

Vakhtang MAISAIA<sup>1</sup>  
Georgia  
Alikha GUCHUA<sup>2</sup>  
Georgia

## NATO NUCLEAR POLICY AND SELECTED ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT

### **Abstract:**

*Nuclear threats and challenges to global security are growing in modern world politics. NATO plays an important role in nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation policy. It is also actively working on issues of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Geoeconomics and economic security play an important role in modern world politics, which has a significant impact on nuclear disarmament. This is very important at a time when several states want to become the owners of nuclear weapons, which leads to even greater threats. Using the example of North Korea, we can tell how dangerous it is for nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of a totalitarian regime. The development of nuclear weapons requires significant economic resources, including financial costs for the development of technologies, raw materials, costs for specialists, the implementation of security systems for nuclear facilities, and so on. This article discusses NATO's role in nuclear disarmament policy, selected economic dimensions of nuclear disarmament, and current challenges. The policy of the nuclear states and approaches to disarmament. The article will discuss the economic factor and its role in disarmament policy. Importance of the New START Treaty for Global Security and Nuclear Nonproliferation Initiatives. The problem of nuclear terrorism and its threats to global security will be discussed. Iran's nuclear policy and the importance of creating nuclear-free zones will be discussed.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Vakhtang Maisaia, PhD, Professor at Caucasus International University. Email: vakhtang.maisaia@ciu.edu.ge

<sup>2</sup> Alikha Guchua, PhD, Associate Professor at Caucasus International University, Head of the Strategic Studies Institute for Research CBRN Threats and Risks, Email: alika\_guchua@ciu.edu.ge

**Keywords:**

*NATO, Security, Geoeconomics, Economic Security, Nuclear Policy, Nuclear Terrorism, Disarmament Policy, Arms Control, Non-Proliferation, Russia, WMD, New START. Global Security.*

## **Introduction**

The modern international security environment requires the creation of active defence and security systems. This is an important factor for all states. The NATO Alliance is battling new threats in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. These include cyber terrorism, international terrorism, hybrid warfare, nuclear terrorism, and biological terrorism, and so on. As well as the dangers posed by the creation of weapons of mass destruction. With the development of new technologies, it has become possible to easily manufacture and distribute certain elements of this weapon. It, therefore, requires more involvement from the Alliance, as well as other approaches and the development of new strategies. For states from a geo-political and geo-economic point of view, owning and maintaining nuclear weapons requires quite large resources and expenditures. It should also be noted that creating a weapon of mass destruction component is quite costly for states. It must be said that the existence of weapons of mass destruction requires the state to spend more effort on security issues. The existence of weapons poses a significant threat to the international community and global security. That is why politicians and security experts have been talking about the need for disarmament policies since the creation of the Bitcoin weapon. All this, in their opinion, will make the world safer. However, the question arises here, will there be a safer world after nuclear disarmament? While it is one of the important factors in not starting big wars. The next important question is what role does economic policy play in nuclear disarmament? These include nuclear states. Among which in case of conflict, we may get a third world war. It is also possible to become participants in a ball war when there is very little chance of humanity surviving. It all depends on which states will be involved in nuclear war and how much nuclear arsenal will be used. Consequently, it must be said that the international community is facing several dilemmas.

### **NATO's Role in Nuclear Disarmament and Selected Economic Aspects**

There is a heated debate in the academic and political circles about nuclear weapons. It is about the possible use of small-scale nuclear warfare and the use of 'tactical nuclear weapons'. The latter is a less powerful weapon that could theoretically be used by the conventional armed forces against the enemy. Or at the initial stage of military escalation. For a war to be limited, its political goals

must be the same. The unconditional capitulation of the adversary recorded in the logic of a ruthless war is no longer acceptable. It must be said that total victory is very close to total defeat. Indeed, the notion of limited purpose in a conflicted relationship is difficult to define. The goal of a limited war for one camp may come first for the other. Maintaining Polish independence in 1939 was a limited goal. In reality, the original goals of war do not necessarily determine the nature of hostilities. The issue of limited resources is also not a panacea, as the use of 'tactical' weapons could lead to large-scale nuclear escalation<sup>3</sup>.

During the wars of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century, 8-14% of the national income of the belligerent states was spent on the war economy, up to 33% during the First World War and 50% during the Second World War. The growth of the war economy was facilitated by the widespread proliferation of weapons that began after World War II. The military-industrial enterprises of the countries belonging to the military alliances developed and carried out long-term military scientific research, equipping the armed forces with ever more advanced weapons.

