Emerging Nuclear States in the 21st Century: Challenges and Global Implications

Fatma Cengiz[1] and Dilara Özmen[2]

Abstract

This paper examines the complex landscape of nuclear proliferation in the 21st century, focusing on emerging nuclear states and their impact on global security. Through an analysis of key proliferation hotspots, notably North Korea and Iran, the study explores the drivers of nuclear ambition, the challenges to the global non-proliferation regime, and the international community's responses. The research highlights the multifaceted nature of proliferation threats, including technological advancements, shifting regional power dynamics, and the evolving nature of deterrence. By synthesizing recent developments and scholarly perspectives, this paper contributes to the ongoing dialogue on effective strategies for managing nuclear risks and strengthening international non-proliferation efforts.

[1]Tespam International, Ankara/Türkiye,(fcengiz@tespam.org)
[2]Tespam International, Ankara/Türkiye(ozmendilara@hbv.edu.tr)

1. Introduction

Nuclear proliferation, the spread of nuclear weapons, fissile materials, and related technology to non-nuclear states, remains a critical global security concern. Emerging nuclear states, defined as countries actively pursuing or recently acquiring nuclear capabilities, pose significant challenges to international stability and security frameworks. The importance of this topic is multifaceted, encompassing strategic, security, and normative dimensions.

The acquisition of nuclear weapons can dramatically alter regional and global power dynamics, elevating a country's geopolitical status (Villa, 2023). This shift raises fears about potential nuclear conflicts, accidents, or the risk of nuclear materials falling into the hands of non-state actors (Sagan & Waltz, 2013). Moreover, emerging nuclear states test the effectiveness of the global nuclear nonproliferation regime, centered on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) (Müller & Wunderlich, 2018).

The introduction of new nuclear powers complicates existing arms control frameworks and efforts to reduce global nuclear stockpiles (Sobek et al., 2012). In volatile regions, the presence of nuclear weapons can exacerbate tensions and trigger arms races (Jägermeyr et al., 2020). Furthermore, states pursuing nuclear weapons often face diplomatic isolation and economic sanctions, impacting global trade and diplomacy (Fitzpatrick, 2008).

This paper aims to provide a comprehensive analysis of the challenges posed by emerging nuclear states in the 21st century. By examining key proliferation hotspots, exploring the global non-proliferation architecture, and assessing international responses, we seek to

contribute to the ongoing discourse on effective strategies for managing nuclear risks and strengthening non-proliferation efforts.

2. Proliferation Hotspots: Regional Analyses

2.1 East Asian Nuclear Dynamics: The North Korean Challenge

North Korea's nuclear program has been a focal point of international concern for decades. Initiated in the 1960s with Soviet assistance, the program was marked by the establishment of the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center. North Korea's relationship with the NPT has been tumultuous, signing in 1985 but withdrawing in 2003 (IAEA, 2021).

As of 2024, estimates suggest North Korea possesses approximately 50 nuclear warheads and fissile material for up to 90 weapons. The period from 2019 to 2024 saw 119 missile tests, showcasing rapid technological progress (IAEA, 2024). A constitutional amendment in 2013 declared North Korea a "nuclear state," and the 2022 nuclear doctrine law outlined specific scenarios for nuclear weapon deployment (Korean Central News Agency, 2013; KCNA, 2022).

The international community has responded through various means:

- Diplomatic endeavors, including the 1994 Agreed Framework, Six-Party Talks (2003-2009), and Trump-Kim summits (2018-2019) (Pollack, 2017)
- Economic measures, with UN Security Council resolutions imposing various restrictions (United Nations Security Council, 2006-2017)
- Military posturing, exemplified by U.S.-South Korea joint exercises and strategic asset deployments

Despite these efforts, North Korea has adapted by diversifying energy sources and establishing clandestine trade networks while protesting sanctions as violations of international law (Van der Meer, 2016).

2.2 Middle Eastern Proliferation Concerns: Iran's Nuclear Ambitions

Iran's nuclear program has evolved significantly since its inception, shaping regional dynamics. The program began during the Pahlavi era with a 5-megawatt research reactor at Tehran University in 1968 (IAEA, 2021). After a brief pause following the 1979 Islamic Revolution, Iran resumed its nuclear pursuits under altered geopolitical circumstances (Takeyh, 2006).

A pivotal moment came with the revelation of undisclosed uranium enrichment facilities, constructed in collaboration with China and hidden for 18 years (IAEA, 2003). Iran's nuclear ambitions serve multiple strategic objectives:

1. Regional deterrence and power projection (Chubin, 2010)
2. Energy diversification and security (World Nuclear Association, 2023)
3. Economic and technological advancement (Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 2021)
4. International negotiation leverage (Maloney, 2022)
5. Assertion of national sovereignty (Patrikarakos, 2012)

Key diplomatic milestones include Iran's accession to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (1970), the IAEA Safeguards Agreement (1974), the Paris Agreement (2004), and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA, 2015) (United Nations, 2015).

