Saber : Jurnal Teknik Informatika, Sains dan Ilmu Komunikasi
Volume. 3 Nomor. 3 Juli 2025
e-ISSN : 3025-342X; p-ISSN : 3025-2776, Hal. 122-156
DOI: https://doi.org/10.59841/saber.v3i3.2948
Available online at: https://jurnal.stikes-ibnusina.ac.id/index.php/SABER

Analyzing the Irreversibility of Nuclear Disarmament: Kazakhstan's Study Case

Cavin Willy Mohonis Sambenthiro
Hasanuddin University,Indonesia

Address: Jl. Perintis Kemerdekaan Km.10 Tamalanrea, Makassar Sulawesi Selatan Indonesia
Correspondence Email: cavinsambers@gmail.com

Abstrak. *This study examines the irreversibility of nuclear disarmament by analyzing Kazakhstan's post-Soviet experience to identify mechanisms that constrain rearmament. Using a qualitative case study informed by Science and Technology Studies frameworks on socio-technical unmaking, the research explores discursive reframing, institutional changes, tacit knowledge erosion, material dismantlement, and governance innovations. Findings indicate that Kazakhstan's strong political commitment, anti-nuclear identity, comprehensive international cooperation, and binding legal obligations collectively create robust barriers to reversal, while ongoing challenges include securing residual materials and managing geopolitical pressures. The study highlights the importance of multi-dimensional approaches that integrate normative drivers, sustained stewardship, adaptable agreements, and strategic partnerships to enhance enduring disarmament. These insights offer policy guidance for global efforts to reinforce irreversible pathways toward nuclear risk reduction.*

Kata kunci: *irreversibility, nuclear disarmament, Kazakhstan, socio-technical unmaking, international cooperation, governance, verification*

Abstrak. Studi ini meneliti ketidakterbalikan pelucutan senjata nuklir dengan menganalisis pengalaman Kazakhstan pasca-Soviet untuk mengidentifikasi mekanisme yang membatasi persenjataan kembali. Dengan menggunakan studi kasus kualitatif yang diinformasikan oleh kerangka kerja Studi Sains dan Teknologi tentang penghancuran sosial-teknis, penelitian ini mengeksplorasi pembingkaian ulang diskursif, perubahan kelembagaan, erosi pengetahuan diam-diam, pembongkaran material, dan inovasi tata kelola. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa komitmen politik Kazakhstan yang kuat, identitas anti-nuklir, kerja sama internasional yang komprehensif, dan kewajiban hukum yang mengikat secara kolektif menciptakan hambatan yang kuat untuk pembalikan, sementara tantangan yang sedang berlangsung termasuk mengamankan material sisa dan mengelola tekanan geopolitik. Studi ini menyoroti pentingnya pendekatan multidimensi yang mengintegrasikan pendorong normatif, pengelolaan yang berkelanjutan, perjanjian yang dapat disesuaikan, dan kemitraan strategis untuk meningkatkan pelucutan senjata yang langgeng. Wawasan ini menawarkan panduan kebijakan untuk upaya global untuk memperkuat jalur yang tidak dapat diubah menuju pengurangan risiko nuklir.

Kata kunci: ketidakterbalikan; pelucutan senjata nuklir; Kazakhstan; penghancuran sosial-teknis; kerja sama internasional; tata kelola; verifikasi

1. BACKGROUND

Naskah Nuclear disarmament irreversibility is fundamentally defined as a quality of a disarmament or arms control process that involves limiting the capacity for re-armament, including the possible re-constitution of aspects of weapons programs. This concept aims to exclude re-armament after disarmament steps or comprehensive disarmament have been accomplished, specifically by erecting strong barriers against backsliding from nuclear weapons commitments. It is crucial to understand irreversibility not as an absolute, binary status achieved once and for all, but rather as a constant striving over a long period without an end date. It is best conceptualized as a continuum or scale where the degree of irreversibility is measured by the costs and difficulty of reversal. This spectrum ranges from a minimum, such as the mere dismantlement of nuclear explosive devices while retaining components and infrastructure, to a maximum, which includes the complete abandonment of all nuclear

Received: Mei 09, 2025; Revised: Mei 30, 2025; Accepted: Juni 17, 2025; Online Available; Juni 24, 2025

weapons, their means of production, and even constraints on nuclear fuel cycle facilities and a dilution of militarism as a cultural system.

Irreversibility is formally recognized as one of the three foundational pillars of nuclear disarmament, alongside verification and transparency. This status underscores its critical importance in international nuclear discourse and treaty obligations, as highlighted in the Final Documents of the 2000 and 2010 NPT Review Conferences. Kazakhstan's decisive actions, driven by a unique confluence of strong political will, pressing security concerns, economic imperatives, and a deeply ingrained anti-nuclear national identity, align remarkably with the theoretical "unmaking" framework. This framework encompasses discursive, institutional, competency, and material destabilization, coupled with robust governance of termination. The case demonstrates that the "unmaking" of a nuclear complex is not only theoretically plausible but practically achievable, even for states with significant inherited capabilities. This success is contingent upon strong political resolve and sustained, collaborative international engagement, providing a compelling model for future global disarmament efforts.

This report provides an in-depth analysis of nuclear disarmament irreversibility, conceptualizing it not as an absolute state of "uninvention" but as a dynamic spectrum focused on significantly limiting the capacity for re-armament through the comprehensive "unmaking" of a nuclear weapons complex. It highlights Kazakhstan's unparalleled historical position as a state that inherited the world's fourth-largest nuclear arsenal, comprising over a thousand nuclear warheads, dozens of heavy bombers, and more than a hundred intercontinental ballistic missiles, after the Soviet collapse, yet voluntarily and strategically chose to renounce it.

2. THEORITICAL REVIEW

Bagian The concept of irreversibility inherently poses a paradox for arms control. On one hand, states desire enduring progress in nuclear arms control that is resilient over time. On the other hand, policymakers must ensure agreements are politically palatable to domestic stakeholders and flexible enough to adapt to changes in the security environment. This often necessitates the inclusion of withdrawal clauses, creating a parallel tradeoff between measures that strengthen irreversibility and security concerns that demand flexibility.

The discourse on nuclear disarmament irreversibility draws heavily from **Science and Technology Studies (STS)**, particularly the scholarship on "Large Technical Systems" (LTS) and "Actor-Network Theory" (ANT). This perspective posits that nuclear weapons are not merely material technologies but "social objects" deeply intertwined with societal structures, meanings, and institutions. Maximizing irreversibility, therefore, is about the "unmaking" of a nuclear weapons complex, which is viewed as a large socio-technical system. This "unmaking" entails the discontinuation, or unraveling, of the system's network of materials, competencies, meanings, and institutions, the erosion of tacit knowledge, the discursive reframing of nuclear weapons, and new governance processes to manage discontinuation. This "unmaking" involves several interconnected forms of destabilization and new governance processes:

1. **Discursive Destabilization and Reframing:** This theory emphasizes that irreversibility requires a fundamental shift in how nuclear weapons are understood within a society. It involves actively reassessing their value, necessity, and legitimacy, often leading to their delegitimization and even social stigmatization. When nuclear weapons are reframed as liabilities rather than assets, the political and societal will to reconstitute a program is severely undermined, creating a strong normative barrier against re-armament. This process can be rooted in direct societal experience, such as the trauma from nuclear testing, leading

to a deep-seated "allergy" to nuclear weapons that provides robust political legitimacy for disarmament. This underscores that the source and depth of discursive shifts significantly impact the resilience of disarmament decisions.

2. **Institutional Destabilization:** This aspect focuses on the weakening or dismantling of the formal organizations and shared patterns of practice that sustain a nuclear weapons complex. It occurs when "system builders"—the political executive—lose interest in maintaining the system, leading to a de-emphasis of its core mission, dwindling career incentives, and fragmentation of responsibilities. For states inheriting arsenals, this can involve preventing the formation of an indigenous nuclear weapons establishment and reorienting inherited assets towards non-proliferation governance. The absence of an entrenched, indigenous pro-nuclear institutional base significantly reduces internal resistance to disarmament.

3. **Competency Destabilization and Erosion of Tacit Knowledge:** This theory highlights the loss of expertise and, crucially, "tacit knowledge"—the practical "know-how" acquired through experience, distinct from explicit knowledge found in documents. The erosion of tacit knowledge makes re-emergence of a nuclear weapons system very difficult, requiring "reinvention" rather than simple "restarting". This can happen through degradation of methodological instructions, retirements, career changes, and loss of data or records. The absence of an indigenous pool of nuclear weapons scientists and engineers, or reliance on external expertise for disarmament, structurally embeds irreversibility by preventing the formation of critical human capital for weaponization.

4. **Material Destabilization:** This involves the deliberate or organic physical degradation, removal, or repurposing of the infrastructure, materials, and components of a nuclear weapons complex. The aim is to make it difficult to sustain or reconstitute an arsenal, moving from a "weak" decline (where components might remain dormant) to a "strong" decline (where realignment is very hard due to destruction of materials or banning of parts). This includes the physical removal of weapons, destruction of delivery infrastructure, and securing or transferring fissile materials.

