

PROCESS OF NUCLEAR WEAPON FREE ZONES' FORMATION AND PROSPECTS OF THEIR EXPANSION

Marianna Zabolotna

Ph.D student

Department of Modern and Contemporary History of Foreign Countries

Taras Shevchenko National University Of Kyiv

Ukraine



Abstract: The paper analyzes the state of scientific research problems and proves the theoretical and methodological framework used by the author during the study. The peculiarities of the nuclear weapon free zones' formation are researched by author. The patterns of their creation in five regions: Latin America, South Pacific, South-East Asia, Central Asia and Africa are investigated. The author analyzes importance of denuclearized zones for the non-proliferation regime and the reveals the prospects of their expansion. Author has determined world leaders' main motives for the deployment and adoption of action programs. There is authors' view in the paper on the similar zones' possible creation in the Arctic regions, North-East Asia, the Middle East and Europe. Author highlights the main challenges of such processes in this direction. Also author specifies alternative methods that are aimed to improve the system expansion of denuclearized zones at the regional level and beyond. In the paper author has proved the successful experience of the denuclearized zones existence and the need for further work towards improving their participation and nuclear countries direct support, and especially the United States.

Keywords: nuclear weapons, nuclear weapons prevalence, nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZs), the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).

1. Introduction

It is important nowadays to analyze the formation of the denuclearized zones that are closely linked with the problem of nuclear proliferation in the structure of international relations and their importance in world politics. It is needless to underline the fact that the vast majority of scientists treat denuclearized zones as the third element of the non-proliferation regime as one of the key and most successful parts. Therefore, issues related to the study of zones free of nuclear weapons and the prospects for their improvement and expansion have attracted the attention of many scientists and researchers all over the world. In Ukraine, the study of this issue was made by such scholars as C. Galaka [1] A. Kuras [2]. In their work they give a detailed analysis of non-proliferation policy' value problems, considering the development of nuclear programs in these areas and reasonably estimate their impact on the sector.

Among the studies of Western authors, it is important to highlight the works of M. Kareem [3] A. Kapoor [4] M. Fitzpatrick [5] K. Bailey and others. In these works the authors have presented a profound analysis of the existing and expanding new denuclearized zones, considered the impact of the unrecognized nuclear countries' global policy that undermine the non-proliferation regime and influence the need for nuclear - free zones in those regions.

Among the Russian scientific works, we have paid attention to the works of A. Arbatov [6] B. Dworkin [6] R. Hotemyuller [7] T. Anichkina and others. These scientists are depicting the post-bipolar time, a powerful software deployment phase with the creation of three of the five nuclear areas in their works.

Based on the fact that the number of local scientific researches on the above mentioned problems in Ukrainian

historical science is very limited today, and the overwhelming part of them do not go beyond 2008-2010, author will make an attempt to analyze and give an objective assessment of the value of the denuclearized zones' and their possible expansion in the future.

2. Materials and methods

The denuclearized zone is partly demilitarized and neutralized region where, according to international agreements of the concerned countries, the parties undertake not to develop, produce, acquire, test and possess nuclear weapons [8, C. 83]. This concept to nuclear non-proliferation first began in 1950, and with the conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1968 became an additional element of the regional approach to the non-proliferation regime. Thus, Article VII of the NPT approves the right of some countries to have nuclear weapon free zones. Today there are five such zones: Latin America - the Treaty of Tlatelolco, South Pacific - Treaty of Rarotonga, South-East Asia - Treaty of Bangkok, Africa - Treaty of Pelindaba, Central Asia - Treaty of Semipalatinsk.