As of May 2024, Iran's nuclear capabilities include an enriched uranium stockpile of 6,201.3 kg, with 142 kg enriched to 60% purity. The country has deployed advanced IR-6 centrifuges and announced plans for the "Iran Hormuz" nuclear power plant, scheduled to begin operations in 2028-2029 (IAEA, 2024; Iranian Nuclear Energy Organization, 2024).

3. Global Non-Proliferation Architecture: Strengths and Vulnerabilities

3.1 International Treaties and Agreements

The global non-proliferation regime is built upon a foundation of international treaties and agreements:

- The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) serves as the cornerstone of global non-proliferation efforts. However, it faces challenges from non-signatories and withdrawals, as exemplified by North Korea (Müller & Wunderlich, 2018).
- The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) aims to ban all nuclear explosions but faces ratification hurdles from key states, limiting its effectiveness (Dahlman et al., 2011).
- Regional Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones have seen successes in Latin America, the South Pacific, Southeast Asia, and Africa. However, establishing such a zone in the Middle East remains a significant challenge (Potter & Mukhatzhanova, 2012).

3.2 Verification Mechanisms and Challenges

Effective verification is crucial to the success of non-proliferation efforts:

The IAEA Safeguards System conducts regular inspections and monitoring of declared nuclear facilities. However, it faces limitations in detecting undeclared activities (Findlay, 2015).

- The Additional Protocol enhances the IAEA's ability to verify the absence of undeclared nuclear activities, but it has not been universally adopted (Rockwood, 2014).
- Emerging technologies offer potential for improved verification through satellite imagery, environmental sampling, and big data analytics. However, these advancements also create new proliferation risks (Garsow et al., 2018).

4. Motivations and Implications

4.1 Drivers of Nuclear Proliferation

Understanding the motivations behind nuclear proliferation is crucial for developing effective counter-proliferation strategies:

1. Regional Security Concerns:

- Nuclear weapons serve as a deterrent against perceived threats
- They act as a "power equalizer" for smaller states against stronger rivals
- States may pursue nuclear capabilities in response to existential threats from rival powers (Sagan, 2006)

2. Domestic Political Factors:

- The military-industrial complex, scientific community, and political factions can influence nuclear policy
- Consolidation of power by leaders may sideline traditional nuclear policy experts

- Domestic politics sometimes serve as a stronger incentive than external security concerns (Hymans, 2012)

3. Technological Aspirations:

- Nuclear technology has dual-use potential for energy and military applications
- Nuclear capabilities are seen as a source of prestige and international status
- The development of nuclear weapons requires significant technological facilities, expertise, and economic capacity (Acton, 2014)

4.2 Global Security Implications

The proliferation of nuclear weapons has far-reaching consequences for global security:

1. Challenges to Non-Proliferation Efforts:

- Emerging nuclear states and non-state actors strain the NPT's effectiveness
- Verification and enforcement mechanisms face complications
- Cases like North Korea's NPT withdrawal highlight the regime's limitations (Findlay, 2015)

2. Shifts in Regional Power Dynamics:

- Nuclear weapons alter strategic stability through mutual deterrence (e.g., India-Pakistan) (Kapur, 2007)
- There is potential for nuclear escalation during conventional conflicts (Ganguly & Kapur, 2010)
- Regions like the Middle East face risks of proliferation cascades (Bahgat, 2019)

3. Risks of Nuclear Conflicts or Accidents:

- Expanded arsenals increase the danger of unintended nuclear incidents (Schlosser, 2013)
- The development of tactical nuclear weapons raises concerns about lowering the threshold for nuclear use (Lieber & Press, 2017)
- The threat of nuclear terrorism persists (Allison, 2004)
- Command and control systems are vulnerable to cyber attacks (Futter, 2018)

5. International Responses

The international community has employed various strategies to address nuclear proliferation:

1. Diplomatic Efforts and Negotiations:

- Coercive diplomacy combines threats and inducements (Jentleson & Whytock, 2005)
- Notable achievements include the JCPOA (2015), despite subsequent challenges (Samore et al., 2015)

- Multilateral efforts, such as the Six-Party Talks with North Korea, have been attempted (Grzelczyk, 2009)

