

International University

Course: Strategy of Nuclear Security and Combating Terrorism

Research Questions: WEAPONS OF TERROR. Freeing the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms. Chairman-Hans Blix(Part I)

Submitted to: Prof Karl-Heinz Czock

Submitted by: Vitaliy Kostenko

Vienna 2007

"Before us lie two very divergent courses. One path can take us to a world, in which the proliferation of nuclear weapons is restricted and reversed, through trust, dialogue and negotiated agreement.... The other path leads to a world, in which a rapidly growing numbers of States feel obliged to arm themselves with nuclear weapons, and in which non-State actors acquire the means to carry out nuclear terrorism. The international community seems almost to be sleepwalking down the latter path -- not by conscious choice, but rather through miscalculation, sterile debate and the paralysis of multilateral mechanisms for confidence-building and conflict-resolution."

- United Nations Secretary-General Kofi Annan, May 18, 2006

These words were the ones uttered by Mr. Annan as a warning to the international community in the middle of the 21st century. These words depict the seriousness of the situation in which the mankind has appeared to be in the age of the most highly developed technology, communication, and human ability for achievement.

We have never been so united and on the other hand we have never been so divided. Our interests and common goals never used to be so multiple and the achievement has been so complicated. The nations have never been so dependable upon the natural resources and have never invested so much effort into dominating over them. The societies of the Western civilization have achieved the unprecedented level of technological development on the one hand and, on the other hand, the Islamic countries have never lagged behind more as they do now. There have never been so quick industrializations and capitalizations of the societies, like we experience in China and Russia now.

All these factors when put together give us unprecedented globalization, coming of the world together and, on the other hand, unprecedented economic rivalry of ones getting richer and the other getting poorer. This creates inequality and unequal opportunities. Ideological and religious differences pose even more problematique into the situation.

The presence of the nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the Nuclear states under the given conditions presents more danger than only a decade ago. Therefore, the immediate action and will to secure and disarm the world should be the first point on the agenda of the international community.

This is what the report of Hans Blix was called to do - be a notification, challenge and warning for the international community that the immediate action is necessary. Hans Blix is a Swedish national. He is the one of the most often mentioned figures in the foreword of the 2nd Iraq war. He was the one to check the presence of the Weapons of Mass Destruction(WMD) in Iraq before the American invasion. He was also the one to call some high-rank American politicians-"Bastards from the Capitol Hill" for spreading false information about him and putting him under pressure in order to get a favorable result in his report.

On all stages of his work Hans Blix was professional, honest and enthusiastic. The disarmament has become the goal and reason of his life. I would put him to the group of individuals who put their best endeavor to make our world a safer place.

In 2003 Anna Lindth a former high-rank EU representative with her EU colleagues came out with new incentives concerning non-proliferation. These incentives were necessary in the light of the changing world and new realities. The new principles were as following:

- The countries should feel that they do not need the WMD
- Violators should be allowed to walk back and rejoin international community
- The omnipotence of cooperative approach to the international community should prevail
- Rule-based international order
- Military action can be imposed only under the Chapter VII of the UN charter with the security council as the final arbiter

Anna Lindth was the one to offer Mr Blix a chair at the new Commission. He agreed. This report was also created with a great help from the Swedish government and Fraser University from Holland.

This report was not the first one. There were at least 3 more commissions which had similar goals and came out with different results.

- 1982. This commission was headed by Olaf Palme. The report was called "Common Security". It pinned its hopes on the strong anti-war opinion. This was the time of the

Cold War. There were significant multi-lateral agreements concluded between the US and USSR as the result of this report.

- 1996 Report of the Canberra Commission on the Elimination of the nuclear Weapons. This was the post cold war time and the place for hope was immense. The Canberra commission urged that practical steps be taken to eliminate the WMD immediately.
- 1998. “Tokyo Forum”. The initiator was the Government of Japan. What made it very unhappy is that it was just some months after the India/Pakistan nuclear tests. This report came out with the “action-plan” concerning disarmament, non-proliferation and terrorism.