Let's consider the implementation of such motives. Thus, in 1967 the first agreement on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in Latin America (the Treaty of Tlatelolco) was signed, which came into force for 11 countries in 1968, and in 1975 the number of members has expanded to 20. Today, this Agreement has 33 countries members (Cuba has joined the last one in 2002), whose main task is to prevent and ban the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition of nuclear weapons and its receipt, storage, installation, placement or possession [9, C. 149]. One of the most controversial points of the document is Article 18, which allows nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. It has

been added to the contract for two Additional Protocols of nuclear powers. The first concerned the distribution status of a nuclear-free zone in the territory and in the region, international responsibility for which were carrying out France, Netherlands, USA and UK. The contract was signed and ratified by all parties. Second - included a so-called "negative guarantees" of nuclear powers that pushed the interests of the two superpowers in the region - the US and the USSR. Gradually, however, this protocol was also ratified by all nuclear countries. Later on three amendments were added to the Treaty: the first (1990) - added to the title of the Agreement the words "and the Caribbean", which facilitated the joining of English-speaking Caribbean countries. Second Amendment (1992) changed the second paragraph of Art. 25. Third (1992) - and amended the Articles 14-16 and 19-20, which contributed to the IAEA in the region, leaving for it the exclusive right to conduct special inspections. Consequently, the Treaty of Tlatelolco in 1967 became the first successful experience towards a nuclear-free zone in Latin America and has established the functionality and importance of denuclearized zones as an additional element to the non-proliferation regime.

The Treaty of Rarotonga was signed by the South Pacific nations on the island of Rarotonga (where the capital of the Cook Islands is located) on 6 August 1985, came into force with the 8th ratification, and has since been ratified by all of those states. It was the first time when the concept of a nuclear explosive device and ban on testing, both for military and for peaceful purposes was applied [10, S. 167], as well as the suspension of nuclear materials exports or equipment without appropriate IAEA safeguards. To the Treaty the countries have added three protocols and four applications according to which they are obliged not to produce and use nuclear explosive devices, place them and conduct testing on its territory, not participate in their production. Today the Treaty of Rarotonga has 13 members from the South Pacific countries and it has cemented the status of denuclearized zones.

On 12.15.1995 new Treaty was opened for signature on the agreement on nuclear-free zone in Southeast Asia or so called Bangkok Treaty. On 28.03.1997 after the ratification of Cambodia, it has come into force. Today the agreement was signed by 10 countries in the region - Brunei, Vietnam, Indonesia, Cambodia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Philippines. Five official nuclear countries refused to sign the protocols, mainly because of the American and French claims concerning respective responsibilities for the safety and extended territory, including the exclusive economic zone. During the 2000s, negotiations are still continuing. The contract contains two elements that go beyond traditional contracts. The first zone includes not only the territory of countries members, but also as well the continental shelf (about 200 km). Secondly, the nuclear states are obliged not to use nuclear weapons against countries participating in contract. But in other aspects Bangkok Treaty repeats the previous one.

On 04.11.1996 the Treaty establishing zones free of nuclear weapons in Africa - the Pelindaba Treaty was

open for signature. Only after ratification of the 28th state, Burundi, on 07.15.2009 it has come into force. Protocol to the Treaty was signed by all nuclear states and includes 54 member countries. Innovation was the obligation of all parties to the Treaty to declare any possibility of the nuclear explosive devices production and to maintain the highest level of safety and efficiency of nuclear materials and facilities physical preservation. The Treaty of Pelindaba is the only of NWFZs treaties that is prohibiting research in relation to any nuclear explosive devices by any means and in any place, which further has expanded the authority of the NPT [11, p 190].

On 8.09.2006 p. was signed another important agreement on the zone free from nuclear weapons in Central Asia or the Treaty of Semipalatinsk. On 21.03.2009 it has entered into force. Territorial Agreement covers 5 Central Asian countries: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Among the other agreements of the denuclearized zones formation the Treaty of Semipalatinsk stands out because member countries are obliged to comply with the provisions of The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and to conclude with the IAEA and implement not only the Safeguards Agreement, but also the Additional Protocol.

