UNIVERZITA KARLOVA

FAKULTA SOCIÁLNÍCH VĚD

Institut politologických studií

Bc. Lucie Hrdinová

NATO and WMD: Evolution of the threat construction and Alliance's response

Diplomová práce

Praha 2017

Autor práce: **Bc. Lucie Hrdinová**

Vedoucí práce: **Dagmar Rychnovská, LL.M., M.A., Ph.D.**

Rok obhajoby: **2017**

Bibliografický záznam

HRDINOVÁ, Lucie. *NATO and WMD: Evolution of the threat construction and Alliance's response.* Praha, 2017. 95 s. Diplomová práce (Mgr.) Univerzita Karlova, Fakulta sociálních věd, Institut politologických studií. Katedra mezinárodních vztahů. Vedoucí diplomové práce Dagmar Rychnovská, LL.M., M.A., Ph.D.

Abstrakt

Diplomová práce s názvem „NATO and WMD: Evolution of the threat construction and Alliance's response" se zabývá vývojem chápání zbraní hromadného ničení v Severoatlantické alianci. Zbraněmi hromadného ničení (ZHN) se NATO zabývá již od počátku své existence, nicméně důraz byl až do skončení studené války kladen převážně na jednu z kategorií, a to jaderné zbraně. Avšak od počátku 90. let je patrné, že se Aliance zaměřuje na ZHN jako zastřešující pojem pro biologické, chemické, jaderné a od teroristických útoků z 11. září 2001 i radiologické zbraně. Přestože se jedná o významný koncept, není vymezení zbraní hromadného ničení zcela jednoznačné. Avšak to, jak aktéři ZHN chápou, je velmi důležité. Z tohoto důvodu je zkoumán oficiální diskurz NATO jako indikátor chápání ZHN v Alianci, přičemž tento postup také umožní splnit dva cíle této práce. Prvním cílem je analýza vývoje konstrukce a interpretace hrozby ZHN v NATO od roku 1991 až po současnost. Zadruhé chce práce zjistit jakým způsobem NATO odpovědělo na hrozby plynoucí ze zbraní hromadného ničení (tj. proliferace a terorismu) a identifikovat konkrétní opatření, jež byla přijata v rámci boje s rozvíjející se hrozbou ZHN. Tato diplomová práce vychází z teorie sekuritizace, jež umožňuje nahlížet na bezpečnost a hrozby jako na sociálně konstruované. Zbraně hromadného ničení jsou tak zde chápány ne jako fixní koncept, ale jako (relativně) flexibilní, politicky podmíněný konstrukt s významnými bezpečnostními implikacemi. Překvapivě málo prací se zabývá tím, jak jsou hrozby ZHN konstruovány a chápány v NATO, a proto by tato práce ráda přispěla k částečnému zaplnění této mezery.

Klíčová slova

Zbraně hromadného ničení (ZHN), NATO, obsahová analýza, terorismus, proliferace, sekuritizace, konstrukce hrozby

Abstract

This Diploma Thesis called "NATO and WMD: Evolution of the threat construction and Alliance's response" deals with the evolution of understanding of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). WMD, especially the nuclear ones, have preoccupied NATO since its establishment. However, it was only after the end of the Cold War that NATO started to focus on WMD as a specific overarching category, consisting of chemical, biological and nuclear (since 9/11 also radiological) weapons. Despite the conspicuousness of the concept and increased use of the WMD term, the definition of weapons of mass destruction is not clear-cut. However, the way the actors understand WMD is very important. For this reason, NATO's official discourse is studied as an indicator of how is WMD understood in the Alliance, which will allow to fulfill objectives of this thesis. First, the work intends to analyze how has the WMD threat been constructed and interpreted within the Alliance since the year 1991 until this day. Secondly, this thesis aims to find out what is NATO's response to the dangers posed by the identified WMD threats (i.e. proliferation and terrorism) and identify the concrete measures the Allies undertook to tackle the evolving WMD threat. This thesis is based on securitization theory, which views security and threats as socially constructed. Accordingly, the WMD are treated in this thesis not as a fixed concept, but as a relatively flexible, politically conditioned, construction with important implications for international security. Since there is surprisingly little research done on how NATO constructs and interprets the WMD threat, this thesis would like to contribute to the yet under-researched topic of WMD threat construction within this Alliance.

Keywords

Weapons of mass destruction (WMD), NATO, content analysis, terrorism, proliferation, securitization, threat construction

Extent of the study: 33 324 words, 215 277 characters

Prohlášení

1. Prohlašuji, že jsem předkládanou práci zpracovala samostatně a použila jen uvedené prameny a literaturu.
2. Prohlašuji, že práce nebyla využita k získání jiného titulu.
3. Souhlasím s tím, aby práce byla zpřístupněna pro studijní a výzkumné účely.

V Praze dne 20. 12. 2016 …….

Lucie Hrdinová

Poděkování

Tímto bych chtěla poděkovat Dagmar Rychnovské, LL.M., M.A., Ph.D. za vloženou důvěru při výběru práce, milé vedení, neocenitelné rady a veškerý čas, který této práci věnovala. Ráda bych také poděkovala své rodině za jejich nepřetržitou podporu v průběhu mého studia.

Contents

Abbreviations

ALTBMD	Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence
BMD	Ballistic Missile Defence
BTWC	Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction
CBR	Chemical, Biological and Radiological
CBRN	Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear
CS	Copenhagen School
CTBT	Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty
CWC	Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction
IAEA	International Atomic Emergency Agency
INF	Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NBC	Nuclear, Biological and Chemical
NPT	Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
OPCW	Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons
PSI	Proliferation Security Initiative
UN	United Nations
U.S.	United States
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction

Introduction

The fundamental purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been since its establishment in 1949 to safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means (NATO, 2010a). The purpose of the Alliance has not changed since then, however, the dangers to NATO's security differ significantly. The Alliance has to continually respond to the new challenges and security threats stemming from the changing security environment, one of which are definitely weapons of mass destruction.

However, a question arises – what is meant by weapons of mass destruction? Though the term Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) has been part of policy, diplomatic and academic discourse for approximately seventy years and its use has increased significantly over the last two decades (Enemark, 2011: 382), there is one significant problem surrounding it – a lack of consensus on the term's meaning. Despite its frequent use in the recent years, there is a widespread perception that the WMD term has no accepted definition and that it means whatever the user wants it to mean (Carus, 2012: 1). This is, however, incorrect. The United Nations Commission on Conventional Armaments created a first authoritative definition of WMD in August 1948, in which WMD are defined as "atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above" (UN General Assembly, 1981). This definition essentially equalled WMD with chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons, which is still until now the most common understanding of weapons of mass destruction.

Weapons of mass destruction, especially the nuclear ones, have preoccupied NATO since its establishment (Terzuolo, 2004: 1). However, WMD as a specific encompassing category did not figure heavily in the policy formulation of the Cold War era. It was only after the end of the Cold War, when the Allies have recognized that WMD threats endanger the Alliance. But what kind of WMD threats? How does NATO understand weapons of mass destruction? These questions, combined with the complex nature of WMD and the lack of clarity surrounding them, resulted in formulation of two following research questions:

> **RQ 1:** *How has the construction and interpretation of the WMD threat evolved in NATO since 1991 until today?*

RQ 2: *What were the specific measures undertaken by NATO in response to the evolving WMD threat?*

The aim of this thesis is thus twofold. First, the work intends to analyse how has the WMD threat been constructed and interpreted within the Alliance since the year 1991, which is the start of the analysis as the new Strategic Concept, in which greater attention was paid to WMD, was accepted. Moreover, the author is also interested in identifying the reasons behind it. Second, the thesis aims to find out what was the NATO's response to the dangers posed by the WMD threat. Specifically, the works intends to identify specific measures undertaken by the Alliance in order to deal with the evolving threat.

Given the fact, that weapons of mass destruction are one of the most prominent and powerful concepts within contemporary security studies, it is no surprise that a lot has been written about it. This diploma thesis was therefore inspired by many sources, yet some of the key ones shall be briefly mentioned here. The works of authors who have employed constructivist outlook on the topic of WMD were considered particularly important. The research by Michelle Bentley (2013, 2014) has had the biggest influence on how are WMD understood in this thesis. Renowned works that focused on the normative separation of WMD – while Richard Price (1995) focused on the chemical weapons taboo, Nina Tannenwald (1999) studied how nuclear weapons became stigmatized and how this normative stigma has caused that nuclear weapons were not used since 1945 – were great source of inspiration as well. Research by Eric Terzuolo (2004) was particularly important (and rare) source of information regarding NATO's approach towards weapons of mass destruction. Still, the approach adopted in this thesis is unique in a sense that it views WMD as a social construct with important security implications and adopts this point of view on the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. There is surprisingly little research done on how the NATO constructs and interprets the WMD threat, as well as what the specific measures undertaken by the Alliance in response to the evolving threat are. This thesis would like to contribute to the yet under-researched topic of WMD threat construction within this Alliance.

As was previously mentioned, there was significant increase of awareness within NATO about the threats posed by the WMD since the beginning of the 1990s. "Assessments of the urgency and magnitude of the security implications associated with WMD proliferation" (Bravo, 2003: 1) resulted in the launching of Weapons of Mass Destruction Initiative at the 1999 Washington Summit, which led to the establishment of the WMD Centre at NATO Headquarters the following

year. The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, that resulted in the deaths of nearly 3,000 people, emphasized the salience of the WMD threat. Though still conventional in nature, these attacks opened up the discussion on what would have happened if weapons of mass destruction were employed. There is no doubt, that a similar attack with WMD would have been far more devastating. Given the existence of certain terrorist groups that are actively seeking to develop or acquire WMD capabilities there should be no surprise that since 9/11 "NATO's military thinking, resources and energy have given greater attention to the fight against terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction" (Chiarini, 2013). Subsequently, NATO's official documents identified the proliferation of WMD and their delivery systems, as well as the possibility that terrorists will acquire these weapons, as the principal threats to the Alliance over 10-15 years (NATO, 2009b). Recognizing this, the Alliance has been vigilant and has responded to this challenge with a number of policy and security countermeasures, including a comprehensive set of practical initiatives to protect their populations, forces and territory against the potential use of WMD (NATO, 2008a). As the threat posed by weapons of mass destruction is constantly evolving, so is NATO's understanding and response to it. The author of this thesis therefore believes that it is very important to understand the relationship between the Alliance and the concept of WMD, as it has significant consequences for NATO, its members and their populations and forces.

To provide answers to above stated research questions and to fulfil the objectives of this diploma thesis, a detailed analysis of NATO's official documents relevant to the topic of WMD and within the timeframe from 1991 until today shall be conducted. The analytical approach employed in this thesis is therefore qualitative content analysis, which aims to clarify the ways people "use or manipulate symbols to invest communication with meaning" (Hermann, 2008: 151) and which allows, compared to its quantitative counterpart, to study the latent and more context-dependent meaning (Schreier, 2013: 170). The concrete analytical framework shall be described in detail in Chapter 2.

Theoretically, this research is based on securitization theory. The securitization theory, which was developed by the Copenhagen School (CS), is considered one of the most important and original contributions to security studies in recent years. The main argument of securitization theory is that security is an intersubjective concept, socially constructed through discourse (Buzan et al., 1998). The Copenhagen School thus offered a constructivist perspective on how security problems emerge, evolve and dissolve by suggesting that security threats are socially constructed

in a process called securitization (Balzacq, 2010: 56). The process of securitization consists of several steps - a securitizing actor adopts speech acts (i.e. utterances that label something as a security issue) in order to declare certain security issue as an existential threat to a specified referent object (i.e. those who are threatened), thus implying a right to use exceptional and extraordinary means to tackle the threat (Buzan et al., 1998; Jin and Karackattu, 2011). However, whether an issue has been successfully framed as a security issue is not decided by securitizing actors alone. Therefore, the securitization is successful only if an audience accepts the security argument (Buzan et al., 1998). This whole process – securitization – can be studied directly, through analysing discourse[1]. According to Buzan et al. (1998, 32), "to study securitization is to study the power politics of a concept". The study of securitization thus aims to achieve an understanding of who securitizes (the actor), on what issues (the threat), on behalf of whom (referent object), why (the reasons), with what results and under which conditions (Buzan et al., 1998: 32; Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 25).

The securitization theory understands threats to be socially constructed, as does this thesis. The analytical framework as developed by Copenhagen School is particularly useful for the purposes of this thesis, as it allows to study the process of threat construction in NATO. Specifically, it will allow to investigate the way in which WMD have been increasingly reframed as a security threat within the Alliance since the beginning of the 1990s, thus answering primary research question. However, the thesis is not primarily interested in whether the securitization has been successful or not. The author is instead interested in the nature of policy and security measures drafted in response to a securitizing move. "By focusing on security as a practice with outcome…additional insights into the variety of countermeasures in place to counter modern threats" (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 26) shall be gained. Thus, the secondary research question shall be answered.

This diploma thesis is divided into four key chapters.

The first chapter will deal with the WMD as a dynamic concept, albeit problematic one, with strategic implications. The key works for the study of WMD in general as well as for WMD a social construct in particular will be discussed. In this part, the logic behind the approach adopted in this thesis will be introduced. It will be argued that WMD should not be treated as a "fixed, concept,

[1] In this thesis, discourses are understood as "bodies of texts that bring ideas, objects and practices into the world" (Hardy et al., 2004: 20).

but as a flexible, politically contingent, construction" (Bentley, 2014: 4) with important implications for international security. A successful portrayal of "an issue as a mass destructive concern ascribes it a certain weight" (Bentley, 2014: 133), thus allowing the policy makers – in this case NATO - to accept certain measures to deal with these WMD threats, which would not have been otherwise possible. Additionally, it is impossible to discuss WMD without mentioning the critique of the concept, as well as to talk about threats posed to NATO's security without understanding the differences amongst each type of WMD (as in CBRN). This will be subject of the first chapter as well.

The second chapter will elaborate the theoretical and analytical framework employed in this thesis. It will start with introducing the securitization theory, which is the approach most closely associated with issues of threat construction in political science (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 24), and its basic tenets as developed by Copenhagen School. To study securitization, one needs to understand the processes of how shared understanding of what is considered as an existential threat is constructed (Buzan et al., 1998). The way to study the process of securitization is through analysis of relevant texts, which is precisely what will be done in this thesis through adopting the qualitative content analysis methodology. The second chapter will thus explain the concrete research design behind this analysis as well as will introduce the concrete data. The data used for the analysis consist of a number of primary and secondary source materials, with primary source materials including NATO's official, publicly available, documents which were the basis for the content analysis conducted in this thesis.

The third chapter is the empirical core of this thesis, which will aim to answer both research questions. NATO's official documents, including Strategic Concepts, Policy Frameworks, Summit Communiqué etc., since the year 1991 until now shall be studied. The objective is to analyse how has the construction and interpretation of the WMD threat within NATO evolved over time, however, this is done simultaneously with the analysis of the policy and security measures that NATO undertook as a response to the changing understanding of WMD threat within the Alliance as it cannot be treated separately.

The aim of the fourth chapter is to discuss and interpret the findings of the conducted analysis. This will be done through concisely answering to each of the questions, which are defined in the analytical framework, based on the information gathered in the previous chapter. Lastly, attention

will be paid to the lessons learnt as well as on the possible challenges NATO might face in the future from the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction.

1. The politics and the meaning of the WMD

1.1. Origins of the term WMD

It has often been assumed that the concept of WMD is a modern U.S. construct, which was "developed post-9/11 as a product of the George W. Bush administration's controversial justification of US military action" in Iraq (Bentley, 2014: 4). However, the assumption is incorrect as the concept of WMD has a long history. The first documented reference to "weapons of mass destruction" dates back to 1937 commentary in London Times by William Lang, Archbishop of Canterbury (1937, cited in Carus, 2012: 7): "Who can think at this present time without a sickening of the heart of the appalling slaughter, the suffering, the manifold misery brought by war to Spain and to China? Who can think without horror of what another widespread war would mean, waged as it would be with all the new weapons of mass destruction"? While the Archbishop's remarks did not indicate what exactly he meant by WMD, under the circumstances it is generally assumed that he had in mind the aerial bombings on Guernica during the Spanish Civil War and on China during Sino-Japanese War (Carus, 2012: 7; Bentley, 2013: 78). In the given context, the focus of the Archbishop Lang was more on the future and the expansive levels of destruction, that could be achieved with new and advanced weaponry (Bentley, 2013: 78). Such advanced weapon capable of the horrific destructiveness emerged few years later. As William Fielding Ogburn (1946: 267) commented: "The explosion of the atomic bomb over Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, is thought to have ended an era of history". The unprecedented level of destructiveness experienced in Hiroshima and Nagasaki is also fittingly illustrated by the following quote by Chris Hables Gray (1997: 128): "The Atomic bomb changed parameters of lethality forever". Because nuclear weapons were so devastating, it was impossible to let them be loose in the anarchic world. Their control was essential and this had to be addressed within the international system. What was important was the realisation that the nuclear weapons could not be considered alone, in isolation from other similarly destructive weapons. "It was this incorporation that laid out the foundations for a collective understanding (WMD)" (Bentley, 2014: 29).

This thinking led to the first authoritative WMD definition on 12 August, 1948, as generated by the UN Commission on Conventional Armaments, which defined WMD as "atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of the

atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above" (UN General Assembly, 1981). This definition[2] essentially equalled WMD with CBRN. As Bentley (2014: 29) noted: "More than any other interpretation of meaning, this is the one that has most influenced discussion surrounding the concept". Nonetheless, as the following sections will demonstrate, the creation of WMD category that brought these weapons groups together despite their unique histories and differences between each weapon type in a way that has had significant policy implications has been subjected to a criticism by a number of academicians and practitioners. Additionally, despite the existence of the authoritative definition, the use of the WMD term has been far from being consistent. As will become apparent from the literature review conducted for this thesis, a majority of authors did not consider radiological weapons to be part of the WMD category and when they discussed WMD, they meant nuclear, biological and chemical weapons (NBC) only. The troubles associated with WMD terminology as well as critique of the joint grouping of very different weapons will be therefore discussed in the following sections.

1.2. Inconsistency in the use of the WMD term

One of the biggest problems regarding the "weapons of mass destruction" – as was apparent from the majority of studied literature – is complete lack of consensus on the term's meaning. For illustration, "U.S. Government entities had adopted nearly 20 alternative definitions for WMD, and this did not count additional definitions used by international organizations or state governments" (Carus, 2012: 1). By the late 1990s, the term "WMD" was already an integral part not only of the American security discourse (as evident by its growing usage[3]) (Carus, 2012: 1), but within NATO as well. However, as Carus (2012: 1) notes, there is - despite the extensive use of the term within the past two decades - a "widespread perception that it has no accepted definition and that it means whatever the user wants it to mean". He presents a following quote by one academic as a representative statement of this view: "The phrase "weapons of mass destruction", for example, is an amorphous one, changing meaning according to the whims of the speaker. Raising the spectre of WMD is more a way by which politicians assign blame or take a stand on seemingly objective

[2] Because the Soviet Union voted against this definition, its submission to the Security Council in 1948 was blocked. The WMD definition from 1948 was formally accepted as late as in 1977 (Carus, 2012: 10).

[3] Seth Carus (2012: 3) conducted a full text search of the *New York Times* database, in which he searched for the articles mentioning the term WMD. As he identified, between late 1950s and the1960s the "WMD" was involved in circa 20 articles in average per year. However, after the end of the Cold War, the term saw increasing usage. In the late 1990s, the term appeared in average in 160 articles per year, while the most frequent use of the "WMD" was during and after the 2003 Iraq invasion – as demonstrated by 1,069 stories in 2003.

moral standards than a way by which they assess a particular weapon system" (Moeller, 2004: 28). As Carus (2012: 4) rightly asserts, many analysts find existing definitions problematic, therefore they either propose a new definition or they consider the traditional definitions for weapons of mass destructions intellectually problematic, and therefore they want to drop the term "WMD" altogether.

The proponents of this radical approach towards the WMD argue that the conflation caused by common practice of lumping nuclear, biological and chemical weapons together is dangerous. "It is misleading from the technological viewpoint, and it renders the term vulnerable to political manipulations (Enemark, 2011: 382). It is argued that the language of WMD obscures the superior threat of nuclear weapons, exaggerates the destructive power of chemical weapons and does not help in the context of biological weapons (ibid.). Christian Enemark, who is one of the proponents, also argues that in the "areas of deterrence, defence, and non-proliferation, WMD-based language can mischaracterize the challenges that are uniquely associated with each weapon type" (Enemark, 2011: 382). Based on these arguments, he concludes that it would be better if the term "weapons of mass destruction" is abandoned altogether (Enemark, 2011: 397). However, a number of authors does not share the same opinion about the abandonment of the WMD term. For example, Michelle Bentley, whose work shall be introduced later, responded with the following: "As long as the value remains – as long as WMD is an effective resource for policymakers to shape security policy – there is little chance of being able to abandon the WMD concept in the foreseeable future" (Bentley, 2012: 384).

Nonetheless, while the call for the abandonment of the WMD term was not reiterated very often within the studied literature, the usefulness of the term WMD as a useful analytical unit was frequently questioned. For example, Neil Narang (2015: 457) asserts that the "popular use of the term "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD) can be understood to imply a relationship between nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons proliferation insofar as it assumes that the separate weapons technologies can be usefully grouped together into a single analytic category". However, such assumptions – if not proved to be correct – can have dangerously misguided policy implications and therefore, caution is necessary (Narang, 2015: 466). Additionally, there are authors who have worked with the WMD term before, however, they changed their minds about the usefulness of the term and thus decided to drop it, as demonstrated by the following example. It was found particularly interesting that the book written by Joseph Cirincione, Jon Wolfsthal and

Miriam Rajkumar called *"Deadly Arsenals: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Threats"* from the year 2005 no longer employed the term WMD. Yet the previous edition from the year 2002, called *"Deadly Arsenals: Tracking Weapons of Mass Destruction",* as obvious from the title, did. The authors themselves comment the change with the following: "Though used widely by officials and the media, this phrase conflates very different threats from weapons that differ greatly, consequence of use, and the availability of measures that can protect against them" (Cirincione et al., 2005: 26). However, at his point, it should be noted that majority of authors of the studied literature (Bentley, 2012, 2013, 2014; Oren and Solomon, 2013, 2015; Shamai, 2015; Maurer, 2009; Blix, 2006 and other sources) who have been using the WMD term was perfectly aware of the dangers posed by the conflation of such different weapons into one single category.

Additionally, even government officials are aware of the existing disagreements regarding the definition and understanding of the WMD term as illustrated by the comment offered by the British government review of Iraq WMD intelligence in 2004: "There is considerable and long-standing academic debate about the proper interpretation of the phrase "weapons of mass destruction". We have some sympathy with the view that, whatever its origin, the phrase and accompanying abbreviation is now used so variously as to confuse rather than enlighten readers" (Baron Butler of Brockwell, 2004: 3). While Carus (2012: 5) rejects this argument, by asserting that there in fact is an authoritative definition of WMD generated by the United Nations in 1948, another group of authors – those who look at the term of WMD through interpretative and constructivist angle (Bentley, Oren and Solomon, Shamai etc.) – are of a different opinion. Given the objectives of this thesis, it is precisely the outlook of this group that is particularly interesting.

1.3. WMD as a social construct

Michelle Bentley's articles (2012, 2013) and especially Bentley's book (2014) *"Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Foreign Policy: The strategic use of the concept"* were important sources of information that influenced understanding of the term WMD as utilized in this thesis. Bentley argues that despite the significance of the WMD concept, the current understanding of WMD is flawed. According to her, previous analyses aimed at identifying conception of WMD are inaccurate, because it is impossible to reduce the meaning to a single interpretation, i.e. definition (Bentley, 2013: 69). Bentley argues that the definition of weapons of mass destruction is not fixed, because different weapons can be included into the category – and therefore be considered as mass destructive – at different times (ibid.). To her, the variations of the WMD concept are the product

of strategic construction, as illustrated by the following statement: "Distinct versions of meaning emerge as actors seek to define the concept in ways that best serve their own political ambitions" (Bentley, 2013: 69). Simply put, "WMD is not merely an expression of extreme threat, but a strategic resource" (Bentley, 2013: 69). To Bentley, the real question is not whether there is or is not a sufficient conceptual specification to underpin the categorization of WMD, but "rather what an actor intends the concept to mean, how is it politically constructed, and for what purpose" (Bentley, 2013: 74). Bentley then applies this logic in her analysis in order to find out, how has the usage of WMD concept changed over time in the United States and what were the (strategic) reasons behind it. This is not dissimilar from the primary aim of this diploma thesis and that is why Bentley's analysis proved to be a great inspiration.

The approach of Ido Oren and Ty Solomon (2013, 2015) follows similar logic to Michelle Bentley. The authors focus primarily on George W. Bush administration's justification of invasion to Iraq based on the assertion that Saddam Hussein's regime possessed weapons of mass destruction. Oren and Solomon (2013: 109) assess that during 2002-2003, when the phrase 'weapons of mass destruction' was ceaselessly repeated, hardly anyone stopped and asked: "What does WMD mean anyway"? Additionally, they argue that the incessant incantation of the phrase 'weapons of mass destruction' first by government officials, then by media and finally by the public, "successfully obscured the historically variable, ambiguous, and contested meanings of the concept, creating the illusion that WMD was a firm, stable, and self-evident signifier of a pre-existing danger" (Oren and Solomon, 2013: 111). Finally, the authors understand Bush administration's claim that Iraq had WMD not as an actual description of an Iraqi threat but rather as a rhetorical way of constructing and inflating such a threat (Oren and Solomon, 2013: 128). Oren and Solomon (2013: 134) conclude their analysis with the following quote: "Figures of speech do not merely describe the truth, they constitute it". This point of view is in accordance with the securitization theory, which is based on the speech act theory - as developed by Austin (1962) and Searle (1969) - that says that language has performative character, i.e. "by saying the words, something is done" (Buzan et al., 1998: 26; Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 25).