5. **Governance of Termination:** This refers to the deliberate interventions and new governance processes necessary to "unmake" or discontinue complex socio-technological systems. It involves mobilizing existing governance instruments and inventing new ones to support the discontinuation of existing orders. This can include clear strategic decisions to disarm, robust international partnerships, and transparent policy initiatives for peaceful nuclear programs that consciously distinguish them from weaponization. This deliberate construction of new forms of governance, rather than mere retreat, solidifies the discontinuation of a nuclear weapons complex and significantly raises the political and practical barriers to any future re-armament.

Beyond the STS framework, irreversibility is widely conceptualized as a **spectrum or continuum**, rather than a binary state of being either "reversible" or "irreversible". The degree of irreversibility is measured by the costs and difficulty of reversal. This spectrum ranges from minimal actions, like merely dismantling nuclear explosive devices while retaining components, to maximal actions, such as the complete abandonment of all nuclear weapons,

their means of production, and even constraints on nuclear fuel cycle facilities and a dilution of militarism as a cultural system.

The distinction between "adequate irreversibility" (where reversal is detectable) and "total irreversibility" (an unrealizable ideal) is crucial for pragmatic policy.

Another key theoretical concept is the **Irreversibility Paradox**, which highlights the tension between states' desire for enduring progress in arms control and their need for flexibility to adapt to evolving security environments. This often leads to the inclusion of "withdrawal clauses" in treaties, creating a tradeoff between measures that strengthen irreversibility and security concerns that demand flexibility. The paradox suggests that the most enduring arms control agreements may paradoxically be those that strategically incorporate flexibility, reflecting a pragmatic recognition of evolving national interests and geopolitical uncertainties.

Finally, **Path-Dependency** offers a lens to view nuclear disarmament as a historical process rather than a single event. Once a state embarks on a disarmament path, the costs of reversal become very high, leading to a "lock-in" of behavior. This is driven by "reproductive mechanisms," which can be utilitarian (cost-benefit calculations, increasing returns, coordination effects) or normative (belief in the "appropriateness" of rules, ideas, values, and norms, often linked to national identity, reputation, and prestige). "Narratives of intent" play a crucial role in framing and justifying disarmament decisions, making them authoritative for both domestic and external actors.

Why Irreversibility Matters in Global Security

The concept of irreversibility is formally recognized as one of the three foundational pillars of nuclear disarmament, alongside verification and transparency. Its significance in global security is profound:

- **Reduces Proliferation Risk:** By limiting the capacity for re-armament and making it difficult, time-consuming, and costly to reconstitute nuclear weapons programs, irreversibility directly reduces the long-term threat of nuclear proliferation and the re-emergence of nuclear arsenals.
- **Builds Confidence and Mitigates Hedging:** When states have high confidence that an adversary's disarmament is genuinely irreversible and verifiable, they are less likely to perceive a need to maintain their own latent nuclear capabilities or engage in "hedging" strategies. This fosters a more secure and stable global environment by reducing incentives for a return to nuclear competition.
- **Contributes to Long-Term Stability:** A high degree of programmatic irreversibility, achieved through the systematic degradation or removal of a state's capability to produce nuclear weapons, significantly increases the time and resource costs (and risk of discovery) required to re-establish a nuclear program. This directly contributes to long-term global stability by making a return to nuclear competition substantially harder and riskier.
- **Reinforces Legal and Political Commitments:** Irreversibility is fundamentally a political exercise, driven by political will. Legal commitments, such as those in the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), serve to reinforce and legitimize these political commitments, embedding disarmament within national and international legal frameworks.
- **Deters Non-Compliance:** Robust verification mechanisms, while distinct from irreversibility, are mutually supporting. They build confidence, deter non-compliance, and manage the transition to a disarmed state by identifying and addressing potential gaps or areas of lower irreversibility. The increased likelihood of detection and the associated political and economic costs make re-armament attempts less attractive.

In essence, the theoretical understanding of nuclear disarmament irreversibility moves beyond a simplistic notion of "uninvention" to a comprehensive, multi-dimensional framework. It highlights that achieving enduring disarmament is a continuous process involving profound shifts in a state's material capabilities, institutional structures, human expertise, and fundamental perceptions of nuclear weapons. This holistic approach is vital for building a more secure and stable world, where the specter of nuclear re-armament is systematically and robustly diminished.

3. METODE PENELITIAN

Nuclear disarmament irreversibility is understood not as a binary state but as a spectrum, indicating the degree to which a state's return to nuclear weapons is physically, institutionally, and politically impeded. A core theoretical approach, drawn from Science and Technology Studies (STS), posits that maximizing irreversibility involves the "unmaking" of a nuclear weapon complex, treating it as a large socio-technical system. This "unmaking" encompasses five key processes: discursive reframing, institutional destabilization, competency erosion, material dismantlement, and the establishment of new governance structures for termination. The "Irreversibility Paradox" highlights the tension between achieving enduring disarmament and maintaining sufficient flexibility in arms control agreements to adapt to evolving strategic environments. Furthermore, path-dependency theory illustrates how initial policy choices, reinforced by utilitarian and normative factors, can create self-sustaining pathways towards non-nuclear status, exemplified by South Africa's experience. This includes establishing compelling "narratives of intent" that solidify a state's commitment to disarmament. The legal dimension, as seen in treaties like the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, transforms political commitments into binding international law, reinforcing permanence. Robust verification and transparency measures are indispensable, as they build confidence, deter non-compliance, and provide objective evidence of disarmament. They help manage the inherent paradox by ensuring observable and credible steps towards non-reversibility. Ultimately, understanding and achieving irreversibility is paramount for global security as it reduces proliferation risks, fosters international trust, and prevents backsliding by former or current nuclear-weapon states. These multifaceted theoretical lenses are crucial for developing effective and enduring disarmament policies.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Bagian **Kazakhstan's Irreversible Disarmament: A Case Study in Unmaking a Nuclear Weapons Complex and Lessons for Global Non-Proliferation**

Introduction: Kazakhstan's Unique Path to Disarmament

Kazakhstan's journey to becoming a nuclear-weapon-free state presents a compelling and unique case study in the complex landscape of nuclear disarmament. Upon the dissolution of the Soviet Union in December 1991, Kazakhstan found itself in an unprecedented position, inheriting what was then the world's fourth-largest nuclear arsenal. This formidable inheritance included more than a thousand nuclear warheads, dozens of heavy bombers, and over a hundred intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs).[1] Beyond these conventional weapons platforms, the country also gained full control over substantial quantities of nuclear material and critical

nuclear facilities. Most notably, this included the infamous Semipalatinsk Nuclear Testing Site, a vast area where the Soviet military had conducted over 450 nuclear tests between 1949 and 1991, leaving behind a legacy of severe health and environmental devastation.[1] This extensive nuclear infrastructure and material base provided a robust foundation for Kazakhstan to potentially develop an indigenous latent nuclear capability, particularly given the inherent technological challenges associated with producing nuclear material.[1]

The legal status of the Soviet weapons remaining on Kazakh territory was initially ambiguous. It was not until March 1994, through agreements between Kazakhstan and Russia, that these weapons were formally identified as the property of the Russian Federation, albeit temporarily located in Kazakhstan.[1] However, it is crucial to note that Kazakhstan never exercised physical control or command-and-control access over these weapons, which remained under the guard and operational purview of Moscow-controlled military forces.[1] This distinction, between inheriting and physically controlling, set Kazakhstan apart from other states that developed their own nuclear programs.

The concept of "irreversibility" in nuclear disarmament is central to understanding Kazakhstan's achievement. It is not a binary state—either reversible or irreversible—but rather a dynamic spectrum defined by the increasing cost and difficulty of re-establishing a nuclear weapons program once disarmament steps have been taken.[1] This spectrum ranges from minimal irreversibility, where nuclear explosive devices are dismantled but components are retained, to maximal irreversibility, which involves the complete abandonment of weapons and their production capabilities, extending even to nuclear fuel cycle facilities and power reactors.[1] The understanding is that while the fundamental scientific knowledge of nuclear fission cannot be erased or "uninvented," the practical capacity and political intent to reverse disarmament can be significantly diminished.[1] In this sense, irreversibility functions as a "regulative ideal"—a goal that can be continuously approached and maximized, even if never perfectly attained.[1]

Kazakhstan's experience offers a particularly valuable perspective on this concept due to its unique starting point. Unlike states such as South Africa, which *developed* their own nuclear arsenals through significant domestic investment and expertise, Kazakhstan *inherited* its nuclear legacy.[1] This fundamental difference meant that Kazakhstan's initial decision to disarm was not about abandoning a deeply entrenched national project, but rather about relinquishing a foreign legacy. This distinction likely reduced the domestic political and identity costs associated with renunciation, making the path to disarmament potentially less contentious than for a state that had invested decades in building its own nuclear program. The genesis of a nuclear program, whether inherited or indigenous, profoundly influences the

drivers and relative ease of its reversal, offering distinct lessons for global non-proliferation efforts.