The Hans Blix Commission had to face similar issues, but in the new world’s environment. The reality of today’s world is:

1. US declined to support the ratification of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty
2. No progress on nuclear disarmament, nuclear proliferation, fears of Terrorism that have intensified and take the first issue in the agenda of the major states, undermining the importance of disarmament.
3. The post cold war window of opportunities was gone. This might have been the most tragic of all factors. The so much necessary momentum for taking the vital decisions was lost. The countries were either not trusting one another, or they were busy asserting themselves as the new-born Super-powers, or ruthlessly fighting for the resources.

Additionally, it is worth mentioning that, although, global economic interdependence accelerated the same threats of disease are faced by all states, no serious conflicts between the major powers took place in the last 10 years- the climate of Arms control and disarmament deteriorated drastically.

All major treaties are still missing now. The most important and crucial Non-proliferation Treaty stagnated and was not completed. The same problems faced the Biological and Toxin weapons Convention. There was no signing of the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban treaty. There was even no opening of the talks concerning the cessation of the fissile material production.

On the contrary, we see more and more investments going into the high-technology, aimed at pursuing war in the technological era. The Americans got busy building their Missile

Shield in Eastern Europe, triggering countermeasures by Russia and China. This can be called the new arms race. The Chinese have trained in shooting down their satellite in space. We may conclude that the major powers are calculating the cost of new, technological war. The general declarations of the major states can seem to be pacifistic and peaceful; the real picture, however is that the USA, China and Russia are building up their armies, expanding their military budgets, investing more money into the advance military technology.

The countries with not democratic regimes are doing their best to preserve their power and rule in those countries. For them the military is a vital means of survival. The building up of military muscles does not come in question with them at all. I am talking about the Iran or Burma, for example. The acquisition of the WMD would have been for them the solution of all problems. This would allow the totalitarian, non-democratic regimes to preserve the status quo, to keep their own population in control and get additional bargaining power with the neighbors and other countries.

The world has become a closer world, globalization is moving on. The fear of some countries has not diminished, but increased. WMD is regarded as a solution.

The contemporary problems and difficulties come along with the deterioration in the interest of the public in the questions of disarmament. The headlines of the world have been occupied with the “war on terror” news. The permanent, endless problems of the Americans in the Iraq take the front lines of all major news agencies. The war of terror is justified in many respects, but it has taken too much public attention and has come out with very few positive results. The interest to the topic of disarmament has been naturally set aside. The intensity of the action of war in Iraq is leaving no place for the interest and engagement in the topics of disarmament.

The problems of the WMD cannot be ignored, however. We can see the so-called cases of the “Rogue States”. These are the specific cases concerning the problems of disarmament that are particularly regarded in a certain period of time separately from the questions of disarmament. The actual specific questions of non-proliferation are Iraq and Iran. There have been seen a lot of hope and confidence in the case of N. Korea recently. North Korea has been known to be developing WMD for very long time. The north Koreans made rocket launches in 2006. They also seem to have made the subterranean nuclear test.

While making these tests and militarizing the country with the only reason of preserving the dictator regime,- the country has virtually appeared to be on the brink of a disaster. The economic situation is so dramatic that the country cannot feed its own people with the basic means of nourishment. There are shortages of bread in North Korea. There are problems with electricity and water supply. Under such conditions any further developments in the WMD program would be simply funny when taking into the account the poverty and helplessness of the North Korean population.

Therefore, we may think to be prudent on the side of the North Korean authorities to give up their bold ambitions concerning the program and give up under the pressure of the world's community and finally giving up the program. This will allow for disarming and taking under control the process of nuclear process in North Korea and feed the population of this troublesome country.

The Americans made some diplomatic reverences to the North Koreans to make them quicker surrender on the issue which was also 100% right.

A little different situation is with the Islamic Republic of Iran. This is a deeply religious country with certain Islamic norms and rules and a certain official opinion that can be regarded as dangerous

For certain countries, like Israel. The acquisition of the WMD by the Iran can be seen by ones as the destabilizing factor in the whole region. On the other hand, it can be seen by the others as a balancing factor in the region because the Israelis have the WMD already. The hypothetical possession of the WMD by the Iran will not really alter the situation. The Iranians will not risk destroying the state of Israel. We will have another case of India and Pakistan where the countries do not really like each other, but have to coexist and come to agreements under the pressure of the WMD arsenals in their warehouses. The only losers in this case will, for sure, be the population of the Iran. The Iranians have no democracy in their country and the ruling regime will cement itself with the WMD. The other loser will be the world's community that craves for disarmament, but instead will get another nuclear State. The international relations between the nations and cultures will also be more intense because the Iran and its possible allies will get more bargaining power.