There is, of course, another approach towards WMD that focuses on the norms, stigmatization of weapons of mass destruction and on the following taboo regarding their use. Two authors, who have written renowned works on the normative separation of WMD, are the representatives of this approach – While Richard Price (1995) focused on the chemical weapons taboo, Nina Tannenwald

(1999) studied how nuclear weapons became stigmatized and how this normative stigma has caused that nuclear weapons were not used since 1945. The underlining logic behind this approach is this: "Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons – Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD)[4] - are distinct from any other contemporary weapon of war. All three also differ greatly from each other in the mechanism and scale of their effects. Collective stigmatization is the characteristics that all three share" (Shamai, 2015: 104). Not only all three categories of weapons are framed as inhumane given their potential of causing mass destruction, they are also viewed with horror and revulsion (Shamai, 2015: 105). In 2006, WMD Commission used in its report the sense of stigmatization as a tool of overcoming problematic differences between the categories of weapons constituting WMD and also to retain the classification (Bentley, 2013: 73). The report (Blix, 2006: 23) went: "…all three categories [nuclear, biological and chemical] fall under the same stigma, which makes it logical to deal with them as a group". In this fashion, the WMD have been clearly marked as a different, thus having political leverage as such (Bentley, 2013: 73). Nonetheless, there is usefulness in that as argued by Patricia Shamai (2015: 105), who asserts that the awareness of the increasing threats posed by WMD intensifies the relevance and importance of maintaining the categorization of weapons of mass destruction as "naming these weapons as distinct maintains global attention and efforts to prevent the threats posed by the development, use and proliferation of these weapons".

In this thesis, the weapons of mass destruction are treated not as fixed concept, but as – to a certain degree – flexible and dynamic construction whose meaning is derived from the strategic intentions of political actors. In this regard, the author of this thesis associates herself mostly with the thoughts of Michelle Bentley, yet she has slightly different opinion regarding the flexibility of the WMD term. While accepting that 'weapons of mass destruction' are open to certain conceptual changes – based on the security circumstances and strategic interests of the political actors, who are in the position to shape the meaning; the author believes that the concept's understanding is not as flexible as some authors presume and "WMD" certainly does not mean whatever the user wants it to mean. As will be demonstrated through the analysis of NATO's official discourse, the meaning

[4] This is a one of the examples regarding the previous discussion about existence of different definition of what is constituted as weapon of mass destruction in practice. As already mentioned, a number of academics and practitioners equate WMD with NBC (nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons), not CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons).

of ‘weapons of mass destruction’ within the Alliance does not change “according to the whims of the speaker” (Moeller, 2004: 28) and when NATO refers to WMD, it has very concrete weapons in mind (i.e. NBC/CBRN). Additionally, the author shares Patricia Shamai’s opinion regarding the usefulness of maintaining the categorization of WMD, as it – as will be argued throughout the analysis of NATO’s official documents – indeed helps in maintaining the focus and necessary resources of the international community on the threats posed by these dangerous weapons. On the other hand, while the joint categorization of WMD may have some advantages, it would be foolish and potentially dangerous to consider chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons as equal. Each weapon type differs greatly from the other in “terms of modes of production and deployment, predictability and lethality of effect, and effective response measures” (Enemark, 2011: 384).

The following section will thus address the critique of the WMD concept – in which the criticism of conflating different weapons into one joint category stands particularly high – as well as will discuss the characteristics of each CBRN weapons. Additionally, as will be apparent from the conducted analysis, NATO does refer to WMD as a joint category, but also refers to each weapon type individually. Therefore, it is necessary to be familiar with the differences amongst the weapons of mass destruction.

1.4. WMD as a category of weapons

1.4.1. Critique of WMD concept

As was already mentioned, WMD is widely recognized as a problematic concept. As such, it has been subjected to criticism from many sides. It is important to familiarize ourselves with the most problematic and criticized aspects of the WMD concept/category.

The conceptual meaning of WMD has been principally linked to the capacity by certain weapons to cause mass destruction – “that is, the vast levels of destructive effect associated with these weapons justify their classification as a separate and discrete category of armament” (Bentley 2014: 8). This is, however, highly problematic, because there is no clear measure what constitutes a “mass destruction”. For example, NATO defines WMD as a “weapon that is capable of a high order of destruction and of being used in such a manner as to destroy people, infrastructure or other resources on a large scale” (NATO, 2012a). But conventional weapons can clearly cause high order of destruction and destroy people, infrastructure or other resources on a large scale as well. So what

does separate the damage inflicted on Hamburg or Tokyo during World War II from the destructiveness of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima or Nagasaki (Carus, 2012: 37)? Bentley (2014: 8) argues that "understanding of the WMD have assumed more abstract and instinctive approach to measuring effect".

Another issue with the WMD concept is that it excludes conventional weapons. Based on the assumption that mass destruction is what conventional weapons cannot achieve, it is imperative to separate WMD from conventional weaponry (Bentley, 2014: 14). However, conventional weapons can cause mass destruction and mass casualties as well. Carus (2012: 41) argues, that "conventional armaments used in sufficient quantity by organized military forces can cause mass casualties, creating effects similar to those of nuclear weapons". To illustrate this point, during the firebombing of Hamburg in July and August 1943, estimated 50,000 people died (Carus, 2012: 41). It is estimated that 64, 000 people died during the nuclear strike on Nagasaki on 9 August, 1945 (Atomic archive, 2016). From the numbers of casualties, it is seen that even conventional weapons can, indeed, cause mass destruction. There is no better example to demonstrate the potential lethality of small arms and primitive weapons than the 1994 Rwandan genocide. "More than 800,000 people died in only 13 weeks, or around 8,000 people a day, many through use of weapons no more advanced than machetes" (Carus, 2012: 42). Additionally, former UN Secretary General Kofi Annan reacted on the approximately 500,000 deaths caused by small arms every year in the following way: "In terms of the carnage they cause, small arms, indeed, could well be described as 'weapons of mass destruction'" (UN, 2006: 1). Landmines are another example of conventional weapon with extreme and widespread impact, as obvious from the fact, that they have been often dubbed as "weapons of mass destruction in slow motion" (Bentley, 2013: 71). It has been, therefore, often argued that CBRN cannot be differentiated from mass-scale conventional attacks given the significant overlap in destructive effect (ibid.).

Problems also exist in attempts to classify WMD based on them being more barbaric in effect, indiscriminate or inherently immoral, compared to conventional weapons (Bentley, 2013: 71). In all these categories, WMD are viewed as distinct. However, there is a number of arguments, that are countering these assumptions. Regarding the barbaric effect, Ronald Higgins (2002: 3) argues: "However dreadful, a death from poison gas or smallpox is not obviously more horrific than a fiery death from napalm or through multiple lacerations from antipersonnel landmines or carpet-bombing". Concerning the indiscriminate character of WMD, for example conventional devices

such as landmines are generally considered to be indiscriminate as well (ICRC, 2016). Also, regarding the morality of weapons, Bentley (2013: 72) argues that it is "hard to see a moral distinction between being killed by gas and being blown up". Based on these arguments, some analysts conclude that the distinction regarding the WMD and conventional weapons is flawed (ibid.). Conversely, while talking about the issue of morality of use - there exists an intrinsic separation in how attacks with the use of WMD are perceived. "The immorality associated with these weapons means that their use cannot be tolerated or justified within the international system; they are taboo (Bentley, 2014: 20). This precise perception of WMD is believed to be the reason behind the creation of international arms control regimes that established the illegality of the WMD use (ibid.). Additionally, these agreements – such as Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty or Chemical Weapons Convention – are considered to represent the development of stigma surrounding WMD (Bentley, 2014: 20). The collective stigmatization of NBC/CBRN weapons is used, as was already discussed, as a reason by many analysts to keep the distinct categorization of WMD.

One of the biggest critiques towards the WMD stems from the joint categorization of very different weapons. As Bentley (2013: 70) argues, "it is unclear how such diverse weapons can be jointly classified as distinct concern". If CBRN are compared, the 'disparity of effect' is revealed (ibid.). Levels of destruction caused by each separate form of WMD are claimed to be not equivalent and not sufficient to justify the WMD label (Bentley, 2014: 9). While the nuclear weapons are widely viewed as mass destructive, the likelihood that the non-nuclear WMD will inflict comparable destruction is a subject to dispute (ibid.). The disparity of effect, however, has important strategic consequences, as it can lead to serious miscalculation in threat perception. The adherence to the concept presumes that all WMD pose the same level of destructive threat (Bentley, 2014: 14). According to George Perkovich (2004: 9): "If people lose the distinctions among "WMD" and begin to see "WMD" itself as the brand, then the heretofore less valuable chemical and biological categories begin to earn the same fear-respect-value as previously unrivalled nuclear weapons". However, this is very dangerous in the sphere of deterrence, defence and non-proliferation as it mischaracterizes challenges, that are uniquely associated with each type of weapon (Enemark, 2011: 382). Such mischaracterization can, however, generate unfortunate security consequences in case this leads to implementation of flawed countermeasures (ibid.).

As apparent from this short introduction regarding the criticism of the WMD concept, it is indeed a complex issue. The differences between the distinct types of weapons were most vocally

criticized. Bearing that in mind, as well as realizing that "development of accurate threat assessments and effective national policies requires understanding of the technologies of various types of weapons" (Cirincione, 2005: 5), the next section shall be dedicated to short introduction of the four categories (CBRN) of weapons of mass destruction.

1.4.2. Characteristics of Weapons of Mass Destruction

As was already mentioned, weapons of mass destruction include chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons (CBRN). Their common denominator is enormous dangerousness, massive effectiveness based on their character, exploitability and fatal consequences for unprepared population (Fusek, 2003: 5). Because WMD can inflict death and destruction on such a massive scale, the dangers posed by WMD occupy central stage in international politics.

Despite some popular misconceptions, chemical and biological warfare is not a new method of waging war. Indeed, it has been employed since ancient times. However, with advancement of technology over time, the development and use of biological and chemical weapons has advanced significantly as well. Chemical weapons in the primitive form of poisoned arrows and spears have been used for thousands of years, but the range of chemical agents developed in the 20th greatly expanded the ability of nations – and terrorists – to wage chemical warfare on a new and larger scale (Lowther, 2008: 98). During the World War I, poison gas was used for the first time in history as both the Central Powers and the Allies tried attacks with chlorine gas, mustard gas and other agents in order to break the trench warfare stalemate (Cirincione et al., 2005: 4). Similarly, the use of biological weapons, which was once limited to catapulting plague infected corpses over castle walls, evolved with scientists developing new and more devastating strains of biological organisms (Lowther, 2008: 98). At the beginning of World War II, Japan used biological warfare in its attacks against the Chinese, as they spread cholera, typhoid, plague and anthrax (Harris, 2002). The harnessing of the atom in the 1940s changed the nature of war forever. Nuclear weapons were used for the first and last time during the final stage of World War II, when the United States dropped the bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 6 and 9, 1945, respectively. As with chemical and biological weapons, nuclear weapons technology advanced since then as well (Lowther, 2008: 98).

1.4.2.1. Chemical weapons

The traditional definition regards chemical weapons as a toxic chemical that is contained in a delivery system, such as a bomb or a shell (OPCW, 2016a). Chemical weapons use the toxic properties of chemical substances in order to cause physical and psychological damage to an enemy (Cirincione, 2005: 7). The toxic chemicals that have been used as chemical weapons, or have been developed for such use, are generally categorised, based on their physiological effects on human body, as choking, blister, blood and nerve agents (OPCW, 2016a). Choking agents (also known as pulmonary agents), amongst which the most famous ones are chlorine and phosgene, enter the body primarily via inhalation and they function by disrupting normal breathing (UPMC, 2014). Blister agents (or vesicants), such as mustard and lewisite, act via inhalation and contact with skin (Bagley, 2009: 111). As the name suggest, they cause large, painful and often life-threating skin blisters which resemble severe burns (OPCW, 2016b). Blood agents, like hydrogen cyanide, generally enter the body via inhalation and they are distributed via the blood. As they inhibit the ability of blood cells to utilise and transfer oxygen, they effectively cause the body to suffocate (OPCW, 2016c). Lastly, the nerve agents – such as sarin, soman, or VX – interfere with the nervous system and they can cause death primarily due to respiratory arrest (Bagley, 2009: 111). They are highly toxic and have rapid effects (within minutes) when absorbed both through skin or via respiration (OPCW, 2016d).

The experience of horrifying chemical warfare during the World War I led to the 1925 Geneva Protocol[5] that forbids the use of chemical and biological agents in war (UNODA, 2016a). The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction (CWC), which reinforces aspects of the Geneva Conventions, entered into force in 1997. As the name suggests, CWC aims to eliminate an entire category of WMD by "prohibiting the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention, transfer or use of chemical weapons" by, currently 188, states parties (OPCW, 2016e). The CWC is administered by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), which promotes and verifies[6] adherence to the Convention.

[5] The full name of Geneva Protocol, that entered into force in 1928, is "Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare" (UNODA, 2016a).

[6] The verification mechanism consists of both evaluations of declarations by member states and on-site inspections (OPCW, 2016e).

1.4.2.2. Biological weapons

Biological weapons are complex systems that disseminate agents or toxins to harm or kill humans, animals or plants (UNOG, 2016). They generally consist of two parts – a weaponized agent and a delivery mechanism. Biological weapons are divided into two categories: pathogens and toxins. Pathogens are living infectious organisms, that cause disease or illness in their host, and they include bacteria (causing anthrax, plague, cholera or tularemia), viruses (causing smallpox), rickettsiae (causing epidemic typhus or Rocky Mountain spotted fever) and fungi (Bagley, 2009: 111; UNOG, 2016). Toxins are chemical substances of biological origin, produced from the metabolic processes of living organisms, i.e. microorganisms, fungi, plants and animals (Hrdina et al., 2004). They can be produced either naturally or synthetically, and they range in effect from disabling to acutely toxic (Bagley, 2009: 111). Botulinum toxins are the most toxic compounds known with its lethal dose being at 1 $ng.kg^{-1}$ (Měrka, 2004: 154). Botulinum toxin is also 100,000 times more toxic than sarin; consequently, it is also one of the most feared potential bioweapons (ibid.).

Recognizing the dangers posed by biological weapons, the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction – more commonly known as the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) – was opened for signature in 1972 and entered into force three years later, in 1975 (UNODA, 2016b). The BTWC, that has currently 178 states parties, is the first multilateral disarmament treaty that bans production and use of an entire category of weapons; however, so far no agreement has been reached –despite significant efforts - on a verification regime that would monitor compliance with the Convention (Blix, 2006: 34).

1.4.2.3. Radiological weapons

"The purpose of a radiological weapon is to disperse radioactive materials or emit ionizing radiation from a stationary or mobile radioactive source that has not been dispersed into many pieces" (Fergusson and Smith, 2009: 23). One type of radiological weapons is the so called "dirty bomb", which uses conventional explosives in order to spread radioactive material, most commonly the highly radioactive waste material from nuclear power reactors or other non-weapon source (e.g. radioactive medical waste) (Cirincione, 2005: 9). While the authoritative UN definition includes radiological weapons into the WMD category, there is an ongoing debate regarding the potential of radiological weapons to cause mass casualties or mass destruction. As U.S. Nuclear

Regulatory Commission (NRC) (2014) argues: "Most RDDs [Radiological Dispersal Devices] would not release enough radiation to kill people or cause severe illness – the conventional explosive itself would be more harmful to individuals than the radioactive material". The U.S. NRC thus does not consider a dirty bomb as a weapon of mass destruction, but rather as a "weapon of mass disruption", where contamination and anxiety are the terrorists' major objectives.

1.4.2.4. Nuclear weapons

"A nuclear weapon is a device with explosive energy, most or all of which is derived from fission or combination of fission and fusion processes" (Cirincione, 2005: 6). Explosions from such devices cause destruction due to the high temperatures and ground shocks, which are produced by the initial blast, and the lasting residual radiation (ibid.). Nuclear weapons are the deadliest weapons ever invented – the only "true" weapons of mass destruction according to many analysts (Cirincione, 2005: 6). A single nuclear weapon can destroy a whole city, potentially killing millions of people, and endangers the natural environment and lives of future generations given its long-term effects (UNODA, 2016c). Although nuclear weapons have only been used twice in warfare, at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, about 22,000 reportedly still remain today and there have been over 2,000 nuclear tests conducted to date (ibid.).

While disarmament is the best protection against dangers posed by nuclear weapons, achieving this goal has been far from easy (ibid.). A number of multilateral treaties have been established in order to fulfil this objective. The most famous one amongst them is the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) that seeks "to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament" (UNODA, 2016c). The Treaty entered into force in 1975 and was extended indefinitely in 1995. A total of 190 parties have joined the NPT, including the five nuclear-weapon states United States, Russia, China, France and United Kingdom (Blix, 2006: 34).

2. Theoretical and Analytical Framework

2.1. Securitization theory

This thesis is theoretically based on the securitization theory as formulated by the so-called Copenhagen School (CS) of security studies. Securitization theory emerged in the 1990s as a result of contemporary debate about the focus and direction of security studies after the end of the Cold War[7]. Military focused and state-centred views of traditionalists clashed with the views of wideners, who were dissatisfied with the narrow focus of security studies on military issues and nuclear weapons as was apparent during the Cold War. Instead, this group of scholars called for 'widening' and 'deepening' of the concept of security, i.e. incorporation of other security dimensions apart from military ones (i.e. political, societal, economic and environmental) and addressing referent objects other than states (e.g. nation, rain forests, the liberal international economic order etc.). The Copenhagen School, associated mostly with Barry Buzan and Ole Wæver, took part in this debate. The CS dismissed the "idea that security issues have any objective essence and thus only need to be 'discovered'" (Zakopalová, 2012: 1) and instead offered a radically constructivist approach towards the concept of security (Buzan et al., 1998: 4). According to the securitization theory, security is not something given, but something that is socially constructed. Security can be thus defined as "a self-referential practice, because it is in this practice that the issue becomes a security issue – not necessarily because a real existential threat exists but because the issue is presented as such a threat" (Buzan et al., 1998: 24). The process of bringing an issue from a non-politicized or politicized stage into the securitized (i.e. the issue has been presented as an existential threat, thus requiring extraordinary measures) stage is called securitization (Buzan et al., 1998: 23). In the process of securitization, a securitizing actor adopts 'speech acts' (i.e. utterances that label something as a security issue), designates the threat to a specific referent object and declares the existential threat, thus claiming the right to use extraordinary means or break normal rules for security reasons, i.e. to tackle the threat (Buzan et al., 1998; Buzan and Wæver, 2003).

[7] For a better understanding of the debate, see, for instance: Stephen M. Walt (1991) 'The Renaissance of Security Studies', *International Studies Quarterly*, 35(2): 211-239; Edward A. Kolodziej (1992) 'Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!', *International Studies Quarterly*, 36(4): 421-438; Keith Krause and Michael C. Williams (1996) 'Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods' *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40(2): 229-254 etc.

Thus, the speech act is based on a distinction of three main types of units, that are involved in a security analysis: 1) *referent objects*, i.e. who or what is said to be existentially threatened and has a legitimate claim to survival (traditionally state, or in a hidden way, nation) , 2) *securitizing actors* are those who securitize the issues by declaring that a referent object is existentially threatened (traditionally political leaders, governments etc.), and 3) *functional actors*, i.e. those who affect the dynamics of a sector by influencing decisions in that given field (military, political, environmental etc.) (Buzan et al., 1998: 36).

However, we should be aware of the fact, that the discourse in which something is presented as an existential threat to a specified referent object does not by itself create a securitization. This is called a securitizing move. The issue is successfully securitized only if and when an audience accepts the security argument and thus allows securitizing actor to use exceptional and extraordinary means, which may break established rules, in order to deal with the threat (Buzan et al., 1998).

To study securitization, one needs to understand the processes of how shared understanding of what is considered as an existential threat is constructed. The process of securitization can be equated to what is called in the language theory as a 'speech act': "it is not interesting as a sign referring to something more real; it is the utterance itself that is the act" (Buzan et al., 1998). Simply put, by saying the words, something is being done.

In accordance with what is said above, what can be studied in practice is the following: *Who securitizes (i.e. who can do or speak security successfully)? Which issues (i.e. threats)? On behalf of whom or for what (i.e. referent objects)? Why? Under which conditions (what explains when securitization is successful)? With what results?* (Buzan et al., 1998: 32) Nevertheless, it should be noted that just saying security is not enough; "what is essential is the designation of existential threat requiring emergency action or special measures and the acceptance of that designation by a significant audience" (Buzan et al., 1998: 27). Though Copenhagen School does not offer any explicit explanations for questions of *Who wins? Why? And when?* (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 26), it assumes, however, that there are certain features of the speech act that function as the "facilitating conditions". By facilitating conditions, the CS means circumstances under which the speech act works, compared to cases in which it does not (Buzan et al., 1998: 32). There are three main facilitating conditions for securitization. First, the speech act has to follow the grammar of security, meaning that it constructs a plot which includes an existential threat as a threat to the survival of a

referent object, point of no return and a "securitized" way out. Second, the securitizing actor has to hold a position of authority from which the security speech act can be made. Third, it is more likely to securitize an issue, that is generally viewed as a threatening – be they tanks, polluted water or – as is the case in this thesis - weapons of mass destruction (Buzan et al., 1998: 32-33).

According to Lene Hansen (2006: 31), the successful securitization, however, brings along responsibility of the securitizing actor for answering the existential threats, that have been constructed as such. Once on the political agenda, the securitizing actors cannot turn their back on threats to national or international security without re-articulating the situation first in such a manner that it is no longer considered as a matter of 'security'; in Copenhagen School's words – de-securitizing it (ibid.). For Copenhagen School, 'security' is seen as a negative thing. It is viewed as a failure to deal with the issue in the realms of normal politics (Buzan et al., 1998: 29). Desecuritization is thus seen as the optimal option in the long run, since it means that issues are no longer phrased as existential threats against which exceptional countermeasures have to be adopted, but it means that the issues could be dealt with in the ordinary public sphere (ibid.).

While the securitization theory as developed by Copenhagen School is the suitable theoretical tool for this thesis given its objective – to map how has the construction and understanding of WMD threat evolved in NATO and what was the Alliance's response to the evolving threat – it should be noted that the CS's securitization theory has a number of shortcomings. First, Copenhagen School's theory has been often criticized for the lack of clarity, or vagueness, regarding the 'audience' (Balzacq, 2011; Stritzel, 2007; Dunn Cavelty, 2008 etc.). Securitization moves are only successful if and when an audience accepts such security argument – however, it is to a great extent unclear "which audience has to accept what argument, to what degree, and for how long" (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 26). Secondly, securitization theory as developed by Copenhagen School has been criticized for the "undertheorized role of the social sphere, i.e. context, in which the process of securitization takes place" (Zakopalová, 2012: 1). It has been argued that the framework does not consider how the existing social context affects the securitization's dynamics and its potential success (ibid.). Additionally, the understanding of securitization within Copenhagen School implies that anything labelled as a security issue must be dealt with in an exceptional and urgent manner (Charrett, 2009: 18). This logic, according to Charrett (2009: 18), feeds into dominant (i.e. realist) discourses of how security issues are to be managed, as it does not allow for the security threats to be dealt with in any other way. Moreover, CS's very specific

understanding of security – as an exceptional form of politics – has been criticized as well, as "the threshold defining security is extremely high and consequently, one may find only very few cases of 'truly securitized' issues" (Zakopalová, 2012: 4). Consequently, the critique of the Copenhagen School's securitization theory led to re-conceptualization of the theory from a number of scholars (so called second generation of securitization scholars – e.g. Balzacq 2010, 2011; Stritzel 2007 etc.).

While being aware of the critique, this thesis employs the securitization theory as developed by Copenhagen School as it explains how security threats emerge and evolve and therefore allows to investigate the way in which WMD have been increasingly (re)framed as security threat in NATO since the beginning of the 1990s. Additionally, as will be discussed in the following section, this thesis goes beyond securitization theory and focuses also on the actual policy and security measures that were approved by the Alliance in order to deal with the evolving threat.

2.2. Analytical Framework

2.2.1. Methods

In the previous section, securitization theory and its basic tenets as developed by the Copenhagen School was introduced. As already mentioned, the way to study securitization is through analysis of relevant texts, which is precisely what will be done in this thesis through employing the qualitative content analysis methodology. However, in order to explain what qualitative content analysis is, it is necessary to focus first on the content analysis in general. The best way to explain content analysis is by contrasting it with another method with which it has lot in common, yet there are significant differences – a discourse analysis.

The objective of content analysis is to clarify the ways people "use or manipulate symbols to invest communication with meaning" (Hermann, 2008:151). This is actually not far from what a discourse analysis tries to achieve as well. Both methods are very much concerned with drawing conclusions from a set of texts (Balzacq, 2011: 51). However, "while content analysis concentrates on the text as an independent entity, discourse analysis focuses on the situated and social aspects of the text; in other words, the text emerges out of an intersubjective context" (Balzacq, 2011: 51). Therefore, a discourse analysis is interested in the reaction, which studied text provokes in a given audience as well, while content analysis is not (ibid.).

Both content analysis and discourse analysis use very similar range of data and the decision to select one type of data is dependent upon the research question. In fact, both methods use data that convey meaning; these are generally called as "texts" (Balzacq, 2011: 51).

The biggest difference between these two methods, however, lies in the logic of enquiry. "While discourse analysis insists on the constructed character of the meaning generated by the analyst, content analysis hold that the meaning of the text can be fixed and, if well coded, be retrieved via replication by other investigators" (Balzacq, 2011: 51). Simply put, while discourse analysis operates inductively, content analysis proceeds deductively. In other words, content analysis views the meaning of the text as constant and stable across time and place, which allows in turn for occurrences of words, or other larger units of texts, to be assumed equivalent and thus counted (Balzacq, 2011; Hardy et al., 2004).