Furthermore, Kazakhstan's success underscores that irreversibility is far more than a technical process of dismantling weapons. It involves the comprehensive "unmaking" of a complex "socio-technical system".[1] This means addressing not only the physical materials and infrastructure but also the human competencies (including tacit knowledge), the shared meanings and narratives (such as national identity and the legitimacy of nuclear weapons), and the institutional structures and legal frameworks that underpin a nuclear complex.[1] Kazakhstan's comprehensive approach, encompassing all these dimensions, suggests that future disarmament efforts must adopt a holistic, multi-dimensional strategy. Technical steps, while necessary, are insufficient without corresponding political, social, and institutional transformations that contribute to the "unmaking" of the nuclear enterprise.

Historical Context: Kazakhstan's Nuclear Inheritance

Kazakhstan's nuclear inheritance was not merely a matter of military hardware; it was a deeply ingrained and profoundly damaging legacy of the Soviet era. The country served as a central component of the Soviet nuclear weapons complex, bearing the brunt of its testing program and hosting critical elements of its nuclear fuel cycle.

Soviet Legacy: The Profound Impact of the Semipalatinsk Test Site and the Inherited Strategic Arsenal

The Semipalatinsk Nuclear Testing Site, established in eastern Kazakhstan, became the primary location for Soviet nuclear experiments. Between 1949 and 1991, the Soviet military conducted over 450 nuclear tests there, with devastating health and environmental consequences for the local population.[1] These tests were carried out in an atmosphere of extreme secrecy and with a complete disregard for the well-being of the inhabitants. Within a few years of the initial experiments, residents in villages, towns, and cities across Eastern Kazakhstan began to suffer from a range of severe health and mental issues, including elevated rates of cancers, stillbirths, deformed newborns, and suicides.[1] This tragic human cost formed a deep-seated public aversion to nuclear weapons that would later become a powerful driver for disarmament.

Beyond the testing grounds, Kazakhstan's rich uranium resources were extensively exploited to produce nuclear fuel for the Soviet program. Large nuclear facilities, such as the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk, were built to process uranium and produce other sensitive materials like beryllium and tantalum.[1] The fast-breeder reactor on the Caspian Lake's

shore in Shevchenko (now Aktau) served multiple purposes, including plutonium breeding, water desalination, and electricity generation for the town.[1] Kazakhstan also hosted several nuclear research facilities, research reactors, and significant military installations, including the Sary-Shagan anti-missile testing ground and the Baikonur space launching pad.[1] A substantial portion of the Soviet nuclear arsenal, comprising intercontinental ballistic missiles, heavy bombers, and strategic nuclear warheads, was stationed on Kazakh territory. However, due to institutionalized discrimination within the Soviet system, ethnic Kazakhs were largely excluded from serving in the Soviet strategic rocket forces, meaning they had little direct involvement in or control over these weapons.[1]

Decision to Disarm: President Nazarbayev's Decisive Action and the Geopolitical Rationale for Renunciation

Following its independence, Kazakhstan's leadership, under President Nursultan Nazarbayev, made a swift and strategic decision to pursue a non-nuclear path. This choice was shaped by a confluence of security, economic, political, and diplomatic considerations.[1]

From a security perspective, Kazakhstan faced significant risks from its immediate neighbors, two nuclear powers: Russia and China. Russian nationalist politicians, in particular, aggressively asserted claims over parts of Kazakhstan, especially its northern regions with large ethnic Russian populations. Kazakh leaders concluded that possessing nuclear weapons would not enhance their security but would instead increase their vulnerability. As foreign policy advisor Oumirserik Kassenov argued, being a nuclear state would entail a "greater risk of being turned into ashes" in any nuclear conflict, making a non-nuclear path strategically preferable.[1]

Economically, Kazakhstan was in a dire situation following the collapse of the Soviet Union, with its economy in ruins and intra-republic economic ties disrupted. The country desperately needed foreign direct investment, technology, and access to international markets to develop its rich natural resources and ensure its statehood. Kazakh decision-makers clearly understood that any attempt to "go nuclear" would isolate the country and effectively block access to these vital external resources.[1]

Politically, domestic groups advocating for a nuclear path were either weak or non-existent. While some nationalist movements called for retaining nuclear weapons, their political power and influence on public discourse were negligible. Furthermore, the practical reality was that Kazakhstan did not have physical control over the Soviet nuclear weapons, making any attempt to seize them a non-starter. Crucially, the profound and tragic experience with Soviet nuclear tests had instilled a deep societal "allergy" to nuclear weapons among both the government and the general population.[1] This public sentiment, often described as a "social

stigma" associated with nuclear energy and weapons, created a powerful domestic constraint against any potential reversal of the disarmament decision.[2]

This deep-seated public aversion was not merely passive; it was actively mobilized. The anti-nuclear movement, Nevada-Semipalatinsk, which emerged in 1989, galvanized millions of people across Kazakhstan. This movement, symbolizing a global struggle against nuclear tests, was spurred by the spread of radioactive contamination following an underground test in February 1989. Leveraging increased political freedom under Mikhail Gorbachev, Kazakh writer and Soviet legislator Olzhas Suleimenov used this information to rally protests. After two years of persistent advocacy by the movement and the Kazakh government, President Nazarbayev signed a decree on August 29, 1991, officially shutting down the Semipalatinsk Nuclear Testing Site.[1] This act marked a pivotal moment of Kazakhstan reclaiming agency over its nuclear destiny.

Diplomatically, Kazakhstan sought to establish itself as a respected and responsible new member of the international community. Its leaders did not want the young nation to be perceived as a "disruptor" or a "pariah state".[1] They accepted existing non-proliferation norms, even while acknowledging the perceived unfairness of the global nuclear order. Renouncing nuclear weapons was therefore central to Kazakhstan's re-emerging national identity, serving as a powerful statement of its sovereignty and its commitment to international peace and stability.[1]

The profound trauma inflicted by Soviet nuclear tests on the Kazakh population represents a unique and deeply embedded normative driver for disarmament. This goes beyond purely rational cost-benefit calculations, indicating a fundamental societal rejection of nuclear weapons. The public's "deep allergy" and the "social stigma" against nuclear weapons created a powerful domestic constraint on any potential reversal, actively mobilized through movements like Nevada-Semipalatinsk. For other states contemplating disarmament, cultivating and leveraging public awareness of the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of nuclear weapons could serve as a potent, long-term strategy. This approach can build enduring anti-nuclear norms and significantly reduce the political and societal costs of renunciation.

President Nazarbayev's decision to close Semipalatinsk just months before the Soviet Union's collapse highlights a shrewd utilization of a geopolitical window of opportunity—the weakening Soviet grip—by a strong domestic agent (Nazarbayev and the anti-nuclear movement).[1] The decision was not externally imposed but internally chosen, reinforcing Kazakhstan's re-emerging national identity. This contrasts with South Africa's disarmament, which, while influenced by external pressure, was primarily driven by its internal political transition.[1] Successful disarmament often requires a confluence of internal political will and

opportune external circumstances. States seeking to disarm should actively identify and exploit such windows, while the international community can play a facilitating role.

Year	Event/Action	Description/Significance
1989	Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement begins	Mass anti-nuclear movement mobilizes public against Soviet tests, fueled by radioactive contamination and desire for national identity.[1]
1991 (Aug 29)	Semipalatinsk Test Site closed by decree	President Nazarbayev's decisive action, reclaiming agency over nuclear matters and marking a pivotal moment for Kazakhstan's anti-nuclear stance.[1]
1991 (Dec)	Soviet Union collapses, Kazakhstan inherits arsenal	Kazakhstan becomes independent, inheriting the world's fourth-largest nuclear arsenal and extensive nuclear infrastructure.[1]
1994 (Mar)	Legal status of weapons formalized	Kazakhstan-Russia agreements identify Soviet weapons as Russian Federation property temporarily in Kazakhstan.[1]
1994	Kazakhstan joins NPT	Formal accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.[3]
1995 (Apr)	All warheads transferred to Russia	Completion of the transfer of strategic warheads to Russia, a key step in physical disarmament [User Query].
1995 (Aug)	Agreement with US on nuclear infrastructure elimination	Formal commitment by Kazakhstan not to preserve infrastructure useful for a latent nuclear program, with US funding for sealing tunnels.[1]

