

March 28, 2024

Interview with Ian Fleming Zhou

Citation:

"Interview with Ian Fleming Zhou", March 28, 2024, Wilson Center Digital Archive, <https://digitalarchive.umd.edu/document/301103>

Summary:

Ian Fleming Zhou, a PhD candidate in international relations, focuses on nuclear diplomacy and non-proliferation. His interest began during his undergraduate studies, where his academic curiosity about foreign policy narrowed into nuclear negotiations, influenced by his mentor. Active in both academia and activism, he sees these roles as complementary, enhancing his ability to advocate for disarmament. Zhou critiques the current geopolitical climate, noting failures in arms control dialogue and the destabilizing effects of nuclear weapons, and calls for greater civil society involvement to pressure governments for policy change. This document summary was generated by an artificial intelligence language model and was reviewed by a Wilson Center staff member.

Credits:

This document was made possible with support from Carnegie Corporation of New York (CCNY)

Original Language:

English

Contents:

Transcript - English

Robin Möser: Hi there. This is Ian Fleming Zhou talking to me, Robin Möser, for the project “Civil Society and Nuclear Risk”. I will briefly introduce Mr. Zhou. He's currently pursuing a PhD in international relations at the University of Pretoria. And he specializes on nuclear diplomacy, Non-Proliferation, arms control and disarmament. He's actually involved in, and I'm not sure if this is still ongoing, but anyway, he's actively involved or was involved in various international organizations and research groups such as the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty Organization Youth Group and the Youth on TPNW. I'm interested to hear more about that. And what struck me is that you participated in the 10th NPT RevCon as the chair of the Youth Working Group on Peaceful Uses. And besides that, Zhou is an ARCONA fellow and he also is at the Board of BASIC, the British American Security Information Council based in London.

Yes, my first question, given my introduction, what I want to know is: How did you develop an interest in nuclear-nonproliferation and disarmament and how did you end up doing a PhD on the topic? What's your background?

Ian Fleming Zhou: So, how it started is when I was doing my undergrad, my Bachelor of Arts in international relations and diplomacy, I was thinking of which areas I wanted to focus on. So, at some point, I was like, Okay, I'm mostly interested in foreign policy, so let me focus on foreign policy. And then, as I was now focusing on foreign policy, I was like, Okay, what within foreign policy do I actually want to focus on? And for some reason, I ended up diving into diplomacy and negotiations. And I was still very curious. I was like, Okay, this is not enough, let me make it smaller. So, I was having these conversations with my mentor, Professor Jo-Ansie van Wyk. So at the time she's been my lecturer when I was an undergrad, she went on to become my master's research supervisor a few years later. So at the time, I think I was now doing my honors, we were having these conversations. And then she was like, why don't you join the Youth for CTBTO? And then I was like, oh, okay, that could be cool. And then I ended up joining the Youth for CTBTO. And as I started doing work for the Youth for CTBTO, I was very much interested now in the work of non-proliferation. And that's actually how this all started. So, now coming back to my confusion about what to actually focus on, I ended up focusing on nuclear diplomacy. During my master's dissertation, I ended up focusing on nuclear diplomacy, specifically, the use of tactics in nuclear negotiations. And I analyzed the six party talks on North Korea's nuclear program. Okay. Yeah. And then fast forward to PhD after masters. I still wanted to look at North Korea, because I wanted to continue doing something that I was already familiar with to make my life easier for the PhD. So, I didn't want to start something totally new. And so I am still looking at, as you mentioned, at North Korea, but now I'm looking at economic sanctions and Non-Proliferation.

Robin Möser: The Nexus, I see. Yeah. And to be honest, you stand out from the people I interviewed so far, because they are either academics or activists. And what I gather from your background, you sort of managed to combine these two areas; and you still do. Therefore, I would be interested to hear more about it. How do you switch roles and cope with these overlapping tasks?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think it was very beneficial for the roles to intersect. Yeah, it was at the time, I thought it would be beneficial for me to still be in academia, right. And then just to also be an activist, because I thought there is more instead of just staying within one role, I thought both of them will be equally beneficial for my growth in the field and for myself as well in terms of knowledge wise. So, from the very start with the Youth for CTBTO, that was activism, and I was already interested in activism. On the academic side, I still continued publishing papers as well as continued researching on

these issues. So, the two are actually complementary if you really think about it. I think most people have just not figured that one out, maybe. But they are very complementary. So I've also done, besides Youth for CTBTO, you mentioned that I was a CTBTO research fellow in 2022. Again, that's when I was the Youth Chair for a Peaceful uses Working Group under BASICs emerging voices network.