In the last decade of the twentieth century, after the collapse of the socialist camp, the processes of conversion of military production flourished in several countries. In the context of the reform of the military economy, the countries were tasked with maintaining their defence potential at the level of an adequate response to existing and potential military threats. However, it was necessary to take into account the economic potential of the state. Already in our time, it can be said that states are pursuing the same policy in economic terms, all states are analyzing the role of increasing military potential and at the same time taking into account economic opportunities. The Covid-19 pandemic has dealt a significant blow to the global economy, which is why countries have to use their financial resources to combat the pandemic.

The main elements of NATO's nuclear policy can be found in various decisions adopted over the years based on consensus. Nuclear deterrence has been an essential part of NATO's overall defence posture for 70 years, and the 2010 Strategic Concept directly referred to NATO as a nuclear alliance<sup>4</sup>. It must be said that during the 'Cold War', the US nuclear arsenal contained many types of nuclear weapons. These include short-range missiles and artillery for use on the battlefield. Also, medium-range missiles and aircraft. They could destroy targets outside the theatre of combat operations. As well as short-

---

<sup>3</sup> P. D. Senarklen, I. Arifen, *International Politics: Modern Theories and Objectives*, Tbilisi 2014, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup> S. Hill, *NATO and the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons- What does the entry into force of the TPNW mean for NATO and its member states?*, <<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/01/nato-and-treaty-prohibition-nuclear-weapons/02-nato-nuclear-policy>> (2.06.2021).

distance and medium-distance systems located on submarines. As well as long-range missiles stationed in the United States and on nuclear submarines. As well as heavy bombers threatening Soviet targets from US military bases. Also, short-range and medium-range systems are considered non-strategic nuclear weapons. It is called a tactical and theatrical nuclear weapon on the battlefield. Long-range missiles and heavy bombers are known as strategic carriers of nuclear weapons.

NATO's November 1991 'Strategic Concept', noted that "the fundamental purpose of the nuclear forces of the Allies is political: to preserve peace and prevent coercion and any kind of war"<sup>5</sup>. It is noteworthy that during the 1990s, the United States significantly reduced the number and types of weapons in its strategic nuclear arsenal. This was all due to both the modernization process and the 1991 agreement, which provided for the restriction of strategic armaments. In addition, the United States continued to support the Strategic Nuclear Forces Triad of both ICBMs and SLBMs as well as bombers. According to the Department of Defense, such a combination of forces would give the United States a wide range of capabilities. As well as flexibility in nuclear planning and made it difficult to plan enemy attacks. Would also be insured against unexpected problems in the nuclear warhead transmission system. This last problem has become even more serious in modern times. Because the United States has removed from the arsenal many different types of warheads and missiles that they have deployed over the years. All of this even reduced his excess number of weapons<sup>6</sup>.

1990, when the Cold War came to an end and was the last year of the Soviet Union, more than 12,000 nuclear warheads were deployed in the United States, approximately 1,875 strategic nuclear weapons carriers. As of July 1, 2009, under the terms of the Initial Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), the United States has reduced 1,188 strategic nuclear weapons carriers to 5,916 nuclear warheads. Under the terms of the 2002 Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty (known as the Moscow Treaty) between the United States and Russia, that number was to be reduced to no more than 2,200 operational strategic nuclear warheads by the end of 2012. This weapon of mass destruction is of particular importance in Russia's military doctrine, given the NATO factor, and Russia is still not interested in negotiating arms control in this area.

The U.S. State Department said the United States had already reduced its 1,968 operational-tactical strategic offensive weapons in December 2009. A

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Mendelsohn, *NATO's Nuclear Weapons: The Rationale for 'No First Use'*, <<https://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999-07/features/natos-nuclear-weapons-rationale-first-use>> (4.06.2021).

<sup>6</sup> *U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues*, Congressional Research Service, <<https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/6605853/U-S-Strategic-Nuclear-Forces-Background.pdf>> (3.06.2021).

new agreement signed by former US President Barack Obama and former Russian President Dmitry Medvedev on April 8, 2010, further reduced this arsenal to offensive checkpoints and heavy bombers to no more than 1,550. According to the U.S. State Department, as of September 1, 2019, the U.S. had 1,376 nuclear warheads deployed on 668 ICBMs, SLBMs, and heavy bombers. A total of 800 were deployed on ICBMs, SLBMs, and heavy bombers.

