

The Non-Aligned Movement and Nuclear Security

Rajiv Nayan

Rajiv Nayan is Senior Research Associate at the Institute for Defence Studies & Analyses (IDSA), New Delhi

March 16, 2012

Summary

Nuclear terrorism was perceived as a remote reality by NAM countries and a mechanism to disturb the nuclear energy programmes of the developing world. The NAM summit has not yet taken a collective stand on nuclear security or the nuclear security summit process. The last NAM summit separately identified terrorism as a security problem. However, the phrase "nuclear terrorism" still eludes the official summit documents. The NAM countries still believe that only a world without nuclear weapons may ensure them security, thus the official documents and resolutions emphasise "nuclear disarmament". Admittedly, a few issues relating to the operationalisation of the Nuclear Security Summit made the NAM countries apprehensive. This is because NAM's relationship with "nuclear security" is relatively new, although the association is growing. The approach of the NAM countries towards nuclear security is very positive and the grouping has started working with other groups and through several institutions. Despite not taking a stand on nuclear security or nuclear terrorism, the NAM appears determined to adopt key elements of nuclear security.

The Republic of Korea is hosting the second Nuclear Security Summit (NSS) in Seoul from March 26–27, 2012¹, which would see around 50 world leaders and some international organisations in attendance. The first NSS was organised in Washington on April 13, 2010,² which saw the participation of 47 countries along with the European Union, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and the United Nations.³ The Washington Summit succeeded in spreading the idea of nuclear security across the globe. Until then, the threat of nuclear terrorism had been confined, politically, to national governments and, intellectually, to a few Western think-tanks, university departments, and non-governmental organisations (NGOs).

To a great extent, the credit goes to US President Barack Obama who wanted to secure vulnerable materials within four-years.⁴ It was a significant issue during his Presidential election campaign; however, when these four years could commence was not specified by Obama. That the four-year period began from April 13, 2010 could become clear only after the first NSS. After becoming the President of the United States (US), he continued his drive: his famous 2009 Prague speech included the idea of securing nuclear materials.⁵ Different international meetings in which the US participated witnessed President Obama emphasising upon the need for securing these materials and nuclear security. He, thus, held a summit to gather support for his idea. The size of the summit was a matter of global interest: it was neither very big nor restricted to the US' friends and allies. The idea behind the endeavour seemed to have a small but representative gathering. Participating countries also felt that the overall approach of the NSS was quite refreshing and that it seemed to bridge many old divides existing in the international system.

On April 12, 2010, the US Vice-President, Joseph Biden, told a gathering of the leaders of different countries that “the goals of the Non-Aligned Movement [NAM] and my

¹ Seoul Nuclear Security Summit 2012, “Overview”, available at http://www.thenuclearsecuritysummit.org/eng_info/overview.jsp, accessed on March 3, 2012.

² For documents on the 2010 Washington Summit see US Department of State, “Nuclear Security Summit, Washington, DC, April 12-13, 2010”, available at <http://fpc.state.gov/c35775.htm>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

³ US Department of State, “Nuclear Security Summit-Heads of Delegation”, available at <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/140180.pdf>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

⁴ “Barack Obama’s Plan to Keep America Safe: Obama’s Foreign Policy Vision”, available at http://www.barackobama.com/static/Flyers/Issue_Flyers/foreign_policy.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012.

⁵ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Remarks by President Barack Obama”, April 5, 2009, available at http://www.whitehouse.gov/the_press_office/Remarks-By-President-Barack-Obama-In-Prague-As-Delivered, accessed on January 20, 2012.

country [the US] on the important issues of nuclear security... have never been closer than they are today.”⁶ However, analysts and scholars kept referring to the NAM countries vis-à-vis nuclear security in different contexts.⁷ The NAM, as a referral category, often comes for negative perception vis-à-vis nuclear security. This makes the case for a closer scrutiny of the relationship between the NAM and nuclear security. One simple but pertinent question arises: how is the NAM approaching nuclear security? Does the NAM really believe that “nuclear security is another method to stymie nuclear development in non-Western countries?”⁸