However, we must not simplify the issues with the Iran. It is very questionable where the country in terms of its nuclear program really is. Another major player-Russia is not really interested in having the nuclear armed Iran in the vicinity of its borders. The only thing that the Russians can be interested in is the economic limitations put on the Iran to prevent it from selling its natural resources under sanctions and, by attaining this goal,- maximizing Russia's own profit from the sky high gas prices.

The recent report by the US intelligence that the Iran is a couple of years behind in its nuclear program is a diplomatic sign that there are some changes coming. I am not informed enough in the form and context of these changes. The Americans are not capable of any further military expansion and the world is more and more in need of the natural resources.

When coming back to the factors for the public opinion deterioration and losing of interest, we cannot help, but mention the fact that the treaties did not stop a high empowered individual in the face of Osama bin Laden to make the 9/11 happen. The peoples of the world well understand that in the contemporary globalized world of today there must be much more done to disarm Osama.

Another trivial and everybody easy to understand factor is that international treaties did not prevent Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Iran to acquire the parts, specialists and dreams about the WMD.

Summing up all these factors, one may say that the today's most powerful country –the USA have changed its political and military doctrine.

1. The USA have started to more and more rely on its own military in the case of the military necessity
2. 2002 the US national Security strategy made it clear that the US will use its own armed forces without the authorization of the SC if there be a need in the form not only of an actual attack, but also of a potential threat. This is a so-called "preemptive Strike" doctrine.

The US policy was also called the "selective multilateralism". An increasing US skepticism regarding the effectiveness of the international institutions (UN) was the major drive for freedom of action to maintain an absolute global superiority in weaponry and means of its delivery:

- The US is less interested in the global approach than it was in the Cold War.

- Iraq 2003 –the US relied upon its own intelligence and completely disregarded the results of the international verification.
- Such an aggressive approach can be called-“counter proliferation”
- The majority of the states oppose to such a wide license on the use of force. Other countries to a greater or lesser extent position themselves as stakeholders in a system where all have the write to resolve all issues by the means of consensus. On the other hand, needless to say, how problematic is it to resolve any crucial issue by a consensus nowadays where so much is at stake to start with natural resources.

We must understand that though, the Cold War is over, the US is remaining the only democracy with enough military power that can intrude into the world of the military affairs, be a sample for the world of the military affairs and be the world’s “watchdog”. When the USA is making such a drastic shift in its military doctrine- other countries cannot help, but react.

All the above factors are the bricks in the wall of factors that make the world of today such a problematic place when it gets to the disarmament. I would like to add two more reasons which are more from the political realm that complicate the already complicated issues:

- Paralyzing system of requirements of consensus combined with the outdated system of the block politics. This can be called the remnant of the Cold War system, but the international community with its SC on top of its all having hard times getting to the consensus. On the other hand, should one look through the history of the crisis in the last 30-40 years, and he will see that the world’s most powerful ones were always divided with respect to these or the other questions.
- Nuclear- weapon states do not take their commitment to disarmament seriously. I would say that these states might feel being elevated over other states. They should, however, never forget that they will always be the reason for other non-nuclear countries for craving for the WMD. These nuclear-countries should be the ones to understand the first that they are responsible for setting the sample for the others.

Finally, when making a look at the core of the problem, there must be three steps made direction disarmament for making the whole world a much safer place:

1. Bringing the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty into force would significantly impede the development of the new weapons. The weapons that exist at the moment is pretty bad and its majority can be unusable at all.
2. Negotiating a global treaty to stop the production of the fissile material for the weapons would close the source for appearing of such material and heavily hinder possible arms races, in Asia in particular.
3. Finally, US should take a lead and the whole world will follow.

Why Weapons of Mass Destruction? Why is it the most important and crucial of all? Why not the issue of “small arms”? There are statistically more people become the victims of the handguns than of nuclear bombs. The WMD can pose much more ultimate suffering and the most ultimate threat. There fore the current standstill is no good and the world’s community must refocus itself and revive the efforts to achieve disarmament, arms controls and proliferation. Why is it so important particularly right now?