2. Sanctions and Pressure Tactics:

- Economic sanctions are a key tool in non-proliferation efforts (Hufbauer et al., 2007)
- Effectiveness varies: sanctions contributed to Iran negotiations but had limited impact on North Korea (Maloney, 2015; Van der Meer, 2016)
- Maintaining international consensus on sanctions implementation remains challenging

3. Role of International Organizations:

- The IAEA plays a crucial role in promoting peaceful nuclear use and verifying compliance (Fischer, 1997)
- The UN Security Council imposes sanctions and adopts resolutions (e.g., UNSCR 1540) (Bosch & van Ham, 2007)

Political divisions among member states limit the effectiveness of these organizations

- There is a need to strengthen the IAEA's mandate and resources (Findlay, 2015)

6. Conclusion

The landscape of nuclear proliferation continues to evolve, presenting ongoing challenges to global security. Persistent threats to the non-proliferation regime, exemplified by North Korea and Iran, have significant impacts on regional power dynamics and global stability. The evolving nature of nuclear risks, including the potential for accidental detonation and emerging cyber threats, further complicates the security landscape.

Looking to the future, several key considerations emerge:

1. Technological Advancements: Potential breakthroughs in areas like laser enrichment may lower barriers to nuclear weapons development (Acton, 2014)

2. Regional Security Dynamics: Actions of established nuclear powers will continue to influence potential proliferators (Hymans, 2012)

3. Evolution of Non-Proliferation Regimes: Strengthening verification mechanisms and addressing perceived inequities in the current system is crucial (Müller & Wunderlich, 2018)

4. Climate Change and Energy Security: The growing appeal of nuclear energy may increase proliferation risks (Sagan, 2011)

These developments have significant implications for global security and diplomacy:

- There is a need for recalibration of deterrence strategies (Krepinevich, 2019)
- Maintaining and developing new arms control agreements faces substantial challenges (Arbatov, 2019)
- Addressing proliferation concerns requires tailored approaches for different contexts (Miller & Narang, 2019)
- Strengthening international institutions like the IAEA is critical (Findlay, 2015)
- Innovative governance mechanisms are necessary to address emerging technologies (Futter, 2018)

The future of global security hinges on effectively managing nuclear risks, preventing further proliferation, and working towards reducing the existential threat posed by nuclear weapons. This requires continued adaptation, innovation, and international cooperation in the face of evolving challenges. As the global community navigates these complex issues, sustained research, policy development, and diplomatic engagement will be essential in shaping a more secure nuclear future.

References;

Acton, J. M. (2014). Watering down the red line? The future of the NPT. In J. Raynolds & W. Potter (Eds.), Forecasting Nuclear Proliferation in the 21st Century (pp. 47-66). Stanford University Press.

Allison, G. (2004). Nuclear terrorism: The ultimate preventable catastrophe. Times Books.

Arbatov, A. (2019). Mad momentum redux? The rise and fall of nuclear arms control. Survival, 61(3), 7-38.

Bahgat, G. (2019). Proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East. University Press of Florida.

Blix, H. (2004). Disarming Iraq. Pantheon Books.

Bosch, O., & van Ham, P. (Eds.). (2007). Global non-proliferation and counter-terrorism: The impact of UNSCR 1540. Brookings Institution Press.

Chubin, S. (2010). Iran's nuclear ambitions. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Dahlman, O., Mykkeltveit, S., & Haak, H. (2011). Nuclear test ban: Converting political visions to reality. Springer.

Findlay, T. (2015). Proliferation alert! The IAEA and non-compliance reporting. Project on Managing the Atom, Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School.

Fischer, D. (1997). History of the International Atomic Energy Agency: The first forty years. IAEA.

Fitzpatrick, M. (2008). The Iranian nuclear crisis: Avoiding worst-case outcomes. Routledge.

Futter, A. (2018). Hacking the bomb: Cyber threats and nuclear weapons. Georgetown University Press.

Ganguly, S., & Kapur, P. (2010). India, Pakistan, and the bomb: Debating nuclear stability in South Asia. Columbia University Press.

Garsow, M., Schmidt, O., & Spector, L. (2018). The emerging role of big data in nuclear verification. In J. Finlay & B. Pelopidas (Eds.), Global Nuclear Order (pp. 183-204). Oxford University Press.

Grzelczyk, V. (2009). Six-party talks and negotiation strategy: When do we get there? International Negotiation, 14(1), 95-119.

Hufbauer, G. C., Schott, J. J., Elliott, K. A., & Oegg, B. (2007). Economic sanctions reconsidered (3rd ed.). Peterson Institute for International Economics.

Hymans, J. E. C. (2012). Achieving nuclear ambitions: Scientists, politicians, and proliferation. Cambridge University Press.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2003). Implementation of the NPT safeguards agreement in the Islamic Republic of Iran. GOV/2003/75.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2021). IAEA and DPRK: Chronology of key events. IAEA.

