INTRODUCTION

Although the present book never intended to be quite so timely, Beyond Nunn-Lugar: Curbing the Next Wave of Weapons Proliferation Threats from Russia is one book that, coming so soon after the events of September 11, 2001, and shortly before President Bush’s Russian summit, should find a ready audience. The essays in the book were originally commissioned by the Nonproliferation Policy Education Center (NPEC) as part of a year-long study on the future of U.S.-Russian nonproliferation cooperation. What makes the book different from other studies of U.S.-Russian cooperation is its reliance on competitive strategies.¹

Originally devised as a business management tool and subsequently used by the Pentagon to guide its military planning against the Soviet Union, the analytical approach based on competitive strategies requires analysts to evaluate long-term trends, 10 to 20 years out. Rather than beginning with one’s own aims and strategies, however, competitive strategies demands that analysts first understand the objectives, strengths, and weaknesses of competitors and other key parties. A key objective of competitive strategies is to detail how best to pit one’s strengths against a competitor’s enduring weaknesses in a series of moves and countermoves. The goal is to devise strategies that force one’s competitor to spend more time and resources shoring up his weaknesses than in taking offensive action.

Although businesses and other organizations generally use competitive strategies analysis to secure advantage over their challengers, it also can be used to help them identify beneficial opportunities for cooperation. To date, this has not been the approach U.S. officials have taken on nonproliferation cooperation with Russia. Instead, they have assumed that the specifics of cooperation should be
determined by whatever goals and strategies Russia and the United States share. This book takes a very different approach. The authors first focus on how Russia’s and America’s proliferation-related strategies and goals differ. They then identify each nation’s relevant strengths and weaknesses and determine where these might best be mated to produce new forms of cooperation.

An example of what this kind of analysis is capable of producing can be found in the first chapter, the final report of the competitive strategies working group on U.S.-Russian nonproliferation cooperation. Here the different goals of each nation regarding medical and health services are identified. Russia still has a good number of biological weapons-related experts that it has yet to find civilian employment for, but a relatively poor level of medical services. It also has a population whose health is seriously deteriorating and a Russian president who wants to change this. Finally, although the availability of medical services is very low, Russia still has a fairly competent, functioning public health system.

In contrast, provision of medical services in the United States is quite high, but America’s public health system is barely functional. Unlike Russia, it has few, if any, biological weapons experts, but it is very concerned about being able to detect the use of biological weapons and the spread of dangerous diseases and pathogens within America and from other nations (including Russia).

After reflecting on these issues and the commissioned research of health demographer Murray Feshbach reported in Chapter 4 (“The Health and Future of Russia’s Population”), the working group focused on the prospects for U.S.-Russian cooperation on health monitoring both to enhance the health of Russia’s population and to increase the chances of detecting the spread of dangerous diseases caused by either nature or the hand of man. One of the nation’s leading health surveillance experts, Dr. Alan Zelicoff of Sandia National Laboratory, was brought in to
brief the group about a health monitoring system already operating in New Mexico known as Rapid Syndrome Validation Project, or RSVP.

RSVP uses computers, touch-screen entry, and the Internet to enable physicians to make speedy reports to public health authorities when they encounter patients who have a particular set of symptoms. A physician’s report can be filed in less than a minute, assumes no prior knowledge of exotic diseases, and can address over 90 percent of the diseases a biological-weapons attack might spread. The system is also cheap to deploy—an entire global system of 10,000 reporting stations could be put in place for between 10 and 20 million dollars.

After learning this and more about RSVP, the working group recommended that the U.S. Government support RSVP’s deployment in Russia as a cooperative threat reduction effort and that the United States use biological weapons experts at Russia’s former biological weapons research laboratories to set up and run the system. NPEC staff subsequently briefed this recommendation to U.S. officials in the Departments of Defense and Energy. As a result, both departments agreed early in 2002 to fund deployment of RSVP in Russia and several former Soviet Republics.

The working group also made several other recommendations. One set had to do with how best to account for Russian nuclear weapons materials and to help pay for reducing the threats they and other Russian strategic weapons activities present. Discussion of this set of recommendations, which focused on allowing Russia to earn money storing U.S.-origin spent fuel from East Asia and Europe in exchange for better data on its nuclear inventory and the use of profits to help pay for important Nunn-Lugar programs, also can be found in Chapter 1. In making these recommendations, the working group benefited from the analyses of Army War College researcher Dr. Stephen Blank ("The Foundations of Russian Strategic
Power and Capabilities,” Chapter 2); of Heritage Foundation’s Russian Studies Director Dr. Ariel Cohen (“Russian Rule and the Regional Military Industrial Complexes,” Chapter 3); and of the Natural Resource Defense Council’s Dr. Thomas Cochran (“New Metrics for Denuclearization,” Chapter 5).

Finally, the working group made a set of recommendations regarding the next generation of Russian strategic weapons workers. This set of recommendations, which focused on increasing the quantity and quality of Russian and Western student exchanges, turned heavily on the analysis found in Chapter 6 by Professor Mark Kramer of Harvard University (“Demilitarizing Russian Weapons Scientists: The Challenge”); in Chapter 7 by Centra Technologies’ Matthew Partan (“Defense Conversion: How Far Can Russia Expand Small and Medium Enterprises?”); and Chapter 8 by this book’s coeditor and NPEC’s Wohlstetter Fellow, Thomas Riisager (“Turning the Next Generation of Russians Away from Weapons Work”).

None of these chapters makes for breezy reading. However, given how high the costs of U.S.-Russian nonproliferation cooperation failure might be—terrorist access to weapons materials and the further proliferation of strategic arms to unstable, hostile states—they are all too timely and deserve to be read with care.
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