Each of these Treaties includes the protocol, which commits nuclear countries that have ratified and signed the agreements not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against the countries participating in this agreement ("negative security assurances" NSA). All five nuclear countries have agreed to Protocol II of the Tlatelolco Treaty of NSA. Besides, Russian Federation, United Kingdom, France and China have signed and ratified the II and III NSA protocols of the Treaty of Rarotonga (prohibiting nuclear tests in the area) and Protocols I (NSA) and II to the Pelindaba Treaty (prohibiting nuclear tests in the region). The United States have signed but not ratified the agreement. Also is still not signed by nuclear countries the same protocol of Bangkok Treaty. In addition, these agreements convert other areas into nuclear-free zones, "Antarctic Treaty" (adopted in 1959, entered into force in 1961), "Outer Space Treaty" (adopted and entered into force 1967), and «Seabed Treaty" (adopted in 1971, entered into force in 1972).

Today parliamentarians, except strengthening and developing the existing zones free of nuclear weapons, are focused on the perspectives of the development of security without nuclear weapons in a new, equally important regions in terms of non-proliferation. President Barack Obama fully supports the expansion of free zones, which contributes to nuclear non-proliferation, peace and security. In 2010 the administration of President has decided to extend positive security assurances to each country which hasn't nuclear weapons, is a member of the NPT and fulfils its obligations. Today the most support is gained on the nuclear free zones in Northeast Asia, the Arctic, the Middle East and Europe.

The ability to create such zones is deeply complicated by the perennial crisis over North Korea's nuclear program, but does not stop the actions in this direction, especially from the concerned countries in this region. Thus, in February 2010

parliamentarians of Japan and South Korea met in Tokyo in order to discuss the conditions for the creation of NWFZs in Northeast Asia. In May a group of Japanese and Korean parliamentarians issued a joint statement on the establishment of NWFZs in this region, which was accepted by 86 Japanese parliamentarians, 7 political parties and 7 parliamentarians from the three political parties in Republic of Korea. In March 2012 members of the inter-Japan Parliamentarians of the Department of Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament have formed a working group with the aim of NWFZs creation promoting in Northeast Asia, including the creation of a draft Treaty and to exchange of the views on this issue with fellow parliamentarians from six member countries, except Japan. Officially, Pyongyang has left this six-party discussion in 2009, it has repeatedly expressed its willingness to return to dialogue (in January 2010, and in January 2015), but the requirements that were expressed by North Korea were unacceptable to the participants of the negotiations and especially USA. Therefore, in order to somehow bring the chance of creating nuclear weapon free zone in this region, first it is important to find a way to return to the negotiation between United States and North Korea that in the short term is mostly unlikely.

The main advantage of creating nuclear weapon free zone in the Arctic is the exclusion of the possibility of the nuclear weapons' presence in the region, contributing to the prevention of tension and mistrust among countries while solving regional issues. In Canada, former parliamentarian Larry Behnell by the personal initiative has proposed bill to create the Canadian Arctic nuclear-free zone. Under this Bill C-629, presented on 02.15.2011 "possession, production, testing, storage, transportation and deployment of nuclear weapons in Canada's Arctic zone" fall under prosecution [12]. This bill was not adopted, but the Behnell initiative drew attention to this problem.

The situation in the field of nuclear non-proliferation in the Middle East is determined mainly by policy of the leading countries - Israel, Iran and, to a lesser extent, Egypt. The influence of Syria, Algeria and Saudi Arabia is very weak and can only have meaning in a collective format, along with Egypt and, especially, Iran.

Regarding the situation in the Middle East, in our opinion, is crucially important for IAEA to continue its efforts to control the development of Tehran nuclear programs. In 1974 the Shah of Iran initiated the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the region, but still country's desire is not implemented [13, C. 29] This is due to result of Washington's mistrust and suspicion formation towards Tehran, which, respectively resulted in US reluctance to make concessions towards a compromise with Iran. With the election of Barack Obama, the United States began to prefer more diplomatic methods of dialogue with Iran. In November 2013 President Hassan Rouhani announced during the United Nations annual meeting that Tehran had no intention to produce nuclear weapons and supports the establishment of a Middle East nuclear weapon free zone. But today the opportunity looks illusive, though all Middle East countries are supporting the corresponding initiative.