Nuclear security is now almost synonymous with the prevention of nuclear terrorism. Interestingly, the NAM once struggled not only with nuclear terrorism, but terrorism per se. The member states differed on their understanding of terrorism. However, gradually the NAM started adopting resolutions on terrorism and the need to fight against it.⁹ Similarly, on nuclear terrorism, the NAM member states were initially reluctant and resistant. Nuclear terrorism was perceived as a remote reality for these countries and a mechanism to disturb the nuclear energy programmes of the developing world. The NAM summit has not yet taken a collective stand on nuclear security or the nuclear security summit process. The last NAM summit separately identified terrorism as a security problem. However, the phrase “nuclear terrorism” still eludes the official summit documents. The NAM countries still believe that only a world without nuclear weapons may ensure them security, thus the official documents and resolutions emphasise “nuclear disarmament”.

Admittedly, a few issues relating to the operationalisation of NSS made the NAM countries apprehensive. This is because the relationship of the NAM with “nuclear security” is relatively new; however, the association is growing. The approach of the NAM countries towards nuclear security is very positive and has started working with other groups and through several institutions. Despite not taking any stand on the nuclear

⁶ The White House, Office of the Vice President, “Remarks by the Vice President before a Lunch Meeting with Foreign Leaders and Dignitaries”, Washington DC, April 12, 2010, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-vice-president-a-lunch-meeting-with-foreign-leaders-and-dignitaries>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

⁷ Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, “The Global Nuclear Order – Build or Break?”, Carnegie Europe, Brussels, April 18, 2010, available at http://carnegieendowment.org/files/Nuclear_order%20transcript.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012.

⁸ International Institute for Strategic Studies, “Nuclear Summit Strengthens Security Measures”, IISS Strategic Comments, Volume 16, Comment 15, April 2010, p. 3.

⁹ For example, XV NAM Summit, 15th Summit Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, “Sharm El Sheikh Summit Declaration”, NAM2009/SD/Doc.4, Sharm El Sheikh, 15-16 July 2009, available at <http://www.namegypt.org/Relevant%20Documents/05Sharm%20El%20Sheikh%20Summit%20Declaration.doc>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

security or nuclear terrorism, the NAM appears determined to adopt key elements of nuclear security. For example, the final document laid down at the 2009 Sharm el Sheikh Summit stated: “The Heads of State and Government *affirmed* the need to strengthen the Radiological Safety and Protection Systems at facilities utilising radioactive materials as well as at radioactive waste management facilities, including the safe transportation of these materials. They *reaffirmed* the need to strengthen existing international regulations relating to safety and security of transportation of such materials.”¹⁰ So, the idea of nuclear security generally gained acceptance among the member states.

Nuclear Summit Process

The NAM did not participate in the April 2010 Nuclear Security Summit (NSS) meeting, in which delegates from 47 countries took part. However, 17 NAM members (see Table 1) participated in it. Seven observer countries (see Table 2), which generally or frequently work with NAM countries on the global agenda in international bodies or negotiations, participated in the 2010 NSS. All in all, 36 per cent of the countries that participated in the NSS were the NAM member countries, and if the member and observer countries are combined their presence in the 2010 Washington Summit comes to 51 per cent. The goal of the summit and that of the NAM may not be contradictory. In general, the NAM countries appreciate efforts towards nuclear security. This was underscored not only by the US Vice-President but also by the participating NAM countries during the Summit.

Table 1: NAM member-participants in 2010 NSS at Washington

1. Algeria	10. Pakistan
2. Chile	11. Philippines
3. Egypt	12. Saudi Arabia
4. India	13. Singapore
5. Indonesia	14. South Africa
6. Jordan	15. Thailand
7. Malaysia	16. United Arab Emirates
8. Morocco	17. Vietnam
9. Nigeria	

¹⁰ XV NAM Summit, 15th Summit Conference of Heads of State and Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, “Final Document”, NAM2009/FD/Doc.1, Sharm El Sheikh, 15-16 July 2009, available at <http://www.namegypt.org/Relevant%20Documents/01FINAL%20DOCUMENT.DOC>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