The 2010 agreement is the result of Barack Obama's 'Global Zero' initiative. 'Global Zero' is an international, non-partisan alliance that includes 300 world leaders and aims to eliminate nuclear weapons. The initiative, launched in December 2008, facilitates the phasing out and oversight of the destruction of all equipment owned by official and unofficial members of the Nuclear Club. The 'Global Zero' Campaign aims to achieve a sustainable international consensus. All this is aimed at the global movement of world leaders and citizens to eliminate nuclear weapons. The result of the 'Global Zero' is the agreement between the United States and Russia. Also, under this treaty, the nuclear states should participate in multilateral negotiations, as the nuclear arsenal is gradually reduced. Within the framework of 'Global Zero' there is a diplomatic dialogue and expansion of work with states. Plans to work on critical issues related to nuclear disarmament are also ongoing. The 'Global Zero' plan includes the phasing out of all nuclear weapons. This is a four-stage strategy aimed at reaching a global zero agreement by destroying all nuclear warheads. The participants of 'Global Zero' realize how dangerous nuclear war is and how many catastrophes it will bring to humanity. To better analyze all this, they also resort to strategic modelling of nuclear war.

It should be noted that even during the Cold War there were attempts to create nuclear-free zones (Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone, NWFZ). It should be noted that the first initiative in Europe was launched in the 50s of the last century, which provided for the creation of a nuclear-free military unit and a zone free of hydrogen weapons. Relevant statements were also made in the 1960s about the creation of nuclear-weapons-free zones. Specific regions were considered to be the Balkans, the Mediterranean, and the Adriatic. There was also talk of the Far East, Middle East, and several other regions of the world. Subsequently, an agreement was reached through the efforts of diplomatic negotiations and the involvement of international organizations. This agreement was about the creation of four nuclear zones – in Latin America (the Tlatelolco Agreement), in the South Pacific (the Rarotonga Agreement), in South Asia (the Bangkok Agreement), and in Africa (the Pelindaba Agreement). In connection with the U.S. signature of the protocol to the African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (ANWFZ) Treaty in 1996, it announced that U.S. adherence “will not limit options available to the United States in response to

an attack by an NWFZ party using weapons of mass destruction”<sup>7</sup>. Other regions are also named where it is also possible to create nuclear-free zones. For example the Korean Peninsula, Eastern, and Central Europe, Central Asia. Another important achievement is UN General Assembly Resolution 51/45 on the establishment of a nuclear-free zone in the Southern Hemisphere. It must be said that the United States, Britain, and France were opposed to this agreement. Russia, along with 38 other countries, also refrained. It is interesting to mention the fact that while the Association of Southeast Asian Nations attempted to implement and enforce a Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in 1995, none of the recognized nuclear weapons states has agreed to its terms<sup>8</sup>.

After the end of the ‘Cold War’, NATO dramatically reduced the number of nuclear weapons stationed in Europe and its reliance on nuclear weapons in NATO strategy. NATO remains committed to contributing to creating the conditions for further reductions in the future based on reciprocity, recognising that progress on arms control and disarmament must take into account the prevailing international security environment<sup>9</sup>.

It should be noted that one of the particularly delicate issues in the distribution of cargo in the transatlantic alliance is the containment of nuclear weapons. And also its distribution among European allies. What no one could have imagined a few years ago resurfaced in NATO’s political agenda, this is a discussion about nuclear weapons.

### **Nuclear weapons containment**

It should be noted that this issue has been under discussion in the Alliance for several years. In any case, it includes, first and foremost, the modernization of obsolete atomic bombs – B61 – and the aircraft platforms required for their transport under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. The participating parties are the United States, Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey. Also in 2014, the Russian president resumed these debated debates in the context of the annexation of Crimea. He again raised the issue of Russia’s nuclear arsenal and praised NATO members who have long demanded more for technological re-equipment with their usual, threatening rhetoric. At the same time, the 1987 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF Treaty) on the destruction of short- and medium-range systems in Europe was threatened. This agreement, together with the Strategic Assault Arms Reduction Treaty (START

---

<sup>7</sup> S. Lodgaard, *Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation. Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world?*, New York 2011, p. 63.

<sup>8</sup> N. K. Finney, *On Strategy: A Primer*, Fort Leavenworth 2020, p. 192.

<sup>9</sup> *NATO and Nuclear Disarmament*, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, October 2020, p. 1 <[https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/10/pdf/2010-factsheet-nuclear-disarmament-en.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/10/pdf/2010-factsheet-nuclear-disarmament-en.pdf)> (5.06.2021).

Treaties), forms the basis of nuclear arms control between the United States and Russia. The repeal of the 1987 Treaty led to new threats and risks to nuclear safety around the world. These developments and the threat posed by changes in national nuclear strategy, the collapse of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, and the modernisation of nuclear and conventional forces of major and regional powers require NATO to maintain a robust and credible deterrence and defence<sup>10</sup>.