While content analysis that uses predominantly quantitative methodology, i.e. results of the analysis can be tested with statistics, there are versions of content analysis that are much more similar to discourse analysis than expected. These are "more qualitative forms of content analysis that do not assume highly stable meaning of words but, rather, include a sensitivity to the usage of words and the context in which they are used" (Hardy et al., 2004: 20). The decision to employ either quantitative or qualitative version of content analysis depends on what we study. In fact, "if the investigator looks for the presence or absence of "securitization frame" in materials under scrutiny" (Balzacq, 2011: 51), which is what this work also intends to do, it is better to use qualitative method. Additionally, while the focus of quantitative content analysis is on the manifest meaning of the chosen texts, qualitative content analysis allows to study the latent and more context-dependent meaning (Schreier, 2013: 170). Furthermore, unlike other qualitative methods for data analysis - discourse analysis included - qualitative content analysis helps to reduce the amount of material (ibid.). "It requires the researcher to focus on selected aspects of meaning, namely those aspects that relate to the overall research question" (Schreier, 2013: 170). Content analysis, in fact, rarely analyses documents, i.e. interview, speech, as a whole (Balzacq, 2011: 51). "What is coded, instead, are more manageable units such as words, sentences, paragraphs or themes, extracted from the materials that the researcher has available" (ibid.). In turn, the coding itself is derived from how research questions have been defined.

2.2.2. Operationalization

The qualitative content analysis is a very useful method for the purposes of this thesis, as it allows to study the official discourse of NATO as an indicator of understanding of WMD within the Alliance. While the methodology itself was introduced in the previous section, the aim of this part is to explain how exactly the content analysis will be employed in this work.

As was already written, it is the research question that guides what will be precisely studied in the analysed texts. It is, therefore, important at this point to reiterate research questions: 1) *How has the construction and interpretation of WMD threat evolved in NATO since 1991 until today?* and 2) *What were the specific measures undertaken by NATO in response to evolving WMD threat?* Additionally, the chosen theory is equally important as it underlines the overall outlook of the thesis. Theoretically, this research is based on securitization theory as developed by Copenhagen School as it is "the approach most closely associated with issues of threat construction in political science" (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 24). Securitization theory also provides a concrete list of variables, that can be studied in practice: *Who securitizes? Which issues? For whom or what? Under which conditions? With what results?* (Buzan et al., 1998: 32). According to Dunn Cavelty (2008: 25) - whose work, dealing with how and why cyber-threats came to be considered one of the classic security threats of modern times in the U.S. history, was a great inspiration for the analytical framework applied in this thesis – "by naming these variables, the approach delivers the basic components to work with when studying threat politics". By threat politics, Dunn Cavelty (2008: 24) means "the political process by which threats are moved onto and removed from the political agenda or which alters the face of threats on the political agenda". In order to truly capture the specifics of threat politics, one needs to employ two-phased approach. While the first phase focuses on the initial framing and securitization move, "until the issue has made its way 'successfully' onto the agenda and elicits its first policy response", the second phase starts when the issue at hand is "on the agenda and subsequently begins to undergo change" (Dunn Cavelty, 2008: 24). Given the chosen topic of this thesis – weapons of mass destruction – to focus on the first phase does not make much sense, since we already know that WMD were successfully securitized already in the 1940s. In fact, "WMD has always been a political priority; indeed, this distinction was a fundamental aspect of the concept itself" (Bentley, 2014: 76) given the destructive potential of the weapons. But it is the second phase that is particularly interesting and it is precisely what this thesis wants to find out, as it corresponds with the primary research question. Additionally, as inspired

by Dunn Cavelty's work, it is especially interesting to find out what is the nature of security measures that were drafted by relevant securitizing actor – in this case NATO – in order to counter the threat(s). In the words of Myriam Dunn Cavelty (2008: 26): "By focusing on security as a practice with an outcome, I will gain additional insights into the variety of countermeasures in place to counter modern threats". This corresponds to objective of second research question, which aims to identify the specific measures undertaken by NATO in response to evolving WMD threat.

Based on the premises of securitization theory and inspired by the above mentioned framework as developed by Myriam Dunn Cavelty, and by adopting an interpretative rather than causal logic, the research – while applying qualitative content analysis – proceeds in this way. The first stage entailed a close examination of NATO's texts representative of the "weapons of mass destruction" discourse. The primary data will be introduced in detail in the following section; nonetheless, they consisted of Strategic Concepts, Summit Communiqués, concrete policy frameworks, and other relevant official materials, issued since 1991 until now, 2016 – which is also the temporal limitation of this analysis. Since the aim of this thesis is to find out how has the construction and interpretation of WMD threat evolved in NATO over time, each text was first examined with aim to find usages/utterances of the term 'weapons of mass destruction', 'WMD', 'CBRN', 'NBC' etc. Once the relevant passages in the texts using WMD or WMD-related language were identified through primary reading, during secondary reading the author focused on finding answers, in the relevant passages that discussed WMD, to the following questions:

- Which technologies are constructed as WMD?
- What exactly constitutes the threat?
- Who or what is threatened by WMD?
- Who is considered to be the agent responsible behind the threat(s)?
- What should be done in order to deal with the identified threat(s) and which specific strategies and/or measures are drafted in response?

Through answering each of these specific questions, a very good understanding of how has the construction and interpretation of WMD threats within NATO evolved as well as how the Alliance responds to the progressing WMD threat (i.e. which concrete countermeasures were approved) is gained. Additionally, since the official NATO documents that will be analysed are always reacting to what is happening in the world at the moment, it is necessary to focus attention on the context in which the analysed texts occur. At this point, it will be also considered whether there have been

any events (such as terrorist attacks, crises or change in administration) that have occurred in between two analysed texts and that could have had significant impact on the understanding of WMD threat. It is, therefore, necessary to take context into account.

Subsequently, all these above mentioned questions, as well as taking into account the context in which the analysed texts occur, will be applied to every analysed official NATO text. By answering all these questions, a very good understanding about how has the construction and interpretation of the WMD threat evolved in NATO over time, as well as what kind of measures were accepted in order to tackle these threats, will be gained.

To illustrate this process in practice, let us have a look at the following example. While analysing NATO's 2010 Strategic Concept, the first mention of weapons of mass destruction is in the 9th paragraph: *"The proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery, threatens incalculable consequences for global stability and prosperity. During the next decade, proliferation will be most acute in some of the world's most volatile regions"* (NATO, 2010a: par. 9). What piece of information does this paragraph contain? By applying the set of questions stated above, a lot can be learnt from this content. First of all, it is interesting that WMD are here described by the language of "nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction", which clearly indicates that the nuclear weapons have dominant position and are considered more important than the chemical, biological, and radiological weapons (despite the joint categorization of WMD). Secondly, we know what constitutes the threat – proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery. Who is considered to be responsible for these threats? We know the answer from the previous 8th paragraph, which warns about certain actors trying to acquire ballistic missiles (that could be used as a delivery of WMD onto the territory of NATO member state). Additionally, the biggest risk of proliferation of WMD and their delivery means lies in the world's most volatile regions. We also know who or what is threatened – in this case, it is global stability and prosperity which are threatened by the incalculable consequences of WMD. However, from previous texts we know that it is usually NATO's populations, territory and forces who are threatened by WMD. In the 19th paragraph, NATO offers solution – it is necessary to develop the capability to defend Alliance's population against ballistic missile attack and to further develop NATO's capacity to defend against the threat of CBRN (NATO, 2010a: par. 19). This is the way in which all primary sources will be addressed.

2.2.3. Data

The data used for the analysis consist of a number of primary and secondary source materials. Primary source materials (see Table 1) include NATO's official, publicly available, documents which were the basis for the qualitative content analysis conducted in this thesis.

Table 1: Primary source materials

NATO's primary sources	
Strategic Concepts *(documents outlining NATO's purpose, nature and fundamental security tasks)*	1991 Strategic Concept 1999 Strategic Concept 2010 Strategic Concept
Summit Declarations or Communiqué *(documents resulting from NATO summits, which are periodic meetings at the highest levels, often introducing new policy, launching new major initiatives, inviting new members etc.)*	1991 Rome Summit *("The Rome Declaration")* 1994 Brussels Summit *("The Brussels Summit Declaration")* 1997 Madrid Summit *("Madrid Declaration")* 1999 Washington Summit *("Washington Summit Communiqué")* 2002 Rome Summit *("Rome Summit Declaration")* 2002 Prague Summit *("Prague Summit Declaration")* 2004 Istanbul Summit *("Istanbul Summit Communiqué")* 2006 Riga Summit *("Riga Summit Declaration")* 2008 Bucharest Summit *("Bucharest Summit Declaration")* 2009 Strasbourg-Kehl Summit *("Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Declaration")* 2010 Lisbon Summit *("Lisbon Summit Declaration")* 2012 Chicago Summit *("Chicago Summit Declaration")* 2014 Wales Summit *("Wales Summit Declaration")* 2016 Warsaw Summit *("Warsaw Summit Communiqué")*
Other relevant documents	Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (1994); NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats (2009); Briefing on Countering weapons of mass destruction (2008), Deterrence and Defence Posture Review (2012), Statement on combating terrorism (2001) etc.

The limitation regarding the data set available for analysis stemmed from the sensitive nature of the WMD issue. For example, the 1991's Strategic Concept is accompanied with "MC Directive for Military Implementation of the Alliance's Strategic Concept (MC 400)", however, this type of material is for obvious reasons still classified. While this type of material would definitely broaden

the scope of this thesis, the author believes that the analysis will be able to fulfil the objective of this thesis with available primary sources, which will be complemented with secondary literature. This material includes relevant books, scholarly articles in security and strategic studies, IR journals and reports by experts in the field. The secondary literature will allow to situate the concrete data into context.

3. Evolution of NATO's understanding of WMD threat and the Alliance's response

3.1. Introduction to NATO and WMD during the Cold War era

On April 4, 1949 the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington. Few months later, on 24 August, the Treaty entered into force and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was born. The Alliance, based on the principle of collective defence - principle that is enshrined in Article 5, according to which an attack against one Ally is considered as an attack against them all – was created primarily to counter the perceived military threat from the Soviet Union and its allies (Lindley-French, 2007). Originally consisting of 12 members, it was increased by three more in the 1950s, West Germany included. As a response, the Soviet Union created the Warsaw Pact in 1955 as a counter-balance to NATO. The alignment of nearly every European country into one of these two opposing camps not only formalized the political division of Europe that took place after the end of World War II, but it also provided the framework for the military standoff which continued throughout the Cold War (History, 2010). However, one important event that changed the course of the Cold War had taken place already six years before the Warsaw Pact was established. On 29 August, 1949, the Soviet Union successfully detonated its first atomic bomb. It came as a great shock to the West, especially to the United States, as they did not expect the Soviets to possess the nuclear weapon knowledge so soon (Cold War Museum, 2016). The Cold War thus become truly nuclear, as the American nuclear monopoly was broken and prospects of nuclear confrontation were raised (Lindley-French, 2007: 23). Thus, the weapons of mass destruction have preoccupied NATO since its earliest days. Due to the overwhelming conventional superiority of the Soviets and its allies, NATO preferred to rely on nuclear weapons as a means of compensating as well as of containing the costs (Terzuolo, 2004: 1). Regarding the chemical and biological weapons, NATO's policy "was strictly defensive, with retaliation in kind left strictly to national assets and national decision-making, basically that of the United States" (Terzuolo, 2004: 9).

Nonetheless, NATO's attention to weapons of mass destruction during the Cold War era focused predominantly on nuclear weapons. The overarching category of "weapons of mass destruction" did not figure heavily in the policy formulations of the Cold War years, although the term was used occasionally – however, in reference to nuclear weapons only (Terzuolo, 2004: 6). The same applies to proliferation of WMD to states outside of Europe and to non-state actors – this

threat did not have such a significant position in NATO's hierarchy of threats for the first forty-plus years of its history as it did later (Terzuolo, 2004: 10). It was only by the end of the Cold War, and especially after the disintegration of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, that NATO realized the necessity for a major reassessment of both risks and possible responses (ibid.). The following section will therefore focus on the reinvigoration of WMD within the Alliance since the beginning of the 1990s.

3.2. Increasing awareness of WMD threat since 1990/1991

Admittedly, weapons of mass destruction were, indeed, not Alliance's top priority in the busy days that followed the collapse of Soviet control and of communist regimes in Central and Eastern Europe in the autumn of 1989 (Terzuolo, 2004: 10). Quite understandably, building relations with the newly democratic states and with a transforming Soviet Union was at the top of the agenda (ibid.).

At the landmark London Summit of 5-6 July 1990, the Heads of States and Governments recognized that security challenges and risk which NATO faces are different in nature from what they were in the past. Thus, they set in motion the strategic review of the Alliance that led to the acceptance of new Strategic Concept the following year. Additionally, the decision to reduce forward presence and the role of nuclear weapons in the new European strategic context was made (Lindley-French, 2007: 59). Allies also committed themselves to negotiations with the Soviet Union on reductions of nuclear arsenals (Terzuolo, 2004: 10).

However, there was no mention of "weapons of mass destruction" or proliferation-related threats in the summit document. In the London Declaration, NATO focused entirely on the consequences of dramatically changed security environment stemming from diminishing Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact (Terzuolo, 2004: 10). The first reference to WMD proliferation as a new security threat to the Alliance came in a NATO communiqué of December 1990, in which North Atlantic Council (NAC) stated that "the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the spread of destabilizing military technology have implications for Allies' security and illustrate that in an ever more interdependent world" NATO faces "new security risks and challenges of a global nature" (NATO, 1990: par. 15, in Bravo, 2003: 6). Question arises: why now? According to Bravo (2003: 5), the collapse of the Soviet Union had two profound effects on the increased possibility of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. First, a discipline that has been imposed by U.S.-Soviet competition on a number of regional conflict was lost. Secondly, WMD technologies,

materials and expertise were diffused as the weak post-Soviet states, including Russia, were not as capable and consistent as the Soviet Union of upholding non-proliferation policies. Additionally, the proliferation of WMD-associated technologies, together with missiles and other means of delivery, remained to be attractive – because of its perceived political and military advantages of possessing WMD – in the post-Cold War days as well (Bravo, 2003: 5). All these factors led to increased awareness in NATO of the need to be prepared to defend themselves against adversaries that use weapons of mass destruction.

The Gulf War of 1990-1991 and its aftermath only proved that the Alliance has been correct in their recognition of threats posed by WMD proliferation. Operation Desert Storm, which resulted in the expulsion of invading Iraqi troops from Kuwait in 1991, was not NATO operation as such, however it did involve forces from many NATO member states. The operation was overwhelmingly effective, but as Terzuolo (2004: 11) states: "Iraq was able to use ballistic missiles against coalition forces and against cities in Israel and Saudi Arabia, and it threatened use of chemical and biological weapons". This led to increase of NATO's attention on WMD-related risks as well.

Additionally, experience from Iraq shaped preparations for NATO's Rome Summit in November 1991. At this summit, the Alliance's new Strategic Concept was approved, which gave the WMD threats a clearer and more visible place in the Alliance's strategy (Terzuolo, 2004: 12). The Security Concept explicitly stated that the security of NATO – as demonstrated by the Gulf War – is dependent on "the stability and peace of the countries on the southern periphery of Europe", "all the more so because of the build-up of military power and the proliferation of weapons technologies in the area, including weapons of mass destruction and ballistic missiles capable of reaching the territory of some member states of the Alliance" (NATO, 1991a: par. 11). Additionally, NATO recognized that its security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, proliferation of WMD included (NATO, 1991a: par. 12) and highlighted concerns over WMD by stating that: "In light of potential risks it poses, the proliferation of ballistic missiles and weapons of mass destruction should be given special consideration. Solution of this problem will require complementary approaches including, for example, export control and missile defences" (NATO, 1991a: 49). Additionally, the Alliance called for "global, comprehensive, and effectively verifiable ban on all chemical weapons"- which will materialize few years later with adoption of Convention on Chemical Weapons (CWC) – while stating that "precautions of a purely defensive

nature will need to be maintained" (NATO, 1991a: par. 13). That said, and with accordance to Terzuolo (2004: 12), the 1991 Security Concept still saw the biggest risk for Allies to be stemming from the instability in Central and Eastern Europe in the aftermath of the collapse of Soviet Union, and not from the weapons of mass destruction.

Following the announcement of NATO's new Strategic Concept, the Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation reiterated NATO's awareness of new threats and basically repeated what was already written in the Strategic Concept. It would be, therefore, redundant to discuss the particularities of the Rome Declaration in detail.

Two following years were not rich in a new information regarding the understanding of WMD threat in NATO. During 1992 and 1993, NATO only repeated in their North Atlantic Council communiqués their determination to prevent proliferation of WMD and related technologies (Bravo, 2003: 7). It took more than two years since the Rome Summit before NATO leaders, at the highest level, mandated development of a comprehensive policy framework that would address the growing proliferation threat within the Alliance (Terzuolo, 2004: 13).

3.3. Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of WMD in 1994 and a new cognizance of WMD threat

At the Brussels Summit, that took place on 10-11 January 1994, NATO Heads of State and Government signalled heightened attention of the Alliance towards the WMD threats. In the opening paragraph of the Brussels Summit Declaration, NATO leaders identified four initiatives aimed at contributing to peace and stability in Europe, with the decision to intensify Alliance's efforts against proliferation of WMD and their delivery systems being at fourth position (NATO, 1994a: par. 1). Carter and Omand (1996: 10-15) provide an explanation for such a rapid increase of NATO's focus on WMD: "By 1993, more than 25 countries, many located near NATO territory, were identified as potentially having NBC capabilities, and at least half of them had operational ballistic missiles, while other countries were trying to develop them". Such extent of WMD proliferation and its implications for the Alliance's security obviously led to an increased attention to this challenge within the Alliance.

NATO also signalled increased cognizance of the WMD threat by agreeing that the "proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means constitutes a threat to international security and is a matter of concern to NATO" (NATO, 1994a: par. 17). In response,

NATO decided to intensify and expand its political and defence efforts against the proliferation of WMD. Additionally, the NATO leaders directed that the appropriate fora of the Alliance should start working immediately on developing "an overall policy framework to consider how to reinforce ongoing prevention efforts and how to reduce the proliferation threat and protect against it" (NATO, 1994a: par. 17). This led to the creation of the Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, which was approved by NATO five months after the Brussels Summit, in June 1994.

The Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction was NATO's first comprehensive strategy document of the emerging challenge. The policy framework laid out a series of principles that would guide NATO's approach to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction for more than 15 years. The document recognized the developments stemming from the changing security environment that give rise to the possibility of increased WMD proliferation, which in turn endanger the Alliance. As the indicators of the growing risk, the text pointed first towards failure of some states – Iraq and North Korea were named outright – to respect their non-proliferation commitments. The Gulf War and the follow-up inspections shed light on the true extent of Iraqi WMD capability, as was made clear that Iraq did possess chemical and biological weapons that were ready for delivery and was pursuing additional improvements (Carter and Omand, 1996). North Korea was on the list because of suspicious findings of International Atomic Emergency Agency (IAEA) according to which "North Korea reprocessed plutonium from fuel rods for a nuclear weapons program" (Terzuolo, 2004: 13). Additionally, Pyongyang announced in March 1993 its intention to withdraw from NPT – which North Korea actually fulfilled, but ten years later - in January 2003 (BBC, 2003a). Additionally, NATO identified potential proliferation problems stemming from the break-up of Soviet Union, as well as recognized that a number of states at the periphery of the Alliance either seeks to develop or acquire WMD and their delivery systems or wants the capability to produce them. Moreover, growing concerns of non-state actors – such as terrorists, as well as increasing transfers of commercially available dual-use technologies (the acquisition of which are difficult to contain through export controls), and risks of proliferators seeking to profit or gain political benefit by "selling WMD and their delivery means, relevant technology and expertise", also figured in the list of concerns (NATO, 1994b: par. 2; Terzuolo, 2004: 20).

The Alliance Policy Framework also expressed support for international treaties and regimes intended to prevent proliferation of WMD and missile delivery systems, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Chemical Weapons Convention and the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. Additionally, the regimes intended to help control trade in sensitive technologies, such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Zangger Committee, the Australia Group and the Missile Technology Control Regime were mentioned as well. NATO also expressed support for negotiation of a universal and verifiable Comprehensive Nuclear-Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), as well as for negotiation of a possible convention banning the production of fissile materials for nuclear explosive devices (to be known as Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty) (NATO, 1994b: par. 3-5). Nonetheless, the Alliance stressed that it is not NATO's policy to duplicate or substitute the aforementioned treaties, but that its role is strictly aimed at supporting, reinforcing and complementing them (NATO, 1994b: par. 6). At this point, it should be noted that similar expressions of support for arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation treaties and regimes is standard element of all Alliance's statement that have something to do with WMD, "even though NATO *qua* NATO did not have a role in these treaties" (Terzuolo, 2004: 28). As it would be redundant to reiterate NATO's support for these efforts in every analysed Summit declaration or relevant documents, only the significant changes that have some impact on the evolving understanding of WMD within Alliance shall be discussed.

In this document, NATO also stated that its approach to proliferations will have two dimensions – one political, and the other defensive. In the political dimension, the principal non-proliferation goal of the Alliance will be to "prevent proliferation from occurring or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means" (NATO, 1994b: par. 11). This formulation has become the central pillar of NATO policy ever since, and it is being repeated in the official documents as well. Continuing with the political dimension, to fulfil its objective, the Allies committed themselves to assess the proliferation risks, consult regularly on WMD proliferation threats and coordinate their WMD-related activities as well as support implementation of arms control and disarmament regimes in any way possible (ibid.). In the defence dimension, the Allies admitted that the recent events in Iraq and North Korea effectively demonstrated that international non-proliferation norms and regimes offered no guarantee against proliferation. Hence, NATO – as a defensive Alliance – has to "address the military capabilities needed to discourage WMD proliferation and use, and if necessary, to protect NATO territory, populations and forces" (NATO, 1994b: par. 12). The

Alliance will therefore examine carefully current and future threats posed by WMD proliferation, as well as its implications for defence planning and defence capabilities. Moreover, NATO will also consider whether any measures are required in the defence area, and will also seek to improve defence capabilities of its members in order to protect their territory, populations and forces against WMD use (NATO 1994b: par. 13).

To implement the new Alliance's policy framework on proliferation of WMD, two groups were established in 1994 – the Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP) and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP) – with mandate to focus on proliferation issues. While SGP was mandated to address the political aspects of NATO's approach to the proliferation problem, DGP was ordered to identify necessary military capabilities needed to discourage proliferation, deter the use of WMD and to protect NATO members (Foreign Affairs Committee, 2009: 147). This marked the "beginning of a joint strategy of arms control and non-proliferation on the one hand, and military counter-proliferation on the other; both as a part of a coordinated approach to the reduction of nuclear and other WMD threats to NATO" (ibid.). Together, these two groups constituted the Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP)[8] that reported directly to the NAC. The findings made by the SGP and DGP significantly contributed to NATO's Weapons of Mass Destruction Initiative in 1999 (Bravo, 2003: 13). The WMD Initiative that was launched by the Allies at the 1999 Washington Summit will be, given its significance, discussed later. First, one more summit needs to be mentioned.

On 8-9 July 1997, the Heads of State and Government gathered once again at NATO Summit, this time in Madrid. However, WMD issues were not at the centre of the attention. The Madrid Summit focused instead much more on the enlargement of the Alliance, specifically on the invitation of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to join NATO. As the name of the summit document suggests – Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation – NATO's attention was put on the strengthening of relationship with Partners, through the new Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and enhancement of the Partnership for Peace (NATO, 1997: par. 1). The

[8] Following the June 2010 committee reform, SGP, DGP and JCP were replaced by the Committee on Proliferation (CP) – which is „responsible for information sharing, policy development and coordination on the issues of prevention and response to proliferation, bringing together experts and officials with responsibilities in this field" (NATO, 2011).

significance of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation, signed on 27 May, 1997, which led to the establishment of NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, was emphasized as well. However, as Terzuolo (2004: 39) rightly asserts, the invitations to the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland – i.e. former members of the Warsaw Pact, "required careful preparation, touching inter alia on WMD matters. Making enlargement somehow acceptable to Russia was a major challenge, and nuclear issues played a central role". Nevertheless, this issue did not reach the content of Madrid Summit Declaration.

Additionally, the summit declaration did not discuss the issue of non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament at length. It was only briefly stated that the Alliance views efforts aimed at preventing proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery with "utmost importance" and that progress achieved in this area since the Brussels Summit in 1994 is welcomed and that the work should continue (NATO, 1997: par. 23). However, very significantly, it was decided at Madrid Summit that the current Strategic Concept, adopted at the 1991 Rome Summit, no longer fits the need of the changed security environment and that it should be reviewed. This set in motion the process that led to the new Strategic Concept of 1999, which - compared to its predecessor - focused much more on the WMD threat.

On 8th December 1998, NATO foreign ministers decided – at their last meeting before April 1999 Washington Summit – to broaden the Alliance's efforts to address the evolving threat of proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery. They instructed the Council in Permanent Session to prepare proposals, for the Washington Summit, for an initiative that would ensure that NATO has both the political and military capabilities necessary to deal effectively with the challenge (NATO, 1998: par. 14). According to Terzuolo (2004: 44), this implied recognition that NATO had troubles addressing WMD proliferation in a visible and comprehensible way that would ease the increasing public anxiety in the member and partner countries. The upcoming Washington Summit was thus expected to provide a fundamentally improved Alliance's approach in dealing with a WMD threat. And it did.