Table 2: NAM Observer Participants in the NSS 2010

1. Argentina	5. Kazakhstan
2. Armenia	6. Mexico
3. Brazil	7. Ukraine
4. China	

Some non-participant countries, such as Iran, which have a hostile relationship with the US, may have reservations with the 2010 NSS or the Summit process. The non-participant NAM member countries, such as Afghanistan, Bangladesh and Iraq, are working closely with the US on security and other issues. Even Iran which was a non-participatory country of the NSS process and is opposed to UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) on nuclear security, acknowledges that nuclear security is a global problem.¹¹ Moreover, countries such as Cuba and Iran oppose Security Council resolutions because they are passed by small group of countries.¹² A renegade country like North Korea never supported nuclear terrorism, at least in principle. However, the proliferation network it fed may have helped further nuclear terrorism.

The 2010 NSS produced two important documents: the communiqué and the work plan. These are consensus documents which were negotiated by the participating countries in several preparatory sherpa meetings. The negotiations of the NSS documents did not witness a unified proposal from the participating NAM countries, nor did observer countries join the NAM countries to work in unison.

However, most of the participating NAM countries are united with the US on the need of countering the al-Qaeda type of terror organisation, which has an avowed intent to acquire materials to use as a tool of terror. It must be noted that many NAM countries, which did not participate in the 2010 Summit or may not participate in the 2012 Summit, are fighting the al-Qaeda at regional and internal levels. These countries would like the Summit process to succeed in securing materials as there is now a the growing threat of terrorist networks—such as the Taliban and al-Qaeda—in the non-Western countries and organisations, which hitherto considered nuclear terrorism a marginal or remote issue.

Besides, countries like Chile are facing a different kind of threat. The anarchist groups in these countries have so far used small bombs, but there is always a possibility of these organisations networking outside and acquiring nuclear materials for other terrorist

¹¹ The International Atomic Energy Agency, General Conference, Fifty Fourth Regular Session, Committee of the Whole: Record of the Fourth Meeting on September 22, 2010, GC(54)/COM.5/OR. December 4, 2010, available at http://www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC54/GC54Com5Records/English/gc54com5or-4_en.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012

¹² Ibid.

organisations. Already, a number of reports have indicated that a few Latin American non-state actors are acquiring nuclear materials.¹³ The highly-developed organized crime in the region may try to acquire sensitive materials and use them for extortion.

The so-called “high politics of Anti-Americanism and Anti-Westernism” of NAM countries included the idea of working together with all the major groupings of the world to fight nuclear terrorism, which is regarded as low-probability, high-consequence threat. The communiqué issued during the 2010 Summit, in its opening paragraph, noted: “Nuclear terrorism is one of the most challenging threats to international security, and strong nuclear security measures are the most effective means to prevent terrorists, criminals, or other unauthorised actors from acquiring nuclear materials.”¹⁴ Many NAM countries are active on various platforms. For example, the 2010 Review Conference (RevCon) of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) also deliberated on nuclear security, though the final document only mentions the 2010 Summit in a highly non-committal way because most countries did not participate in the Washington summit. Moreover, some member states were not very comfortable discussing what happened at the 2010 Summit. To forge a consensus document, the RevCon seemingly avoided greater elaboration of the Summit. However, practically all the major initiatives of the Summit are endorsed by the NPT 2010 RevCon. The NPT has as signatories almost all the countries in the world except three (India, Pakistan and Israel plus North Korea which withdrew from the treaty); all the NAM countries are signatories except India and Pakistan.

One of the commitments of the 2010 Summit was the conversion of Highly-Enriched Uranium (HEU) to Low-Enriched Uranium (LEU). The participating NAM and observer countries continue to be serious regarding this issue. In fact, Chile made the news before the 2010 Summit for removing all its HEU stocks. Some of the countries have transferred their HEU to the US. Though technical difficulties and limitations emerged as an issue for converting HEU to LEU, no country has as yet retraced on conversion. It appears that all the countries may gradually fulfil their commitment regarding the conversion.

