

In short, existing NWFZs have amounted to much less than what may have originally been hoped by their supporters, certainly much less than what is demanded by many anti-nuclear activists, and undoubtedly much less than they are presently given credit for by many advocates and critics of NWFZs alike. This is not to say that the existing zones have no value in themselves, or that they may not be useful as initial steps toward more comprehensive measures of denuclearization. Neither should it be taken to discourage efforts to create new zones in the face of the mixed record and sometimes disappointing results of the existing agreements. But the record of past experience with NWFZs is highly suggestive of the practical difficulties and limitations to be faced by future NWFZ efforts, as well as providing an indication of what they can realistically be expected to accomplish in the near- to medium-term.

A good example of how difficult, complex and time-consuming the process of establishing an NWFZ can be is provided by the Nordic case. Of all the proposals for Arctic arms control, the Nordic NWFZ has received by far the most sustained attention, sparking the greatest amount of public and governmental debate and action. It is therefore worth considering in some detail in its own right, as the most "successful" (yet still unconsummated) example of an Arctic-specific arms control proposal. Moreover, a brief sketch of its evolution and of the remaining problems provides guideposts for an evaluation of the even more ambitious proposals for Arctic "denuclearization" that have been made in recent years but not been elaborated in nearly as much detail.

### **EVOLUTION OF THE NORDIC NWFZ PROPOSAL**

The genesis of the Nordic NWFZ idea is usually, erroneously, traced to a speech by Finnish President Urho Kekkonen in May 1963. Actually, it was first proposed by Soviet Premier Bulganin in letters to the Premiers of Norway and Denmark in January 1958, and reiterated by Premier Khrushchev the following year.<sup>3</sup> It was not

---

3. For the early history of the proposal, see my *Arms Control in the North*. Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University Centre for International Relations, *National Security Series* No. 5/81, 1981, pp. 89-95.