3.4. Important year of 1999 – Strategic Concept & WMD Initiative

The Washington Summit on 23-24 April, 1999, which welcomed the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland as new members of the Alliance, was predestined to be a milestone for NATO. The year 1999 was triply symbolic: fifty years since the Alliance's creation, ten years since the fall of

the Berlin Wall and on the eve of the new millennium (Terzuolo, 2004: 93). Additionally, one month earlier, NATO had initiated Operation Allied Force, military intervention in Kosovo. Not only that this decision put NATO at the centre of international debate over the legitimacy of the use of force – as the Alliance launched the military campaign without the approval of UN Security Council – but it also highlighted dramatic discrepancies between the military capabilities of the United States and other Allies. Furthermore, the Kosovo intervention also caused pausing of rapprochement between NATO and Russia. "The moment was genuinely dramatic" as Terzuolo (2004: 93) commented.

Importantly, at the Washington Summit the Heads of State and Government approved the Alliance's new Strategic Concept. While the dramatic changes in the Euro-Atlantic landscape following the end of the Cold War were reflected in the 1991 Strategic Concept, a lot has happened since then and NATO had to react adequately to the further profound political and security developments (NATO, 1999a: par. 2). With respect to the weapons of mass destruction, the Strategic Concept provided stronger and more detailed justification than its predecessor why NATO has to focus on the challenges posed by WMD proliferation (Terzuolo, 2004: 94). The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction was listed alongside ethnic conflict, collapse of political order etc. as the "complex new risks to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability" that emerged during the last ten years (NATO, 1999a: par. 3). As the Strategic Concept continues: "The proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. In spite of welcome progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes, major challenges with respect to proliferation remain. The Alliance recognises that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to the Allies' populations, territory and forces. Some states, including on NATO's periphery and in other regions, sell or acquire or try to acquire NBC weapons and delivery means. Commodities and technology that could be used to build these weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means are becoming more common, while detection and prevention of illicit trade in these materials and know-how continues to be difficult. Non-state actors have shown the potential to create and use some of these weapons" (NATO, 1999a: par. 22).

The language used in the 1999 Strategic Concept is quite similar to the formulations already employed in the Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in 1994 and other relevant documents following the approval of the preceding Strategic Concept.

"The reference to the threat of non-state actors, however, was notably stronger and more urgent than in the Alliance Policy Framework" (Terzuolo, 2004: 95). The reason behind this is the event that occurred on 20 March, 1995. On this day, the Japanese apocalyptic religious sect Aum Shinrikyo released self-manufactured Sarin gas in the Tokyo subway; thirteen people eventually died and more than 5,500 were injured (Zanders, 1999: 17). "Following these incidents, terrorism was said to have made a qualitative leap: for the first time a terrorist organization had discharged a weapon of mass destruction" (ibid.). Nonetheless, the 1999 Strategic Concept still did not make any explicit linkage between weapons of mass destruction and terrorism – though the time will come, and soon, when this relation shall become integral part of every single NATO document. In the 1991 Strategic Concept, terrorism and proliferation of the WMD, alongside disruption of the flow of vital resources, were put on the same equal level – as the "risks of a wider nature" (NATO, 1991a: par. 12). However, in the new Strategic Concept, WMD proliferation no longer figured in the list of risks of a wider nature, but got its own separate treatment. According to Terzuolo (2004: 95) this meant that: "The treatment of the two issues in the 1999 Security Concept clearly indicated that the Alliance gave a higher priority, at that point, to the WMD threat".

Additionally, the Strategic Concept emphasized the importance of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements, as they "support NATO's political and military efforts to achieve its objectives" (NATO, 1999a: par. 19). While the Alliance welcomed some positive developments in the field, such as reductions in nuclear weapons thanks to the START treaties or the entry of CWC into force, it also highlighted the need for further enhancement of its political efforts to reduce dangers stemming from WMD as well as the importance of having effective military capabilities to address the threat (NATO, 1999a: par. 40, 53). Additionally, the Strategic Concept called for improved defence posture, including through work on missile defences, as well as required that doctrines, planning, training and exercise policies prepare Alliance forces for the possible NBC contingencies. The aim was to "further reduce operational vulnerabilities of NATO military forces while maintaining their flexibility and effectiveness despite the presence, threat or use of NBC weapons" (NATO, 1999a: par. 56). Lastly, the Strategic Concept emphasized that while chemical and biological warfare capacity is not included in the NATO strategy, the defensive precautions would remain essential even if there was a further progress in banning chemical and biological weapons (NATO, 1999a: par. 57).

In effect, the 1999 Strategic Concept laid out the blueprint for the NATO of 21st century, and consolidated the conceptual framework for further NATO efforts in the field of WMD proliferation. Nonetheless, as Terzuolo (2004: 97) commented: "In itself, though, it lacked a certain element of "newness". However, the sought novelty was to be found in the WMD Initiative.

As previously said, at the Washington Summit, the Heads of State and Government decided to step up their efforts against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means. To that end, they launched the WMD Initiative that "builds upon a work since the Brussels Summit to improve overall Alliance political and military efforts in this area" (NATO, 1999b: par. 30). Thus, the objective of the WMD Initiative is to:

- ensure that there is a more rigorous and structured debate at NATO that will lead to strengthened understanding among Allies on the WMD issues and what the response to them should be;
- improve the quality and quantity of intelligence and information-sharing among NATO members on proliferation issues;
- support development of a public information strategy to increase awareness of proliferation issues and to inform about the Alliance's efforts in supporting non-proliferation;
- enhance existing Allied programs that increase military readiness to operate in a WMD environment and to counter the WMD threats;
- strengthen the information exchange process about Allies' national programmes of bilateral WMD destruction and assistance;
- enhance the possibilities for the member states to assist one another in the protection of their civilian populations against WMD risks;
- create a WMD Centre within the International Staff at NATO to support these efforts. (NATO, 1999b: par. 31 [emphasis added]).

Nonetheless, as Terzuolo rightly noted (2004: 99): "WMD Initiative did repeat, in largely similar language, a number of objectives already included in the 1994 Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction". Consultation and coordination, information-sharing and improvement of defence capabilities were already on the list of activities already approved in said 1994 policy framework. However, what was definitely a new element in the 1999

WMD Initiative was the decision to establish the WMD Centre (Terzuolo, 2004: 100). While the Washington Summit took the executive decision to create the WMD Centre, its actual establishment required significant additional work. Launched in May 2000 and fully operational by Autumn of the same year, the role of the WMD Centre is to "improve coordination of WMD-related activities, as well as strengthen consultations on non-proliferation, arms control, and disarmament issues. The Centre also support defence efforts to improve the preparedness of the Alliance to respond to any potential threats posed by WMD and their means of delivery" (NATO, 2008a: 3). The WMD Centre combines the military and civilian knowledge of national experts and it was structured as such - to serve as a bridge between the International Staff and International Military Staff, thus making sure that the WMD-related information and intelligence, which is available to military authorities, was taken into account in analyses for the civilian side of NATO (Terzuolo, 2004: 102). In words of Ted Whiteside, the director of the WMD Centre at the time, "the Alliance has a very active programme of work regarding WMD risks and threats, and the Centre is the focal point for support of these efforts" (NATO, 2001a).

The WMD Initiative launched at the Washington Summit established the Alliance's agenda in the WMD area for the next two and a half years, i.e. until the tragic events of 11 September 2001 that caused shift of attention towards potential use of weapons of mass destruction by terrorists. The events of 9/11, when Al-Qaeda terrorists flew loaded passenger aircrafts into the World Trade Center and Pentagon, forced a major reflection of NATO's approach and role in combating both WMD and terrorism.

3.5. From 11 September 2001 to the Prague Summit in 2002

The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 were immediately condemned by NATO Allies and partner countries and the atrocities committed against the United States were considered as an attack against all. On the evening of 12 September, less than 24 hours after the attacks - and for the first time in NATO's history - the Allies invoked the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty. Additionally, the Allies pledged to "undertake all efforts to combat the scourge of terrorism" (NATO, 2001b).

Moreover, the attacks of 9/11 significantly raised the threshold of violence for terrorist activity – as they led to the death of nearly 3,000 people – and they were not expected to be a one-off event. It was natural for the international community to wonder what more can the terrorists do next time in order to increase the number of victims – the natural answer was: to use weapons of mass

destruction (Terzuolo, 2004: 154). It has to be noted, however, that concerns about terrorist use of WMD were by no means new. The discourse on WMD terrorism emerged already six years earlier, after Aum Shinrikyo used sarin on the Tokyo subway on 20 March 1995 (Bentley, 2014: 97). Nonetheless, there was still considerable ambivalence in the 1990s among security and defence experts on whether terrorists would employ WMD. The arguments were mainly twofold: first, it was considered inconsistent with the aims of 'traditional' political and ethno-nationalist terror organisations and second, would terrorists really go to the trouble of obtaining WMD technologies when they could achieve their objectives through easily obtainable conventional means? (Bentley, 2014; Terzuolo, 2004) However, scepticism about the WMD-terrorism link seemed to evaporate following the 9/11 attacks. As Terzuolo (2004: 153) comments: "Conflation of the WMD and terrorism threats became a characteristic of NATO policy documents". Be that as it may, it was not really a surprising reaction. Though the terrorist attacks of 9/11 had not involved WMD, they were, indeed, more shocking and devastating than any terrorist event experienced before. Moreover, religiously motivated terrorists seemed especially ready to raise their level of violence, by whatever means. As Bentley states (2014: 99): "Specifically, 9/11 was taken as a sign that Islamic extremism had translated into the adoption of mass destructive tactics".

Additionally, the fear of WMD was exacerbated by the anthrax letter attacks that occurred within the United States over the course of several weeks, beginning only one week after the 9/11 atrocities, on September 18. Anonymous letters containing anthrax spores were mailed to several media companies and congressional offices. By November, 22 people had been infected with anthrax, half of them contracted inhalational anthrax by inhaling *Bacillus anthracis* spores and the other half suffered cutaneous anthrax by absorbing it through the skin. Five of the victims who had contracted inhalational anthrax later died (Roberts, 2009a: 3). These anthrax attacks, though unrelated to attacks of 9/11, focused significant attention on possible terrorist use of WMD. Biological agents have characteristics of what have been termed by Jessica Stern (2003) as "dreaded risks". Because biological agents are considered mysterious, invisible, indiscriminate, uncontrollable etc., they elicit disproportionate fear in the public. According to Terzuolo (2004: 154) it were, in fact, "the anthrax attacks that truly focused the minds of those responsible for WMD defense".

The 9/11 attacks, together with anthrax letter attacks, emphasized the salience of the threat posed by WMD terrorism. The Alliance therefore recognized that it needs to adapt its capabilities

to meet this challenge. However, the definition of the WMD terrorism did not lead to an entirely new paradigm for the Alliance's WMD efforts. According to Terzuolo (2004: 154): "It may be better to think of NATO as having intensified both its efforts to address terrorism and its efforts to deal with WMD challenges". As was demonstrated in the preceding paragraphs, NATO had already undertaken a number of WMD-related initiatives well before the 11 September attacks. They would remain basis for Alliance's efforts in the subsequent period, although NATO's approach to WMD, especially its defence dimension, saw significant innovations (Terzuolo, 2004: 155). The Prague Summit in November 2002 was particularly important as it was a great opportunity to assess the Alliance's progress in developing relevant capabilities as well as to introduce new initiatives.

The Heads of State and Government met in Prague on 21-22 November 2002 to enlarge the Alliance – seven new countries were invited to join NATO: Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia – and to further strengthen NATO in order to "meet the grave new threats and profound security challenges of the 21st century" (NATO, 2002a: par. 1). At the Prague Summit, the Alliance reacted to the 9/11 and subsequent invocation of Article 5 by approving a comprehensive package of measures, that were aimed at strengthening its abilities to protect its forces, population and territory from challenges of various origin. The decisions made in Prague aimed at having balanced and effective capabilities, so that "NATO can better carry out the full range of its missions and respond collectively to those challenges, including the threat posed by terrorism and by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery" (NATO, 2002a: par. 3). Nonetheless, in order to carry out the full range of its mission, NATO has to have forces that are capable of moving quickly to wherever they are needed, they have to sustain operations over distance in time and to function effectively in an environment where they might face nuclear, biological and chemical threats, and they have to be able to fulfil its objectives (NATO, 2002a: par. 4). NATO, therefore, decided to approve seven clusters of actions – four of which had significant impact on Alliance's approach in dealing with WMD threat – that were related to transformation and adaptation of its military forces.

First, NATO approved the Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) as a part of the continuing effort to improve and develop new military capabilities for modern warfare. "Individual Allies have made firm and specific political commitment to improve their capabilities in the areas of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear defence" (NATO, 2002a: par. 4c). Second, NATO leaders

endorsed the agreed military concept for defence against terrorism. The concept is part of a package of measures that aim to strengthen NATO's capabilities in this area and which also includes improved intelligence sharing and crisis response arrangements. Allies also committed themselves to fully implement the Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) Action Plan for the improvement of civil preparedness against possible attacks with chemical, biological or radiological (CBR) agents. This step demonstrates – compared to previous activities of the Alliance – increased focus of NATO on protection of civilian population. It is, however, very logical step given the fact that the victims of 9/11 had been overwhelmingly civilians and all non-combatants (Terzuolo, 2004: 186). Additionally, enhancement of NATO's ability to provide support, when requested, to help national authorities with consequences of terrorist attack – CBRN attacks against critical infrastructure included – was announced. Third, implementation of five nuclear, biological and chemical weapons defence initiatives which will enhance Alliance's defence capabilities against WMD was endorsed: 1. Prototype Deployable NBC Analytical Laboratory, 2. Prototype NBC Event Response Team, 3. virtual Centre of Excellence for NBC Weapons Defence, 4. NATO Biological and Chemical Defence Stockpile, and 5. Disease Surveillance system (NATO, 2002a: par. 4e). The Allies also reaffirmed their commitment to boost and improve their NBC defence capabilities. Lastly, NATO initiated a new Missile Defence feasibility study in order to examine options for protecting Allied territory, population and forces against the full range of missile threats. Moreover, the Allies supported "the enhancement of the role of the WMD Centre within the International Staff to assist the work of the Alliance in tackling this threat" (NATO, 2002a: par. 4g).

As the months following the 11 September attacks also saw intensification of cooperation between NATO and Russia, the Prague Summit Declaration thus welcomed the significant achievements of NATO-Russia Council since the historic Rome Summit, which took place in May 2002. At Rome Summit, the Allies and Russian Federation agreed to work together on a number of activities, such as fight against terrorism, non-proliferation of WMD or theatre missile defence (NATO, 2002b). Nuclear weapons received significant attention as well.

In sum, the Prague Summit was aimed at enhancing NATO's political and military efforts in addressing the challenge of terrorism, WMD included. As it came 14 months after the 9/11 attacks, it was an opportunity to approve a number of initiatives that would cover the whole range of NATO's activities. The linkage between terrorism and WMD was very strong throughout the Prague Summit Declaration, and "in this sense the 11 September attacks tended to strengthen the

sense of political urgency to address the WMD threat as well as terrorism" (Terzuolo, 2004: 206). What is apparent from the Prague Summit Declaration, however, is that the weapons of mass destruction underwent significant conceptual change. It was the first NATO summit declaration in which radiological weapons were included on the list of WMD threats. Michelle Bentley (2014: 102) explained the reasons behind it on the example of the USA. Whereas U.S. political attention had previously focused on nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons, 9/11 highlighted the potential threat associated with radiological weapons. "Specifically, the act of flying commercial airplanes into the Twin Towers and the Pentagon raised concerns that 'next time' those buildings could be nuclear reactors, initiating a radiological incident similar in effect to the 1986 Chernobyl disaster" (Bentley, 2014: 102). As a consequence, a shift occurred in the US policy conceptualization of WMD towards a formal recognition of radiological weapons as mass destructive. Thus the NBC understanding has changed into CBRN, firstly within the United States, and then within the Alliance (given the dominance of USA) as well. Nonetheless, this is one of the best examples of how can the construction and understanding of weapons of mass destruction change or evolve over time.

The Prague Summit was considered a success for the Alliance, which "seemed to have reinvented itself yet again as a body appropriate to address the risks that were uppermost in the mind of the international public" (Terzuolo, 2004: 206). However, soon after the Prague Summit the circumstances changed significantly. Events of early 2003 demonstrated that there are significant policy and philosophical differences amongst Allies with respect to using force when it comes to addressing WMD threats. The exceptional unity of spirit within the Alliance that followed after 9/11 changed rapidly to unusually open discussions amongst NATO members over Iraq (Terzuolo, 2014: 211).

3.6. From Iraq War to the Istanbul Summit in 2004

In fact, the Prague Summit had taken place in the context of considerably increased attention of international community to the situation in Iraq, which had been labelled by U.S. President George W. Bush in his State of the Union speech from 29 January 2002 as a part of "axis of evil", alongside North Korea and Iran (CNN, 2016). On November 21, the Heads of State and Government issued Prague Summit Statement on Iraq, in which they pledged their full support for

the implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1441[9] and called on Iraq to comply with it and with all UN relevant resolutions. In the closing paragraph of the statement, NATO leaders recalled warnings of Security Council about the serious consequences Iraq will face unless it stops violating its obligations and that NATO Allies "stand united in their commitment to take effective action to assist and support the effort of the UN to ensure full and immediate compliance by Iraq" (NATO, 2002c). Just a few days after the Prague Summit, United Nations and IEAE inspectors were deployed once again to Iraq in search of WMD weapons and their means of delivery. "The allied governments that were taking the hardest line on Iraq – the United States and the United Kingdom – stressed their conviction that, despite the work of UN weapons inspectors following the 1991 Gulf War, Saddam Hussein still possessed weapons of mass destruction, the capability to produce more, and the will to use them again" (Terzuolo, 2004: 213). The European Allies were divided, with France, Germany, Belgium and Luxembourg being the most sceptical regarding the need for military intervention to address the problem of Iraqi WMD as the hardliners required. They wanted instead to give as much time as possible to the inspectors to locate said weapons of mass destruction (ibid.). However, as the U.S. attempts to get a UN Security Council resolution backing a military campaign in Iraq failed, the United States – along with coalition forces primarily from the United Kingdom – initiated war on Iraq without UN mandate on 20 March 2003 (BBC, 2003b). The enormous wave of sympathy for the United States that followed after the 9/11 attacks ended, especially when it was reported on 2 October 2003 that the Iraq Survey Group, mandated to find the Iraqi WMD, has found no weapons of mass destruction in Iraq (CNN, 2016).

Not surprisingly, the division over Iraq took its toll in the relationship between Europe and United States and on the foundations of NATO as well. Nonetheless, "an unspoken "gentlemen's agreement" to focus on concrete challenges and not mull over the past seemed to prevail" (Terzuolo, 2004: 221) and the Alliance got back to business. The dispute over Iraq did not stop the progress on the WMD initiatives that were approved at Prague. In June 2003, NAC decided to further enhance and take forward these initiatives by forming a Multinational CBRN Defence Battalion and Joint Assessment Team. Together they form Joint CBRN Defence Task Force, which

[9] Resolution 1441, which was adopted unanimously on 8 November 2002 by the United Nations Security Council, offered Saddam Hussein's Iraq a last chance to comply with its disarmament obligations that had been defined in a number of previous resolutions. According to this resolution, Iraq was in material breach of the ceasefire terms, and the breaches were related to weapons of mass destruction, as well as construction of prohibited types of missiles etc. (UN, 2002).

is a NATO body that is specifically trained and equipped to deal with CBRN events and/or attacks aimed against Alliance's population, territory or forces (NATO, 2015a). While Joint Assessment Team consists of specialists that provide CBRN-related advice and support, the mission of the CBRN Defence Battalion is to "provide rapidly deployable and credible CBRN defence capability in order to maintain NATO's freedom of action and operational effectiveness in a CBRN threat environment" (NATO, 2015a). Nonetheless, the Battalion does not train only for armed conflicts but also for deployments in crisis situations such as natural disasters and industrial accidents that include those involving hazardous material. The Battalion was declared fully operational at the June 2004 Istanbul Summit, which will be discussed next.

The Heads of State and Government met again on 28-29 June 2004 Summit in Istanbul. However, a new initiative focused specially on WMD was never on the horizon for Istanbul, though terrorism and proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery were identified as key threats to the Alliance at the moment. But the major focus of Istanbul Summit was on terrorism, as a result of the March 2004 terrorist attacks in Madrid, a NATO capital. Madrid bombings, coordinated near-simultaneous attacks that targeted commuter trains in Madrid on the morning of March 11 and which resulted in 191 dead and more than 2,000 injured, were one of the worst Islamist terrorist attacks in European history (Britannica, 2016). As the NATO leaders commented, continuing terrorist attacks have demonstrated the acuteness of threat of terrorism in the world and that is why they decided to agree on an enhanced set of measures which would strengthen Alliance's contribution to the fight against terrorism, including the need to prevent terrorists from acquiring WMD (NATO, 2004: par. 13). The specific measure that was most directly connected to WMD was: "a greater ability to respond rapidly to national requests for assistance in protecting against and dealing with the consequences of terrorist attacks, including attacks involving chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons and, in this regard, continued robust support for the NATO Multinational CBRN Defence Battalion" (ibid.).

Additionally, the Alliance reinforced its support to arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation as is customary, and newly stressed the importance of the Hague Code of Conduct against the Proliferation of Ballistic Missiles (NATO, 2004: par. 14). The Hague Code of Conduct (HCOC) was established on 25 November 2002, just a few days after the Prague Summit, as an arrangement to prevent the proliferation of ballistic missiles and to further delegitimize such

proliferation (U.S. Department of State, 2016). It is not only a result of international efforts to regulate access to ballistic missiles which could potentially deliver weapons of mass destruction, but also an illustration of the continuing and growing importance of the WDM threat. Moreover, the NATO leaders strongly supported UN Security Council Resolution 1540, which "calls on all states to establish effective national export controls, to adopt and enforce laws to criminalise proliferation, to take cooperative action to prevent non-state actors from acquiring WMD, and to end illicit trafficking in WMD and related-materials" (NATO, 2004: par. 14). Additionally, NATO decided to strengthen their efforts to reduce and safeguard nuclear and radiological material, as well as welcomed the discovery and ongoing investigation of the A.Q. Khan proliferation network (ibid.). Abdul Qadeer Khan was a Pakistani nuclear weapons scientist who was arrested in 2004. He publicly confessed and confirmed the existence of a global proliferation network which had, over almost twenty years, provided nuclear technology, expertise, and designs to Iran, North Korea, Libya and possibly other countries (IISS, 2007). However, A.Q. Khan was not the only nuclear merchant and Pakistan was not the only country embroiled in this shadowy network. It stretched, in fact, over three continents and eluded both national and international export control systems that were designed to prevent this illicit trade (ibid.). "The discovery of the network highlighted concerns that nuclear technology is no longer the monopoly of industrially advanced countries, but possibly can be purchased off-the-shelf by both states and terrorist groups" (IISS, 2007).

Furthermore, at Istanbul Summit the Alliance also underscored its support for the aims of the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), which was established in 2003 and which aims to coordinate participating states' efforts to stop shipments of WMD, delivery systems and related materials (PSI, 2016). Lastly, the options for addressing the increasing missile threat to Alliance were examined as well.

3.7. From Riga to Bucharest – Need for Ballistic Missile Defence

On 28-29 November 2006, the Heads of State and Government gathered once again for NATO Summit in Riga. The Riga Summit is most famous for the endorsement of a Comprehensive Political Guidance (CPG), "which provides a framework and political direction for NATO's continuing transformation, setting out, for the next 10-15 years, the priorities for all Alliance capability issues, planning disciplines and intelligence" (NATO, 2006a: par. 2). The Comprehensive Political Guidance identified terrorism, increasingly global and lethal in results, and the proliferation of WMD as the principal threats to the Alliance over the next decade (NATO,

2006b: par. 2). The most dangerous combination would, of course, be terrorists armed with weapons of mass destruction. Additionally, combination of proliferation of WMD and failed states was identified as another security threat to the Alliance. Recognizing this, NATO needs to focus on "enhancing its ability to anticipate and assess the threats, risks, and challenges it faces", as well as has to have "the ability to conduct operations taking account of the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction and chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear hazards, including the ability to defend deployed NATO forces against theatre missile threats" (NATO, 2006b: par. 7, 16).

Alliance's work on defending its forces, populations and territory against the threat of missile-borne WMD continued at Riga Summit as well, as NATO leaders paid major attention to the development of ballistic missile defence. It was announced in Riga that the first major contract for a NATO Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence (ALTBMD[10]) system was signed, and that it is "a major step towards improving the protection of deployed forces" (NATO, 2006a: par. 24). The aim of the Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence capability is – as written above - to protect deployed NATO forces against short- and medium-range ballistic missile threats (i.e. up to 3,000 km range) (NATO, 2015b: 125). Additionally, a Missile Defence Feasibility Study – initiated at Prague Summit in response to the increasing missile threat and undertaken by a transatlantic multinational industry team in cooperation with NATO – was announced to be completed at Riga Summit (NATO, 2008a: 6). It concluded that missile defence is technically feasible and NATO leaders tasked continued work "on the political and military implications of missile defence for the Alliance including an update on missile threat developments" (NATO, 2006b: par. 25).

Lastly, the NATO leaders in Riga also discussed the threats stemming from North Korea and Iran. The Alliance "fully supports the UN Security Council's determination that the North Korean nuclear tests constitute a clear threat to international peace and security and the Council's demand that the Iranian government suspend all enrichment-related and reprocessing activities including research and development to be verified by the International Atomic Energy Agency" (NATO, 2006b: par. 44). The Allies called on Iran and North Korea to fully comply with the demands of relevant UN Security Council Resolutions (ibid.). At this point, it should be noted that similar

[10] The ALTBMD is "a multi-layered system of systems, comprising early warning sensors, comprising early warning sensors, radar and various interceptors that should reach full operational capability in the 2016-2017 timeframe" (NATO, 2008a: 6). While the individual member countries will provide the sensors and weapon systems, NATO will develop a commonly funded architecture to integrate all these elements (ibid.).

formulations regarding North Korea and Iran will be reiterated in every NATO's analysed document as well.