Participating NAM countries are actively implementing other ideas and commitments they made in the 2010 Summit. The regional meetings to promote nuclear security were held in several regions such as Latin America and South-East Asia under the leadership

¹³ Alex Sanchez, “The Dirty Little Secret: Nuclear Security Issues in Latin America and the Caribbean,” January 6, 2010, available at <http://www.coha.org/nuclear-security-issues-in-latin-america-and-the-caribbean/>; Siobhan Gorman, “Patagonia Crime Scene Plays Role in Nuclear-Security Bid”, *The Wall Street Journal*, October 9, 2009, available at <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB125504219290974603.html>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

¹⁴ The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, “Communiqué of the Washington Nuclear Security Summit”, April 13, 2010, available at <http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/communiqu-washington-nuclear-security-summit>, accessed on January 20, 2012

of the participating NAM countries.¹⁵ These regional meetings and training programmes were attended by countries which had not participated in the 2010 NSS.

Nuclear security may give a unique opportunity to otherwise hostile NAM countries to work together. Cooperation on nuclear security between India and Pakistan in South Asia is a case in point. The cooperation is more significant because India agreed to the consensus that the Summit would not target any specific country. The Indian strategic community was puzzled by this idea because there was an understanding that Pakistan could be either the main or the sole source of supply of nuclear items for nuclear terrorism, considering the alarming state of affairs in the country. Moreover, after the killing of Osama bin Laden, the whole world is talking about it. The idea, thus, is that all the concerned parties may work with an integrated approach so that the optimum use of all kinds of resources is done.

Institutional Centrality of the IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has emerged as an important centre of activities for NAM countries; it is now the most preferred institutional framework for the NAM countries. Some of the non-participating NAM countries are being engaged in the regional framework led by the participating NAM countries and supported by the US and other developed Western countries. Countries which are not willing to get involved with the NSS process are active with the IAEA programmes. Even participating NAM countries are urging the IAEA to become more active on nuclear security so that duplication of efforts is avoided.¹⁶

The final document of the 2010 RevCon recommended the IAEA to formulate a “comprehensive set of guidelines” for the countries which are willing to take assistance. Action 43 of the RevCon document prescribes its members to put into practice the principles of the revised IAEA Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and the Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources approved by the IAEA Board of Governors in 2004.¹⁷ For this purpose, the document prescribes

¹⁵ For example, US Embassy, “Regional Seminar on Nuclear Security”, June 6, 2011, available at <http://chile.usembassy.gov/2011press0622-security.html>, accessed on ; US Department of State, Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs, “Plan of Action to Implement the Indonesia-U.S. Comprehensive Partnership”, September 17, 2010, available at <http://www.state.gov/p/eap/rls/ot/2010/147287.htm>, accessed on January 20, 2012

¹⁶ Statement by I. Gusti Agung Wesaka Puja at the 55th Annual Regular Session of the General Conference of the International Atomic Energy Agency, available at <http://www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC55/Statements/indonesia.pdf>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

¹⁷ United Nations, 2010 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, “Final Document”, NPT/CONF.2010/50 (Vol. I), New York 2010, available at [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50%20\(VOL.I\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=NPT/CONF.2010/50%20(VOL.I)), accessed on January 20, 2012.

“development of an appropriate infrastructure”.¹⁸ It maintains that the IAEA infrastructure could be more useful for the countries which are new to nuclear energy production. The 2010 RevCon also appealed to the member countries to apply the IAEA recommendations on the physical protection of nuclear material and nuclear facilities (INFCIRC/225/Rev.4 [Corrected]).¹⁹ The 2010 Washington NSS wanted the fifth revision of the document. Quite naturally, the appeal will be equally valid for the fifth version as well.

