countries possessing nuclear power have to provide others with the economically attractive and internationally recognized fuel supplies and services in order to fulfill the energy needs of the “advantaged majority”. From the other side, the existing amounts of available nuclear substances make the non-proliferation efforts difficult to achieve as the availability of the material creates a temptation of using it. That is why the enrichment of the uranium has to be stopped and the separation of plutonium, at least for a few decades, paused. There is enough material at present to fulfill the peaceful nuclear energy needs of the countries-parties to NPT. The non proliferation would become completely irreversible if the UN Security Council could pass a resolution which will “make a state nonetheless responsible for violations committed while it was still a party to a treaty.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 37) Besides that, “states that withdraw from the treaty should be banned from using nuclear assets acquired internationally before their withdrawal.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 37) And finally, the states-members of the NPT have to avoid any nuclear cooperation with the countries the IAEA cannot approve their compliance with the nonproliferation treaty. (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 38)

Nuclear weapon states*, 1945–2006

*As outlined in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Year	United States	SU/Russia	Britain	France	China	Total
1945	6					6
1946	11					11
1947	32					32
1948	110					110
1949	235	1				236
1950	369	5				374
1951	640	25				665
1952	1,005	50				1,055
1953	1,436	120	1			1,557
1954	2,063	150	5			2,218
1955	3,057	200	10			3,267
1956	4,618	426	15			5,059
1957	6,444	660	20			7,124
1958	9,822	869	22			10,713
1959	15,468	1,060	25			16,553
1960	20,434	1,605	30			22,069
1961	24,126	2,471	50			26,647
1962	27,387	3,322	205			30,914
1963	29,459	4,238	280			33,977
1964	31,056	5,221	310	4	1	36,592
1965	31,982	6,129	310	32	5	38,458
1966	32,040	7,089	270	36	20	39,455
1967	31,233	8,339	270	36	25	39,903
1968	29,224	9,399	280	36	35	38,974
1969	27,342	10,538	308	36	50	38,274
1970	26,662	11,643	280	36	75	38,696
1971	26,956	13,092	220	45	100	40,413
1972	27,912	14,478	220	70	130	42,810
1973	28,999	15,915	275	116	150	45,455
1974	28,965	17,385	325	145	170	46,990
1975	27,826	19,055	350	188	185	47,604
1976	25,579	21,205	350	212	190	47,536
1977	25,722	23,044	350	228	200	49,544
1978	24,826	25,393	350	235	220	51,024
1979	24,605	27,935	350	235	235	53,360
1980	24,304	30,062	350	250	280	55,246
1981	23,464	32,049	350	274	330	56,467
1982	23,708	33,952	335	274	360	58,629
1983	24,099	35,804	320	279	380	60,882
1984	24,357	37,431	270	280	415	62,753
1985	24,237	39,197	300	360	425	64,519
1986	24,401	45,000	300	355	425	70,481
1987	24,344	43,000	300	420	415	68,479
1988	23,586	41,000	300	410	430	65,726
1989	22,380	39,000	300	410	435	62,525
1990	21,004	37,000	300	505	430	59,239
1991	17,287	35,000	300	540	435	53,562
1992	14,747	33,000	300	540	435	49,022
1993	13,076	31,000	300	525	435	45,336
1994	12,555	29,000	250	510	400	42,715
1995	12,144	27,000	300	500	400	40,344
1996	11,009	25,000	300	450	400	37,159
1997	10,950	24,000	260	450	400	36,060
1998	10,871	23,000	260	450	400	34,981
1999	10,824	22,000	185	450	400	33,859
2000	10,577	21,000	185	470	400	32,632
2001	10,527	20,000	200	350	400	31,477
2002	10,475	19,000	200	350	400	30,425
2003	10,421	18,000	200	350	400	29,371
2004	10,358	18,000	200	350	400	29,308
2005	10,295	17,000	200	350	400	28,245
2006	10,104	16,000	200	350	200	26,854

Obligation two:

devalue the political and military currency of nuclear weapons.