One important event, related to the WMD topic, took place before the 2008 Bucharest Summit. In July 2007, NATO Allies activated a Joint CBRN Defence Centre of Excellence in Vyškov. The objective of this Centre is to offer recognized expertise and experience to the Alliance's benefit, especially in support of its transformation process (NATO, 2015b: 161). It also develops defence doctrines, standards and knowledge with the goal of improving interoperability and capabilities in the CBRN defence area by enhancing multinational education, training and exercises (NATO, 2008a: 5). Additionally, the Centre trains the CBRN Defence Task Force of the NATO Response Force (NATO, 2015b: 161).

The Heads of State and Government gathered again at Bucharest Summit on 2-4 April 2008 to enlarge NATO – Albania and Croatia were invited to join the Alliance – and to further strengthen the ability of the Allies to deal with existing and emerging threats of 21st century. NATO leaders strongly condemned all acts of terrorism and emphasized the determination of the Allies to fight terrorists, who may seek to use WMD to threaten international peace and security (NATO, 2008b: par. 15). As the protection of NATO's population, territories, forces and (newly mentioned) infrastructure against the consequences of terrorist attacks is of utmost importance, the Allies will "continue to develop and contribute to policies to prevent and counter proliferation, with a view to preventing terrorist access to, and use of, WMD" (ibid.).

At Bucharest, NATO leaders reiterated that ballistic missile proliferation is, indeed, an increasing threat to the Alliance and therefore missile defence - as a part of a broader response to counter this threat - is needed. Additionally, "Allied leaders recognized that the planned deployment of European-based United States missile defence assets will help protect many Allies, and agreed that this capability should be an integral part of any future NATO-wide missile defence architecture" (NATO, 2008a: 7). Options for a comprehensive missile defence architecture that would extend coverage to all Allied populations and territory, not otherwise covered by the U.S. system, were tasked to be reviewed at NATO's Strasbourg/Kehl Summit in 2009 (NATO, 2008b: par. 37). In this regard, cooperation with Russia on theatre missile defence (TMD) – under the auspices of the NATO-Russia Council – was regarded as essential. At Bucharest Summit, the

Alliance leaders reaffirmed to Russia that NATO Missile Defence efforts are intended to better address the security challenges both of them face and that they do not pose a threat to their relationship (NATO, 2008b: par. 28). In this regard, Russia was encouraged to take advantage of U.S. missile defence cooperation proposals, while NATO leadership announced that they are "ready to explore the potential for linking United States, NATO and Russian missile defence systems at an appropriate time" (NATO, 2008b: par. 38).

Lastly, NATO reiterated its commitment to developing policies and capabilities to deal with emerging challenges and threats, including "development of a comprehensive policy for preventing the proliferation of WMD and defending against chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear threats" (NATO, 2008b: par. 45). This decision will result in adoption of the substantial 'NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats' at the Strabourg/Kehl Summit following year.

3.8. NATO's 60th anniversary and new WMD policy after 15 years

The Strasbourg/Kehl Summit that took place on 3-4 April 2009 was an important one, as the Heads of State and Government gathered in France and Germany to celebrate the 60th anniversary of NATO. Here, the Alliance leaders adopted a Declaration on Alliance Security that reaffirmed the basic values, principles and purposes of the Alliance. Additionally, they decided to launch the process of developing a new Strategic Concept which would define long-term role of NATO in the new security environment of the 21st century (NATO, 2009a: par. 1).

However, the WMD did not top the agenda for Strasbourg/Kehl Summit. One important event that received most attention at this milestone summit happened in summer of the previous year. In August 2008, Russo-Georgian war between Georgia, Russia and the Russian-backed self-proclaimed republics of South Ossetia and Abkhazia took place. This event had obviously profound impact on the NATO-Russia relationship, as NATO reiterated its continued support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Georgia and called on Russia to fulfil its commitments with respect to Georgia, i.e. withdraw from the Georgian areas it has committed to leave (NATO, 2009a: par. 34). Additionally, NATO viewed the build-up of Russian military presence in Georgian territories, Abkhazia and South Ossetia, as a particularly concerning (ibid.). As a response to Russian behaviour in Georgia, NATO decided to suspend the formal meeting of NATO-Russia Council and cooperation in some areas until spring 2009 (NATO, 2016a). Nonetheless, the Alliance

reiterated the importance for their relationship to continue, as Russian Federation is particularly important partner and neighbour given the shared security interests such as counter-terrorism, non-proliferation of WMD and cooperation on missile defence (NATO, 2009a: par. 35).

Speaking of missile defence, NATO leaders reaffirmed at Strasbourg/Kehl Summit the importance of missile defence, as ballistic missiles remain an increasing threat to Allies' forces, territory and populations (NATO, 2009a: par. 50). In response to the task made at the previous Bucharest Summit to "develop options for a comprehensive missile defence architecture to extend coverage to all European Allied territory and populations, several technical architecture options were developed and subsequently assessed from politico-military perspective" (NATO, 2009a: par. 51). NATO leaders assigned two tasks for the Council in Permanent Session: first, to present recommendations about missile defence architecture alternative at the next summit taking place in Lisbon in 2010, and second, to identify and undertake work related to a "possible expanded role of the Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence (ALTBMD) programme beyond the protection of NATO deployed forces to include territorial missile defence" (NATO, 2009a: par. 53).

Importantly, at Strasbourg/Kehl Summit NATO leaders decided to intensify Alliance's efforts to prevent state and non-state actors from accessing WMD and their means of delivery. In this regarded, they endorsed 'NATO's Comprehensive Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats', which was made public on 31 August 2009 by the decision of the North Atlantic Council.

'NATO's Comprehensive Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats' is particularly important as it supersedes Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction from 1994, which guided NATO's WMD efforts for 15 years. The new policy document reiterated findings from the Comprehensive Political Guidance about proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery, as well as terrorists acquiring WMD, being principal threats for the Alliance over the next 10-15 years (NATO, 2009b: par. 1). Recognizing this, NATO has been vigilant in developing policies designed to tackle the WMD proliferation threat. Nonetheless, despite significant progress, major challenges still remain. Non-

adherence to existing international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation commitments, as well as programs aimed at developing WMD and their delivery means, can significantly undermine global norms and constitute a serious threat to Alliance security (NATO, 2009b: par. 1). While existing nuclear weapons as well as chemical and radiological agents could be vulnerable to exploitation if not properly secured, bioterrorism threat is being continuously increased by rapid advances in biological science and technology (ibid.). Furthermore, indications that terrorists want to acquire CBRN materials for malicious purposes already exist. "Recognising the difficulties associated with defending against these threats – especially those that derive from non-State actors – the Alliance must take a pragmatic and practical approach to address them" (NATO, 2009b: par. 1).

However, NATO's approach must take into consideration "every stage of an adversary's potential acquisition, intention and preparation to use, and employment of WMD" (NATO, 2009b: par. 2). To this time, Alliance has responded to this challenge by addressing WMD proliferation, CBRN defence and consequence management within relevant bodies. However, the adopted policies have focused primarily on developing military capabilities and measures that would protect NATO's deployed forces, population and territory against the use of weapons of mass destruction, rather than on preventing proliferation (ibid.). Given the constant developments in security environment, an updated and comprehensive policy, one that builds upon earlier work, is essential for bringing clarity and direction to NATO's extensive efforts aimed to address the WMD threats.

Thus, the vision of this new policy is to secure NATO's population, territory and forces from CBRN threats, WMD included, and to ensure that Alliance members will not be coerced by those posing such a threat (NATO, 2009b: par. 3). With this in mind, the strategic document set forth its mission: "With due respect to the primarily military mission of the Alliance, NATO will work actively to prevent the proliferation of WMD by State and non-State actors, to protect the Alliance from WMD threats should prevention fail, and be prepared for recovery efforts should the Alliance suffer a WMD attack or CBRN event, within its competencies and whenever it can bring added value, through a comprehensive political, military and civilian approach" (NATO, 2009b: par. 4).

Subsequently, the document presents a number of concrete steps and activities that NATO has to follow in order to fulfil this mission. While the document is, indeed, very complex – as it constitutes a new basis for NATO's efforts in the field of WMD for many years to come – and discussing its content in detail would be difficult, few points have to be mentioned. The document

for example highlights 'strategic enablers' which will allow NATO to effectively undertake the three pillars of its approach to: prevent the proliferation of WMD, protect against WMD, and recover should the Alliance suffer from a WMD attack (NATO, 2009b: par. 26). These strategic enablers consist of "intelligence sharing, CBRN Reachback[11], international outreach and partner activities, as well as public diplomacy and strategic communications" (ibid.). Additionally, NATO has vowed to improve collaboration with partners, relevant international and regional organizations and national authorities in member states while implementing this policy (NATO, 2009b: par. 36). Lastly, to ensure that this new Alliance policy is properly implemented, NATO promised to accelerate their efforts to transform their capabilities to address WMD threats, while Allies were encouraged to reflect this policy in their national documents. Lastly, based on this policy, military authorities of the Alliance were tasked to review and revise the relevant analyses, defence and force planning documents as well as develop required concepts accordingly (NATO, 2009b: par. 37).

3.9. Lisbon Summit and new Strategic Concept 2010

The Heads of State and Government met again at the Lisbon Summit that took place on 19-20 November 2010. At this summit, NATO leaders adopted a new Strategic Concept that lays out the vision for the Alliance for the next decade: "NATO will be more agile, more capable and more cost-effective, and it will continue to serve as an essential instrument for peace" (NATO, 2010b: par. 2).

New Strategic Concept entitled 'Active Engagement, Modern Defence' will guide the next phase in NATO's evolution, so that it can continue to be an effective Alliance in the ever changing world, with new capabilities, new partners and against existing and new threats (NATO, 2010a: 4). "The proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, and their means of delivery" was identified as one of the biggest threats to Alliance's security as it "threatens incalculable consequences for global stability and prosperity" (NATO, 2010a: par. 9). However, what is particularly interesting from the phrasing is the division of WMD into "nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction", which clearly indicates that nuclear weapons stand above the rest of mass destructive weapons – chemical, biological and radiological (CBR). For

[11] CBRN Reachback capability provides timely and comprehensive scientific/technical and operational expertise on CBRN, as well as assessments and advice to NATO commanders, their staff and deployed forces during both planning and execution of operations. Joint CBRN Defence Centre of Excellence is the responsible organ, as it integrates a CBRN Reachback element, which has reached its full operational capability in January 2016 (NATO, 2016a: 49).

comparison, see phrasing of the previous Strategic Concept from 1999, in which "the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern" (NATO, 1999a: par. 22). As was already discussed, the Alliance considered radiological weapons to be part of the joint WMD categorization after the 9/11 attacks, and especially after Iraq War, so it is no surprise that only nuclear, biological and chemical weapons were mentioned in this previous Strategic Concept. Nonetheless, the phrasing of the 2010 Strategic Concept clearly indicates the heightened attention on nuclear weapons within the Alliance. As will be demonstrated by the following three summits – in Chicago, Wales and Warsaw – that will be analysed, this phrasing that separates nuclear (N) from chemical, biological, radiological (CBR) weapons will be much more common.

However, coming back to the 2010 Strategic Concept, another security threat that was discussesed, was terrorism. Not only that it poses a direct threat to the security of the citizens of NATO countries, but "extremist groups continue to spread to, and in, areas of strategic importance to the Alliance, and modern technology increases the threat and potential impact of terrorist attacks, in particular if terrorists were to acquire nuclear, chemical, biological or radiological capabilities" (NATO, 2010a: par. 10). Therefore, it is essential that NATO develops further its capacity to defend against the weapons of mass destruction.

While stressing that Alliance does not consider any country to be its adversary, no one should, however, "doubt NATO's resolve if the security of any of its members to be threatened" (NATO, 2010a: par. 16). For this reason, deterrence – based on an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional capabilities – remains a core element of NATO's overall strategy. The reason behind the need for nuclear weapons is straightforward – "as long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance" (NATO, 2010a: par. 17). Additionally, NATO committed to develop the capability to defend its populations and territories against ballistic missile attack as a core element of its collective defence (NATO, 2010a: par. 19).

Furthermore, since NATO seeks its security at the lowest possible level of force, the Alliance swears to play its part in "reinforcing arms control and in promoting disarmament of both conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction, as well as in non-proliferation efforts" (NATO, 2010a: par. 26). Lastly, the new Strategic Concept called for more efficient and effective use of Alliance's limited resources, as it has significant impact on the NATO's capability to carry out its missions, which are essential to the security of the Alliance populations and territory (NATO, 2010a: par. 37).

Apart from adopting new Strategic Concept, the Lisbon Summit is also known for the decision to develop a missile defence capability in order to "provide full coverage and protection for all NATO European populations, territory and forces against the increasing threats posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles" (NATO, 2010b: par. 36). In accordance with Strategic Concept, the objective of the ballistic missile defence is to bolster deterrence as a core element of NATO's collective defence and to contribute to the indivisible security of the Alliance (NATO, 2010b: par. 30). With this goal in mind, NATO leaders tasked the Council to continue reviewing Alliance's overall posture in deterring and defending against the full range of threats to the Alliance (ibid.). This task will result in the Deterrence and Defence Posture Review that shall be approved at the following Chicago Summit in May 2012.

Additionally, as NATO officials identified territorial missile defence as a core alliance objective and adopted a formal NATO program in response – after several years of discussions and disagreements – they further agreed that an expanded ALTBMD Programme should form the command, control and communications backbone of such system. In the official Summit's language: "the scope of NATO's current Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence (ALTBMD) programme's command, control and communications capabilities will be expanded beyond the protection of NATO deployed forces to also protect NATO European populations, territory and forces" (NATO, 2010b: par. 37). In "a spirit of reciprocity, maximum transparency and mutual confidence", opportunities for a missile defence cooperation with Russia will be continuously explored. Moreover, the Alliance reiterated its readiness to invite Russia to explore the potential for linking defence systems in a mutually benefiting way (NATO, 2010b: par. 38). At Lisbon, NATO and Russia agreed on a joint ballistic missile threat assessment, and to continue dialogue in this area. However, as will be demonstrated later, since then "the two sides have failed to agree on the contours of such cooperation, and rhetoric from Russian policymakers has become increasingly hostile to the NATO plan" (Belkin, 2014: 7).

3.10. Chicago Summit at a time of complex security challenges

Heads of State and Government met again at the Chicago Summit that took place on 20-21 May 2012. It was for the first time in the Alliance's history that an American city other than Washington hosted a NATO summit. An agenda for Chicago Summit was packed with a number of events that have occurred since the last meeting in Lisbon, and NATO leaders discussed them –

e.g. the Arab Spring, Libyan Civil War, transition for NATO forces in Afghanistan or global financial crisis constraining Allied defence budgets – at length.

Concerning the topic of this thesis, NATO leaders reiterated that they continue to be deeply concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, as well as their means of delivery, as the proliferation "threatens our shared vision of creating the conditions necessary for a world without nuclear weapons in accordance with the goals of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty" (NATO, 2012b: par. 50). As customary, the NATO leaders called upon Iran and North Korea to fully comply with all their international obligations. Furthermore, the Alliance called on all states to "strengthen the security of nuclear materials within their borders, as called for at the 2012 Seoul Nuclear Security Summit" (ibid.). The underlying logic is to work towards strengthening nuclear security, reducing the threat of nuclear terrorism and preventing terrorists from acquiring nuclear materials (U.S. Department of State, 2012). NATO's increased focus on the nuclear security was most probably heightened by the Fukushima accident. Following a major earthquake, a 15-metre tsunami disabled the power supply and cooling of three Fukushima Daiichi reactor, thus causing a nuclear accident on 11 March 2011 (World Nuclear Association, 2016).

Importantly, the results of Deterrence and Defence Posture Review (DDPR) – as tasked in Lisbon – were approved and made public. According to DDPR, NATO is committed to maintaining an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional and missile defence capabilities for deterrence and defence in order to fulfil its commitments as set out in the Strategic Concept (NATO, 2012b: par. 54). Additionally, DDPR states that missile defence can complement the role of nuclear weapons in deterrence, but it cannot substitute for them. It is a purely defensive capability, which is being established in the light of threats emanating from outside the Euro-Atlantic area (NATO, 2012b: par. 59). Particularly important was the declaration of NATO's leaders that the Alliance has achieved an Interim NATO BMD Capability, which is an operationally significant first step which will offer the maximum coverage within available means to defend NATO's populations, territory and forces across southern NATO Europe against a ballistic missile defence (NATO 2012b: par. 60). Concurrently, NATO leaders reaffirmed that the "NATO missile defence in Europe will not undermine strategic stability" (NATO, 2012b: par. 60). In this regard, the Alliance stressed that its missile defence is not directed against Russia and will not undermine its strategic deterrence capabilities. "While regretting recurrent Russian statements on possible measures directed against

NATO's missile defence system", Russia's willingness to continue dialogue with the aim to find an agreement on the future framework for missile defence cooperation was welcomed (NATO, 2012b: par. 62).

3.11. Wales Summit - "most important one since the fall of the Berlin Wall"

Leaders from the twenty-eight NATO member countries gathered on 4-5 September 2014 in Newport, Wales, for a summit that has been described by Admiral James Stavridis, former NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe, as the "most important one since the fall of the Berlin Wall because of the clear level of multi-crises" happening around the world at once (Hjelmgaard, 2014). What Stavridis had in mind were Russia's aggressive actions against Ukraine; activities of Islamic State in Syria, Iraq and along Turkish border; the nearing end of NATO's ISAF mission in Afghanistan and the challenges of setting up a long-term mission there; the aftermath of the Arab Spring, especially in Egypt and Libya, Ebola outbreak in West Africa, conflict in Ukraine and many others (ibid.). Not surprisingly, the agenda for Wales Summit was packed.

However, as Michael Clarke, the director general of the Royal United Services Institutes, commented the situation: "In one sense this is a summit with a long agenda, but actually, there's only really one item on it" (Hjelmgaard, 2014). The one item being Russia. As Clarke continued: "If NATO is not seen to react meaningfully to Russian action in Ukraine, then it doesn't much matter what it says about the Middle East or events in the Indian Ocean or anything else" (ibid.). Clarke is not wrong, as the Wales Summit did really pay a lot of attention on Russian destabilising actions and policies (at least 15 consecutive paragraphs of the Wales Summit Declaration deals with that, while Russia is mentioned at least 40 times throughout the document).

Since "Russia has breached its commitments, as well as violated international law, thus breaking the trust at the core of our cooperation", NATO leaders decided to suspend all practical civilian and military cooperation within NATO-Russia Council, with only political channels being opened for communication (NATO, 2014: par. 21-22). This decision has, however, significant consequences for the cooperation in a number of issues important for this thesis, i.e. proliferation of WMD, missile defence or status of nuclear weapons. In this context, NATO leaders stressed at Wales Summit that it is of "paramount importance that disarmament and non-proliferation commitments under existing treaties are honoured, including the Intermediate-Range Nuclear

Forces (INF) Treaty, which is of crucial element of Euro-Atlantic security" (NATO, 2014: par. 53). In that regard, Allies called on Russia "to preserve the viability of the INF Treaty through ensuring full and verifiable compliance" (ibid.). However, it should be noted here, that the United States has suspected Russia of violating INF at least since 2011, however, it was not before 28 July 2014 that U.S. President Barack Obama wrote a letter to Russian President Vladimir Putin alerting him about the Russian violation. Additionally, Russia has been hinting about its possible withdrawal from INF for years (Williams, 2014). However, it was only now that the issue was raised on the international agenda and NATO summit declaration as well.

However, Russia's increasingly aggressive behaviour was not, indeed, the only issue on the agenda. The deteriorating situation in Middle East and North Africa (MENA) received a significant attention as well. In the context of this thesis, the successful completion by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)-UN Joint Mission and Allies of the removal and elimination of Syria's declared chemical weapons was particularly welcomed at the Wales Summit (NATO, 2014: par. 36). However, the Alliance remained highly concerned by the continuing reports of the use of chemicals as weapons in Syria.

Furthermore, at Wales Summit the Allies focused on the BMD as well. They reiterated basic parameters for NATO BMD and announced that the "deployment of Aegis Ashore in Deveselu, Romania, is on track to be completed in 2015 timeframe". Aegis Ashore is a "sophisticated collection of phased-array radars, fire control directors, computers and missiles" (Lockheed Martin, 2016), which will be offered to NATO and will provide a significant increase in NATO BMD capability, so that the population of European NATO states, deployed forces, territory and the Alliance assets can be protected from ballistic missile attacks (NATO, 2014: par. 57).

As customary, NATO reiterated that the proliferation of nuclear weapons and other WMD, as well as their delivery means, by states and non-state actors continues to pose a threat to Alliance and therefore "addressing serious proliferation challenges remains an urgent international priority" (NATO, 2014: par. 75). In this context, NATO leaders called on all states to commit themselves to effectively fight the proliferation of WMD through the universalisation of the relevant treaties, i.e. NPT, CWC, BTWC and CTBT. Additionally, as in Chicago Summit, Allies called on all states to strengthen the security of nuclear materials – and newly mentioned – radioactive sources within their borders (NATO, 2014: par. 78). Alliance officials also committed to ensure that NATO is postured to counter CBRN threats, including through the Combined Joint CBRN Defence Task

Force (ibid.). The defence against CBRN threats also continues through the Defence Against Terrorism Programme of Work.

Lastly, the need to reverse the trend of declining budgets as well as more effective use of the available funds was another important element agreed upon at Wales Summit. It is particularly important decision as the Alliance's overall security and defence depends on how much is spent and how it is spent (NATO, 2014: par. 14). After all, the fight against proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery, as well as ensuring appropriate CBRN defence is not possible without sufficient funding.

3.12. Warsaw Summit as the most significant NATO summit since the Cold War

The last NATO summit, which shall be analysed in this thesis, took place on July 8-9, 2016 in Warsaw. At this summit, Montenegro was formally invited to become the 29th member of NATO. This was probably the most positive point of the whole Warsaw Summit, as the rest of the summit communiqué pays attention to the changed and evolved, i.e. deteriorating, security environment. As the Heads of State and Government stated: "There is an arc of insecurity and instability along NATO's periphery and beyond. The Alliance faces a range of security challenges and threats that originate both from east and from the south; from state and non-state actors; from military forces and from terrorists, cyber, or hybrid attacks" (NATO, 2016b: par. 5). Aggressive actions of Russia, including provocative military activities at the periphery of NATO territory and its demonstrated willingness to pursue goals through threats and force, have fundamentally challenged the Alliance and have damaged the Euro-Atlantic security (ibid.). The security of NATO is also affected by the significantly deteriorating security situation in Middle East and North Africa (MENA). Terrorism, as perpetrated particularly by the so-called Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL), "has risen to an unprecedented level of intensity, reaches into all of Allied territory, and now represents an immediate and direct threat to our nations and the international community" (NATO, 2016b: par. 5).

In the months preceding Warsaw Summit, the Allies faced a number of Islamic terrorist attacks on their soil and cities, such as terrorist attacks in Paris (11/2015), Brussels (3/2016), Nice (7/2016) etc. In particular, it is Islamic State that "poses a grave threat to the wider Middle East and North Africa region and to our own nations" (NATO, 2016b: par. 7). As a response, all NATO Allies are

contributing to the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL and the Alliance is prepared to do more in counter-terrorism. Additionally, NATO leaders stated that the continuing crises and instability across MENA region demonstrates that the security of the region has direct implications for NATO's security (NATO, 2016b: par. 25). They continued with: "In addition to the spill-over of conflict from failing and failed states, terrorism and violent extremism, we face other common transnational security threats and challenges, including trafficking of small arms and light weapons, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means" and other threats (ibid.). Additionally, the instability in MENA region contributes to the refugee and migrant crisis (NATO, 2016b: par. 5).

At Warsaw Summit, NATO leaders stated that credible deterrence and defence are essential means of preventing conflict and war. Therefore, deterrence and defence which is based on an appropriate mix of nuclear, conventional, and missile defence capabilities remains a core element of NATO's overall strategy (NATO, 2016b: par. 52). While reiterating that as long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will have to remain a nuclear weapons alliance, NATO leaders also emphasized that the fundamental purpose of Alliance's nuclear capability is to preserve peace, prevent coercion and deter aggression. They continued with: "Nuclear weapons are unique. Any employment of nuclear weapons against NATO would fundamentally alter the nature of a conflict. The circumstances in which NATO might have to use nuclear weapons are extremely remote. If the fundamental security of any of its members were to be threatened, however, NATO has the capabilities and resolve to impose costs on an adversary that would be unacceptable and far outweigh the benefits that an adversary could hope to achieve" (NATO, 2016b: par. 54). Compared to the all previously analysed summit declarations, the formulations about nuclear weapons employed in Warsaw Summit Communiqué is by far the strongest and most menacing.

The role of nuclear weapons in deterrence is complemented, not substituted, by missile defence, as was previously mentioned and reiterated in Warsaw. Significantly, at Warsaw Summit, a new milestone in the development of NATO BMD has been reached as NATO BMD Initial Operational Capability was achieved (NATO, 2016b: par. 57). This was a significant step toward the aim of NATO BMD which offers a stronger capability to defend populations, territory and forces across southern Europe against a potential ballistic missile attack (ibid.). In this regard, Russia was mentioned once again as NATO leaders stressed that they "explained to Russia many times that the BMD system is not capable against Russia's strategic nuclear deterrent and there is no intention

to redesign this system to have such a capability in the future. Hence, Russian statements threatening to target Allies because of NATO BMD are unacceptable and counterproductive" (NATO, 2016b: 59).