Robin Möser: I have a short follow up and I'm now being provocative here. I think as an activist with academic credentials you actually improve your visibility. But in turn, have you ever in academia encountered any disadvantages also wearing your activist hat and the luggage that comes with it? I mean, it works both ways, but I assume being an activist academic is different from being an activist turned academic or vice versa. I mean, have you maybe experienced any prejudice or disadvantages through your activism?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think so far no, no I haven't. In more ways than one, I think it is actually benefited me. More in that sense, because most of the opportunities that I've gotten it's because of that. Yeah, I have noticed that there is a string because of that overlap that happens between being an academic and being an activist, it has given me an extra advantage in the field of activism or in academia as well. Because you speak on issues with more knowledge, because you're already an academic, so you have more knowledge and vice versa, because you're an activist, so you have more leeway to speak when you're an academic. So it's like, a mutually beneficial situation now.

Robin Möser: And you know how to work both fields or manage both systems. Yeah, that's something I think you have an edge over others that are new to either field. Okay. I have another question: How do you see the role of nuclear weapons in world affairs currently? I'm interested to hear your take on it and how do you regard the role of nukes in world politics and how your view may have been shaped over time.

Ian Fleming Zhou: As you said, the view has really changed since 2022. Before, if you'd asked me this question in let's say in 2020 or 2021, I would have answered differently compared to how I'm going to answer now. I think the trajectory is not good. While optimism is always standard, at this particular moment, it is not good. And last year, I think the last six months of 2023, it was even worse. I was like "are we redoing everything that we fought for in arms control?" Because it was literally the infrastructure falling every single day. Russia removes itself from the New START or suspended the New START. And then afterwards they went to the suspension of their role in the CTBTO. So, it was it was crazy, if I may use that word. So it's these things when the arms control frameworks that we have at the moment are falling apart like this. And it doesn't seem like there is room or need for negotiations to actually sit down and talk about these issues. That from either parties. Okay, let's say arms control issues, it becomes so politicized. Because right now, if they decide to sit and discuss arms control matters. You cannot discuss arms control matters and you won't talk about Ukraine. You have to talk about Ukraine. And the moment you raise Ukraine, Russia is gonna be happy. So, there won't be a conversation to be had. If you look at the last NPT Review cycle, that was also the problem, the issue of Ukraine as well. So, we are not on a good trajectory at the moment. So, we can get back on path, but at the moment, it's really concerning.

Robin Möser: And focusing on the impact of nuclear weapons, do you think they have sort of a stabilizing impact or are they a stabilizing factor in global politics?

Ian Fleming Zhou: No, I think they have a destabilizing factor, it's mostly destabilizing. I know, the deterrence camp will say something otherwise, but I feel to this day, they really haven't served us any purpose. So, all I can say that it is a destabilizing factor.

Robin Möser: Okay, and where do you think the focus of the civil society should be when it comes to the elimination and even total disarmament of nuclear weapons. And what practical steps do you consider the world needs to achieve this goal?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think civil society has a very huge role, because if you see when the Non Proliferation movement started, during the Cold War, it was mostly driven by civil society. And they really worked so hard to get us to where we are now. And now I don't see as much commitment. I've seen more work like after Oppenheimer, the movie, came out. This is my opinion. I saw more talks on nuclear proliferation after the movie came out last year. Up until now, there has been talk with people that you would not expect to be talking about these issues, which is the problem, because we cannot talk about these issues, just because a movie came out. This has to be a daily conversation that should be heard. So, with civil society, civil society has to participate so much, because civil society gives pressure to the government to change policies to push for better policies. While we can be writing papers, at the end of the day, civil society votes for these people. So, I think they have more punch to actually influence policy than they realize.

Robin Möser: And with "we", you take into the equation academics as well as activists that actually inform opinions of the voters?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yes.

Robin Möser: OK, I understand. And what would you regard as the biggest failures in the field of nuclear non-proliferation since the end of the Cold War? What would you say were the biggest shortcomings in arms control?

Ian Fleming Zhou: One that has been on my mind, one that I'm advocating for very strongly, it's tactical nuclear weapons. That was a huge failure, because I understand in the 1980s, the issue of tactical nuclear weapons was not really discussed, because the Soviet Union, at the time, had more tactical nuclear weapons compared to strategic weapons. So, in order to facilitate dialogue, the US could not, I think, raise the issue of tactical nuclear weapons too much, because Russia would not have sat at the table. So, I think that's one of the greatest mistakes. And just to build on the issue tactical nuclear weapons as one of the greatest failures is that even in our norms that we have right now, let's cover the NPT, for instance, it does not even address the issue of tactical nuclear weapons explicitly. It does not even on transference, it does not, it's very silent. So, now Russia has leeway to be transferring tactical nuclear weapons to Belarus and what no one is gonna do anything, because they are literally within the legal framework to do so. So, that's pretty concerning. And another point, that's the need for dialogue. Mostly between the US and Russia after 1990. There have been ups and downs and the spirit of actually having conversations on arms control, died pre-1990. Carrying over into after 1990, there wasn't as much of that spirit of wanting to actually discuss these issues. And it has only gotten worse as the years have gone by. So, if there were actually lessons learned from the Cold War, I'm sure that the amounts of nuclear arsenals would have been greatly reduced. But after 1990, I think it wasn't much. Well, there were obviously significant gains, I don't think it was as much as it would have been.