Year	Event/Action	Description/Significance
2002	CTBT ratified	Kazakhstan ratifies the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, reinforcing its commitment to non-testing.[3]
2005	Work on Kolbas completed	Trilateral cooperation (Kazakhstan, Russia, US) successfully secures large containers of abandoned nuclear material at Semipalatinsk.[1]
2008	Kazakhstan ratifies CANWFZ	Becomes a party to the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty.[3]
2009 (Dec)	UN declares International Day Against Nuclear Tests	Kazakhstan-initiated resolution unanimously adopted by UN General Assembly, establishing August 29 as global day of awareness.[5]
2012 (Aug)	ATOM Project launched	International campaign by Nazarbayev Center to build support for abolishing nuclear testing and memorialize victims.[7]
2015 (Aug)	LEU Bank agreement signed with IAEA	Agreement to establish a low-enriched uranium (LEU) fuel bank in Kazakhstan, promoting peaceful nuclear use.[6]
2017 (Aug)	LEU Bank opens	Operationalization of the IAEA LEU fuel bank at Ulba Metallurgical Plant.[6]
2019 (Aug)	TPNW ratified	Kazakhstan ratifies the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons, further solidifying its legal commitment to ban nuclear weapons.[3]

Year	Event/Action	Description/Significance
2020	All HEU eliminated	Completion of the conversion of highly enriched uranium to low-enriched uranium [User Query].
2021 (Jan)	TPNW enters into force	The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons becomes international law, with Kazakhstan as an original State Party.[3]
2023	Russian missile test incident at Sary-Shagan	Kazakhstan allows Russia to test nuclear-capable missiles, raising TPNW compliance concerns.[3]

Table 1: Key Milestones in Kazakhstan's Nuclear Disarmament (1989-Present)

Disarmament Process and Irreversibility Mechanisms: The Unmaking of a Nuclear Complex

Kazakhstan's commitment to irreversible disarmament was not merely a declaration but was meticulously implemented through a series of concrete actions aimed at dismantling its inherited nuclear complex. This process involved the systematic removal of weapons, securing of materials, and elimination of infrastructure, all underpinned by a conceptual framework of "unmaking" a socio-technical system.

Weapons Removal and Dismantlement

The physical removal of nuclear weapons was a primary and immediate objective. All inherited strategic warheads were transferred to Russia by April 1995 [User Query]. This was a critical step in physically disarming the country. Concurrently, intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) were removed from Kazakhstan to Russia, and the associated missile silos were systematically blown up to comply with the provisions of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START I).[1] The complete dismantlement of these missile silos was a collaborative effort, achieved with significant cooperation from the United States and Russia, notably through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program.[1] This program provided essential technical and financial assistance for these complex operations.

Material Security and Conversion

Securing and converting nuclear materials constituted another vital component of Kazakhstan's irreversible disarmament. A major undertaking involved the conversion of highly enriched uranium (HEU) to low-enriched uranium (LEU), with all HEU being eliminated by 2020 [User Query]. A particularly notable operation was the secret airlift of nearly 600 kilograms of HEU from the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in Ust-Kamenogorsk to a secure location in the United States. This HEU originated from a Soviet submarine project, and its removal was prioritized by Kazakhstan to prevent its diversion for nuclear device development by a third country or non-state actor.[1]

Beyond Ulba, material minimization efforts, including down-blending HEU to LEU or outright removal, were conducted at other key facilities. These included the Mangyshlak Atomic Energy Combine (MAEK) in Aktau, the Institute of Atomic Energy in Kurchatov, and the Institute of Nuclear Physics in Almaty.[1] At MAEK, the site of a decommissioned BN-350 fast breeder reactor, three tonnes of "ivory-grade" plutonium (highly attractive for weapons use due to its low isotopic content of less desirable isotopes) were safely transferred to a secure, remote location within the Semipalatinsk Test Site.[1]

The Semipalatinsk Test Site itself posed unique material security challenges. To prevent plutonium scavenging and ensure long-term safety, 181 tunnels and boreholes used for nuclear tests were sealed. This effort was funded by the U.S. under a 1995 agreement "Concerning the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons Infrastructure".[1] The trilateral cooperation among Kazakhstan, Russia, and the U.S. was instrumental in securing abandoned nuclear material, such as large containers known as "Kolbas" and "end-boxes," despite initial challenges stemming from a lack of complete information and technical expertise on Kazakhstan's part.[1]

Infrastructure Elimination

The commitment to irreversibility extended to the permanent elimination of nuclear production infrastructure. Kazakhstan permanently destroyed nuclear production facilities [User Query] and formally affirmed its intent not to retain any infrastructure that could be useful for a latent nuclear program through the 1995 agreement with the U.S..[1] Research reactors were also converted from HEU to LEU fuel, further reducing the country's capacity for weaponization.[1]

Despite possessing an advanced civilian nuclear sector, being the world's largest uranium producer, Kazakhstan deliberately chose not to pursue sensitive technologies like uranium enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing. Instead, it secured its enrichment services

through a joint venture with Russia, demonstrating a clear prioritization of non-proliferation over a full indigenous fuel cycle.[1]

Conceptualizing "Unmaking": Application of Science and Technology Studies (STS) Framework

Kazakhstan's comprehensive disarmament aligns well with the Science and Technology Studies (STS) framework, which views maximizing irreversibility as the "unmaking" of a nuclear weapons complex, understood as a large socio-technical system.[1] This "unmaking" involves the "discontinuation, or unravelling, of the system's network of materials, competencies, meanings and institutions".[1]

- **Materials:** This dimension was addressed through the physical destruction of weapons, the conversion and removal of fissile materials, and the sealing of contaminated infrastructure.[1]
- **Competencies:** The erosion of tacit knowledge, which is acquired through experience and practical "doing" rather than explicit documentation, is a critical component of irreversibility. Such knowledge is difficult to reacquire and would essentially need to be "reinvented".[1] In Kazakhstan's case, the comprehensive dismantlement of facilities and material transfers, combined with the historical exclusion of ethnic Kazakhs from Soviet strategic forces [1], implies a deliberate or de facto "unlearning" of nuclear weapons expertise within the country. This makes reversal significantly harder than simply reacquiring materials. True irreversibility requires not just the destruction of hardware but also the dispersal and atrophy of the specialized human capital and institutional memory associated with nuclear weapons. Disarmament strategies should consider programs for re-skilling or re-employing nuclear scientists to accelerate this "unlearning" process, as seen with some CTR initiatives.[1]
- **Meanings:** This involves the discursive reframing of nuclear weapons, their delegitimization, and even their stigmatization within society.[1]
- **Institutions:** This refers to the restructuring, scaling down, and fracturing of formal organizations and shared patterns of practice that supported the nuclear complex.[1]

The "unmaking" process can be deliberate, termed "exnovation," or an organic, gradual decline, known as "decrementalism," leading to "weak" decline (where reversal is straightforward) or "strong" decline (where realignment is very difficult).[1] Kazakhstan's actions, particularly its elimination of entire classes of weapons and infrastructure, represent a pursuit of strong decline.[1]

Discontinuation Governance: Analysis of Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) as a Model

The Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) program, pioneered by Senators Richard Lugar and Sam Nunn, stands out as a prime example of "reactive discontinuation governance".[1] This initiative was driven by fears that the Soviet nuclear complex was "coming apart at the seams" after the USSR's collapse, necessitating an emergency response from the United States.[1] CTR involved inventing new forms of governance to manage the discontinuation of Soviet nuclear practices, including those in Kazakhstan.

CTR facilitated the irreversible elimination or decommissioning of a significant number of nuclear weapons, materials, and production sites in the former Soviet states, including Kazakhstan.[1] This required a fundamental discursive reframing of Soviet nuclear weapons—from an overwhelming direct military threat to a dangerous liability—which paved the way for cooperative initiatives.[1] The comprehensive dismantlement of facilities and material transfers, coupled with the lack of ethnic Kazakhs in Soviet strategic forces, implies a deliberate or de facto "unlearning" of nuclear weapons expertise within the country. This makes reversal significantly harder than merely reacquiring materials.

The success of CTR relied on forging a robust "CTR actor-network." This involved building domestic coalitions within the U.S. (executive agencies, weapons laboratories, Congress) and establishing international partnerships with governments and agencies in the Soviet successor states.[1] It also necessitated the invention of new institutions, such as the Demilitarization Enterprise Fund and the International Science and Technology Center (ISTC), to manage these complex processes.[1] Kazakhstan's success in achieving "strong decline" was deeply intertwined with these international partnerships. This cooperation provided the necessary financial resources, technical expertise, and, crucially, access to information (from Russia) that Kazakhstan initially lacked.[1] This demonstrates that "discontinuation governance" can be most effective when it is a collaborative, multi-state effort, rather than a purely unilateral one. For states with complex nuclear legacies, international assistance is not merely supplementary but fundamental to achieving deep and lasting irreversibility. This underscores the value of programs like CTR in preventing proliferation and facilitating disarmament.