As to me, this obligation is very hard to achieve. However, as soon as countries will stop using nuclear armament in their international relations and policy making activities, there will be a chance for positive changes. In addition, they have to work on accomplishment of the already signed treaties, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty or START II.

Obligation three:

secure all nuclear materials. “The good news is that the global arsenal of nuclear

warheads has shrunk with the fall of the Soviet Union. The bad news is that nations continue to seek them. Pakistan went nuclear in 1998, and arms control experts worry that North Korea already has the bomb and that Iran is working to build one. About 20

other nations possess the technology to build a nuclear weapon. And attempts to smuggle fissile material across borders suggest that terrorists are also in the market.” (National Geographic, 08.2005) Therefore, a new global standard of protection of the nuclear facilities, materials and weapons has to be established. As to the states which are officially nuclear, they have to identify all of their vulnerable stock, secure or remove it. “Despite the uncertainty, we know that the total global nuclear weapons stockpile is considerably smaller than the 1986 Cold War high of 70,000 – plus warheads. Through a series of arms control agreements and unilateral decisions, nuclear weapon states have reduced the global stockpile to its lowest level in 45 years. In the same period, the number of nuclear weapon states has grown from three to nine. We estimate that these nine states possess about 27,000 intact nuclear warheads, of which 97% are in U.S. and Russian stockpiles.” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 64, table “Nuclear Weapon States, 1945-2006” is taken from the same journal)

Obligation four: stop illegal transfers.

Illegal transfers of the nuclear material from 1992 to 2001:

2001 Asvestochói, Greece: 245 small metal plates of plutonium Pu found in a buried cache: 0.003 kilograms

2000 Batumi, Georgia: People caught selling highly enriched uranium HEU: 0.77 kilograms

1999 Ruse, Bulgaria: Customs agents arrest man trying to smuggle HEU at border: 0.01 kilograms

1998 Chelyabinsk region, Russia: Security agencies foil a conspiracy to steal HEU: 18.5 kilograms

1997 Sokhumi, Georgia: Russian inspection reveals HEU missing: 2 kilograms

1995 České Budejovice, Czech Republic: Police seize HEU: 0.016 kilograms

1995 Moscow, Russia: Man arrested with HEU stolen from nuclear facility: 1.7 kilograms

1994 Prague, Czech Republic: Police seize HEU: 2.7 kilograms

1994 Munich, Germany: Airport seizes Pu: 0.363 kilograms

1994 Tengen-Wiechs, Germany: Police detect Pu in building search: 0.006 kilograms

1994 St. Petersburg, Russia: Person arrested with HEU stolen from nuclear facility: 3 kilograms

1993 Vilnius, Lithuania: HEU discovered in storage area of a bank: 0.15 kilograms

1993 Andreyeva Bay, Russia: Thief steals HEU: 1.8 kilograms

1993 Murmansk, Russia: Russian naval officer steals HEU: 1.3 kilograms

1992 Podolsk, Russia: Worker steals HEU: 1.5 kilograms

(National Geographic, 08.2005)

In order to avoid the illegal transfers of the vulnerable chemical elements, the compliance strategy proposes to start with the enforcements in the homeland legislative system which would “strengthen the export controls and criminalize illicit trade.” (Perkovich, Mathews, Cirincione, Gottemoeller, Wolfsthal, p. 40) One of the main goals of the fourth obligation is to establish a system of data sharing between the Nuclear Suppliers Group, private companies and the IAEA. Information about all the transfers of the material which can be used to produce a nuclear bomb will, simply, help to avoid its assembly. And all the attempts of acquiring parts to build the weapon can be easily traced if the data sharing becomes obligatory.