By and large, the NAM countries are against substituting or undermining the IAEA. They believe that the IAEA has undertaken a number of activities for nuclear security, and that the consolidation of these activities may serve the cause of nuclear security better than initiating an entirely new initiative or institution. In 2009, the IAEA organised a conference in which ideas for nuclear security guided the international community. The IAEA has produced a series of documents on nuclear security and is running Nuclear Security Support Plans, information portal, data gathering and data sharing programmes through the Illicit Trafficking Data Base. It is also active for securing radioactive sources, HEU repatriation, security upgrading of nuclear facilities, Design-Basis Threat workshops, and so on. In fact, the Work Plan of the NSS also highlights activities of the IAEA²⁰ and the 2012 NSS portal explains the meaning of nuclear security.²¹ However, the international community understands nuclear security basically on the basis of working definition given by the IAEA.²²

A NAM country – India – and an observer country – China – have proposed some nuclear security centres of excellence. All these centres are supposed to work in cooperation with

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ US Department of State, “Work Plan of the Washington Nuclear Security Summit”, April 13, 2010, available at <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/140354.pdf>, accessed on January 20, 2012

²¹ Nuclear security is a series of preemptive measures introduced to prevent internal and/or external threats directly or indirectly related to nuclear materials, radioactive substances, relevant facilities, or other associated activities. In the case of imminent threat, it consists of countermeasures to detect, delay and prevent illegal acts as well as administrative and technical measures to minimise the damage caused by accidents. For more details see 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit Backgrounder available at http://www.thenuclearsecuritysummit.org/eng_about/background.jsp, accessed on March 15, 2012.

²² The working definition of nuclear security as formulated by the advisory group on nuclear security of the IAEA is: “The prevention and detection of and response to, theft, sabotage, unauthorised access, illegal transfer or other malicious acts involving nuclear material, other radioactive substances or their associated facilities.” See The IAEA, General Conference, “Nuclear Security – Measures to Protect Against Nuclear Terrorism: Progress Report and Nuclear Security Plan for 2006–2009”, Report by the Director General, GC(49)/17, September 23, 2005, available at <http://www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC49/Documents/gc49-17.pdf>, accessed on March 16, 2012.

the IAEA. Pending the universalisation goal, the global centre proposed by India may be used to train scientists, officials, and security personnel from NAM countries, which are generally very sensitive and suspicious of intrusiveness.

Other Mechanisms

The 2010 NSS documents underlined the significance of several existing initiatives for nuclear security. Though UNSC 1540 Resolution operates within the UN framework, other initiatives such as Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism and the G-8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, are outside the framework of the UN and its family organisations. Despite the fact that the NAM countries initially opposed the UNSCR 1540 as they believed that the Security Council is not the right place to legislate, but they supported the resolution later. Aware of the catastrophic effects acquisition of nuclear materials may have on the international community, these countries started supporting and cooperating with activities of the UNSCR Committee established to pursue the idea of the resolution.

Led by the Western countries, especially the US, initiatives such as Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism and the G-8 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, have struggled to work for nuclear security. In the run up to the 2010 NSS, however, some NAM participating countries announced their willingness to join the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.²³ Some NAM countries, which are not participants of the Global Initiative, participated in the NSS, while NAM participant countries of Global Initiative did not participate in the NSS. Thus, the NAM countries are contributing to the ideals of the Global Initiative both directly and indirectly. For example, on the one hand, Egypt, which participated in the NSS and supported the idea of the Global Initiative, is not among 82 partners of the latter. On the other hand, NAM countries like Afghanistan and Belarus did not participate in the 2010 NSS, yet are partner countries of the Global Initiative.²⁴ G-8 partnership also received support from the NAM participating countries in the 2010 Summit. Depending on the willingness of the individual NAM states, the G-8 partnership is also going to assist NAM countries in the future, thus involving them in global initiatives for nuclear security.

²³ US Department of State, "Highlights of National Commitments, Nuclear Security Summit, April 12-13, 2010", available at <http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/140356.pdf>, accessed on March 15, 2012.

²⁴ US Department of State, "Partner Nations List", available at <http://www.state.gov/t/isn/c37083.htm>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

The 2010 NSS also saw the role for other bilateral, regional, multilateral, and non-governmental activities for promoting nuclear security. Some of the initiatives and institutions discussed above were mentioned, but many were not mentioned in the documents. Some of the NAM countries have expressed their apprehension for Cooperative Threat Reduction Programme or the Global Threat Reduction Programme. However, NAM countries like Chile are working with Global Threat Reduction Programme.²⁵ Other NAM member countries and observers such as Egypt, Indonesia, Argentina, and Kazakhstan are working with one or more programme(s) of the US National Nuclear Security Administration²⁶, and NAM members and observers are getting assistance in securing HEU or its conversion.