Category	Specific Mechanism	Contribution to Irreversibility ("Unmaking" Dimension)
Technical	Warhead transfer to Russia	Physical elimination of weapons, reduction of military capacity [User Query].
	Missile silo destruction (Nunn-Lugar)	Degradation of infrastructure, increased cost/time for re-armament.[1]
	HEU conversion to LEU	Physical transformation of materials, rendering them less usable for weapons.[1]
	Sealing of Semipalatinsk tunnels/boreholes	Physical securing of contaminated sites, prevention of material scavenging.[1]
	Permanent destruction of nuclear production facilities	Degradation of infrastructure, elimination of production capacity.[1]
	Conversion of research reactors (HEU to LEU)	Transformation of dual-use infrastructure, reducing proliferation risk.[1]
	Foregoing uranium enrichment/reprocessing	Deliberate choice to avoid sensitive technologies, limiting future weaponization capacity.[1]

Category	Specific Mechanism	Contribution to Irreversibility ("Unmaking" Dimension)
Legal	Accession to NPT	Binding international commitment to non-proliferation, legal prohibition.[3]
	Ratification of CTBT	Legal prohibition on nuclear testing, increasing difficulty of weapon development.[3]
	Ratification of START I	Legal commitment to strategic arms reduction [User Query].
	Ratification of TPNW	Strong legal prohibition on all nuclear weapons activities, normative embedding.[3]
	Adherence to CANWFZ	Regional legal commitment to nuclear-weapon-free status.[3]
	Acceptance of IAEA Safeguards (CSA & AP)	Transparency and verification mechanisms, confidence-building.[3]
Political/Social	President Nazarbayev's decree closing Semipalatinsk	Decisive political action, symbolic break from Soviet legacy, reclaiming national agency.[1]

Category	Specific Mechanism	Contribution to Irreversibility ("Unmaking" Dimension)
	Anti-nuclear public sentiment (Nevada-Semipalatinsk, ATOM Project)	Normative embedding, public pressure against nuclear weapons, social stigmatization.[1]
	Nuclear renunciation as core national identity	Deep-seated shift in national meaning, raising political cost of reversal.[1]
	Leveraging moral credibility for diplomatic leadership (e.g., International Day Against Nuclear Tests, LEU Bank)	Norm entrepreneurship, shaping global discourse, enhancing international reputation.[5]
	Trilateral cooperation (US, Russia, Kazakhstan)	Collaborative governance, resource sharing, overcoming technical/informational barriers.[1]
	Regional advocacy for TPNW	Promoting broader normative adherence, strengthening regional non-proliferation.[3]

Table 2: Mechanisms of Irreversibility in Kazakhstan's Disarmament

Legal and Normative Foundations for Irreversibility

Kazakhstan's commitment to irreversible disarmament is deeply embedded in a robust framework of international legal instruments and proactive normative leadership. These foundations provide both binding obligations and a powerful moral impetus against any future re-armament.

Treaty Commitments: Kazakhstan's Adherence to Key International Instruments

Kazakhstan has demonstrated a strong and consistent commitment to the international non-proliferation and disarmament regime through its adherence to key treaties. It joined the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) in 1994, becoming a non-nuclear-weapon state under its provisions.[3] This accession was a foundational step, legally binding Kazakhstan to non-proliferation obligations.

Further reinforcing its stance, Kazakhstan ratified the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) in 2002.[3] The CTBT, by banning all nuclear weapons test explosions and any other nuclear explosions, significantly increases the technical and political hurdles for any state attempting to reconstitute a nuclear weapons program.[1] Even though the CTBT has not yet entered into force globally due to outstanding ratifications from certain nuclear-weapon states, the act of conducting nuclear testing is widely considered a violation of customary international law, thereby imposing a strong legal obligation on signatory states to refrain from such activities.[1] Kazakhstan also ratified START I, further demonstrating its commitment to strategic arms reduction [User Query].

In a landmark move, Kazakhstan ratified the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) on August 29, 2019, a date deliberately chosen to coincide with the International Day Against Nuclear Tests. Kazakhstan was among the original 50 states parties to the TPNW when it entered into force on January 22, 2021.[3] The TPNW represents a critical legal instrument for irreversibility, as its Article 1 (a) explicitly prohibits states from developing, testing, producing, manufacturing, acquiring, possessing, or stockpiling nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.[1] This article embodies the core obligations for achieving irreversible nuclear disarmament.

Beyond these global treaties, Kazakhstan is also a Party to the Central Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (CANWFZ), which it ratified in 2008.[3] This regional commitment adds another layer of legal and normative reinforcement to its non-nuclear status.

Diplomatic Leadership and Norm-Building

Kazakhstan has not merely adhered to existing norms but has actively championed and shaped new ones. Its most prominent initiative in this regard is its leadership in establishing the UN's International Day Against Nuclear Tests. The UN General Assembly unanimously adopted Kazakhstan's resolution 64/35 on December 2, 2009, officially declaring August 29 as this international observance.[5] This resolution aims to increase global awareness about the devastating effects of nuclear test explosions and underscore the imperative for their cessation as a means to achieve a nuclear-weapon-free world.[5]

Furthermore, Kazakhstan has co-led significant initiatives aimed at promoting peaceful nuclear use while bolstering non-proliferation. A prime example is its role in establishing the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) Low-Enriched Uranium (LEU) fuel bank. Kazakhstan signed an agreement for this initiative in August 2015, and the LEU Bank officially opened at the Ulba Metallurgical Plant in August 2017.[6] This facility provides a guaranteed supply of LEU fuel for civil atomic energy, reducing the incentive for states to develop their own enrichment capabilities, thereby contributing to non-proliferation and peaceful nuclear use.[6]

Kazakhstan actively promotes universal adherence to the TPNW, consistently co-sponsoring and voting in favor of annual UN General Assembly resolutions that call upon all states to sign, ratify, or accede to the treaty at the earliest possible date.[8] This active "norm entrepreneurship" contributes significantly to the "discursive reframing" and "delegitimization" of nuclear weapons.[1] By promoting the TPNW, Kazakhstan is actively working to establish a legal prohibition norm [1] that, over time, can lead to the "stigmatization" of nuclear weapons, making any potential reversal politically and morally costly.[1] Disarmament efforts should actively support and amplify the voices of states that champion new, stronger legal norms against nuclear weapons, as this contributes to the ideational "unmaking" of nuclear complexes.

Legal Frameworks for Prohibition

The TPNW's Article 1 (a) is a cornerstone for legal irreversibility, explicitly prohibiting states from developing, testing, producing, manufacturing, acquiring, possessing, or stockpiling nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.[1] This article embodies the primary obligations for making nuclear disarmament irreversible. To ensure these prohibitions are effective, the TPNW mandates national implementation through legal, administratidiction or control.[1] For instance, the Austrian Penal Code (§ 177a) provides for imprisonment for

involvement in the development, production, manufacture, or transfer of nuclear weapons, illustrating how such national legislation can reinforce international norms.[1]

The CTBT, by banning nuclear test explosions, also contributes to legal irreversibility by making the re-constitution of a nuclear weapons program more challenging.[1] While computer and sub-critical testing have somewhat eroded the CTBT's effectiveness for technologically advanced nations by making traditional explosive tests less necessary, the CTBTO's comprehensive International Monitoring System, with its 321 global stations and four scientific detection methods, remains a robust verification tool. This system is almost fully operational and highly accurate.[1]

The Role of Safeguards

Safeguards, primarily a verification tool, play a crucial role in building trust in the non-existence of nuclear weapons programs.[1] Under NPT Article III, non-nuclear-weapon states like Kazakhstan are obligated to accept IAEA safeguards to verify their treaty compliance. Should nuclear-weapon states disarm, they would similarly become non-nuclear-weapon states and fall under these IAEA obligations.[1] The TPNW further reinforces this by obligating its State Parties to maintain and conclude safeguards agreements with the IAEA.[1] Kazakhstan has a Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement (CSA) with the IAEA in force since 1995 and an Additional Protocol (AP) in force since 2007 [3], demonstrating its commitment to transparency and verification.

Currently, nuclear weapons activities and fissile material for military purposes in nuclear weapon states are not subject to IAEA inspection. Given that approximately 80% of all fissile material is held in military stocks, full safeguard inspections in former nuclear weapon states would represent a major breakthrough for global irreversibility.[1] The TPNW's Article 4 addresses this by requiring nuclear possessor states that join the treaty, but have not yet completed arsenal destruction, to conclude safeguards agreements that provide credible assurance of non-diversion of declared nuclear material and the absence of undeclared nuclear material or activities.[1]

While legal instruments like the TPNW and CTBT create binding prohibitions, practical irreversibility also hinges on the difficulty and cost of reversal.[1] The CTBT's effectiveness is acknowledged to be "eroded by scientific progress" [1] in computer and sub-critical testing, suggesting that legal bans alone may not prevent the re-acquisition of knowledge. However, the IAEA's robust monitoring system [1] and Kazakhstan's transparent implementation of safeguards [3] provide practical verification that reinforces legal commitments. A truly irreversible future requires a dynamic interplay between strong legal

prohibitions and continuously evolving, intrusive, and comprehensive verification technologies and practices that can detect attempts at re-armament, even those relying on advanced, non-explosive methods.