Obligation five: commit to conflict resolution. Nuclear age meant to continue after the fall of the Berlin Wall. Dominance of the United States on the global arena leaves sometimes many questions about the legitimacy of its actions. The war in Iraq in 2003 left a big pale of unanswered questions. According to the present data, there were no weapons of mass destruction found on the territory of the Middle Eastern state and the attack of the USA can be seen as an “act of aggression” according to the UN Charter. However, nobody stopped the power from proceeding with its attack on Iraq. That is why, the nuclear weapons happen to become the only chance for a state to speak up on the international arena.

The fifth obligation proposes the states which possess a certain authority in the global community, especially the five with the nuclear arsenals¹² behind their backs, to get diplomatically involved in the regional conflicts in order to avoid the nuclear build up of

¹² **Five states officially possessing nuclear weapons:** United States of America, United Kingdom, France, Russian Federation and People’s Republic of China

the arguing parties. Well, when it comes to the questions of security and sovereignty, there is nothing much the old and experienced diplomacy could do. Besides that, “all five original nuclear weapon states continue to insist that nuclear weapons are essential to their national security, which transfers into substantial global nuclear weapon stockpiles for the foreseeable future and the possibility that more nations will want the Bomb as well.” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 66) It is a bitter reality of the international relations. The only possible positive change can be achieved in the case one of the nuclear destroying its atomic arsenals. To be more precise, even though it sounds unrealistic at present, the first step in ending the nuclear age is awaited either from the American or Russian side. “Despite nuclear weapons states’ progress in reducing global stockpiles, convincing nations to abandon their nuclear arsenals altogether remains a formidable task, one that will likely remain impossible until the nuclear powers themselves renounce their weapons.” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 66)

Obligation six: solve the three-state problem. “India has committed to possessing a triad of nuclear forces including land-based ballistic missiles, nuclear-capable aircraft, and sea-based missiles that will probably require an arsenal of 100-150 warheads. Not to be outdone, Pakistan will likely keep peace with a similarly sized arsenal. Whether Israel’s nuclear arsenal remains opaque will likely depend on the development of Iran’s nuclear program, which appears to be about three to ten years away from joining the nuclear weapon club.” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 66) India, Israel and Pakistan have never signed the NPT treaty. That is why they have not violated the agreement by acquiring the nuclear weapons. The compliance strategy proposes world community to persuade the three states to accept the nonproliferation obligations as the five nuclear powers did. It has been agreed to assist India, Israel and Pakistan in strengthening nuclear material security and reactor safety in their respective power facilities. However, there will be no nuclear trade between the three states and NPT signatories allowed.

Case studies: Russia and the United States of America

Decision to choose Russian Federation and the USA as my case studies came to me while I was already writing my research paper. They have started the nuclear age and were the

first to use their atomic arsenal to gain authority within the world community. Of course, I have to be careful when I am speaking of Russia because it was, actually, the Soviet Union trying out American patience and military strengths. Besides the bits and pieces, confusion and economic devastations left after the USSR became a paragraph in encyclopedias and history books, Russia inherited a huge nuclear arsenal, strong military and prestige on the international arena. As to the USA, the state, glorifying its victory over the “red monster”, overtook the responsibility to keep the world order on its own shoulders. Nevertheless, the heavy weight of international relations slowly brought the American mood down. I have to admit that the USA still stays strong regardless the pressure put on its shoulders. American principles of freedom and flourishing democracy remained in place but they slowly stop to match with its policy making actions.

Russia

“The new Russia, in the beginning of post-Communist era, was not part of any alliance system, and its new democratic political institutions and partly privatized economy were extremely fragile, to say the least.” (Gilbert and Large, p. 584) Left in ruins, the state has started to make its own way on the international scene. It has made a significant step since then, keeping its prestigious place within the global community inherited from the Soviet Union. Russia is one of the official countries possessing nuclear arsenal. It is a permanent member of the Security Council and G8. The state cooperates with the IAEA in the frames of the non-proliferation treaty, making effort in securing the nuclear material. “Moscow has released very little information about the size of its stockpile, and its future plans are not known with a great deal of certainty. We estimate that since 1949 the Soviet Union produced some 55,000 nuclear warheads and that about 30,000 warheads existed in 1991 at the end of cold war... Because Russia has removed warheads from its deployed and operational forces faster than it could dismantle them, there is a backlog of warheads awaiting dismantlement.” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 64)