- Science/technology developments create new opportunities & threats. Technologically it is no problem to create and dissipate any virus, create a dirty bomb, or terrorize masses of people. All this can be done with the help of the recent advances in technology.
- 9/11 revealed the seriousness of the problem with Osama in play. Though, it is not proven what could have been done, should the WMD or any derivatives of these appear in the hands of Osama bin Laden or similar extremists. The only rhetorical question can be comes out if we ever want to experience this. Fear is already enough.
- 1968 NPT created a lot of adherents, but did not prevent the second wave of proliferation (India, Pakistan, Israel) + violators (North Korea). We can see that there should be more effort invested to actually hinder and block the nuclear technology leakages. The countries have experienced that it has been not enough control in the recent years.
- 36 years later after the NPT- five nuclear states failed to achieve disarmament through negotiation
- Technological Know-How enables more state-non-state players get hold of chemical, biological, nuclear weapons. It is not only the issue of know-how. It is also the question of globalization. If only a century ago- only states were the major players on the world’s arena. Only 50-60 years ago huge companies have become major players. A couple decades ago venture capital and innovative ideas backed by genius groups

of people took the lead. Now we are facing the situation when individuals can be a non state major player. We face the situation that technology is allowing us all individually, when being smart enough to take over a lot of influence.

- Radioactive substances& waste is not under full control. This is a perpetual problem that can be controlled under the full collaboration and mutual effort of all countries in the world.
- Existence of the private global market where WMD information can be acquired-threat of terrorism. This is another issue of the contemporary world. The communication and illicit trade come together create another threat of nuclear material movement across borders.

Why urgent action is necessary particularly right now? There were a lot of moments in the history of mankind when the peoples stood on the brink of the ultimate catastrophe of mutual distrust, hatred and even annihilation. Nowadays, it is particularly risky due to the technological innovation in internet, globalization, and trade, differences in the standards of living, ideological differences, religious misunderstanding, and a dramatic appearance of an angry man. The major issues are as following:

- Nuclear/Biological/Chemical weapons can be a disastrous danger in the hands of states or N-States. If it only exists, no matter how good it is secured, it can get dangerous. The governments can change over time. The angry men in the face of bin Laden or him alike can get hold of these weapon's type and terrorize the developed world.
- As long as the ones have the other will want. There are a lot of ideological differences between the countries. There are a lot of different interests and ambitions between different countries. Ones want to become greater than they are now. The others want to have more influence and bargaining power. The WMD will always remain a means of attaining of any kinds of desires.
- Stock 27000(12000) actively deployed. There are about 300 bombs needed to wipe out the whole world and make it not possible to living creatures. The mankind has 12000 actively deployed which is about 40 times more
- Nuclear weapons cannot be uninvented, but can be outlawed, like Chemical or Biological Weapons. It is unthinkable under nowadays conditions to use or threaten or develop chemical or biological weapons. Legally these two types of weapons have

been outlawed. The only issue remaining is to destroy its stockpile. The same approach is ought to be taken with respect to the nuclear weapons.

- Momentum lost. These two words describe the failure of the world's community in the last 20 years. The period of time after the Cold war was the window of opportunities where more progress with respect to disarmament could have been attained. This window appeared when the Soviet Union was on its knees and disintegrated. The Russian economy was destroyed and needed urgent help. At that moment politically there could have been more progress under those circumstances. Those days are gone and we have to move on.

What is supposed to be done now? We need like a land map to see where we are going and how we are going there. First of all, we all must agree on the cooperative action-plan. Any kind of success of that scale can only be achieved by collective action. The following issues are most important here and stressing our attention here will be of vital importance:

- Reduce the danger of the arsenals. Seal, secure, access limitations. The borders must be transparent for trade, travel and cultivation of human genius, but sealed for illicit trade, illegal migration. The WMD arsenals and fissile material production facilities and retaining locations should be well protected and unpenetratable for bad angry corrupt guys. This task is impossible to achieve 100%, but it is possible maximize our success and reduce the profit and success of the bad guys. Economics is very important here. Border control must be increased. The law enforcement units worldwide must make information exchange. Police and financial authorities must work together. If they do, the effectiveness will be much higher.
- Prevent proliferation: no new possessors appearing, prohibiting nuclear tests, continue negotiations with N. Korea, Iran. This is a rather broad statement, but it is giving us clear directions for movement. All countries put a lot of effort into the blocking of any new possessors from appearing. The prohibitions of the nuclear tests treaty block the potential possibilities of the nuclear tests.
- Work towards outlawing WMD. Accept the principle that WMD must be outlawed. If the countries of the world take this principle for the rule, this will be a turning point in the history of this planet.
- Stop arms race in space. Space has been used for the peaceful exploration, entertainment and research. This practice should remain unchanged.

- Speed up the destruction of the chemical weapons. Though, this kind of weapons was outlawed, it has not been fully destroyed due to the absence of financing or negligence. Good work in this field should be continued
- Reinforce the ban on development and production of biological weapons. Good work in this field should be continued.

Weapons of Mass Destruction; Weapons of Terror; Threats & Responses; Facts from the Past.

Before I get to the discussion of the threats and responses of the WMD, I want to get You acquainted with the basic facts about what terror the weapons of mass destruction can impose onto the mankind:

- Hiroshima and Nagasaki lost 200 000 lives through two American bombs
- 1 modern submarine has the firepower of all WWII dropped bombs
- Some kinds biological weapons impose a huge suffering even if a human being gets a microscopic amount of it
- Biological weapons attack cells in the human body by using pathogens
- Chemical weapons attack nervous system and lungs, it causes relatively quick, but inhumanly painful death

Finally, before we talk about the ultimate threats of the weapons of mass destruction, I want to once again draw Your attention to the main treaties:

1. Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This treaty seeks to prevent the further spread of WMD. It is seeking to promote the cooperation in the peaceful use of energy. It is pursuing disarmament. It entered into force in 1970 this treaty is concentrating on the global non proliferation regime. The original 'bargain of the treaty is generally understood to be the elimination of nuclear weapons through the commitment by non-nuclear-weapon states to acquire nuclear weapons and the commitment by the five nuclear-weapon states to pursue nuclear disarmament. In addition, the treaty requires parties to facilitate peaceful uses of nuclear energy through exchanges of various kinds between

themselves.(Hans Blix Report). I think the provision about “peaceful uses of nuclear energy exchange” can be abused as in the India/Pakistan case.

Hans Blix’ report is also reporting about the problems that the NPT is constantly facing:

- The nuclear-weapon states are not ready for disarmament. They promised one thing in the NPT, but failed to confirm it in practice.
 - The violations of Iraq, Libya, North Korea and Iran have violated the confidence in the NPT
 - Withdrawal, as in the case with North Korea has also appeared to be a problem.
 - Finally, there is a technical problem. The lack of any provision for a standing secretariat to assist the parties in implementing the treaty has proven inconvenient (Hans Blix Report).
2. Convention on the prohibition of the development and production of biological and toxic weapons.
 3. Convention on the prohibition of the development and production and stockpiling of chemical weapons.

These documents are the main instruments in the hands of the world community in the realm of disarmament and proliferation. There are much more desired to make our world a safer place to be.

Let us now pay more attention to the threats that the mankind faces from the WMD. The first and foremost is the Nuclear weapons. There is a certain classification here:

- The biggest stockpile of nuclear weapons is in the existing arsenals. Mostly USA, Russia, China, France, the UK, Israel, Pakistan, India. Governments may change, can get into bad hands. This is a major threat. The other one is that as long as certain countries have the WMD - the other will want too. There were initially only 5 countries possessing nuclear arsenals. There appeared to be 3 more in the years to come. The commission rejects the suggestion that nuclear weapons in the hands of some pose no threat, while in the hands of others they place the world in mortal jeopardy. Governments possessing nuclear weapons can act responsibly or recklessly. Governments may also change overtime (Hans Blix Report). Some countries or,

better to say, regimes desperately try to create such a nuclear weapon. Thanks God, it is not that easy and takes a lot of time and conspiracy to create a nuclear bomb.