Challenges of Withdrawal Clauses

The presence of withdrawal clauses in most disarmament treaties poses a challenge to the concept of absolute irreversibility.[1] The ease or difficulty of withdrawing from a treaty directly impacts the perceived degree of its irreversibility.[1] While a treaty explicitly prohibiting withdrawal would offer the highest degree of irreversibility, such a provision is often politically unpalatable for states.[1]

Most relevant disarmament treaties allow withdrawal if a state determines that "extraordinary events related to the subject matter of the treaty have jeopardized the supreme interests of the country".[1] This language is broad, leaving considerable room for interpretation, although such judgments are expected to be made in accordance with the fundamental principle of good faith.[1] As demonstrated by the DPRK's withdrawal from the NPT, such actions can be contested but do not reverse the departure of the former state party.[1]

The TPNW's withdrawal clause (Article 17) is notably stronger than that of the NPT. While it retains the "extraordinary events" language, it requires a 12-month notice period before withdrawal takes effect. Crucially, it explicitly forbids withdrawal from taking effect if the withdrawing state party is involved in an armed conflict at the expiry of that 12-month period, thereby creating an "additional hurdle" to reversal.[1] Despite these stronger provisions, the possibility of withdrawal and the inherent danger of treaty violations remain significant challenges to achieving absolute irreversibility. These risks can only be minimized through strong international sanctions that make such behavior prohibitively costly and unattractive.[1]

Political and Social Drivers of Irreversibility

Beyond the technical and legal frameworks, the enduring irreversibility of Kazakhstan's disarmament is profoundly shaped by deep-seated political and social factors. These elements have transformed nuclear renunciation into a core aspect of the nation's identity and diplomatic posture.

Domestic Transformation and National Identity

The decision to renounce nuclear weapons became central to Kazakhstan's re-emerging national identity, significantly raising the political cost of any potential reversal.[1] For Kazakhstan, the Soviet collapse presented a unique opportunity to reclaim agency and define

itself as a respected, independent member of the international community, free from the historical dominance and control of Moscow.[1] The historical context of Soviet institutionalized discrimination, which largely excluded ethnic Kazakhs from serving in strategic nuclear forces, further influenced the post-independence discussions on nuclear options, reinforcing the collective preference for a non-nuclear path.[1] This internal shift in national self-perception solidified the disarmament decision, making it an integral part of the country's narrative of sovereignty and self-determination.

Public Awareness and Anti-Nuclear Sentiment

The profound trauma inflicted by Soviet nuclear testing at Semipalatinsk cultivated a deep and enduring anti-nuclear sentiment among the Kazakh populace. This public "allergy" to nuclear weapons, fueled by memories of widespread health consequences and environmental devastation, acts as a powerful domestic constraint against any pro-nuclear inclinations.[1] This sentiment is actively reinforced through initiatives such as the "ATOM Project," launched in August 2012 by the Nazarbayev Center of Kazakhstan. This international campaign aims to build global support for abolishing nuclear testing and memorializes the victims of past tests, thereby reinforcing anti-nuclear norms.[7] The project's honorary ambassador, Karipbek Kuyukov, himself a nuclear test survivor born without arms, serves as a poignant symbol of the human cost of nuclear weapons, actively campaigning against them and further embedding anti-nuclear values within the national consciousness.[7] Public skepticism and opposition to nuclear energy, even for peaceful purposes, remain strong, driven by the lingering trauma of the Soviet testing program.[2]

The deep-seated anti-nuclear norm, born from the Semipalatinsk trauma [1], has created a "normative lock-in" [1] that appears to override potential economic incentives or strategic flexibility that might otherwise arise from pursuing a full fuel cycle. This is a powerful demonstration of how deeply embedded societal meanings can shape long-term policy choices. For states with dual-use nuclear capabilities, fostering strong domestic anti-nuclear norms and public awareness campaigns could be a crucial strategy to ensure that civilian nuclear programs do not lead to proliferation concerns, thereby reinforcing the irreversibility of non-weaponization.

International Reputation and Moral Credibility

Kazakhstan has skillfully leveraged its disarmament and its unique experience to cultivate a strong international reputation and moral credibility. By voluntarily renouncing its inherited arsenal, Kazakhstan gained significant moral authority, which it has actively used to

advocate for global disarmament [User Query]. This aligns with the concept of "normative path-dependency" [1], where a state adheres to a particular course of action not merely for utilitarian gains, but also out of a belief in the "appropriateness" of certain rules, ideas, and values.[1] Kazakhstan's actions have earned it trust in the international arena, contributing to its desired image as a responsible and peace-promoting state.[1] This unique "moral high ground," rather than military power, has become a key asset in its diplomatic engagements, allowing it to exert influence disproportionate to its conventional capabilities.

Kazakhstan's disarmament, deeply rooted in the trauma of Semipalatinsk, allowed it to claim a unique "moral high ground" [1] in international diplomacy. This moral authority, rather than military power, became a key asset for advocating global disarmament.[1] This is a powerful example of how a normative stance can yield significant utilitarian benefits, such as enhanced international reputation and diplomatic influence. States, particularly non-nuclear-weapon states, can leverage their anti-nuclear positions, especially if backed by a history of renunciation or suffering from nuclear impacts, to gain disproportionate influence in global disarmament forums, thereby reinforcing the normative basis for a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Regional Influence

Kazakhstan's commitment to non-proliferation has extended to its regional diplomacy. It has actively encouraged its Central Asian neighbors to join the TPNW [User Query]. Furthermore, Kazakhstan hosted a meeting in August 2024 to foster greater cooperation among states parties to Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone (NWFZ) treaties, demonstrating its leadership in strengthening regional non-proliferation efforts.[3] Its active participation in regional security dialogues underscores its commitment to promoting a nuclear-weapon-free Central Asia.[10]

Path-Dependency Analysis: Interplay of Utilitarian and Normative Drivers

Kazakhstan's disarmament can be effectively analyzed through a "path-dependency lens".[1] This framework suggests that once an initial decision is made, it sets a course that becomes increasingly difficult to reverse due to the escalating costs associated with deviating from that path.[1] In Kazakhstan's case, both utilitarian (cost-benefit) and normative (identity-based) drivers have contributed to this path-dependency.

- **Utilitarian Drivers:** The economic imperative to attract foreign direct investment and access international markets immediately after the Soviet collapse strongly incentivized a non-nuclear path.[1] The benefits of "staying disarmed," including continued membership in international institutions, enhanced diplomatic influence, and regional recognition, have

consistently outweighed the potential costs of reversal, such as international sanctions or pariah status.[1]

- **Normative Drivers:** The profound societal "allergy" to nuclear weapons resulting from the Semipalatinsk testing trauma [1], coupled with the desire for a non-disruptor identity in the international system [1], provided powerful normative justifications for disarmament. These "narratives of intent" [1]—the shared understandings and justifications for action—framed and reinforced the disarmament path.

Both utilitarian and normative logics have provided "discursive resources" [1] that mutually reinforce the decision to disarm and to remain disarmed, creating a self-sustaining cycle that embeds irreversibility over time.[1] This dynamic interplay ensures that the political and social costs of re-armament would be prohibitively high, further cementing Kazakhstan's non-nuclear status.

Challenges and Risks to Enduring Irreversibility

Despite Kazakhstan's comprehensive and largely successful disarmament, the path to enduring irreversibility is not without its challenges and inherent risks. These include legacy security threats and evolving geopolitical compliance tensions, which highlight the complex nature of maintaining a nuclear-weapon-free status in a dynamic international environment.

Security Threats to Legacy Materials

Even years after formal disarmament, the physical security of residual nuclear materials and contaminated sites continues to pose a challenge. Between 2001 and 2012, scavengers nearly accessed fissile material at the Semipalatinsk Test Site, underscoring ongoing vulnerabilities [User Query]. The severe economic crisis following the Soviet collapse in the early 1990s drove locals to search for scrap metal at the abandoned site, inadvertently risking radiation exposure and potential access to nuclear material.[1] This situation highlights that the "unmaking" of a nuclear complex is a long-term, active management process, not a one-time event. The "debris" of a dismantled system [1] can still present significant proliferation and safety risks, necessitating sustained international attention and resources. Kazakhstan's initial lack of comprehensive information on Soviet-era activities and remaining material, coupled with limited technical expertise and financial resources, further compounded these challenges, making international cooperation essential for securing these sites.[1] Disarmament agreements must therefore include robust, long-term provisions for environmental remediation and physical security of residual materials and contaminated sites, recognizing that these challenges persist for decades and can undermine the practical irreversibility of the process.