As customary, Allies stressed their deep concern regarding the proliferation of WMD and their delivery means and they emphasized the strong commitment towards arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. In this regard and as in Wales, NATO leaders called on all states to commit to the effective fight against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction through universalisation of the relevant treaties and regimes, i.e. CWC, BTWC, CTBT etc. Continued use of chemical weapons in Iraq and Syria further underscores the evolving and increasing WMD threat to the Alliance (NATO, 2016b: par. 66). Additionally, Alliance leaders reiterated their deep concern about the persistent provocative behaviour of North Korea. Regarding Iran, the conclusion of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between Iran and E3/EU+3, signed on July 2015, and its ongoing implementation was commended. However, NATO remains to be seriously concerned by the development of Iran's ballistic missile programme and continuing missile tests which are inconsistent with relevant UN Security Council resolutions (NATO, 2016b: par. 67-68).

Particularly important point of Warsaw Summit was NATO's commitment to continue enhancing the resilience of the Alliance and to further develop individual and collective capacity to resist any form of armed attack. The central pillar of Allies' resilience and a critical enabler for Alliance collective defence is civil preparedness (NATO, 2016b: par. 73). While national authorities are primarily responsible for protecting their population and critical infrastructure against consequences of terrorist attacks or/and CBRN incidents, NATO can support Allies in assessing and, upon request, enhancing their civil preparedness (ibid.; NATO, 2016c: 50).

Additionally, NATO leaders committed themselves to ensure that "NATO continues to be both strategically and operationally prepared with policies, plans, and capabilities to counter a wide range of state and non-state CBRN threats, based on NATO's Comprehensive Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing Proliferation of WMD and Defending Against CBRN Threats that was endorsed in 2009" and to report on its continued implementation at the next Summit which will take place in 2017 at NATO Headquarters in Brussels (NATO, 2016b: par. 74).

Lastly, with key decisions to reinforce NATO's deterrence and defence, project stability beyond its borders and to promote its values, NATO leaders concluded that the Warsaw Summit has demonstrated the unity, solidarity and strength of the Alliance.

4. Discussion and interpretation of findings

While the previous chapter – which was the empirical core of this thesis – analysed simultaneously how has the WMD threat been understood within NATO since the beginning of the 1990s, as well as what kind of specific measures Alliance approved in response to the evolving WMD threat, the aim of this chapter is to discuss and interpret findings of the conducted analysis. This will be done through providing concise answers to each question, as defined in the analytical framework, based on the information gathered in the previous analysis.

- **Which technologies are constructed as WMD?**

As was already discussed, the weapons of mass destruction have preoccupied NATO since its establishment in 1949. However, NATO's attention to WMD during the Cold War era focused predominantly on one category of mass destructive weapons – nuclear weapons. The encompassing category of "WMD" did not figure heavily in the policy formulations of the Cold War years, although the term was used occasionally – but in reference to nuclear weapons only (Terzuolo, 2004: 6). According to Maller (2013), the "construction of WMD category as a threat did not actually emerge and solidify until the emergence of a new post-Cold War security environment". The conducted content analysis of NATO's official documents confirms Maller's assertion. The end of the Cold War nuclear stalemate caused weakening of the selective focus on nuclear weapons which had dominated foreign policy discourse up until this point and also highlighted the risks associated with other two categories of WMD – chemical and biological weapons (Bentley, 2014: 78). One of the reasons behind this increased awareness was the realisation that threats, which were formerly restrained under the forces of bipolarity such as smaller states pursuing or considering to pursue programmes of chemical and biological acquisition, were no longer kept under control (ibid.).

It can be seen from the analysis that NATO started to focus on the joint category of WMD and on the threats it poses, indeed, by the end of the Cold War, and especially after the disintegration of the Soviet Union at the end of the 1991. However, within this context, it was NBC - nuclear, biological and chemical - interpretation of WMD that dominated NATO's discourse at this stage. Despite the existence of authoritative UN definition of WMD since 1948, which essentially equalled WMD with chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons, the Alliance did not consider radiological weapons to be part of the weapons of mass destruction until after the

terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. Radiological weapons were, in fact, largely ignored throughout the Cold War and the 1990s. However, they reappeared within the conceptual understanding of WMD, when the act of flying planes into the Twin Towers and Pentagon on 9/11 raised concerns that next time terrorists could target a nuclear reactor, thus causing a radiological incident similar in effect to the Chernobyl disaster of 1986 (Bentley, 2013: 95). As discussed in the previous chapter, the November 2002 Prague Summit declaration was the first analysed document in which NATO included radiological weapons on the list of WMD threats. Since then, the understanding of WMD as NBC – which prevailed in the first decade of the analysis – shifted within the Alliance into CBRN as a result of formal recognition of radiological weapons as mass destructive.

As could be seen from the analysed texts, until the Lisbon Summit and the approval of new Strategic Concept in 2010, the WMD was treated as a group of somehow "equal" weapons – meaning that the distinction between separate categories was not very apparent. However, since 2010 a new language within NATO appeared, which divided the category of WMD into "nuclear weapons" and "other weapons of mass destruction", thus clearly indicating that nuclear weapons stand above the rest of mass destructive weapons. Since the Lisbon Summit Declaration, NATO's official documents keep separating nuclear from chemical, biological and radiological weapons, thus highlighting increased attention of the Alliance towards nuclear weapons. Additionally, the language surrounding nuclear weapons in the NATO's official documents is becoming increasingly stronger and more menacing in the last two summit declarations (Wales and Warsaw). There is, however, reason behind it. According to Alexander Vershbow (2015), former Deputy Secretary General of NATO, "Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and its continuing destabilization of Eastern Ukraine" has put "European security system – and all the rules and agreements that underpin it – under severe strain". Although Russia's modus operandi in the Ukraine conflict can be described as hybrid warfare, the conflict has, nevertheless, a WMD dimension as well (ibid.). In the words of Vershbow, "Russia has stepped up its nuclear exercises and integrated a nuclear component into conventional exercises. Russian bombers have been flying closer to Allied borders. And the Russian leadership has been boasting about the development of new nuclear weapons. Perhaps this is mostly rhetoric, but it is highly irresponsible" (Vershbow, 2015 [emphasis in original]). Consequently, the dominance of nuclear weapons over the rest of WMD and NATO's increasingly sharped formulations surrounding nuclear weapons have to be understood in the

context – as a response to Russian nuclear weapons statements and to renewing of nuclear arsenals. The following event should serve as a representative example: In October of this year, Russia has moved – according to its Ministry of Defence – nuclear-capable Iskander-M missiles into the Kaliningrad enclave that borders two NATO members, Poland and Lithuania (The Guardian, 2016). Although Russia's defence ministry said the new deployment was part of military exercises and had already happened before, the fact that certain modifications of the Iskander-M missiles can hit targets which are 700 km away, thus for example putting Berlin in range of Kaliningrad, do not help to ease the tensions (ibid.).

Nonetheless, to conclude the answer to the question of how has the "WMD" term been used and understood in the NATO's official texts; from the start of the analysis in 1991 until the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, the Alliance equalled WMD with NBC, thus omitting radiological weapons. Radiological weapons were added into NATO's definition of WMD following 9/11 attacks. Since then, when the Alliance talks about weapons of mass destruction, it has in mind chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons. However, in the last few years, NATO's documents reflect increased attention towards nuclear weapons as dominant category of the WMD, as demonstrated by the often repeated phrase of "nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction". It remains to be seen whether this type of formulation will become standardized in NATO's official discourse in the years to come or whether the joint categorization of "weapons of mass destruction" will take over once again.

- **What exactly constitutes the threat?**

As became apparent from the analysed texts, two principal threats to NATO stemming from the WMD have been identified – first, proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery and second, WMD terrorism. In fact, the Comprehensive Political Guidance approved in 2006 identified the spread of WMD and their means of delivery as well as the possibility that terrorists will acquire WMD as the most important threats to NATO over the next 10-15 years.

Starting with the first identified threat; as we already know, NATO commented on the emerging risk of WMD proliferation already in the 1991 Strategic Concept. The world has changed significantly and the "loss of bipolarity and the new relevance of existing and emerging actors within the international system created the perception that opportunities for WMD employment had increased" (Bentley, 2014: 76). In this way, the proliferation of WMD became highlighted as

a key security concern for NATO. As previously discussed, one of the reasons behind it was the volatile security situation surrounding the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the lack of Russia's capability to adequately secure its stockpiles (Bentley, 2014: 78). Yet, it was not only transfer of material but also transfer of know-how that were identified as security risks (ibid.). In general, the proliferation of WMD has destabilized the international system since the Cold War as the "number of non-state armed groups, as well as states, that are determined to acquire WMD and their delivery systems" (Kibaroglu, 2009: 161) has increased.

At this point, it should be reiterated, however, that a CBRN agent must not only be capable of inflicting harm but also has to be deliverable to its intended target in order to qualify as an actual WMD (Maurer, 2009: 13). Therefore, much of the proliferation debate in the past decade has focused not only on the weapons themselves, but on the possible means for delivering them – specifically ballistic missiles, given their "capabilities to deliver such weapons over considerable distances, with increasing accuracy, with little warning and without risk to pilots" (Blix, 2006: 140). As discussed in the empirical chapter of this thesis, NATO has paid significant attention towards the threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles that are capable of delivering WMD onto the Allied territory. The cognizance of the threat resulted in the development of ballistic missile defence that would protect NATO's population, territory and forces from the potential ballistic missile attack.

Another major identified threat for NATO was the possibility that terrorists will acquire weapons of mass destruction and that they will indiscriminately use them against a civilian population. Prior to 1995, while the threat of WMD terrorism could not be entirely dismissed, the chances of terrorists actually employing weapons of mass destruction were mostly written off as insignificant, as the mass destructive activity was considered to be "inconsistent with the aims of 'traditional' political and ethno-nationalist terror organisations" (Bentley, 2014: 99). However, on 20 March 1995 the Japanese apocalyptic sect Aum Shinrikyo released sarin nerve agent in the Tokyo subway in an event which has been described as "the first major sub-state use of such weapon" (Maurer, 2009: 13). This event, which caused dozen of fatalities and thousands of injuries, obviously weakened the faith that terrorists would not employ WMD. However, the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 in which terrorists from Al-Qaeda flew loaded passenger aircrafts into the World Trade Center and Pentagon shattered the faith completely. However, despite the fact that the strikes on New York and Washington were more shocking and destructive than any terrorist

event that happened before, the attacks were still conventional in nature. A similar attack with weapons of mass destruction would have been far more devastating and NATO was aware of the fact. In this regard, the 9/11 attacks acted as a wake-up call, which taught the Alliance that it should prepare itself for the possibility of WMD terrorism (Roberts, 2009b: 15).

Fortunately, the efforts of terrorist groups to acquire or use WMD and CBRN materials have been so far sporadic and mostly unsuccessful (Santamano, 2013: 6). However, even if the potential terrorist use of WMD remains to be at the high end of the threat spectrum, the following words of Harold Agnew – an American nuclear weapons engineer and the third director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory – should serve as a warning of the need to take the WMD terrorism threat seriously: "If you believe that it is easy to make an improvised nuclear weapon, you are wrong. But if you believe it is impossible for a terrorist group to make an improvised nuclear bomb, you are dead" (Santamano, 2013: 6). Sceptics would argue that in order to perpetuate an act of WMD terrorism, the terrorists would have to overcome a number of hurdles, while maintaining that the "technical difficulties and the moral boundaries of such an attack are too high and that the motivation of terrorist groups to acquire WMD is too low or such an event to occur" (Roberts, 2009a: 2). However, the author of this thesis completely agrees with the previous statement by Harold Agnew as well as with Guy Roberts, former NATO's Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Weapons of Mass Destruction Policy, according to whom "such assessments are overly optimistic, worse still, such assumptions could lull civil society into a false sense of security and result in a failure to adequately invest the necessary time and effort to prepare for the eventuality of a WMD attack" (Roberts, 2009a: 2). As became apparent from the conducted analysis, though, NATO seems to be of the same opinion as the Alliance is well aware of the threat posed by WMD terrorism (which will be discussed in the following sections in more detail).

- **Who or what is threatened by the WMD and who is considered to be the agent responsible behind the threat(s)?**

The aim of this section is to first discuss what would be in securitization theory called referent object, i.e. who or what is said to be existentially threatened and has a legitimate claim to survival (Buzan et al., 1998). Secondly, this section will continue to discuss the agents that NATO considers as responsible for the threats posed by proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery as well as WMD terrorism.

As it became perfectly clear from the analysis of NATO's official documents, it is NATO members' population, territory and forces that are vulnerable to the identified WMD threats. If wider outlook on the matter is employed, it could be argued that since NATO's essential mission is to "ensure that the Alliance remains an unparalleled community of freedom, peace, security, and shared values, including individual liberty, human rights, democracy, and the rule of law" (NATO, 2016b: par.2), the weapons of mass destruction thus threaten the indivisible security and NATO's common values as well. Nevertheless, to protect and defend its populations and its territory against attack (with conventional or unconventional weapons), as defined in the Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, is the greatest responsibility of the Alliance. In this regard, two types of actors who are threatening NATO's security were identified – states and non-state actors.

In the first decade of conducted analysis, that is in the 1990s, the principal WMD threat for the Alliance stemmed from the state actors. As was already discussed: "By 1993, more than 25 countries, many located near NATO territory, were identified as potentially having NBC capabilities, and at least half of them had operational ballistic missiles, while other countries were trying to develop them" (Carter and Omand, 1996: 10-15). Such extent of the WMD proliferation and its security implications for NATO noticeably affected the Alliance's focus on the threat posed by state actors. However, the content analysis also revealed that after the Washington Summit in April 1999, NATO believed that "the threat of WMDs was extremely serious not only from sovereign states such as North Korea and Iran but from non-state actors, such as terrorist groups" as well (Roberts, 2009a: 7).

As we already know, this realisation of a new threat posed by terrorists was triggered by the 1995 Aum Shinrikyo's sarin attack in the Tokyo subway and especially furthered by the events that occurred six years later. The attacks of 11 September 2001 and the anthrax letter attacks that followed shortly afterwards had twofold effect – first, they increased awareness of the worldwide Islamic terror and second, they heightened the focus of the international community – NATO included – on the ability of such terrorist groups to obtain nonconventional weapons. Since then, "although no significant spike in actual incidents of WMD terrorism has yet occurred, there are increasing indications that certain types of terrorist groups are planning WMD attacks, and more worrisome still, several apparent WMD plots have already been interdicted" (Maurer, 2009: 13). To illustrate this in practice, certain terrorist groups, such as Al Qaeda, have made no secret of their intent to use CBRN and number of statements have already been made that indicate their intention

to acquire such capabilities (Roberts, 2009b: 10). Osama bin Laden himself, when asked by a journalist for TIME magazine whether he was trying to acquire nuclear or chemical weapons, replied: "Acquiring weapons for the defence of Muslims is a religious duty. If I have indeed acquired these weapons, then I thank God for enabling me to do so. And if I seek to acquire these weapons, I am carrying out a duty. It would be a sin for Muslims not to try to possess the weapons that would prevent the infidels from inflicting harm on Muslims" (TIME Magazine, 1999). It is not necessary to provide more illustrations of the WMD terrorism threat, as this quote by the former Al-Qaeda leader himself could not be more expressive.

Nonetheless, one other terrorist organization took over Al-Qaeda in NATO's threats assessments – and that is the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). Terrorism, as perpetrated especially by ISIL, was identified at the 2016 Warsaw Summit as the immediate and direct threat to NATO's nations and the international community. This year has already shown that terrorism is coming again closer to Europe (Rudischhauser, 2015). Furthermore, there is a real risk that the Islamic State would turn "into practice what up to now has been largely a theoretical possibility: to actually employ weapons of mass destruction or CBRN material in terrorist attacks" (ibid.). According to Stephen Hummel[12](2016: 18), the Islamic State is actively seeking the weapons of mass destruction as well the personnel with technical experience that would be capable of expanding its program. Additionally, the Islamic State has, to a limited extent, used such weapons in Syria and Iraq (ibid.). Hummel refers to the fact, that there are various media reports indicating that the Islamic State is currently employing chemical weapons, specifically mustard agent. The media, however, also report that the agent is crude and that it has not produced the mass effects which would be typical of a state-run program (Hummel, 2016: 20). In September this year, the Islamic State used a rocket containing sulfur-mustard blister agent against U.S. troops in Iraq (The Atlantic, 2016). Luckily, no one was killed or injured in the attack, but the news is still particularly concerning because even though it was not the first time ISIL has used chemical weapons in Iraq and Syria, it was the first time a chemical weapon has been used against U.S. forces there (ibid.). Nonetheless, Hummel (2016: 18) argues that the Islamic State's program faces many challenges and logistical issues that have tempered their ambitions, which "means that the group is not yet capable of striking Western nations with WMD, though it cannot be ruled out that the Islamic State

[12] Captain Stephen Hummel is currently serving as an instructor in the Chemistry and Life Science Department at West Point and he previously served as the USAREUR (U.S. Army Europe) CBRN plans officer (Hummel, 2016: 18).

could deploy rudimentary chemical devices against the West in the next several years". At this point, it could be argued that it is impossible to predict how long it actually takes before a motivated terrorist group, such as ISIL, acquires a necessary capability and – in the words of Roberts (2009b: 12) – "we may not become aware of this until after the fact". Additionally, we should be mindful of the fact that the non-state actors which are aspiring to obtain and use WMD are difficult to locate and difficult to assess (Kibaroglu, 2009: 169). For all these reasons, the need for NATO to adequately defend itself and its members' population, territory and forces against the threat posed by WMD terrorism as well as by proliferation of WMD and their delivery means should be indisputable.

- **What should be done in order to deal with the identified threat(s) and which specific strategies and/or measures are drafted in response?**

As we already know, the Alliance stepped up its activities in the area of weapons of mass destruction with the launch of WMD Initiative, which was approved at Washington Summit in April 1999. With this Initiative, NATO wanted to take a step forward and integrate political and military aspects of its work in responding to the increasing challenge of proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery (NATO, 2015c: 1). However, many things have changed in the 17 years and the security environment has evolved significantly. The terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 resulted in the invocation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty for the first time in Alliance's history. The anthrax letters attacks that occurred in the United States soon after 9/11 not only emphasized the threat posed by bioweapons but they also "transformed the CBRN threat from an interesting theoretical possibility to a real national security challenge" (Moodie et al., 2007: 2). Significantly, the proliferation of nuclear weapons has taken place and proves to be of a great concern for the international community. On 9 October 2006, North Korea announced that it had successfully conducted its first nuclear test. A fifth nuclear test, so far the most powerful one, occurred only recently – on September 9, 2016, when North Korea claimed to have successfully detonated a nuclear warhead that could be mounted to a ballistic missile (NY Times, 2016). Similarly, Iran – though a party to the NPT Treaty since 1970 – "has an advanced nuclear program that was subject of international negotiations and sanctions from 2002 until implementation of a comprehensive nuclear deal began in 2016" (NTI, 2016). Though the recent deal with Iran has eased concerns over proliferation of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, it did not completely

eliminate them (NATO, 2015c: 22). Additionally, chemical weapons were used in 2013 during the Syrian civil war; UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon called it "the most significant confirmed use of chemical weapons against civilians since Saddam Hussein used them in Halabja in 1988" (CNN, 2013). Last but not least, recent terrorist attacks across Europe have shown that terrorism remains acute and direct threat to NATO's population, territory and forces and "the risk that such terrorist groups consider the use of CBRN materials has grown" (NATO, 2015c: 1).

This section was just an illustration of some of the most important developments in the WMD area which have direct impact on the security of the Alliance and to which NATO has to respond. Fortunately, as apparent from the conducted analysis, NATO has been aware of these developments and continues to tailor its policies and activities to the changing environment and to the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. However, since the third chapter already discussed what NATO should do in order to deal with the identified threats, as well as introduced specific strategies and measures that the Alliance approved as a response to the evolving WMD threat, it would be redundant to repeat it all here once again. Yet, while the most visible activities of NATO in the fight against WMD proliferation and WMD terrorism were mentioned, the Alliance has undertaken a number of other steps that are also important in the overall response. The objective of this section is thus to provide a better picture of all NATO's activities in the field that are aimed at tackling the WMD-related threats.

As we already know, NATO is actively engaged in preventing the proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery by both state and non-state actors through dynamic agenda of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as by developing and harmonising CBRN defence capabilities. NATO also continues to work on defending its populations, territory and forces against the threat of missile-borne WMD through the missile defence and the Allies keep intensifying its defence response to the risks posed by WMD by improving civil preparedness and consequence management capabilities (NATO, 2016c: 47-48). Overall, it can be seen that both political and defence dimensions are vital in order to secure the Alliance.

Within NATO, it is the WMD Non-Proliferation Centre, which was launched in May 2000 as a result of the WMD Initiative approved at the 1999 Washington Summit, that plays very important role. It is precisely the WMD Centre that is responsible for strengthening of the dialogue on WMD issues, enhancing consultations on non-proliferation efforts, assessing the risks and supporting the

defence efforts that improve NATO's preparedness to respond to the risks posed by WMD and their means of delivery (NATO, 2016c: 48).

Since then, a number of initiatives were undertaken by NATO in order to improve its CBRN defence capabilities. In this regard, particularly important was the establishment of the Combined Joint CBRN Defence Task Force and of the Joint CBRN Defence Centre of Excellence. The Combined Joint CBRN Defence Task Force, which consists of the multinational CBRN Defence Battalion and the Joint Assessment Team, is a special NATO body specifically trained and equipped to deal with CBRN events and/or attacks aimed at the population, territory and forces of the Allies (NATO, 2015a). The Task Force is led by an individual Ally on 12-month rotational basis and it operates, under normal circumstances, within the NATO Response Force (NRF). However, the Task Force is capable of operating independently of NRF if required (NATO, 2016c: 48). The Joint CBRN Centre of Excellence, which was activated in Vyškov (the Czech Republic) in 2007, has played important role in the transformation process of NATO as it provides opportunities to improve interoperability and capabilities by enhancing multinational education, training and exercises as well as assists in development of concepts, doctrines, procedures and standards (NATO, 2016c: 49). Importantly, the Centre of Excellence is also responsible for CBRN Reachback support to operations and operational planning support. The Reachback capability, which provides timely and comprehensive scientific and operational CBRN expertise, assessments and advice to NATO commanders, their staff and deployed forces, became fully operational in January 2016 and it is able to operate – if needed – 24/7 (NATO, 2016c: 49).

Furthermore, NATO is also active in creating and improving important standardization documents, as well as in conducting training and exercises, and developing vital capability improvements in the field of CBRN defence through the work of many groups, bodies and institutions (ibid.). Significantly, the Alliance also promotes scientific collaboration, especially through the Science for Peace and Security (SPS) Programme – "a policy tool that enhances cooperation and dialogue with all partners, based on scientific research, innovation and knowledge exchange" (NATO, 2016d). The central objective of SPS in WMD non-proliferation and CBRN defence is to improve NATO's ability to protect its populations and forces from chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear threats (NATO, 2016c: 49). Additionally, since countering WMD threats is a global endeavour, the Alliance engages actively to enhance the international security through partnerships with relevant countries and other international organizations. The

underlying logic behind the outreach to partners, international and regional organization is that it "helps develop a common understanding of the WMD threat and encourages participation in and compliance with international arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation efforts to which they are party" (NATO, 2016e). Moreover, it helps to enhance global efforts to protect and defend against CBRN threats as well as improve crisis management and recovery in case WMD are used against NATO or its interests (ibid.).

To conclude this section, it can be seen – not only from this section but from the previous empirical part of this thesis – that NATO knows what it is supposed to be doing in order to deal with the threats posed by proliferation of WMD and their delivery means as well as by the WMD terrorism threat. To this end, the Alliance has approved and undertaken a number of specific strategies and measures whose aim is to tackle the threats to its security which stem from the weapons of mass destruction.

Conclusion

This diploma thesis aimed to shed light on the important issue of WMD threat construction in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Specifically, this thesis had two objectives in mind. First, it aimed to answer how has the WMD threat construction and interpretation within the Alliance evolved since the year 1991, when the new Strategic Concept in which greater attention was paid to weapons of mass destruction was approved. Second, this work was interested in the Alliance's response to the evolving WMD threat, particularly in the concrete measures which were undertaken to tackle the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. To fulfil these objectives, a detailed qualitative content analysis of NATO's official documents relevant to the topic of WMD was conducted. Based on the framework provided by Copenhagen School's securitization theory, this thesis considered WMD as a social construct with important strategic implications. Consequently, this approach allowed us to trace the evolution of WMD understanding within the Alliance.

Let us start with the first objective of this research - to answer how has the WMD threat construction and interpretation in NATO evolved since the start of the analysis in 1991. Throughout the Cold War years, the overarching category of "weapons of mass destruction" did not figure heavily in the policy formulations of the Alliance. Although the term was used occasionally during the Cold War era, it referred mostly to nuclear weapons only. The same applies to the proliferation of WMD to states outside of Europe and to non-state actors as well – the threat did not have such a significant position in NATO's hierarchy of threats as it did later (Terzuolo, 2004: 10). It was only by the end of the Cold War, and especially after the disintegration of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, that NATO realized the necessity for a major reassessment of both risks and possible responses to the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. Although weapons of mass destruction have always been a political priority – indeed, the distinction was a fundamental aspect of the concept itself (Bentley, 2014: 76) – it seemed that the WMD threat entered a new phase since the beginning of the 1990s. The world changed significantly and the loss of bipolarity has created a perception that opportunities for WMD employment had increased (ibid.). Accordingly, Maller's (2013) assertion that the "construction of WMD category as a threat did not actually emerge and solidify until the emergence of a new-post Cold War security environment" seems perfectly true. However, the results of the analysis also showed that within this context, it was NBC – nuclear, biological and chemical – interpretation of the WMD that dominated NATO's discourse at this stage, as it reflected the primary concerns of the Alliance. Despite the existence of the authoritative

UN definition of WMD, which understood weapons of mass destruction as chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons (i.e. CBRN), the Alliance did not consider radiological weapons as mass destructive at this point.