- Proliferation-threats for regional global politics, global security. Proliferation may increase the risk of use. Domino effect, producing fear, alarm and possibly countermeasures involving WMD in neighboring countries. Pressures and risks as with Iraq and Iran. Some governments will want to assert their power, terrorize the neighbors. There can be also the arms race. For example, should Iran get nuclear weapons, Israel will increase the number of its arsenal.
- Terrorism- the biggest difficulty for them is to acquire fissile material. They can try to steal nuclear materials during the transportation or storage. To counteract is to seal and secure nuclear storage sites. Make scientists more accountable. Dirty bomb is the most probable danger of all. Dirty bombs can potentially make certain areas completely impossible for any kind of inhabitation for the years to come. The effects of the dirty bomb can be similar to those of Chernobyl. The Chernobyl zone is a delimited area with no inhabitants in it for more than the last 20 years. The dirty bomb would have had the effect on a lesser amount of territory, but the outcomes would be similar- people would have to leave those places and move over to the other. The economic distractions would be colossal.

We should not underestimate all three sources of the Nuclear Weapons threat. I would say that the terrorism is the most acute one at the moment of time.

The next horrifying WMD threat can be the one coming from the biological weapons. We are following the same classification here:

- Existing Weapons is outlawed by the Treaty. The biggest possessors of this weapon are Russia and the USA, some countries in Middle East and East Asia. It can be difficult to detect the production lines. Due to the new biotechnologies this kind of weapons can pose a great danger. Just before the invasion into Iraq, there was a mustard gas found there. The Saddam regime used some types of biological weapons against the Kurds.
- Proliferation threat comes out predominantly from export. Export controls are not enough to prevent movement of Biological weapons. As the technology grows- more states will be ready to produce biological weapons. On the other hand, it is relatively

dirty kind of weapons that need to keep trained people and facilities to keep this weapon ready for action.

- Terrorism- difficult to ascertain. Different opinions if they have it, but most probably not due to the fact that it is not practical to keep it mobile and they need facilities which are expensive and easy to trace should they have been bought and moved from place to place. The rise of technology might promise certain simplifications in the production, transportation and putting of this kind of weapons to action. Aum Shinrikyo has been so far the only proven case-study of the terrorist use of the biological weapons.

The next horrifying WMD threat can be the one coming from the Chemical weapons. We are following the same classification here:

- Existing weapons are predominantly concentrated between Russia and the USA. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the declared items was destroyed under the treaty. This kind of weapons was outlawed and is officially not supposed to be in the development or production. This weapon is relatively difficult and unpleasant to keep ready for action or develop. This kind of weapons is relatively dangerous even when taken care about.
- Proliferation-remain repugnant to the overwhelming majority of states and have shown its dubious utility as weapons of war. As mentioned before-chemical weapons creates unpleasant effects and requires unpleasant attention when being serviced by the servicemen. As I have heard from the servicemen in the soviet army there was usually nobody who would voluntarily go and help around the chemical weapons. But the main reason why proliferation is not normally the case with this kind of weapon is because it has shown its relative utility as a weapon of war. It is not controllable enough, creating too much trouble after its use, dangerous for ones' own stuff, inflicting uncontrollable results, and inhuman sufferings. It is repugnant.
- Terrorism- may attack the sites that produce some chemical substance and contaminate the area. This would be the most logical and probable movement of thoughts of some terrorist organization. I would risk saying that developing or purchasing and retaining of chemical weapons is far above the possibilities of the terrorist organizations.

Now we have regarded the main of threats. Let us look at the traditional responses to the threats of WMD. These are the examples how countries have tackled the problem of WMD.

I am proud to say that Ukraine was one of those countries which have masterfully become the classical example of the traditional responses to the threats of WMD. It is also worth mentioning the words of Hans Blix concerning the “lost window of opportunities” after the end of the Cold War. Ukraine was not lost in the process of disarmament:

- **Unilateral response.** Ukraine was left with the huge arsenal of nuclear weapons after the demise of the Soviet Union. Under the guarantees of China, Russia, the UK, France and the USA the Ukrainians proclaimed itself as the non-nuclear state. The nuclear weapons was sent either to Russia or utilized in Ukraine. Another case of unilateral response is S. Africa. This country stopped its nuclear program some time ago. The other examples were Sweden, Brazil. Still another example is the USA with its denouncement of chemical weapons usage.
- **Bilateral responses.** The most recent and interesting example is the Clinton-Yeltsin summit in Helsinki 1997 between 2 in the interest of the world’s community. This summit helped to sign certain agreements concerning non-proliferation between the USA and Russia.
- **Plurilateral.** This kind of response is taking place between more than 2, but not involving all. The fresh example is China, Japan, North Korea, Russia, South Korea, the US on North Korea nuclear program.
- **Regional** responses are the ones that EU is pursuing incentives to reduce the nuclear weapons.
- **Global Responses** –Convention on human rights and Geneva convention. Most important. Involving all.