Russia has gained its position within the non-proliferation issue. It is a starting as well as the ending ring in the regional nuclear chain. To be simple, Pakistan will never give up its nuclear program unless India will. Letter waits for the actions from the Chinese side and

China itself expects Russia to be the first in dismantling its atomic arsenal. The only positive point in this dilemma is that both neighbors (China and Russia) cooperate in the non-proliferation program. And besides that, Moscow sticks with the fulfillment of the weapons reduction treaty.

The United States of America

Starting the nuclear age in 1945, the US seemed to regret its actions, trying, throughout many years, to keep the nuclear discourse on a theoretical level. SALT and START, NPT and CTR¹³ treaties were achieved with much of the American effort. Since 1991, the state tries to dominate in the international relations and does it with changing success.

If one would return to the idea of power state the US picture would look differently. “The Pentagon has custody of approximately 10,000 stockpiled warheads, of which about 5,735 are considered active or operational. The remaining are categorized as reserve or inactive. Details from an Energy Department 2004 stockpile plan indicate that some 4,000 warheads will eventually be retired, returned to Energy’s custody, and disassembled... Of the more than 70,000 warheads produced by the United States since 1945, more than 60,000 have been disassembled by mid-2006. More than 13,000 of these warheads have been taken apart since 1990, but Energy retains more than 12,000 intact plutonium pits from dismantled warheads and stores them at Pantex (a plant in Texas).” (Nuclear Notebook, p. 64)

American disarmament actions are noticed by the other states. However, the major step is still to be made. The country has started the nuclear age and it has enough power to finish this long-lasting process.

¹³ **CTR** – Cooperative Threat Reduction, Nunn-Lugar program established to secure and dismantle weapons of mass destruction and their associated infrastructure in former Soviet Union states. (www.wikipedia.org)

Conclusion

Universal compliance – it is a strategy proposed to solve the nuclear dilemma. It has a well thought and realistic solutions prepared but it misses the practical part. The rise of the United Nations and formation of the European Union dropped some light on the possibility of states giving away small parts of their sovereignty. However, as soon as the question of national security arises, relations among the countries get on the level of self-preservation. To my opinion, that is the main reason why the universal compliance is still too weak to be working in the present decade. There are no doubts about its functions, there is only time needed to get to the point when globalization will leave no other chance to the nation states accept cooperation.

Bibliography

Gilbert, Felix and Large, Clay David, "The End of the European Era: 1890 to the Present", fifth edition, W.W. Norton and Company, New York – London, 2002

Hook, W. Steven and Spanier, John, "American Foreign Policy Since World War II", sixteenth edition, A Division of Congressional Quarterly Inc., Washington, D.C., 2004

Wolf, Jonathan, "An Introduction to Political Philosophy", revised edition, Oxford University Press, 2006

Perkovich, George, Mathews, T. Jessica, Cirincione, Joseph, Gottemoeller, Rose, Wolfsthal, B. John, "Nuclear Compliance: A Strategy for Nuclear Security", Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D.C., 2005

Norris, S. Robert and Kristensen, M. Hans, "Global Nuclear Stockpiles, 1945-2006", Nuclear Notebook, July/August 2006, www.onb.ac.at

National Geographic, "A World of Weapons", 08.2005, Academic Search Elite, www.onb.ac.at

Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, electronic version, CD, 2007

www.wikipedia.org, 2007

Universal Compliance: Yet Unanswered Questions and Already Given Solutions

Vasyl Sheshurak, Strategy for Nuclear Security and Combating Terrorism, IU Vienna,
Fall 2007