International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). (2024). Verification and monitoring in the Islamic Republic of Iran in light of United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 (2015). GOV/2024/XX.

Iranian Atomic Energy Organization. (1973). Establishment Act of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran.
Iranian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. (2021). Iran's nuclear program: Peaceful purposes and national development.
Iranian Nuclear Energy Organization. (2024). Announcement of the Iran Hormuz nuclear power plant project.
Jägermeyr, J., Robock, A., Elliott, J., Müller, C., Xia, L., Khabarov, N., ... & Rosenzweig, C. (2020). A regional nuclear conflict would compromise global food security. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117(13), 7071-7081.
Jentleson, B. W., & Whytock, C. A. (2005). Who "won" Libya? The force-diplomacy debate and its implications for theory and policy. International Security, 30(3), 47-86.
Kapur, S. P. (2007). Dangerous deterrent: Nuclear weapons proliferation and conflict in South Asia. Stanford University Press.
Korean Central News Agency (KCNA). (2013). Report on plenary meeting of WPK central committee.
Korean Central News Agency (KCNA). (2021). DPRK conducts successful test of new-type ICBM Hwasong-18.
Korean Central News Agency (KCNA). (2022). Law on DPRK's policy on nuclear forces promulgated.
Krepinevich, A. F. (2019). The eroding balance of terror: The decline of deterrence. Foreign Affairs, 98(1), 62-74.
Lieber, K. A., & Press, D. G. (2017). The new era of counterforce: Technological change and the future of nuclear deterrence. International Security, 41(4), 9-49.
Maloney, S. (2015). Iran's political economy since the revolution. Cambridge University Press.
Maloney, S. (2022). Iran's political economy under sanctions. The Washington Quarterly, 45(1), 139-157.
Miller, N. L., & Narang, V. (2019). Is a new nuclear age upon us? Why we may look back on 2019 as the point of no return. Foreign Affairs, 98(4), 107-118.
Müller, H., & Wunderlich, C. (2018). Not lost in contestation: How norm entrepreneurs frame norm development in the nuclear nonproliferation regime. Contemporary Security Policy, 39(3), 341-366.
Nephew, R. (2018). The art of sanctions: A view from the field. Columbia University Press.
Patrikarakos, D. (2012). Nuclear Iran: The birth of an atomic state. I.B. Tauris.
Pollack, J. D. (2017). No exit: North Korea, nuclear weapons, and international security. Routledge.
Potter, W. C., & Mukhatzhanova, G. (Eds.). (2012). Forecasting nuclear proliferation in the 21st century: Volume 1, The role of theory. Stanford University Press.
Rockwood, L. (2014). The IAEA's state-level concept and the law of unintended consequences. Arms Control Today, 44(7), 25-30.
Sagan, S. D. (2006). How to keep the bomb from Iran. Foreign Affairs, 85(5), 45-59.
Sagan, S. D. (2011). The causes of nuclear weapons proliferation. Annual Review of Political Science, 14, 225-244.
Sagan, S. D., & Waltz, K. N. (2013). The spread of nuclear weapons: An enduring debate. W.W. Norton & Company.
Samore, G., Allison, G., Arnold, A., de Becker, M., Burns, N., Feldman, S., ... & Tobey, W. (2015). The Iran nuclear deal: A definitive guide. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School.
Schlosser, E. (2013). Command and control: Nuclear weapons, the Damascus accident, and the illusion of safety. Penguin Press.

Sobek, D., Foster, D. M., & Robison, S. B. (2012). Conventional wisdom? The effect of nuclear proliferation on armed conflict, 1945–2001. International Studies Quarterly, 56(1), 149-162.

Takeyh, R. (2006). Hidden Iran: Paradox and power in the Islamic Republic. Times Books.

United Nations. (2015). Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. S/2015/544.

United Nations Security Council. (2006-2017). Resolutions 1718, 1874, 2087, 2094, 2270, 2321, 2356, 2371, 2375, 2397.

U.S. Department of State. (2018). Ceasing U.S. participation in the JCPOA and taking additional action to counter Iran's malign influence and deny Iran all paths to a nuclear weapon.

Van der Meer, S. (2016). States' motivations to acquire or forgo nuclear weapons: Four factors of influence. Journal of Military and Strategic Studies, 17(1), 209-239.

Villa, M. A. D. (2023). Assessing geopolitical risk: A multi-level approach for top managers of multinationals. Journal of Risk Research, 23(1), 67-85.

World Nuclear Association. (2023). Nuclear power in Iran.