Controversial is the fact that the Arab countries and Israel are in somewhat divergent definitions of nuclear-free zone parameters and procedure of its creation. Yes, Tel Aviv is formally not opposing this idea, but at the same time it claims that nuclear-free zone can only created with conditions for the all issues related to the security of the participating countries and the signing of the agreement settlement, providing for control over conventional armed potential. At the same time, Israel imposes its own requirements without refusing to use nuclear weapons. Arab countries, in turn, insist that the first step in the creation of nuclear-free zone is the refusal of Israel nuclear weapons or official confirmation of Tel Aviv, when the country will do it.

Despite the difficulty in a compromise reaching in this region, it is worth noting some promise in the creation of nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, which is gaining increasing importance against the background of the Syrian conflict. Discussion on the establishment of nuclear-free zone, on such important, in the terms of non-proliferation, territory is reflected in the final document of the NPT Review Conference in 2010 which stressed the need to convene in 2012 Review Conference of practical progress in establishing nuclear-free zone in the Middle East, however, the convening date is still not defined. A typical situation is maintaining during many years, but despite the operation of the special group on arms control and regional security, there are no prospects yet for its solution. According to the author, neither Islamic countries nor Israel relate to this idea seriously, but rather are playing it for propaganda purposes. Therefore, if we consider the problem more realistically, the prospects of nuclear-free zone creation in the Middle East are highly questionable. This issue is complicated by the fact that the establishment of such zone can be based only on the basis of the Arab-Israeli conflict settlement and a number of disputes' solution between Islamic states.

Speaking of Europe, the nuclear-free zone is not considered as practical reasons for the day agenda. Thus, the idea of creating nuclear-free zone here has immediately gained urgency after the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union. And the implementation of Ukraine and Belarus decisions to refuse nuclear heritage and therefore taking nuclear-free status, has given new breath to such visionary perspectives. According to the author, this action of large scale zones free of nuclear weapons could escalate existing de facto situation into de jure regime. However, the "idea" on its way to realization has immediately met difficulties. Already in 1996, the key problem of this plan was the expansion of NATO to the east and the placing of USA nuclear weapons on the territory of new member countries. It has "indefinitely" postponed the agreement on the limitation or complete elimination of tactical nuclear weapons on the continent, which is a complete anachronism since the "cold war" and is a more serious threat. It is clear that this project would not create challenges because in Europe there are three of the five major nuclear countries and US tactical nuclear forces as a symbol of their commitment to NATO. North Atlantic bloc refuses to support the initiative to create nuclear free zones even in parts of Europe, such as in East

and Southeast, citing the fact that in this case it violates the principle of equal security standards of the Allies.

3. Main results

Despite the positive aspects that are associated with the creation of nuclear free zones, such idea is also criticized by non-nuclear lobby, which believes that such methods restrict freedom of nuclear weapons use as a means of deterrence, thus reducing the level of security in the world. However, even the opposite direction of NWFZs ideas perception, their creation and existence is a significant and important event in the field of non-proliferation. Geographic expansion of such areas is related to the period after the confrontation, when the levels of security threats were increased in many regions that are rigidly controlled by one of the parties. Therefore these areas have become a form of "collective security." NWFZs positive result is in the fact that they are beyond the scope of regions and extend their actions to non-proliferation regime as a whole. So today in the world there are 5 populated zones free of nuclear weapons, whose status is confirmed in respective contracts. However, the question of NWFZs expansion remains. In modern conditions it is particular important to analyze the question of the Korean peninsula denuclearization for non-proliferation regime and the establishment of NWFZs in the Middle east and South Asia.