Compliance Tensions and Geopolitical Shifts

Maintaining disarmament commitments can become complicated by evolving geopolitical landscapes and pressures from powerful neighbors. A significant incident occurred in 2023 when Kazakhstan allowed Russia to test nuclear-capable missiles within its territory, specifically at the Sary-Shagan testing range.[3] This action immediately raised concerns regarding Kazakhstan's compliance with the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), to which it is a State Party. The Nuclear Weapons Ban Monitor, for instance, found Kazakhstan "non-compliant" with the TPNW's prohibition on "assisting a prohibited activity" due to these tests, despite Kazakhstan's assertion that such activities do not constitute a breach of the TPNW.[3] This situation reveals a "compliance gray zone" where Kazakhstan's strong normative commitment to the TPNW clashes with its geopolitical realities, including hosting Russian military activities. This suggests that even a state with a strong anti-nuclear identity and moral credibility can face external pressures that create ambiguities in its disarmament posture. The "non-compliant" finding by the Nuclear Weapons Ban Monitor highlights the tension between a state's interpretation of its obligations and external assessments. For global disarmament, the effectiveness of treaties like the TPNW depends not only on states' initial adherence but also on their ability to resist external pressures that could lead to activities perceived as "assisting" prohibited actions. This calls for stronger international mechanisms to support non-nuclear-weapon states in maintaining full compliance when faced with such geopolitical dilemmas.

The Irreversibility Paradox

The "irreversibility paradox" encapsulates a fundamental tension within arms control: states desire enduring progress in disarmament but simultaneously require flexibility to respond to unforeseen changes in the security environment.[1] This inherent conflict often manifests in the inclusion of "withdrawal clauses" in treaties, which allow parties to reverse their commitments if their supreme national interests are jeopardized.[1] The paradox essentially represents a "tradeoff between political, legal, and technical measures... which can strengthen and confirm irreversibility, and security concerns that will motivate states to build flexibility into agreements, making them less irreversible".[1]

Historical cases, including the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC), the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives (PNIs), the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement (PMDA), the New START treaty, and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), illustrate how states navigate this paradox. Often, states prioritize flexibility to ensure the resilience of agreements over time, even if it

means sacrificing some immediate "depth" of technical irreversibility.[1] This pragmatic approach acknowledges that in a world of evolving threats, the ability to adapt is often more critical for long-term adherence than absolute, rigid commitments.

Lessons for Global Disarmament

Kazakhstan's experience, when viewed in conjunction with other disarmament cases, offers profound lessons for the broader pursuit of global nuclear disarmament. These lessons extend beyond technical procedures, emphasizing the political, social, and comparative dimensions of achieving enduring non-nuclear status.

Irreversibility as a Political Process

Kazakhstan's journey underscores that irreversibility is fundamentally a political exercise.[1] The nation's sustained activism, exemplified by its advocacy for the TPNW and its initiative in establishing the International Day Against Nuclear Tests, has solidified its disarmament status more profoundly than technical steps alone.[1] This highlights that political will, robust domestic buy-in, and committed leadership are indispensable for both initiating and sustaining disarmament efforts over the long term.[1] The "unmaking" of a nuclear complex is not a passive process; it requires continuous organizational effort, intellectual engagement, financial investment, and unwavering political determination.[1] Without these non-technical factors, even the most comprehensive technical dismantlement might prove vulnerable to reversal.

Comparative Insights: Contrast with South Africa

A comparative analysis with South Africa, the only other state to have developed and then dismantled a nuclear arsenal, reveals distinct models of disarmament and offers nuanced lessons for global efforts.[1]

- **Kazakhstan's "Inherited-Arsenal" Model:** Kazakhstan inherited a vast foreign arsenal, a legacy of Soviet occupation. Its disarmament was primarily driven by the profound trauma of nuclear testing at Semipalatinsk and a strong desire to forge a new national identity free from the Soviet past.[1] The decision to disarm was a swift, strategic choice to shed a dangerous liability and gain international legitimacy as a responsible global actor.[1] This process involved extensive international cooperation, particularly through the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, which provided crucial assistance for physical dismantlement and material removal.[1] Kazakhstan achieved the complete elimination of all its HEU by 2020 [User Query].

- **South Africa's "Developed-then-Dismantled" Model:** In contrast, South Africa developed its own indigenous nuclear arsenal covertly, driven by regional security concerns and a need for self-reliance amidst international sanctions during the apartheid era.[1] Its disarmament was a secret, unilateral decision by the outgoing apartheid government, revealed only after the physical dismantlement was complete and NPT accession had occurred.[1] This process involved dismantling a domestic "military-industrial complex".[1] A key distinction is that South Africa retains Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) from its former weapons program, which it labels a "strategic national asset." It also continues to guard its right to uranium enrichment, viewing these as having symbolic value and potential leverage in global disarmament discussions.[1]

While unique, both cases underscore the paramount importance of political decisions, the power of "narratives of intent" in shaping and justifying policy, and the necessity of effectively managing internal and external pressures.[1] South Africa's retention of HEU highlights an "irreversibility equilibrium" [1]—a point where a state may feel it has disarmed sufficiently, but still retains a latent capability. Moving beyond this equilibrium point, as Kazakhstan largely has, often requires "coordination effects" from nuclear-armed states, implying that their own disarmament steps can incentivize further irreversibility in others.[1]

The Indispensable Role of Verification

Verification and irreversibility are "deeply linked and mutually supporting" concepts.[1] Effective verification processes are crucial for building confidence among states, reducing incentives for hedging (maintaining latent capabilities), and deterring non-compliance.[1]

Key qualities of verification that are particularly relevant for supporting irreversibility include:

- **High Confidence:** A robust, transparent, and trusted verification process and its attendant institutions are essential for all parties to accept disarmament.[1]
- **Timeliness:** The ability to detect re-armament attempts early in their development is critical, providing the international community with a window to respond before a militarily significant advantage is gained.[1]
- **Comprehensiveness:** Verification measures must cover all relevant aspects of the nuclear fuel cycle and be designed to address attempts to circumvent the regime.[1] This was a lesson learned from the failure to detect Iraq's nuclear program, leading to the development of intrusive tools like the Additional Protocol.[1]

Kazakhstan's transparency and its willingness to accept extensive international assistance and monitoring throughout its disarmament process significantly reinforced confidence in its non-nuclear status.[1]

Beyond Technical Measures: Highlighting the Importance of Non-Technical Factors for Enduring Arms Control

The "irreversibility paradox" reveals a crucial point: agreements with more *flexibility* (e.g., through withdrawal clauses or defined end dates) tend to be more *resilient* and enduring over time.[1] This is because such agreements are often more politically palatable to states, enabling them to gain wider domestic support, particularly in contexts of political polarization.[1] They also allow states to adapt to unpredictable geopolitical shifts.

- **Domestic Politics:** Internal political dynamics heavily influence a state's willingness to enter into and remain committed to arms control and disarmament agreements.[1]
- **Temporal Aspect:** The durability of arms control agreements can decline over time as geopolitical and technical landscapes evolve. As some experts note, "the enemy of irreversibility is time".[1] However, even agreements with a short duration can contribute to disarmament by limiting arms competition or reducing the risk of incidents for a foreseeable future.[1]
- **Dialogue and Transparency-Building:** Beyond numerical limits, less tangible benefits, such as established communication channels and transparency-building measures, are crucial for reducing nuclear risks and fostering trust.[1]
- **Role of Third Parties:** The ability of third parties to impose significant political costs for non-compliance is a vital deterrent against reversal.[1]

The finding that "agreements with more flexibility are the more resilient over time" [1] presents a crucial observation. While deep technical irreversibility might seem ideal, political realities often necessitate "opt-out" clauses or time limits. This suggests that a pragmatic approach to irreversibility, one that acknowledges the need for flexibility, might be more successful in achieving and sustaining disarmament over the long term, even if it means sacrificing some immediate "depth" of irreversibility. Future disarmament negotiations should therefore not solely focus on maximizing technical barriers to re-armament but also on designing agreements that are politically adaptable and resilient to geopolitical shifts, potentially by incorporating controlled flexibility mechanisms.

Both Kazakhstan and South Africa demonstrate "path-dependency" [1], where initial decisions set a course that is reinforced by both utilitarian (cost-benefit) and normative (identity, moral) drivers. In Kazakhstan, the trauma of testing and the desire for international

legitimacy reinforced disarmament.[1] In South Africa, shedding pariah status and embracing a moral high ground reinforced it.[1] These narratives and benefits create a "lock-in" effect [1] that makes reversal increasingly difficult over time. Global disarmament efforts should focus on identifying and amplifying both the tangible benefits (e.g., economic integration, security assurances) and the intangible, identity-shaping benefits (e.g., moral leadership, international prestige) of renouncing nuclear weapons, thereby creating a self-reinforcing cycle that drives and sustains disarmament.