During the 1990s, NATO had to respond to a new set of challenges stemming from the significantly changed security environment. The proliferation of WMD and their delivery means presented such a challenge. The analysis revealed that the principal threat for the Alliance during the 1990s came from the state actors. As was already discussed, by 1993, more than two dozens of states – many of which were located near NATO's territory – were identified as potentially having NBC capabilities, while at least half of them had also operational ballistic missiles (Carter and Omand, 1996). Such extent of WMD proliferation and its security implications for NATO noticeably affected the Alliance's focus on the threat posed by state actors. However, since Washington Summit of 1999, NATO believed that it was no longer threatened by only sovereign states, such as North Korea and Iran, but by non-state actors, such as terrorists, as well. This realisation of WMD terrorism threat was trigged by Aum Shinrikyo's sarin attacks in the Tokyo subway in 1995 and it was especially furthered by the events that took place on 11 September 2001. The terrorist attacks of 9/11 radically altered fundamental perceptions of security and caused a major transition in understanding of WMD and associated threats (Bentley, 2014: 99).

Not only that the attacks of 9/11 heated up the debate on WMD terrorism, but they were also an important moment of conceptual change. Whereas NATO's attention had previously focused on threat posed by NBC weapons, the attacks of 9/11 highlighted the potential threat associated with radiological weapons. Although radiological weapons were largely ignored throughout the Cold War and the 1990s, they reappeared within the conceptual understanding of WMD when the act of flying planes into the Twin Towers and Pentagon raised concerns that terrorists could next time target a nuclear reactor, thus causing a radiological incident similar in effect to the Chernobyl disaster of 1986 (Bentley, 2013: 95). Importantly, in the words of Michelle Bentley (2014: 103): "The key point, however, is that a distinct policy discourse had emerged in response to the 9/11, one that explicitly recognized radiological weapons as a mass destructive threat in a way that did not exist previously. There was no fixed construct of NBC". This conceptual shift caused that since the 9/11 attacks, the Alliance no longer views WMD as NBC – which is an understanding that prevailed in NATO up until this point – but strictly as CBRN. This is one of the best – and rare – examples of how can the construction and understanding of WMD change or evolve over time.

Importantly, as the results of the analysis show, the 9/11 attacks have also forced a major reflection on the Alliance's role in combating both proliferation of WMD and their delivery means and WMD terrorism as well. Even though the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001 were more shocking and destructive than any other terrorist event that happened before, they were still conventional in nature. A similar attack with WMD would have been far more devastating and NATO was aware of the fact. In this regard, the 9/11 attacks also acted as a wake-up call, which taught the Alliance that it should properly prepare itself for the possibility of WMD terrorism. Thus, the 9/11 attacks undoubtedly gave an added impetus to NATO efforts on the WMD front as well as in its counter-terrorism efforts.

However, the analysis also showed that since the 9/11 conceptual shift, i.e. radiological weapons were recognized as mass destructive threat, NATO's understanding of the WMD has been undergoing another –perhaps less visible – change. Until 2010, WMD category was treated as a group of somehow "equal" weapons, meaning that the distinction between separate categories was not very apparent from the analysed texts. However, in the last six years a new language within NATO appeared, in which the overarching category of WMD is being divided into "nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction", thus clearly indicating that nuclear weapons stand above the rest of mass destructive weapons. Additionally, formulations surrounding nuclear weapons in NATO's official documents are also becoming increasingly stronger and more menacing in the recent summit declarations (especially from Wales and Warsaw). However, there is a reason behind this increased focus on nuclear weapons within the Alliance. Since Russia's illegal annexation of Crimea and its continuing destabilization of Eastern Ukraine, the European security system has been put under severe strain (Vershbow, 2015). Additionally, the face-off between Russia and NATO members has had WMD dimension as well. In the words of Vershbow (2015): "Russia has stepped up its nuclear exercises and integrated a nuclear component into conventional exercises. Russian bombers have been flying closer to Allied borders. And the Russian leadership has been boasting about the development of new nuclear weapons. Perhaps this is mostly rhetoric, but it is highly irresponsible". Consequently, the dominance of nuclear weapons over the rest of WMD and NATO's increasingly sharp formulations surrounding them should be understood in the context – as a response to Russian nuclear weapons statements and to renewing of nuclear arsenals. It remains to be seen whether this type of formulation – "nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction" – will become standardized in NATO's official discourse in

the years to come or whether the joint categorization of "weapons of mass destruction" will take over once again. It also cannot be ruled out that another understanding of the WMD concept, which might better mirror the strategic intentions of NATO's leaders, will be embraced.

Regarding the second objective of this thesis, the results of the analysis demonstrated that Alliance has been paying attention to the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction since the very beginning. Heightened attention on the part of NATO towards the WMD threats was signalled at the Brussels Summit of 1994. Here, the Alliance responded by approving the Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, which was NATO's first comprehensive document of the emerging risk and which laid out a series of principles that would guide NATO's approach to proliferation of WMD for more than 15 years. The analysis also revealed that NATO stepped up significantly its activities with the launch of WMD Initiative which was approved at Washington Summit in April 1999. With this Initiative, NATO wanted to take a step forward and integrate political and military aspects of its work in responding to the increasing challenge of proliferation of WMD. The WMD Initiative established Alliance's agenda in the WMD area for the next two and half years, i.e. until the tragic events of 9/11 that caused shift of attention towards potential use of WMD by terrorists. Even though the potential use of terrorist use of WMD remains to be at the high end of the threat spectrum – given the number of mitigating factors that make the implementation of such an attack problematic – NATO must be ready for such eventuality. Certain terrorist groups, such as Al Qaeda or recently Islamic State, have made no secret of their intent to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction. In fact, the Islamic State has, to a limited extent, already used chemical weapons in Syria and Iraq. As it is impossible to precisely predict how long it takes before a motivated terrorist group, such as ISIL, acquires a necessary CBRN capability to strike the West/Allies, NATO must be capable of adequately defending its member's populations, territory and forces against the threat posed by WMD terrorism, as well as by proliferation of WMD and their delivery means. The analysis, however, revealed that NATO is aware of the WMD threats to its security and that it has continued to tailor its policies and activities to the changing environment. To counter the threats posed by WMD, NATO has approved and undertaken many specific measures and concrete strategies. Given their complexity, these measures will not be reiterated here. Yet, it can be concluded that NATO is actively engaged in preventing the proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery through dynamic agenda of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation, as well as by developing and

harmonising CBRN defence capabilities. NATO also continues to work on defending its populations, territory and forces against the threat of missile-borne WMD through the missile defence and the Allies keep intensifying its defence response to the risks posed by WMD by improving civil preparedness and consequence management capabilities. The analysis also demonstrated that both political and defence dimensions are vital to secure the Alliance from the WMD threats. It should be noted, however, that although NATO has numerous programs, initiatives, response units as well as political structures that are capable of deterring and responding to the WMD threats, all of this requires support of both home governments and populations (Roberts, 2009: 12). Additionally, it also requires significant financial support as well, and it is very important for the security of us all, that these activities of NATO do not fall victims to limited budgets. However, based on the conducted analysis, it seems that the categorization of WMD has so far helped maintaining the focus and necessary resources of the Alliance on the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction.

At this point, the only thing left to do is to reiterate the importance of the studied topic. It was very surprising to find out that despite the salience of the WMD concept in the contemporary security studies and the significance of NATO, whose primary purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of its members, a very little research has been done on how NATO constructs and interprets the WMD threats. Yet, this is important knowledge, as "the way that actors define the concept affects the process of politics itself; consequently, related security issues cannot be understood without considering how WMD has been interpreted and applied" (Bentley, 2014: 4). Although this thesis has attempted to contribute to the yet under-researched topic of WMD threat construction within NATO, a further study which would bridge this identified research gap is necessary. For instance, it would be very beneficial to focus on the practical consequences of the security and policy measures, that were approved by the Alliance based on the changing understanding of the WDM threat, for member states, their population, scientific cooperation etc.

One thing is, however, sure - WMD will be one the agenda of NATO in the years to come, as the current security situation is even more complex than it was two decades ago, when the Alliance began to deal seriously with the threats posed by WMD. In fact, in the words by Terzuolo (2004: 288): "To retain its credibility as a security organization, NATO has to address these challenges and be seen as addressing them. After all, NATO's own documents and statements by the leaders of every member country have played a part in setting WMD and terrorism at the top of the agenda

of security challenges of our times". Given their destructive potential, WMD will always be a major threat to the security of NATO and the Alliance will continue to address them. However, as Michelle Bentley (2014: 4) already stated: "If we talk about WMD then we need to know *what* we are talking about. Failing to establish what we, and the actors we study, believe to constitute WMD can lead to misunderstanding and error". It is therefore necessary that we are aware of how NATO constructs and understands the WMD threat, as it has important security implications that affect all of us.

Summary

The purpose of this diploma thesis is to shed light on the construction and interpretation of the threat of WMD within NATO as well as to analyse the Alliance's response to identified WMD threats. Specifically, the work intends to analyse how has the WMD threat been constructed and interpreted within the Alliance since the year 1991, which is a start of the analysis as the new Strategic Concept in which greater attention was paid to WMD was approved. Furthermore, this thesis aims to find out how NATO responded to the dangers posed by WMD, i.e. which specific measures aimed at tackling the evolving WMD threat were undertaken.

Although weapons of mass destruction, especially the nuclear ones, have preoccupied NATO since its establishment, WMD as a specific encompassing category did not figure heavily in the policy formulations of the Cold War era. It was only after the end of the Cold War, when Allies have recognized that the WMD threats endanger the Alliance. But what kind of threats? How does NATO understand weapons of mass destruction? These questions, combined with the complex nature of WMD and the lack of clarity surrounding them resulted in formulation of two research questions and above stated goals of this work. By applying constructivist lenses on the matter, this thesis considers WMD to be a social construct with important security implications and adopts this point of view on NATO. There is surprisingly little research done on how NATO constructs and interprets the WMD threat and with what practical consequences. Yet, this is important knowledge, as "the way that actors define the concept affects the process of politics itself; consequently, related security issues cannot be understood without considering how WMD has been interpreted and applied" (Bentley, 2014: 4). Based on the premises of securitization theory and by applying qualitative content analysis methodology, a detailed analysis of NATO's official documents relevant to the topic of WMD and within the timeframe from 1991 until today is conducted to fulfil the objectives of this thesis.

This thesis is dived into four key chapters. The first chapter introduces WMD as a dynamic, yet problematic, concept. In this part, the underlying logic behind the approach employed in this thesis - WMD should not be treated as a fixed concept but as a relatively flexible, politically contingent, construct with strategic implications (Bentley, 2014) - is introduced. Additionally, it is impossible to discuss WMD without understanding the differences amongst each weapon type (CBRN); this will be subject of the first chapter as well.

The second chapter elaborates the theoretical and analytical framework used in this thesis. The securitization theory and its basic tenets, as developed by Copenhagen School, will be introduced here. The way to study securitization is through analysis of relevant texts, which is precisely what is done in this thesis as well through adopting the qualitative content analysis methodology. The concrete research design as well as data sources used for this work will be introduced here.

The third chapter is empirical core of this thesis, which aims to answer both research questions. NATO's official documents, including strategic concepts, summer declarations etc., since 1991 until today are studied. The objective is to analyse how has the construction and interpretation of the WMD threat within NATO evolved over time. This is done simultaneously with the analysis of the concrete policy and security measures that NATO undertook as a response to the changing understanding of WMD threat within the Alliance.

The aim of the fourth chapter is to discuss and interpret the findings of the conducted analysis. Based on the conducted analysis, it can be seen that NATO started to focus on the joint category of WMD and on the threats it poses only after the end of the Cold War. At this point, it was NBC (nuclear, biological and chemical) interpretation of WMD that dominated NATO's discourse. The Alliance did not consider radiological weapons to be part of the WDM until after the terrorist attacks of 9/11. Since then, the understanding of WMD as NBC shifted into CBRN (chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear) as result of formal recognition of radiological weapons as mass destructive. Additionally, the analysis revealed that in recent years, the Alliance keeps paying increased attention to nuclear weapons and thus demonstrates superiority of nuclear weapons over the rest (CBR) weapons of the overall WMD category. The analysis also shows that Alliance has been vigilant to the threats posed by WMD – concretely proliferation of WMD and their delivery means and WMD terrorism – and keeps tailoring its policies and activities to the evolving security environment.

Overall, it is concluded that WMD will continue to be a major threat to the security of the Alliance and NATO will have to respond to them in order to retain its credibility as a security organization. Nevertheless, if NATO talks about WMD, we need to know to what the Allies mean by them. It is important that we are aware of how NATO understands and interprets the WMD threat, as it has important security implications that affect all of us.

Bibliography

NATO official sources

CARTER, B. Ashton and OMAND, B. David (1996). Countering the proliferation risks: Adapting the Alliance to the new security environment. *NATO Review,* 5(44), pp. 10-15. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/review/1996/9605-3.htm (Accessed 2016-03-05).

CHIARINI, Gianmarco (2013). *NATO Transformation and Future Challenges*. Speech delivered at the ATA 58th General Assembly, 5th February 2013. [Online] Available from: http://www.comitatoatlantico.it/en/studi/modern-defense-and-economic-development/ (Accessed 2016-03-21).

NATO (1990). *NAC Final Communiqué*, 17-18 December 1990. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c901218a.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1991a). *The Alliance's New Strategic Concept*, 7-8 November 1991. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_23847.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1991b). *Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation*, S-1(91)86, 8 November 1991 [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1994a). *The Brussels Summit Declaration, M-1(94)003*, 11 January 1994 [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24470.htm?mode=pressrelease (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1994b). *Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction*, M-NAC-1(94)45 045, 9 June 1994. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24450.htm?selectedLocale=en (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1997). *Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation*, M-1(97)81, 8 July 1997. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1998). *Final Communiqué of Ministerial Meeting of the North Atlantic Council*, M-NAC-2(98)140, 8 December 1998. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1998/p981208e.htm

NATO (1999a). *The Alliance's Strategic Concept*, NAC-S(99)65, 24 April 1999. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_27433.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (1999b). *Washington Summit Communiqué,* NAC-S(99)64, 24 April 1999. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01).

NATO (2001a). Ted Whiteside: Head of NATO's WMD Centre. *NATO Review.* Winter 2001/2002: 22-23. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/rev-pdf/eng/0104-en.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-01).

NATO (2001b). *Statement by the North Atlantic Council*, (2001)124, 12 September 2001. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2001/p01-124e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-01)

NATO (2002a). *Prague Summit Declaration*, (2002) 127, 21 November 2002. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-127e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2002b). *Rome Summit Declaration*, 28 May 2002. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/2002/0205-rome/rome-eng.pdf (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2002c). *Prague Summit Statement on Iraq*, (2002)133 133, 21 November 2002. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_19551.htm? (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2004). *Istanbul Summit Communiqué*, (2004) 096, 28 June 2004. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2006a). *Riga Summit Declaration*, (2006) 150, 29 November 2006. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2006/p06-150e.htm (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2006b). *Comprehensive Political Guidance*, 29 November 2006. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_56425.htm (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2008a). Weapons of mass destruction briefing: Countering weapons of mass destruction. [Online] Available from: http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/issues/nato-nuclear-policies/PDF/weapons_mass_destruction2008-e[1].pdf (Accessed 2016-03-02).

NATO (2008b). Bucharest Summit Declaration, (2008) 049, 3 April 2008. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2009a). Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Declaration, (2009) 044, 4 April 2009. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_52837.htm?mode=pressrelease (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2009b). *NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats*, 1 September 2009. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_57218.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2010a). *Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization*, 19-20 November 2010. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2010b). *Lisbon Summit Declaration*, (2010) 155, 20 November 2010. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_68828.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2011). *Committee on Proliferation (COP),* 12 May 2011. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_69282.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04)

NATO (2012a). *NATO Glossary of Terms and Definitions (English and French) AAP-06,* (2012) 2. [Online] Available from: http://armawiki.zumorc.de/files/NATO/AAP-6.pdf (Accessed 2016-04-01)

NATO (2012b). *Chicago Summit Declaration*, (2012) 062, 20 May 2012. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_87593.htm?selectedLocale=en (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2014). *Wales Summit Declaration*, (2014) 120, 5 September 2014. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2015a). *Combined Joint Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Task Force*, 6 August 2015. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_49156.htm (Accessed 2016-09-02).

NATO (2015b). *NATO Encyclopedia 2015,* 31 December 2015. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20160414_2015-nato-encyclopedia-eng.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-08).

NATO (2015c). *Outreach Event on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Proliferation and Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats,* NATO HQ Brussels, 22 September 2015.

NATO (2016a). *Relations with Russia*, 20 December 2016. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50090.htm (Accessed 2016-10-16)

NATO (2016b). *Warsaw Summit Communiqué*, (2016) 100, 9 July 2016. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm (Accessed 2016-03-04).

NATO (2016c). *NATO Summit Guide Warsaw,* 8-9 July 2016. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_2016_07/20160715_1607-Warsaw-Summit-Guide_2016_ENG.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-08).

NATO (2016d). *Science for Peace and Security*, 8 August 2016. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/78209.htm (Accessed 2016-09-09).

NATO (2016e). *Weapons of Mass Destruction,* 28 June 2016. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50325.htm (Accessed 2016-09-09).

RUDISCHHAUSER, Wolfgang (2015). Could ISIL go nuclear? *NATO Review,* 26 May 2015. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/docu/review/2015/ISIL/ISIL-Nuclear-Chemical-Threat-Iraq-Syria/EN/index.htm (Accessed 2016-12-01).

VERSHBOW, Alexander (2015). *Preventing WMD proliferation: NATO's engagement with its global partners*. Speech delivered at the annual NATO conference on WMD arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation – Doha, Qatar, March 2015. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/opinions_117732.htm (Accessed 2016-10-21).

Books

BAGLEY, Martin (2009). Flexible Response: First Response to Chemical and Biological Terrorist Threat. In: AYTAC, Osman and KIBAROGLU, Mustafa, eds., *Defence Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism.* Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 109-125.

BALZACQ, Thierry (2010). Constructivism and Securitization Studies. In: DUNN CAVELTY, Myriam and MAUER, Victor, eds., *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies.* London and New York: Routledge, pp. 56-72.

BALZACQ, Thierry, ed. (2011). *Securitization Theory: How Security Problems Emerge and Dissolve*. London and New York: Routledge.

BENTLEY, Michelle (2014). *Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Foreign Policy: The strategic use of a concept*. Florence, GB: Routledge.

BLIX, Hans (2006). *Weapons of Terror: Freeing the World of Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Arms*. Stockholm, Sweden: WMDC.

BUZAN, Barry and WÆVER, Ole (2003). *Regions and Powers: The Structure of International Security*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

BUZAN, Barry; WÆVER, Ole and DE WILDE, Jaap (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder, London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

CIRINCIONE, Joseph; WOLFSTHAL, Jon and RAJKUMAR, Miriam (2005). *Deadly Arsenals: Nuclear, Biological, and Chemical Threats.* Washington, US: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

DUNN CAVELTY, Myriam (2008). *Cyber-Security and Threat Politics: US efforts to secure the information age*. London and New York: Routledge.

FUSEK, Josef et al. (2003). *Biologický, chemický a jaderný terorismus*. Učební text Vojenské lékařské akademie Jana Evangelisty Purkyně v Hradci Králové.

GRAY, Hables Chris (1997). *Postmodern War: The New Politics of Conflict*. New York and London: Guilford Press.

HARRIS, H. Sheldon (2002). *Factories of Death: Japanese Biological Warfare, 1932-45 and the American Cover-Up*. New York and London: Routledge.

HANSEN, Lene (2006). *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. London and New York: Routledge.

HERMANN, G. Margaret (2008). Content Analysis. In: KLOTZ, Audie and PRAKASH, Deepa, eds., *Qualitative Methods in International Relations.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 151-167.

HRDINA, Vratislav and HRDINA, Radomír, eds. (2004). *Přírodní toxiny a jedy*. Praha: Galén.

KIBAROGLU, Mustafa (2009). Dealing With the Threat Posed by Non-State Armed Groups Aspiring to Weapons of Mass Destruction. In: AYTAC, Osman and KIBAROGLU, Mustafa, eds., *Defence Against Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism.* Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 161-169.

LINDLEY-FRENCH, Julian (2007). *The North Atlantic Treaty Organization: The Enduring Alliance.* London and New York: Routledge.

MAURER, M. Stephen, ed. (2009). *WMD Terrorism: Science and Policy Choices*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.

MĚRKA, Vladimír (2004). Bakteriální toxiny. In: HRDINA, Vratislav and HRDINA, Radomír, eds., *Přírodní toxiny a jedy*. Praha: Galén, pp. 147-160.

ROBERTS, Guy (2009b). Preventing Weapons of Mass Destruction Terrorism: Building International Partnership to Meet the Challenge. In: AYTAC, Osman and KIBAROGLU, Mustafa, eds., *Defence Against Weapons of Mass Destruction*. Amsterdam: IOS Press, pp. 9-15.

SCHREIER, Margrit (2013). Qualitative Content Analysis. In: Flick, Uwe, ed., *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London, GB: SAGE Publications, pp. 170-183.

Journal Articles

BENTLEY, Michelle (2012). The Long Goodbye: Beyond an Essentialist Construction of WMD. *Contemporary Security Policy,* 33(2), pp. 384-406.

BENTLEY, Michelle (2013). War and/of Words: Constructing WMD in US Foreign Policy. *Security Studies*, 22(1), pp. 68-97.

ENEMARK, Christian (2011). Farewell to *WMD*: The Language and Science of Mass Destruction. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 32(2), pp. 382-400.

FERGUSSON, D. Charles and SMITH, M. Michelle (2009). Assessing Radiological Weapons: Attack Methods and Estimated Effects. *Defence Against Terrorism Review,* 2(2), pp. 15-34.

HARDY, Cynthia; HARLEY, Bill and PHILLIPS, Nelson (2004). Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes? *Qualitative Methods*, 2(1), pp. 19-22.

HUMMEL, Stephen (2016). The Islamic State and WMD: Assessing the Future Threat. *CTC Sentinel,* 9(1), pp. 18-21.

JIN, Jiyoung and KARACKATTU, Joe Thomas (2011). Infectious Diseases and Securitization: WHO's Dilemma. *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science,* 9(2), pp. 181-187.

KOLODZIEJ, A. Edward (1992). Renaissance in Security Studies? Caveat Lector!'. *International Studies Quarterly,* 36(4), pp. 421-438.

KRAUSE, Keith and WILLIAMS, C. Michael (1996). Broadening the Agenda of Security Studies: Politics and Methods. *Mershon International Studies Review*, 40(2), pp. 229-254.

LOWTHER, B. Adam (2008). Terrorism and the Weapons of Mass Destruction Threat to the United States. *Midsouth Political Science Review,* 2007-2008 (9), pp. 95-118.

MOODIE, Michael; ARMSTRONG, E. Robert and MERKELEY, Tyler (2007). Responding in the Homeland: A Snapshot of NATO's Readiness for CBRN Attacks. *Defense Horizon,* June 2007, 56, pp. 1-6.

NARANG, Neil (2015). All Together Now? Questioning WMDs as a Useful Analytical Unit for Understanding Chemical and Biological Weapons Proliferation. *The Nonproliferation Review*, 22 (3-4), pp. 457-468.

OGBURN, William Fielding (1946). Sociology and the Atom. *American Journal of Sociology,* 51(4), pp. 267-275.

OREN, Ido and SOLOMON, Ty (2013). WMD: The Career of a Concept. *New Political Science*, 35(1), pp. 109-135.

OREN, Ido and SOLOMON, Ty (2015). WMD, WMD, WMD: securitization through ritualized incantation of ambiguous phrases. *Review of International Studies*, 41(2), pp. 313-336.

PRICE, Richard (1995). A Genealogy of the Chemical Weapons Taboo. *International Organization,* 49(1), pp. 73-103.

ROBERTS, B. Guy (2009a). Hostis Humani Generis: The Threat of WMD Terrorism and How NATO is Facing the Ultimate Threat. *Defence Against Terrorism Review,* 2(1), pp. 1-13.

SHAMAI, Patricia (2015). Name and Shame: Unravelling the Stigmatization of Weapons of Mass Destruction. *Contemporary Security Policy,* 36(1), pp. 104-122.

STERN, Jessica (2003). Dreaded Risks and the Control of Biological Weapons. *International Security*, 27(3), pp. 89-123.

STRITZEL, Holger (2007). Towards a Theory of Securitization: Copenhagen and Beyond. *European Journal of International Relations,* 13(3), pp. 357-383.

TANNENWALD, Nina (1999). The United States and the Normative Basis of Nuclear Non-Use. *International Organization,* 53(3), pp. 433-468.

WALT, M. Stephen (1991). The Renaissance of Security Studies. *International Studies Quarterly*, 35(2), pp. 211-239.

ZANDERS, Jean Pascal (1999). Assessing the Risk of Chemical and Biological Weapons Proliferation to Terrorists. *The Nonproliferation Review,* 6(4), pp. 17-34.

Newspapers and Magazines

BBC (2003a). *North Korea withdraws from nuclear pact.* [Online] Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/asia-pacific/2644593.stm (Accessed 2016-10-11).

BBC (2003b). *US launches missiles against Saddam*. [Online] Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/march/20/newsid_3495000/3495453.stm (Accessed 2016-10-12).

CNN (2013). *'War crime': U.N. finds sarin used in Syria chemical weapons attack*. [Online] Available from: http://edition.cnn.com/2013/09/16/politics/syria-civil-war/ (Accessed 2016-11-18).

CNN (2016). *Iraq Weapons Inspections Fast Facts.* [Online] Available from: http://edition.cnn.com/2013/10/30/world/meast/iraq-weapons-inspections-fast-facts/ (Accessed 2016-09-12).