4. Conclusions

Thus, the author concludes that there is long term practice of existing nuclear-free zones establishment and operation, and the recent signing of the Treaty on NWFZs creation in Central Asia and the formation of new initiatives suggest relatively high effectiveness of this form of countries' security strengthening that is covering more than half world countries. With the collapse of bipolarity, including nuclear, there is intensively increased attention to regional threats, which further makes the countries look for new solutions. In this area, NWFZs become a form of collective security, which will reduce the dangerous effects of competing countries in the region. However, today despite many positive factors that NWFZs have, we can not assess even distant picture of the world filled with new NWFZs, because, in our opinion, in the short-term the proposals for such zones' creation in the Arctic regions, North-East Asia and Middle East don't look realistic.

References.

[1] S.P. Halaka (2006) "Yaderne nerozpovsiudzhennia u svitovii politytsi" [Nuclear non-proliferation in world politics], Dys. dok. polit. nauk:

23.00.04, Kyivskiy nats. un-t imeni Tarasa Shevchenka, K., 283 p.

[2] A. Kuras (2006) "Dyplomatychna aktyvnist navkolo yadernoi prohramy KNDR" [Diplomatic activity around the nuclear program of the North Korea], Nauk. zap. In-tu polit. i etno-nats. Doslidzh, Vyp. 30, kn. 2, pp. 310-312.

[3] K. Mahmoud (1998) "A. Nuclear Free-Zone in the Middle East. Problems and Prospects", N.Y.: Greenwood Press, 312 p.

[4] A. Kapur (1992) "South Asian Regional Proliferation and Non-Proliferation Dynamics", Regional Approaches to Curbing Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East and South Asia, Ed. By R. Tariq, Aurora Papers 16, Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Global Security, pp. 69-92.

[5] M. Fitzpatrick (2008) "The Iranian Nuclear Crisis: Avoiding Worst-case Outcomes", Adelphi Paper № 398: Oxon, Oxford, Routledge for the International Institute for Strategic Studies, 99 p.

[6] Yadernoe oruzhie posle «xolodnoi voyny» / Pod red. A. Arbatova i V. Dvorkina ; Mosk. Centr Karnegi. — M. : «Rossiiskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya» (ROSSPEN), 2006. — S. 368, 414

[7] "Yadernoe oruzhie posle «holodnoi voyny»" 2006 [Nuclear weapons after "cold war"], Pod red. A. Arbatova i V. Dvorkina; Mosk. Centr Karnegi, «Rossiiskaya politicheskaya jenciklopedija» (ROSSPJeN), pp. 368-414.

[8] R. Gotemjuller (2005) "Korejskij jadernyj krizis: perspektivy uregulirovaniya" [Korean nuclear crisis: perspectives for regulation], MGIMO(U) MID RF; Fond Karnegi mezhdunarodny mir, M., 76 p.

[9] "Podderzhka rezhima jadernogo nerasprostraneniya i razoruzheniya" (2012) [Support of the nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament], Posobie dlja parlamentariev; MPS., №19, 83 p.

[10] Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco 1967), Nuclear Non-Proliferation, Volume 2. Documents, Moscow, 149 p.

[11] Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in South-Pacific Region (Treaty of Rarotonga 1985), Volume 2. Documents, Moscow, 152 p.

[12] Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Africa, Volume 2, Documents, Moscow, 190 p.

[13] Official site of the Parliament of Canada, Retrieved from: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/HousePublications/Publication.aspx?Docid=4960270&file=4>.

[14] A. Arbatova (2005) "Ugrozy rezhimu nerasprostraneniya jadernogo oruzhija na Blizhnem i Srednem Vostoke" [Threats to non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East], Mosk. CentrKarnegi, M., 29 p.

Information about author

Marianna Zabolotna, Ph.D student, Department of Modern and Contemporary History of Foreign Countries, Taras Shevchenko National University Of Kyiv, 60, Volodymyrska Street; Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine; e-mail for correspondence: marianna.victory@gmail.com