NATO actively contributes to effective and verifiable arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation efforts through its policies, activities, and its member countries. NATO itself is not a party to any treaty, but it supports and facilitates dialogue among members, partners, and other countries to implement their international obligations<sup>11</sup>.

### **The rational and political-strategic basis of NATO ‘Nuclear Alliance’**

As long as there are nuclear weapons in the European environment, Europe will depend on the position of ‘extended containment’. All of this is provided by the nuclear potential of the United States. In the debate over European and especially German strategy during the ‘Cold War’, according to a generally accepted basic principle, nuclear weapons were merely a political mechanism. And should in no way be considered a tactical basic weapon. Thus the line understood the political function of restraint. This approach must be maintained in all strategies, operational and technical considerations. Politicians and nuclear weapons experts, of course, do not rule out that a policy of containment could one day crash and nuclear weapons be used in Europe.

Just a few nuclear warheads can cause a lot of casualties. Also, make a large part of the territory of Europe unusable for life. It will be a humanitarian catastrophe of incredible scale.

The dilemma underlying the nuclear deterrence strategy can be solved, but it takes quite a lot of time and effort. It must be said that nuclear weapons should not be designed or intended as a weapon of war. It should also help curb its use. This is a goal of political-strategic nature. A high level of the so-called nuclear threshold must also be ensured. A dramatic qualitative leap from the use of conventional weapons to the possibility of nuclear destruction must also be maintained. In line with the general trend of nuclear weapons modernization, it needs to become more precise, including adjustment to very low levels of

---

<sup>10</sup> A. Lanata, *Regional Perspectives Report on Russia*, 2021, p. 7, <<https://www.act.nato.int/application/files/9816/1350/4281/regional-perspectives-2021-01.pdf>> (6.07.2021).

<sup>11</sup> *Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation in NATO*, <[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_48895.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_48895.htm)> (6.07.2021).

flexibility and explosive power. All of this could lead to a reduction in the nuclear threshold.

Certain areas of current debate give the impression that the nuclear arsenal of sub-strategic destinations in Europe can be compared in terms of numerical data, for example, the capacity ratio of tanks and fighter jets. Also, such a mechanical notion of equilibrium is not allowed. That is, where nuclear weapons will be used on the battlefield. The role and function of nuclear weapons categories within the overall containment strategy is crucial.

NATO's nuclear deterrent instruments will remain an important element of the Alliance's security, was announced to the meeting with the participation of a representative of the Warsaw Institute organized by the German Council on Foreign Relations (DGAP) and experts of the North Atlantic Pact Organization, which took place on May 20, 2021. It was discussed that NATO does not rule out continuing the path of nuclear deterrence, especially in the context of the published NATO 2030 report, which is a preview of a new strategic document. Due to the policies of countries such as Russia or China, the Alliance as a whole will not abandon the nuclear deterrence doctrine, which is an important element of security and the Alliance's cohesion<sup>12</sup>.

It must be said that NATO's role in global security is quite important. Moreover, its role is crucial in addressing the issue of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and asymmetric threats, as well as other risks. Asymmetric threats have had a major impact on changing the international system. In the modern era, the security dilemma has created a new dimension of the international system. In the context of the new security dilemma, at which time it is impossible to predict asymmetric threat, the role of international organizations is significantly increasing. It must be said that international terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and conflict remain to this day a major problem of international security. The further spread of nuclear technology is a cause for concern, as new nuclear states may be created. Terrorist groups may also seize nuclear weapons. The use of nuclear weapons will lead to significant geopolitical changes. Selected countries will seek to establish or strengthen ties with nuclear-armed states; Other states will even start fighting for global nuclear disarmament.

In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, along with various challenges, limiting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is one of the key issues for global security. It must be said that NATO plays an important role in this direction. NATO is also cooperating with partner countries on the non-proliferation of

---

<sup>12</sup> *NATO's nuclear deterrent instruments continue to be an important component of the Alliance's security: "THE FUTURE OF NATO'S NUCLEAR DEFENSE POSTURE" MEETING*, <<https://warsawinstitute.org/natos-nuclear-deterrent-instruments-continue-important-component-alliances-security-future-natos-nuclear-defense-posture-meeting/>> (10.06.2021).

weapons of mass destruction. In addition, this issue directly defines the basic principles of Euro-Atlantic security. It also contributes to the existence of strategic parity on the European continent. In the light of modern processes, in the context of the 'New Cold War', the re-establishment of the Institute as a nuclear planning group within NATO as a military-political alliance. A new type of nuclear strike strategy has been developed. The serious strategic arms race has begun in world politics itself. A clear example of this is the communist regime in North Korea and its policy of nuclear blackmail. Achieving international security is undoubtedly an urgent and difficult issue in the modern world.