Rules and Conventions

Two international conventions and one code of conduct, along with several resolutions of the international organisations and bilateral agreements, principally provide the legal framework for nuclear security. The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (and its Amendment) and the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism are the two important conventions. The 2010 NSS had universal adherence and hastening of the ratification processes of the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and its 2005 Amendment in its work plan. Similarly, the work plan also strives for universality of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism. The NAM documents also appealed to make the conventions as broad based as possible.

Of the 2010 NSS participating NAM countries, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material has not entered into force in five countries.²⁷ A number of NAM countries that did not participate in the 2010 Summit are parties to the Convention, though several others have expressed reservations over certain provisions of the Convention. Unfortunately, only 51 states have adhered to the guidelines of the 2005

²⁵ National Nuclear Security Administration, "Ahead of Nuclear Security Summit, NNSA Announces Removal of All Highly Enriched Uranium from Chile", Press Release, April 8, 2010, available at <http://nnsa.energy.gov/mediaroom/pressreleases/04.08.10>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

²⁶ For Kazakhstan, National Nuclear Security Administration, "NNSA Secures 775 Nuclear Weapons Worth of Weapons-Grade Nuclear Material from BN-350 Fast Reactor in Kazakhstan", November 18, 2010, available at <http://nnsa.energy.gov/mediaroom/pressreleases/bn35011.18.10>, accessed on January 20, 2012; and for others go to National Nuclear Security Administration, Office of Public Affairs, "Press Releases", available at <http://nnsa.energy.gov/mediaroom/pressreleases>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

²⁷ The International Atomic Energy Agency, "Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material", September 29, 2010, available at http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Conventions/cppnm_status.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012.

Amendment of the Convention.²⁸ The Amendment may need approval of two-thirds of the member states for enforcing it. Among the participant NAM countries, nine have not adhered to the Amendment, but eight have done so. Except four NAM participating countries in the 2010 NSS, all the countries have signed the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.²⁹ Moreover, a large number of signatories of this Convention are NAM countries which did not participate in the 2010 NSS, owing to reservations.

The non-binding Code of Conduct is also expected to garner wider political support from countries either running or planning to run nuclear facilities. However, report after report of different international bodies has expressed concern over the lack of support these documents are receiving. Countries have been supporting it and informing to the IAEA about their support. A country that supports the Code is supposed to designate a point of contact and send the IAEA a completed version of the specimen self-assessment questionnaire annexed to the Guidance. As of November 21, 2011, only 106 countries have adopted the Code.³⁰ Of them, 39 participated in the 2010 NSS. Of the eight countries which have not adopted the Code, seven are NAM participants in the NSS. However, many NAM countries, which did not participate in the 2010 NSS, have adopted the Code of Conduct.

Tasks Ahead

As mentioned, only 17 out of 118 NAM members participated in the 2010 Summit. It means only about 14 per cent of the NAM member countries and 38 per cent of its observer countries participated in the Summit. Admittedly, many of the countries may not have nuclear infrastructure that may attract nuclear security measures. Yet, there are several countries for which nuclear security is relevant. Nuclear security should move away from the 2010 NSS standard of a small group of countries towards a universal structure. The Summit participants may have to decide about the future participation of

²⁸ The International Atomic Energy Agency, "Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material", November 25, 2011, available at http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Conventions/cppnm_amend_status.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012.

²⁹ United Nations, "International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, Chapter XVIII, status as on 19 December 2011", available at http://treaties.un.org/Pages/ViewDetailsIII.aspx?src=UNISONLINE&mtdsg_no=XVIII~15&chapter=18&Temp=mtdsg3&lang=en#Participants, accessed on January 20, 2012.