The traditional responses to the WMD have some weaknesses:

- Lack of Universality is the first and foremost difficulty. It is a colossal difficulty to involve all and get to the consensus. 5 countries have the license of possession from the day when the UN was born. The other do not like to comply to the NPT. They feel being not equal.
- Withdrawal from the already signed treaty is a big limitation like in the case of North Korea. It must be made more difficult to withdraw. To make it difficult the procedure of withdrawal should be made difficult, bureaucratic, multi-dimensional and transparent at the same time. Each country willing to withdraw should be under the utter attention of the whole world when it is going to withdraw from the treaty.

- Inadequate verification is another weakness faced often. It is important for all to know what is there and be able to check it, like in the case of Iraq. The UN representatives spent an enormous amount of time going from place to place looking for the WMD and other weapon. For example the statements of North Korea about holdings of plutonium were misleading. The worst thing that the countries come up with lies and inadequate informing of the international community officials. This is leading to inadequate verification.
- Non-compliance. The treaty signed, but the country is not following it. This is a disrespect and disregard for the treaty. The most brutal violators were the Soviet Union during the cold war and Iraq before the invasion.
- Lack of enforcement. Difficulty to check and control because that can interfere into the internal affair of the state. Now, with the help of the satellites any movement can be seen from the space, but the sovereign rights of the state can be very important and used as an argument by the hiding or not complying state. There is also no police of the international community that would be checking and enforcing the fulfillment of the signed agreements.

There were two documents signed with respect to the traditional responses to the threats from Weapons of Terror:

- The 2003 Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI)-states have agreed to join their initiatives to interdict and seize international shipments of goods believed to be illegally destined to be used in the WMD programs.
- UN SC resolution 1540- establishes a mandatory requirement for all states to refrain from providing any form of support to non-state actors in obtaining WMD.

At this point I want to make an intermediate conclusion on what must be done to revitalize the disarmament and non proliferation talks between the countries.

- There is a need to revitalize and strengthen multilateral cooperative approaches because of their legitimacy effectiveness in addressing WMD threats. There is no other approach than the collective action approach. None of the proliferation problems can be resolved without a broad consensus of the world's community. Every country must be involved. Violators should be allowed to come back to the negotiation table.
- Collective responsibility among governments for achieving disarmaments, non-proliferation and counter terrorism. This is the so called all for one rule when each

country, taking part in the game, should be supportive with respect to the partners and counterparts. There must be a lot of effort invested into the reaching of the mutual respect, understanding the water needs, avoiding sharp corner and cultivating trust. The countries have created so much evil in production of the WMD that its deconstruction should take the equal amount of good.

- SC in close contact with members of the UN should be the focal point. The Security Council must be the central place where the most acute problems can be resolved. We must not forget that this is the central stage where the problems can be resolved. In such a delicate matter as the WMD, the Security Council, no matter how powerful certain countries might be, should become the instrument with which help the countries must put the collective effort to reach the maximum level of trust and cooperation in the hope for ultimate proliferation and disarmament.

Additional References

- **Disarmament Diplomacy; Weapons of Terror: The Report of the WMD Commission One Year On; Issue No. 85, Summer 2007**
<http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd85/85blix.htm>
- **Civil Society Review of the final Report; June 6, 2006.**
<http://wmdreport.org/pages/policymemo.htm>
- **Simon Fraser University; Dr. Hans Blix: Weapons of Terror; Press Conference announcement**
http://www.sfu.ca/pamr/news_releases/archives/news06230602.htm
- **Text Of Hans Blix's Report To U.N. Security Council; UNITED NATIONS, Feb. 14, 2003**
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2003/02/14/iraq/main540681.shtml>