The possible emergence of new nuclear states in terms of geopolitical aspects poses a major threat to global security. Dissemination of nuclear technologies and expertise in this field is a matter of concern. This is because technologies and existing expertise can fall into the hands of terrorists. Terrorists want to seize nuclear materials and other components of weapons of mass destruction. It must be said that the use of nuclear weapons will inevitably lead to significant geopolitical changes in the future. At the same time, many states are trying to strengthen ties with nuclear-weapon states. But, the issue of fighting global disarmament is a major problem in international politics. This is because the nuclear states give way to the existing bitcoin arsenal. There is also a desire for liquidation. They are, on the contrary, trying to refine and improve the components of the existing strategic strike weapons. All of this, of course, puts the world in greater danger.

## **Conclusion**

It should be noted that in modern times NATO plays an important role in ensuring international security. The role of the Alliance as a guarantor of global security is also growing and becoming more relevant. It is important to note that in the face of new challenges and threats, NATO is pursuing a policy of non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and a strategy to ensure global peace.

Nuclear weapons are indeed a key component of NATO's overall capabilities. For deterrence and defence, alongside conventional and missile defence forces. NATO is committed to arms control. Also along with the disarmament policy to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. But as long as nuclear weapons exist, it will remain a nuclear alliance. It should be noted that reliable containment and defence remain a key basis for avoiding conflicts and war in NATO's overall strategy. The credibility of NATO nuclear forces is crucial, which is why the security, combat readiness, and effectiveness of these forces are constantly assessed by technological and geostrategic development policies.

It should be noted that NATO's nuclear policy is aimed at reducing the risks in this area. As well as through control and cooperation. It should be noted that the development of a disarmament policy requires quite serious diplomatic negotiations and the development of new strategies. As well as pursuing significant economic policies in terms of financial costs. We can answer the research questions by saying that after nuclear disarmament, it is quite difficult to predict. That is, what the global security architecture will look like and how stable the world will be. It should also be noted that pursuing a policy of nuclear disarmament requires significant financial resources. It is quite important to pursue the right economic policies and provide assistance to those states that renounce nuclear weapons. They must also have strong guarantees of national security and sovereignty.

The production of a disarmament policy is virtually unattainable in modern conditions. This is due to international geopolitical and geoeconomic factors. Because several states want to become global or regional players. For this, they believe that they must have nuclear weapons. The most effective means of maintaining international peace and security today is to curb weapons of mass destruction and exercise effective control over them. It is also very important that as many states as possible be involved in the disarmament process.

### **Bibliography:**

1. *Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation in NATO*, <[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_48895.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_48895.htm)>
2. Finney N. K., *On Strategy: A Primer*, Fort Leavenworth 2020
3. Hill S., *NATO and the treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons- What does the entry into force of the TPNW mean for NATO and its member states?*, <<https://www.chathamhouse.org/2021/01/nato-and-treaty-prohibition-nuclear-weapons/02-nato-nuclear-policy>>
4. Lanata A., *Regional Perspectives Report on Russia*, 2021, p. 7, <<https://www.act.nato.int/application/files/9816/1350/4281/regional-perspectives-2021-01.pdf>>
5. Lodgaard S., *Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation. Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world?*, New York 2011
6. Mendelsohn J., *NATO's Nuclear Weapons: The Rationale for 'No First Use'*, <<https://www.armscontrol.org/act/1999-07/features/natos-nuclear-weapons-rationale-first-use>>
7. *NATO and Nuclear Disarmament*, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, October 2020, p. 1 <[https://www.nato.int/nato\\_static\\_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/10/pdf/2010-factsheet-nuclear-disarmament-en.pdf](https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2020/10/pdf/2010-factsheet-nuclear-disarmament-en.pdf)>

8. *NATO's nuclear deterrent instruments continue to be an important component of the Alliance's security: "THE FUTURE OF NATO'S NUCLEAR DEFENSE POSTURE" MEETING*,  
<<https://warsawinstitute.org/natos-nuclear-deterrent-instruments-continue-important-component-alliances-security-future-natos-nuclear-defense-posture-meeting/>>
9. Senarklen P. D., Arifen I., *International Politics: Modern Theories and Objectives*, Tbilisi 2014
10. *U.S. Strategic Nuclear Forces: Background, Developments, and Issues*, Congressional Research Service, <<https://s3.documentcloud.org/documents/6605853/U-S-Strategic-Nuclear-Forces-Background.pdf>>