³⁰ The International Atomic Energy Agency, "List of States That Have Made a Political Commitment with Regard to the Code of Conduct on the Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and the Supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources", November 23, 2011, available at http://www.iaea.org/Publications/Documents/Treaties/codeconduct_status.pdf, accessed on January 20, 2012.

some countries such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea in the summit. The indication is that in the 2012 Seoul Summit, the number of countries is not going to increase dramatically. The issue merits serious discussion when the key countries meet for setting the agenda beyond 2012.

Although most of the active NAM countries share the goal of NSS, a perception is gradually creeping in that nuclear security restrictions, especially the new standards, may create hindrances to the quest for nuclear energy. Several NAM countries are nuclear aspirants. Egypt, the current chair of the NAM, participated in the 2010 NSS. In a statement during the 2010 Washington Summit, Egypt cautioned that “any unjustified restrictions”³¹ would adversely affect collaboration for nuclear security. The issue emerged quite frequently even after the Summit as well as earlier, during some of the preparatory sherpas meetings. The apprehensions of these countries ought to be addressed.

Despite the resistance of the US to the inclusion of radiological security in the Summit agenda, it does not appear that it would be included in the 2012 Summit and beyond. Yet, some countries and NGOs are proposing to include radiological security in the 2012 NSS agenda. If the effort succeeds, the NAM countries may develop further apprehensions. A number of NAM countries, including 2010 NSS participant countries require need cancer treatment facilities in future, and new restrictions should not become a barrier in opening these cancer research facilities. For example, India has a few cancer treatment facilities and needs more such facilities in the future.

Apparently, in one of the sherpa meetings, monitoring of nuclear facilities became a major contention. It looked as though the entire summit process would get derailed because of the emerging lack of trust and confidence among countries. The Summit process may draw lessons from the IAEA experience. The IAEA also has an evaluation system and countries adopt that system to improve the security infrastructure of their nuclear facilities. It is voluntary and becomes operational when a member state desires so. The NSS should be careful in forcing the enforcement mechanism. The traditional international divide between the developed and developing world may resurface on the issue.

Needless to add, the balancing act is a big challenge for the countries. The Arab Spring and the situation in Pakistan are further adding to the complexity of the situation. Many NAM countries are the centres of turmoil and the source of the global worry. The international community may have to work out a plan to resolve this dilemma.

³¹ Arab Republic of Egypt, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, “Statement of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the Nuclear Security Summit–Washington, DC (April 12–13, 2010)”, available at <http://www.mfa.gov.eg/english/mediacenter/statments/pages/statementdetails.aspx?source=6781921f-3993-444a-859e-ee26ce851de8&newsid=6a63aa89-4e7e-44df-843c-49297ae9ed69>, accessed on January 20, 2012.

The NAM countries supported the idea of use of technology and forensics for nuclear security during the 2010 Summit. The sherpa meetings before the 2010 Summit discussed issues relating to technology. Pakistan strongly resisted the inclusion of forensics in the NSS 2010 document, but other countries supported development of forensic science for nuclear security. These countries should be encouraged to join international collaborations for development of nuclear forensics for nuclear security. Regarding other equipment and technology, the philosophy of appropriate and affordable technology should be adopted. Local resources and adaptation of available technology should be harnessed as much as possible. A number of the NAM countries, which have a population balance in their favour, may contribute with human resources for not only technical development but other training and assistance programmes. However, there needs to be synergy between the developed and the NAM world.

Conclusion

Almost two years after the 2010 Summit, the NAM countries are actively implementing the agreed upon agenda. Even non-participant countries are adopting best practices for nuclear security. No non-participating country has come out against the idea expressed in the work plan and communiqué: all may coordinate their efforts to promote nuclear security.

This raises a final question: should the groupings existing in international organisations guide the nuclear security agenda? The answer should be negative. Complementarity and sharing practices and experiences should be the guiding principle and a global strategy should be evolved for global cooperation on nuclear security. A sober assessment of threat perception is required and divisive issues needs to be discouraged. The 2010 Nuclear Security Summit is a good move towards this ideal. The immediate need is to consolidate and implement the work plan and then expand it. The approach should be incremental and sincere.