Criteria	Kazakhstan	South Africa
Type of Nuclear Program	Inherited arsenal (Soviet legacy) [1]	Developed indigenous arsenal (covertly) [1]
Initial Drivers for Program	Host to Soviet nuclear complex, uranium resources exploited for Soviet needs [1]	Regional security threats (Soviet/Cuban influence), self-reliance due to sanctions [1]
Key Drivers for Disarmament	Trauma from testing, economic necessity, desire for new national identity/legitimacy, security vulnerability [1]	End of Cold War, domestic political transition (apartheid end), desire for international reintegration, moral conviction [1]
Timing of Disarmament Decision	Swift post-independence decision (1991-1994), leveraging Soviet collapse [1]	Secret decision by outgoing government (1989), revealed after dismantlement and

Criteria	Kazakhstan	South Africa
		NPT accession (1993) [1]
Transparency/Verification Approach	High transparency, welcomed international assistance (IAEA, trilateral cooperation) [1]	Initially covert, then high transparency (IAEA access "anywhere at any time") [1]
Role of International Cooperation	Extensive (Nunn-Lugar, trilateral efforts with US/Russia for dismantlement and material security) [1]	Limited direct assistance for dismantlement; international pressure for NPT accession [1]
Status of Fissile Material/Latency	All HEU eliminated by 2020; no interest in enrichment/reprocessing [1]	Retains HEU as "strategic national asset"; guards right to enrichment [1]
Key Challenges	Securing abandoned materials, lack of historical information, recent compliance tensions (Russian missile tests) [1]	Internal resistance from military/scientists; managing HEU stockpile; no full "uninvention" of enrichment capability [1]

Criteria	Kazakhstan	South Africa
Enduring Lessons for Irreversibility	Power of public sentiment; importance of international assistance; norm entrepreneurship; comprehensive "unmaking" [1]	Political will is paramount; narratives of intent shape outcomes; retention of latency complicates full irreversibility; path-dependency [1]

Table 3: Comparative Analysis: Kazakhstan vs. South Africa Disarmament Models

Conclusion: Sustaining a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Future

Kazakhstan stands as a compelling and instructive case of successful irreversible disarmament, particularly for a state that inherited, rather than developed, a nuclear arsenal. Its journey demonstrates a comprehensive "unmaking" of a nuclear complex across technical, legal, political, and social dimensions. The nation's achievement highlights the critical role of a strong domestic anti-nuclear sentiment, rooted in the trauma of Soviet testing, coupled with decisive political leadership and robust international cooperation.

Key Takeaways and Policy Recommendations for the International Community

The experience of Kazakhstan, complemented by comparative insights from South Africa, offers several vital lessons and policy recommendations for the international community striving for global nuclear disarmament:

- **Adopt a Holistic Approach to Irreversibility:** True irreversibility necessitates dismantling the entire socio-technical system of nuclear weapons, not merely the physical destruction of hardware. This requires simultaneous and coordinated attention to materials, human competencies (including tacit knowledge), shared meanings (national identity, legitimacy), and institutional structures. Disarmament strategies must be multi-dimensional, recognizing that technical steps alone are insufficient without corresponding political, social, and institutional transformations.
- **Leverage Trauma and Identity:** The profound human and environmental impact of nuclear testing can be a powerful and enduring driver for disarmament and norm-building. International efforts should support and amplify the voices of affected communities and

nations, leveraging their moral authority to reinforce global anti-nuclear norms and reduce the political and societal acceptability of nuclear weapons.

- **Prioritize Strategic Cooperation:** International programs, such as the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) initiative, are indispensable for states with complex nuclear legacies. These programs provide vital financial resources, technical expertise, and crucial access to information, enabling comprehensive dismantlement, material security, and the "unmaking" of nuclear capabilities that would be difficult for a single state to achieve unilaterally.
- **Foster Norm Entrepreneurship:** Actively supporting states that champion new legal instruments and global norms, like the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) and the International Day Against Nuclear Tests, is vital. This contributes to the ideational "unmaking" of nuclear complexes by strengthening legal prohibitions and promoting the stigmatization of nuclear weapons, thereby raising the political and moral costs of re-armament.
- **Embrace Pragmatic Flexibility in Agreements:** The "irreversibility paradox" suggests that arms control agreements incorporating a degree of flexibility (e.g., through carefully designed withdrawal clauses or defined end dates) may prove more resilient and politically acceptable over the long term. Future disarmament negotiations should not solely focus on maximizing technical barriers to re-armament but also on designing agreements that are politically adaptable to evolving geopolitical landscapes, potentially by incorporating controlled flexibility mechanisms while maintaining robust verification.
- **Ensure Long-Term Stewardship:** Disarmament is not a one-time event or a single historical moment; it requires sustained, long-term efforts. This includes continuous attention to the physical security of residual nuclear materials, comprehensive environmental remediation of contaminated sites, and ongoing monitoring to prevent re-armament. These challenges persist for decades and require dedicated resources and international collaboration to ensure practical irreversibility.
- **Address Nuclear Latency:** The issue of retained fissile material and the preservation of enrichment capabilities (as seen in the South African case) presents a challenge to achieving deeper irreversibility. Global disarmament efforts must address these forms of nuclear latency through coordinated international efforts, potentially including new control regimes or incentives for states to fully relinquish such capabilities.

Future Outlook for Global Nuclear Disarmament Efforts

The path to a nuclear-weapon-free world is undeniably complex, fraught with geopolitical shifts, security dilemmas, and the inherent "irreversibility paradox." However, Kazakhstan's experience offers a powerful counter-narrative to claims of impossibility. It demonstrates that determined political will, deeply rooted in national identity and public sentiment, coupled with robust international support and a multi-faceted approach to "unmaking" the nuclear enterprise, can lead to profound and enduring disarmament. The lessons from Kazakhstan provide a valuable roadmap, indicating that a nuclear-weapon-free future, while challenging, is indeed attainable through a combination of technical rigor, legal commitment, and, most importantly, sustained political and social transformation.

REFERENCES

Albright, D., Burkhard, S., Pabian, F., & Toole, J. (2019). *Conversion of Fordow: Another unfulfilled hope of the Iran nuclear deal*. Institute for Science and International Security.

Anthony, I. (2011). *Irreversibility in nuclear disarmament: Political, societal, legal and military-technical aspects*. Stockholm International Peace Research Institute.

Bourne, M. (2016). Invention and uninvention in nuclear weapons politics. *Critical Studies on Security, 4*(1), 6–23.

Cliff, D., Elbahtimy, H., & Persbo, A. (2011). *Irreversibility in nuclear disarmament: Practical steps against nuclear rearmament*. VERTIC.

Dalton, T., Hoffman, W., Levite, A., Bin, L., Perkovich, G., & Zhao, T. (2017). *Toward a nuclear firewall: Bridging the NPT's three pillars*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Elbahtimy, H. (2023). Approaching irreversibility in global nuclear politics. *Journal of Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 6*(2), 218–243.

Kassenova, T. (2024). Kazakhstan's irreversible disarmament. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 7*(1), 60–70.

Muti, A., Christopher, G., & Stott, N. (2023). The role of verification in supporting irreversible nuclear disarmament. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 6*(2), 292–302.

Pretorius, J. (2024). Staying the course: Lessons from South Africa for irreversibility of nuclear disarmament. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 7*(1), 41–59.

Ritchie, N. (2023). Irreversibility and nuclear disarmament: Unmaking nuclear weapon complexes. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 6*(2), 218–243.

Rodgers, J., & Williams, H. (2023). The irreversibility paradox: What makes for enduring arms control and disarmament. *Journal for Peace and Nuclear Disarmament, 6*(2), 244–262.

United Nations. (2009). *International Day against Nuclear Tests* (UN General Assembly Resolution 64/35). https://www.un.org/en/observances/end-nuclear-tests-day

United Nations. (2023). *Kazakhstan | Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons*. ICAN. https://www.icanw.org/kazakhstan

United Nations. (n.d.-a). *Kazakhstan's contribution to nuclear disarmament, non-proliferation and peaceful use of nuclear energy*. https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/mfa-amman/press/article/details/59812?lang=en

United Nations. (n.d.-b). *The ATOM Project*. Wikipedia. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_ATOM_Project

United Nations. (n.d.-c). *Kazakhstan*. Office for Disarmament Affairs - Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific (UNRCPD). https://www.unrcpd.org/region/kazakhstan/

United Nations. (n.d.-d). *Kazakhstan - Nuclear Weapons Ban Monitor*. https://banmonitor.org/profiles/kazakhstan

United Nations. (n.d.-e). *Kazakhstan's nuclear ambitions: A path to sovereignty or dependency?* Student Review. https://studentreview.hks.harvard.edu/kazakhstans-nuclear-ambitions-a-path-to-sovereignty-or-dependency/

United Nations. (n.d.-f). *Kazakhstan*. Congress.gov. https://www.congress.gov/crs_external_products/IF/PDF/IF10251/IF10251.15.pdf

United Nations. (n.d.-g). *Kazakhstan's role in shaping regional security in Central Asia*. *The Diplomat*. https://thediplomat.com/2025/05/kazakhstans-role-in-shaping-regional-security-in-central-asia/

United Nations. (n.d.-h). *TPNW/MSP/2023/10 Second Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons*. https://docs.un.org/en/TPNW/MSP/2023/10

United Nations. (n.d.-i). *Abolishing nuclear weapons at a time of nuclear revival: Prospects for the TPNW*. https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/25751654.2025.2516369?src=