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- Approaches to defining Nunn-Lugar
- Some important themes to consider
- Expanding the Nunn-Lugar model

For the purposes of this presentation, “Nunn-Lugar” and “CTR” refer to all of the various programs managed by the U.S. Departments of Defense (DoD), Energy (DOE), State (DOS), etceteras, and their counterpart agencies in the former Soviet Union. Although CTR is the official name only of the DoD program, there is no other convenient moniker with which to refer to all U.S. Government efforts in this area.
Defining Nunn-Lugar
What is Nunn-Lugar?

- Descriptive: mechanical approach
- Theoretical: conceptual approach
- Taxonomy: comparative approach
Descriptive: The Nunn-Lugar Process
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A - SCHEDULE

The Contractor shall deliver the following goods or services in accordance with the Statement of Work (Section J, Attachment #1) and the contract provisions within 90 days of award. This contract includes the following goods and services:

0001 Silo dismantlement construction services for elimination of the Kyrgyz site

0002 Silo dismantlement construction services for elimination of the Zhjakev site

0003 Scrap salvage of usable material designated by COTR for salvage at the Kyrgyz site

0004 Scrap salvage of usable material designated by the COTR for salvage at the Zhjakev site

B PLACE OF PERFORMANCE

All work called for under this contract shall be performed at the silo ICBM sites designated and within the Republic Implementing Agreements Requirements Definition

DoD BUDGET

Source: DoD
Conceptual 1: Broad Look

- An arrangement through which states work together to address common security objectives, generally implemented below the formal treaty level, and involving the donation of equipment and services from one state to another

- Effort to extend financial and technical support to dismantle delivery systems and to secure and control warheads and fissile materials

- Evolution: process of constructive engagement on a topic both sides would allow to occur
  - Common purpose – stable managerial control
  - Direct collaboration for mutual benefit, as opposed to deterrent relationship

- Process of transformation of security relationship from confrontation to collaboration
Conceptual 2: Traditional Arms Control

- 1961: arms control and military strategy are not antithetical; indeed, arms control should be considered a supplementary means of achieving strategic objectives

- Basic principles:
  - reducing the risk of war
  - reducing the cost of preparing for war
  - reducing the damage should war occur

- 1993: *cooperative engagement* became the appropriate principle for dealing with the new security threats

- 9/11: arms control no longer an independent endeavor with tenuous links to broader national and international security policies
Taxonomy 1: Preventive Defense Continuum

- formal arms control treaties
- confidence & security building measures
- parallel unilateral initiatives
- formal cooperative security arrangements & military alliances
- executive agreements & consultative arrangements

CTR: links with above, but something new
Taxonomy 2: Where does CTR fit?

- Intervention
- Preemption
- Interdiction
- Control
- Acquisition
- Use
- Defense & Mitigation
- Consequence Management
- Roll Back
- Export Controls
- Treaty Regulations
- Arms Control
- Counterforce
- Active Defenses
- Passive Defenses
- Interdiction
- Coordinated Threat Reduction

Source:
Taxonomy 3: Models for CTR

- **Arms Control: Treaties**
  - Written agreements
  - Verification
  - Goals/objectives
  - Limitations; reductions

- **Foreign Aid: Marshall Plan**
  - Contain Communism
  - Post war
  - Intended to head off perceived threat vice existing forces
  - Buy American
  - Export American contracting and business practices

- **Cooperative Security: CBMs**
  - Intangibles
  - Interactions of military officers and civilian officials
  - Mil-to-mil programs
  - Int’l project management

- **Collective Security: NATO**
  - NATO model of continual reassurances among historical adversaries
  - Akin to the Nunn-Lugar interaction of military officers, bureaucrats, business executives, and scientists
Evolution in Thinking About Nunn-Lugar

- formal arms control treaties
- confidence & security building measures
- parallel unilateral initiatives
- formal cooperative security arrangements & military alliances
- executive agreements & consultative arrangements

Nunn-Lugar supporting other policy tools
Important Themes
Dismantlement versus Nonproliferation

- Original name: Safe, Secure Dismantlement
- Tension between two concepts/objectives of dismantlement & nonproliferation
  - US objectives/concerns versus Russian objectives/concerns
- Original legislative emphasis on *dismantlement*, then quickly evolved toward *nonproliferation*
  - Nonetheless, stable managerial control over nuclear operations was prominent driver at original program conception
Donor-Client Psychology

- Important to US authorizers and implementers
  - “Our money” & “we’re the victors” attitude
  - Rejected principle of reciprocity
- Significant impact on Russian perceptions
  - Psychology of dependence – real; resentment of it
- Statutory linkages: congressional certification requirements
- Result: ‘coercive threat reduction’ [BGen Kuenning]
- Where the process has worked well, the parties have subordinated this theme
  - Successful projects: mutual relationship
Nunn-Lugar Expansion
Modes of Expansion

- **Vertical:** more of the same
  - Expanding existing FSU projects

- **Horizontal:** expansion of the cooperative aspects of the program to a conceptual basis for bilateral relations
  - Transforming the security relationship
  - Replacing, or at least subordinating, MAD

- **Geographical:** applied to other regions
Generalizing the Model: Nunn-Lugar’s Drivers

- Arms Control Treaty/Agreement Obligations
- Safety & Security
- Economic Disintegration
- Military Security
- Political Instability
- Other
Nunn-Lugar’s Principles & Concepts

- Cooperation
- Expectations
- Flexibility/Adaptability
- Relationships
- Economic and Industrial Development
Venues for a General Model

- Bilateral Programs
- Multilateral
- Non-Governmental Organizations
- Professional & Commercial Associations
- Scientific Laboratories
- International Organizations
- International Groups
Thought Experiment: Inventing Nunn-Lugar

- What if we could start from scratch?
- How would we design the program?
- What are the alternative US policy options? Should the program be implemented on its own, or in a supporting role?
- Why would a state choose to accept foreign threat reduction assistance? What are that state’s alternative policy options? Who would make that choice?
- How would we want to measure the effectiveness/success of the program?
- How would we design the life-cycle of the program? What is the end point, or final objective? What is the critical path; how do we get there?
Conclusions

- Are we currently in a position to initiate major new policy?
  - No: dramatic changes in policy made only during formative moments
  - Therefore, the expansion of Threat Reduction must be evolutionary

- Too much focus on the transferability of specific projects as designed to be implemented in the FSU

- Better: focus on the transferability of the Nunn-Lugar principles as conceived in early post-Cold War era

- Policy of incremental possibilities
  - Keep doors open
  - Adjust policies as needed
  - Build trust
  - Hope more doors open