Encyclopædia Britannica (2016). *Madrid train bombings of 2004.* [Online] Available from: https://www.britannica.com/event/Madrid-train-bombings-of-2004 (Accessed 2016-10-14).

HJELMGAARD, Kim (2014). *NATO summit 'most important' since fall of Berlin Wall*. [Online] USA Today. Available from: http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/world/2014/08/31/nato-summit-heads-of-state-newport-wales/14524803/ (Accessed 2016-10-23).

The Atlantic (2016). *A Mustard Gas Attack on U.S. Troops.* [Online] Available from: http://www.theatlantic.com/news/archive/2016/09/mustard-gas-us-troops-iraq/501347/ (Accessed 2016-12-01).

The New York Times (2016). *North Korea Tests a Mightier Nuclear Bomb, Raising Tension*. [Online] Available from: http://www.nytimes.com/2016/09/09/world/asia/north-korea-nuclear-test.html?_r=0 (Accessed 2016-12-01).

YUSUFZAI, Rahimullah (1999). *Osama Bin Laden: Conversation With Terror,* TIME, January 11, 1999.

Expert Studies & Reports

BELKIN, Paul (2014). *NATO: Response to the Crisis in Ukraine and Security Concerns in Central and Eastern Europe*. Congressional Research Service. [Online] Available from: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43478.pdf (Accessed 2016-10-11).

BRAVO, P. Iliana (2003). *NATO's Weapons of Mass Destruction Initiative: Achievements and Challenges.* Master Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School.

BUTLER, F.E.R. (2004). A Review of Intelligence on Weapons of Mass Destruction. *Report of a Committee of Privy Counsellors*. London: The Stationery Office, July 2004. [Online] Available from: http://news.bbc.co.uk/nol/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/14_07_04_butler.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-11).

CARUS, W. Seth (2012). *Defining "Weapons of Mass Destruction",* Occasional Paper 8, Center for the Study of Weapons of Mass Destruction. [Online] Available from: http://ndupress.ndu.edu/Portals/68/Documents/occasional/cswmd/CSWMD_OccationalPaper-8.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-08).

CHARRET, Catherine (2009). *A Critical Application of Securitization Theory: Overcoming the Normative Dilemma of Writing Security*. Barcelona: International Catalan Institute for Peace. [Online] Available from: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1884149 (Accessed 2016-09-04).

HIGGINS, Ronald (2002). *Weapons of Mass Destruction: Rhetoric and Realities*. ISIS Policy Paper 85. [Online] Available from: https://connections-qj.org/system/files/02.1.08_higgins.pdf (Accessed 2016-11-02).

House of Commons - Foreign Affairs Committee (2009) *Global Security: Non-Proliferation, Fourth Report of Session 2008-09*. London: The Stationery Office. [Online] Available from: https://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200809/cmselect/cmfaff/222/222.pdf (Accessed 2016-10-05).

IISS Strategic Dossiers (2007). *Nuclear Black Markets: Pakistan, A.Q. Khan and the rise of proliferation networks – A net assessment*. [Online] Available from: https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/strategic%20dossiers/issues/nuclear-black-markets--

pakistan--a-q--khan-and-the-rise-of-proliferation-networks---a-net-assessmen-23e1 (Accessed 2016-10-23).

MOELLER, D. Susan (2004). *Media Coverage of Weapons of Mass Destruction*. CISSM: Center for International and Security at Maryland. [Online] Available from: www.cissm.umd.edu/documents/WMDstudy_full.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-11).

PERKOVICH, George (2004). *Deconflating "WMD"*. Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission Paper 17, Stockholm. [Online] http://dead-planet.net/chemical-terrorism/pdfs/No17.pdf (Accessed 2016-09-04).

SANTAMATO, Stefano (2013). *The New NATO Policy Guidelines on Counterterrorism: Analysis, Assessment, and Actions*. Institute for National Strategic Studies – Strategic Perspectives 13. [Online] Available from: http://ndupress.ndu.edu/portals/68/documents/stratperspective/inss/strategic-perspectives-13.pdf (Accessed 2016-11-04).

TERZUOLO, R. Eric (2004). *Regional Alliance, Global Threat: NATO and Weapons of Mass Destruction, 1994-2004*. Final Report - Manfred Wörner Fellowship, 2003/2004. [Online] Available from: http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/03-04/terzuolo.pdf (Accessed 2016-03-21).

WILLIAMS, Heather (2014). *Russian Withdrawal from INF Would Threaten Nuclear and European Security*. Chatham House: The Royal Institute of International Affairs. [Online] Available from: https://www.chathamhouse.org/expert/comment/15372 *(*Accessed 2016-09-08).

ZAKOPALOVÁ, Dagmar (2012). *Contextualizing the process of securitization. Construction of security in the United Nations.* Master Thesis, ETH Zurich.

Other sources

Atomic Archive (2016). *The Atomic Bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki*. [Online] Available from: http://www.atomicarchive.com/Docs/MED/med_chp10.shtml (Accessed 2016-10-15).

Cold War Museum (2016). *Soviet Atomic Bomb Test*. [Online] Available from: http://www.coldwar.org/articles/40s/soviet_atomic_bomb_test.asp (Accessed 2016-10-01).

History (2016). *Formation of NATO and Warsaw Pact*. [Online] Available from: http://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/formation-of-nato-and-warsaw-pact (Accessed 2016-09-01).

ICRC – International Committee of the Red Cross (2016). *Rule 81. Restrictions on the Use of Landmines.* [Online] Available from: https://ihl-databases.icrc.org/customary-ihl/eng/docs/v1_rul_rule81 (Accessed 2016-10-05).

IISS Strategic Dossiers (2007). *Nuclear Black Markets: Pakistan, A.Q. Khan and the rise of proliferation networks – A net assessment*. [Online] Available from: https://www.iiss.org/en/publications/strategic%20dossiers/issues/nuclear-black-markets--pakistan--a-q--khan-and-the-rise-of-proliferation-networks---a-net-assessmen-23e1 (Accessed 2016-10-23).

Lockheed Martin (2016). *Aegis Ashore*. [Online] Available from: http://www.lockheedmartin.com/us/products/aegis/aegis-ashore.html (Accessed 2016-10-23).

MALLER, Tara (2013). *A Historical Look at the Genealogy of the WMD Category & Threat.* Blogs of War [Online] Available from: http://blogsofwar.com/tara-maller-a-historical-look-at-the-genealogy-of-the-wmd-category-threat/ (Accessed 2016-11-06).

NTI – Nuclear Threat Initiative (2016). *Iran.* [Online] Available from: http://www.nti.org/learn/countries/iran/ (Accessed 2016-11-20).

OPCW (2016a). *What is a Chemical Weapon?* [Online] Available from: https://www.opcw.org/about-chemical-weapons/what-is-a-chemical-weapon/ (Accessed 2016-10-04).

OPCW (2016b). *Blister Agents*. [Online] Available from: https://www.opcw.org/about-chemical-weapons/types-of-chemical-agent/blister-agents/ (Accessed 2016-10-05).

OPCW (2016c). *Blood Agents*. [Online] Available from: https://www.opcw.org/about-chemical-weapons/types-of-chemical-agent/blood-agents/ (Accessed 2016-10-06).

OPCW (2016d). *Nerve Agents*. [Online] Available from: https://www.opcw.org/about-chemical-weapons/types-of-chemical-agent/nerve-agents/ (Accessed 2016-10-08).

OPCW (2016e). *Chemical Weapons Convention*. [Online] Available from: https://www.opcw.org/chemical-weapons-convention/ (Accessed 2016-10-09).

PSI (2016). *Proliferation Security Initiative – Who We Are*. [Online] Available from: http://www.psi-online.info/Vertretung/psi/en/01-about-psi/0-about-us.html (Accessed 2016-10-15).

U.S. Department of State (2012). *Hague Code of Conduct Against Ballistic Missile Proliferation (HCOC)*. [Online] Available from: https://www.state.gov/t/isn/trty/101466.htm (Accessed 2016-10-13).

U.S. Department of State (2012). *Nuclear Security Summit – Seoul Communiqué*. [Online] Available from: https://www.state.gov/t/isn/nuclearsecuritysummit/2012/ (Accessed 2016-11-13).

United Nations (2006). *Small Arms Review Conference*. [Online] Available from: http://www.un.org/events/smallarms2006/pdf/backgrounder.pdf (Accessed 2016-10-01).

United Nations General Assembly (1981). *A/RES/36/97*. [Online] Available from: http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/36/a36r097.htm (Accessed 2016-10-02).

United Nations Security Council (2002). *Resolution 1441,* S/RES/1441. [Online] Available from: http://www.un.org/Depts/unmovic/documents/1441.pdf (Accessed 2016-10-11).

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (2014). *Fact Sheet on Dirty Bombs*. [Online] Available from: https://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/doc-collections/fact-sheets/fs-dirty-bombs.html (Accessed 2016-10-01).

UNODA - United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (2016a). *Chemical Weapon*s. [Online] Available from: https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/chemical/ (Accessed 2016-10-14).

UNODA – United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (2016b). *The Biological Weapons Convention.* [Online] Available from: https://www.un.org/disarmament/geneva/bwc/ (Accessed 2016-10-08).

UNODA – United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (2016c). *Nuclear Weapons.* [Online] Available from: https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/ (Accessed 2016-10-09).

UNOG – United Nations Office in Geneva (2016). *What Are Biological and Toxin Weapons?* [Online] Available from:

http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/(httpPages)/29B727532FECBE96C12571860035A6DB?OpenDocument (Accessed 2016-10-10).

UPMC - Center for Health Security (2014). *Pulmonary or Choking Agents*. [Online] Available from: http://www.upmchealthsecurity.org/our-work/publications/choking-agents-fact-sheet (Accessed 2016-10-11).

World Nuclear Association (2016). *Fukushima Accident.* [Online] Available from: http://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/fukushima-accident.aspx (Accessed 2016-10-05).

Diploma thesis proposal

Univerzita Karlova v Praze
Fakulta sociálních věd
Institut politologických studií

Projekt diplomové práce

NATO and WMD: Evolution of the threat construction and Alliance's response

Autor práce: Bc. Lucie Hrdinová
Vedoucí práce: Dagmar Rychnovská, LL.M., M.A.

Introduction

The fundamental purpose of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) has been since its establishment in 1949 to safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means (NATO, 2010). NATO of today, however, faces very different challenges and threats to its security compared to the threats faced by the Allies when the Alliance was formed. The security environment that keeps changing and becoming increasingly unpredictable is presenting NATO with new threats to its security, one of which are definitely weapons of mass destruction.

However, a question arises – what do we mean by weapons of mass destruction? The answer is a complex one. Though the term Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) has been part of policy, diplomatic and academic discourse for approximately seventy years and its use has increased significantly over the last two decades (Enemark, 2011: 382), there is one significant problem surrounding it – a complete lack of consensus on the term's meaning (Carus, 2012: 1). Despite its frequent use in the recent years, there is a widespread perception that the WMD term has no accepted definition and that it means whatever the user wants it to mean (ibid.). This is, however, incorrect. The United Nations Commission on Conventional Armaments (CCA) created a first authoritative definition of WMD in August 1948, in which WMD are defined as "*atomic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal chemical and biological weapons, and any weapons developed in the future which have characteristics comparable in destructive effect to those of atomic bomb or other weapons mentioned above"* (UN General Assembly, 1981). This definition essentially equalled WMD with chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) weapons, which is still until now the most common understanding of weapons of mass destruction.

Nonetheless, the complex nature of the WMD and the lack of clarity surrounding it made me curious about how NATO understands weapons of mass destruction. Thus, I want to find out how has the WMD threat been constructed and interpreted within the Alliance and with what results. The matter at hand shall be looked upon through constructivist lenses. Accordingly, it will be argued that WMD should not be treated as a "fixed concept, but as a flexible, politically contingent, construction" (Bentley, 2014: 4) with important implications for international security. A successful portrayal of "an issue as a mass destructive concern ascribes it a certain weight" (Bentley, 2014: 133), thus allowing policy makers – in this case NATO – to accept certain measures to deal with the WMD threat, which would not have been otherwise possible. Changes in how the

WMD is understood have significant impact upon the very questions and issues at the heart of NATO policy, which is of interest to this thesis.

Relevance

Weapons of mass destruction, especially the nuclear ones, have preoccupied NATO since its establishment (Terzuolo, 2004: 1). However, the WMD as the overarching category did not figure heavily in the policy formulations during the Cold War era (ibid.). It was only after the end of the Cold War, when the Alliance has realized the dangers stemming from the WMD threats. NATO's increased focus on the issue of WMD became apparent during the 1990s and is illustrated by the acceptance of Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction in 1994. However, it was five years later, in 1999 when NATO truly stepped up its activities and launched Weapons of Mass Destruction Initiative, which led to the establishment of a WMD Centre at NATO Headquarters the following year.

The deadly terrorist attacks of 11 September 1991, that resulted in the death of nearly 3000 people, not only shocked the whole world but they also emphasized the salience of the WMD threat. Though still conventional in nature, these attacks led to considerations of what would have happened if terrorists used weapons of mass destruction. There is no doubt, that a similar attack with WMD would have been far more devastating. Thus, the WMD concept became an integral part of everything security-related that happened post 9-11 (Bentley, 2014: 114) - NATO included. Since then, military thinking, resources and energy of the Alliance have increasingly been paying attention to the fight against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (Chiarini, 2013: 1). Subsequently, NATO's official documents made clear that the proliferation of WMD and their delivery systems, as well as the possibility that terrorists will acquire these weapons, is one of the principal threats to Alliance's security in the next 10-15 years at least (NATO, 2009).

Recognizing this, the Alliance has been vigilant and has responded to this challenge with a number of policy and security countermeasures, including a comprehensive set of practical initiatives to protect their populations, forces and territory against the potential use of WMD (ibid.). As the threat of WMD is constantly evolving, so is NATO's understanding and response to it. I therefore believe that it is important to understand the relationship between the Alliance and the concept of WMD, as it has significant consequences for NATO, its members and their population.

Aim of the thesis

The aim of this diploma thesis is twofold. Firstly, I would like to find out how has the WMD threat been constructed and interpreted within the Alliance since the year 1991, which is the start of the analysis as the new Strategic Concept, in which greater attentions was paid to WMD, was accepted. Moreover, I am also interested in identifying the reasons behind it. Secondly, I want to find out what was NATO's response to the dangers posed by the WMD threat. Specifically, the works intends to identify concrete measures that were undertaken by the Alliance in order to deal with the evolving threat and what are their practical consequences for the member states.

Research questions

Given the objectives of this thesis, two research questions were formulated:

- **Primary RQ:** *How has the construction and interpretation of the WMD threat evolved in NATO since 1991 until today?*
- **Secondary RQ:** *What were the specific measures undertaken by NATO in response to the evolving WMD threat?*

Contribution of the thesis

Not surprisingly, a lot has been written about weapons of mass destruction, as they constitute one of the most prominent and powerful concepts within security studies. However, this thesis is unique in a sense that it views WMD as a social construct with important security complications, and adopts this point of view on NATO. There is surprisingly little research done on how the Alliance constructs and interprets the WMD threat and on the practical consequences resulting from this process. The proposed thesis would like to contribute to the yet under-researched topic of WMD threat construction within the Alliance.

Theory

Theoretically, the thesis is based on securitization theory, which was developed by the Copenhagen School (CS). The securitization theory is considered to be one of the most important and original contributions to security studies in recent years (Jin and Karackattu, 2011: 181). The main argument of the securitization theory is that security is an intersubjective concept, socially constructed through discourse (Buzan et al., 1998). The Copenhagen School thus offers a

constructivist perspective on how security problems emerge, evolve and dissolve by suggesting that security threats are socially constructed in a process called securitization (Balzacq, 2010: 56). The process of securitization consists of a number of steps – a securitizing actor adopts speech acts (i.e. utterances that label something as a security issue) in order to declare certain security issue as an existential threat to a specified referent object (i.e. those who are threatened), thus implying a right to use exceptional and extraordinary means to tackle the threat (Buzan et al., 1998; Jin and Karackattu, 2011). However, the success of securitization depends on whether a relevant audience accepts the security argument provided by the securitizing actor (Buzan et al., 1998). According to Buzan et al. (1998: 32), the whole process of securitization can be studied directly through discourse.

Securitization theory is often used to explain why certain threats are dealt with as a security issue, while others are not. Hence, it is a useful theoretical tool that allows me to investigate the way, in which weapons of mass destruction have been increasingly framed as existential threat to NATO since the beginning of the 1990s, thus answering the primary research question. However, in this thesis I am not primarily interested in whether the securitization has been successful or not. I am instead interested in the nature of policy and security measures that were drafted in response to a securitization move. As Myriam Dunn Cavelty (2008: 26) argues: "By focusing on security as a practice with outcome…additional insights into the variety of countermeasures in place to counter modern threats" shall be gained. Thus, secondary research question shall be answered.

Methodology

In order to provide answers to above stated research questions and to fulfill the objectives of this diploma thesis, a detailed analysis of NATO's official documents relevant to the topic of WMD and within the time frame from 1991 until today shall be conducted. The analytical approach used in this thesis is therefore a qualitative content analysis, whose objective is to clarify the ways people "use or manipulate symbols to invest communication with meaning" (Hermann, 2008: 151) and which allows, compared to its quantitative counterpart, to study the latent and more context-dependent meaning (Schreier, 2013: 170). The qualitative content analysis is thus a very useful

method for the purposes of this thesis, as it allows to study the official discourse[13] of NATO as an indicator of understanding of WMD within the Alliance.

Based on the premises of securitization theory, the qualitative content analysis in this diploma thesis shall proceed in this way. The first stage entails a close examination of NATO's official texts representative of the WMD discourse. The primary data consisted of Strategic Concepts, Summit Communiqués, concrete policy frameworks, and other relevant official materials, issued since 1991 until present day – which is also temporal limitation of this analysis. Each text will be examined with aim to find usages or utterances of "weapons of mass destruction", "WMD", "CBRN", etc. When the relevant passages that mentioned "WMW" are found, the next step will be to define the problem, designate the threat subject, ascribe who or what is responsible for it. Then, I will look for the proposed specific measures that should be accepted in order to deal with the WMD threat. I will also attempt to establish the context and identify the reasons behind the given utterances (for example increased focus on WMD terrorism following 9/11). Lastly, I will discuss the concrete policy and security measures that NATO undertook in response to evolving WMD threat.

Data sources

This diploma thesis uses a number of primary and secondary source materials, which will allow me to find answers to both research questions stated above.

1. **Primary source materials**

- *Strategic Concepts* – 1991 Strategic Concept, 1999 Strategic Concept, 2010 Strategic Concept
- *Summit Declarations or Communiqués* – 1991 Rome Summit, 1994 Brussels Summit, 1997 Madrid Summit, 1999 Washington Summit, 2002 Rome Summit, 2002 Prague Summit, 2004 Istanbul Summit, 2006 Riga Summit, 2008 Bucharest Summit, 2009 Strasbourg-Kehl Summit, 2010 Lisbon Summit, 2012 Chicago Summit, 2014 Wales Summit and 2016 Warsaw Summit

[13] Discourses are understood here as "bodies of texts that bring ideas, objects and practices into the world" (Hardy et al., 2004: 20).

- *Other relevant documents* – such as Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (1994); NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats (2009); Briefing on Countering weapons of mass destruction (2008), Deterrence and Defence Posture Review (2012) etc.

2. Secondary source materials

Primary source materials will be complemented with secondary literature that will include relevant books, scholarly articles in security and strategic studies, IR journals and reports by experts in the field.

Thesis outline

Introduction

- Introduction to the chosen topic
- Motivation for research
- Aim of the work
- Research questions (primary, secondary)
- Contribution of the diploma thesis
- Structure of the work – what will be in the individual chapters

1) Literature review & WMD as a construct

- Literature review for weapons of mass destruction
- Introduction of WMD as a social construct with important implications for security
- WMD as a category of weapons – origins of the WMD term, critique of the concept, brief characteristics of CBRN weapons (it is impossible to write about them without understanding what the consequences of their use are)
- How WMD will be understood in the thesis

2) Theoretical and analytical framework

- Theory – Securitization theory as developed by Copenhagen School

- Analytical framework
    - Methodology – Qualitative content analysis (introduction of content analysis, why it was chosen)
    - Operationalization – what exactly shall be studied in the NATO official texts and how the work will proceed
    - Data – what primary and secondary source materials are used for the analysis and what is the time limitation

3) Analysis of the WMD threat construction and interpretation in NATO & Alliance's response

- Simultaneously answering both research questions
- Analysis will include important milestones, such as: 1991 Strategic Concept ⇒ 1994 Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction ⇒ 1999 WMD Initiative ⇒ 2000 WMD Centre ⇒ 9/11 and anthrax letters ⇒ creation of Joint CBRN Battalion and COE in Vyškov ⇒ 2009 NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats (2009) ⇒ New Strategic Concept 2010 etc.

4) Discussion of the findings

- Discussion and interpretation of findings based on the conducted content analysis
- What do results say about the threat construction and understanding of WMD in the Alliance?
- How did NATO respond to the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction?
- Lessons learnt and lessons for the future

Conclusion

- Drawing conclusions from conducted analysis
- My point of view on WMD category
- Possible future research

Bibliography

- Balzacq, Thierry (2010). "Constructivism and securitization studies", In: Dunn Cavelty, Myriam and Victor Mauer (eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Security Studies.* London and New York: Routledge, 56-72.
- Bentley, Michelle (2014). *Weapons of Mass Destruction and US Foreign Policy. The strategic use of concept.* New York: Routledge.
- Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver and Jaap de Wilde (1998). *Security: A New Framework for Analysis.* Boulder, Colo.; London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Carus, W. Seth (2012). "Defining "Weapons of Mass Destruction"'. Washington, D.C.: National Defense University Press. Available online: http://ndupress.ndu.edu/Portals/68/Documents/occasional/cswmd/CSWMD_OccationalPaper-8.pdf (cited 2016-03-21).
- Chiarini, Gianmarco (2013). *"NATO Transformation and Future Challenges".* Italian Atlantic Committee. Available online at: http://www.comitatoatlantico.it/en/studi/modern-defense-and-economic-development/ (cited 2016-03-21).
- Dunn Cavelty, Myriam (2008) *Cyber-Security and Threat Politics: US efforts to secure the information age.* London: Routledge.
- Enemark, Christian (2011). "Farewell to *WMD*: The Language and Science of Mass Destruction". *Contemporary Security Policy* 32(2): 382-400.
- Hardy, Cynthia, Harley, Bill and Phillips, Nelson (2004). "Discourse Analysis and Content Analysis: Two Solitudes?". *Qualitative Methods*, 2(1): 19-22.
- Hermann, G. Margaret (2008) Content Analysis. In: Klotz, Audie and Prakash, Deepa (eds.). *Qualitative Methods in International Relations.* UK: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 151-167.
- Jiyoung, Jin and Karackattu, Joe Thomas (2011). "Infectious Diseases and Securitization: WHO's Dilemma". *Biosecurity and Bioterrorism: Biodefense Strategy, Practice, and Science* 9(2): 181-187.
- Schreier, Margrit (2013) Qualitative Content Analysis. In: Flick, Uwe (ed.). *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. London, GB: SAGE Publications, pp. 170-183.
- Terzuolo, R. Eric (2004). *"Regional Alliance, Global Threat: NATO and Weapons of Mass Destruction, 1994-2004"*. Final Report – Manfred Wörner Fellowship, 2003/2004. Available online at: http://www.nato.int/acad/fellow/03-04/terzuolo.pdf (cited 2016-03-21).

Primary sources (selection)

- NATO (1991). *"Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/49-95/c911108a.htm>
- NATO (1991). *"The Alliance's New Strategic Concept"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_23847.htm>
- NATO (1994). *"Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24450.htm?selectedLocale=en>
- NATO (1994). *"The Brussels Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_24470.htm?mode=pressrelease>
- NATO (1997). *"Madrid Declaration on Euro-Atlantic Security and Cooperation"*. NATO. Available online: < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1997/p97-081e.htm>
- NATO (1999). *"The Alliance's Strategic Concept"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_27433.htm>
- NATO (1999). *"Washington Summit Communiqué"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/1999/p99-064e.htm>
- NATO (2002). *"Prague Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2002/p02-127e.htm>
- NATO (2002). *"Rome Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/comm/2002/0205-rome/rome-eng.pdf>
- NATO (2004). *"Istanbul Summit Communiqué"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2004/p04-096e.htm>
- NATO (2006). "*Riga Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/docu/pr/2006/p06-150e.htm>
- NATO (2008). *"Bucharest Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_8443.htm>
- NATO (2008). *"Countering weapons of mass destruction"*. NATO – Weapons of mass destruction briefing. Available online < http://www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/issues/nato-nuclear-policies/PDF/weapons_mass_destruction2008-e[1].pdf>

- NATO (2009). *"NATO's Comprehensive, Strategic-Level Policy for Preventing the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) and Defending against Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Threats"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_57218.htm>
- NATO (2009). *"Strasbourg/Kehl Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_52837.htm?mode=pressrelease>
- NATO (2010). *"Lisbon Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_68828.htm>
- NATO (2010). *"Strategic Concept for the Defence and Security of the Members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/pdf_publications/20120214_strategic-concept-2010-eng.pdf>
- NATO (2010). „What is NATO? An introduction to the transatlantic Alliance". Available online at: http://www.nato.int/welcome/brochure_WhatIsNATO_en.pdf (cited 2016-03-20).
- NATO (2012). "*Chicago Summit Declaration*". NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_87593.htm?selectedLocale=en>
- NATO (2014). *"Wales Summit Declaration"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_112964.htm>
- NATO (2016). *"Warsaw Summit Communiqué"*. NATO. Available online < http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm>
- United Nations General Assembly (1981). *"A/RES/36/97. General and Complete Disarmament*." Available online: http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/36/a36r097.htm (cited 2016-03-20).