Robin Möser: So, I would reply to that: Who is to blame? I mean, is it policymakers or politicians, think tanks who did not address the issue or was it like were they blinded because of the Cold War curtain falling and thought we now live in a happier place? What would you say?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I'd say most likely policymakers on both sides. Policymakers who did not advocate for these policies to go forward. Of course, also think tanks. They are in the position to actually push or framing these discussions on what's important and what matters. So, I think there is equal blame here.

Robin Möser: What would you see as the most important milestones for the nuclear field to be addressed to make the world safer?

Ian Fleming Zhou: The CTBT must get into force. The annex and non-annex states they have to sign and ratify the treaty. There must be a politically repose. I don't know why there is so much stalling. But then, with parties like Russia suspending their membership, it also makes it very impossible. And we also need to address the issue of humanitarian impacts. That's something that needs to be really be addressed. And the P5 they have to take a very a leading role on this issue. A couple of weeks ago, I think the US passed a law that was reversing, I think, funding for people who were affected by tests, nuclear tests. So, you look at that, and you're like, No, this isn't what I was supposed to be, because why are we reversing instead of actually going forward? So humanitarian impact should be an aim. They should continue advocating for that, especially with the permanent five.

Robin Möser: So, actually disarmament by those who have nuclear weapons and that is Article Six of the NPT, I think you're referring to?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yeah, we need disarmament. Right.

Robin Möser: Okay. And this is now a bit tricky, because you wear so many hats, the academic hat and the activist hat, but taking your activism now a little bit into the focus of this interview: What are the closest partners you work with? And I mean you worked for several youth organizations such as Youth for TPNW. Can you tell me more about this, about how you engage with others when you're, for example, preparing for the NPT Review Conference and chairing the Youth Working Group? I would be interested to hear about more about your cooperation with other activists and organizations who actively work towards the goal of disarmament.

Ian Fleming Zhou: Let me see how to answer this question. Do you want me to focus on the NPT first or when I was chair of the Peaceful Uses Youth Group?

Robin Möser: You can give a general answer. And maybe focus on one or two concrete examples. Pick whatever you like.

Ian Fleming Zhou: Okay. Yeah. Just repeat the question. Again.

Robin Möser: Please tell me more about how you cooperated with other NGOs, organizations, activists in the field of Non-Proliferation. Tell me who your partners are?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Okay. We have to come back to question later on, OK?

Robin Möser: Yes, of course, we can. Then I would say we focus on a different aspect. Let's talk about ICAN, I guess you you've crossed path with them at one at one stage or another. Here's my question: Do you think that African voices were heard in the decisions that were taken by ICAN's leadership? And

could you maybe dwell on that a little: Do you feel that Africans are represented the TPNW campaign? Give me your view on that. Thank you!

Ian Fleming Zhou: There was a very sad moment last year in November. Yeah. That was a very sad, because African states have been prominent supporters of the TPNW and even African civil society has been very vocal and in support of the TPPW. So, last year, their [African] representation was non-existence. And it was almost like there was no key to include African voices in that conversation or to include them. Let me say, maybe probably people from the Global South generally. And that was really concerning. And it gave me pause at the moment to say, Okay, if you're going to sideline the groups that have actually supported the cause, what are we actually doing? So, for me, that was a sad moment. I think that was a missed opportunity there. Because you sideline people that are advocating for you. What's the way forward? The problem was also issue of the UN failing to back up the process. There is this paper that the UN has to give for you to submit with your visa application. And those papers were not given on time. In certain African states, it takes very long to get an US visa. So yeah, that was unfortunate, too. Now I remember!

Robin Möser: And you feel that despite this, the visibility of African ideas and opinions in the debate on global nuclear disarmament are actually represented or are being heard?

Ian Fleming Zhou: No, I don't think so. I think what I experienced, I mean, there is almost what I call a dismissal. Or if you say, Oh, well, like, literally turning a blind eye on Africa and Africans. And I don't know if it's because of colonial history, or is it because of Africa's position in the global international system? I don't know what exactly the reason is, but it's constantly, especially when it comes to African perspectives in these issues, which I think remain very, very crucial. Yeah, the issues that are very deep. Last year 2023, I was working on a policy cycle for diversity, equality and inclusion in the nuclear policy field. And the various issues, right now we already spoke about the issue of visas, systemic issues that exist within this field, that bar people from the global south from participating. Because now you cannot go to New York, because you don't have a visa, that means certain voices have already been put at a disadvantage to be heard. That means we won't say our grievances or our support for TPNW or whichever norm is it at that point. So, inclusion it's something that's really needed, because voice matters, and considering Africa's past, even up until now, there is still you know, uranium mining in Africa. And the Africans are affected disproportionately in these issues, nuclear mining with testing, you name it, we are affected. And then now to be sidelined, now we are not included in these rooms where decisions are being made. It's a cause for concern!

Robin Möser: And not even mentioning the financial resources, financial resources available to Africans to attend these meetings. It's not the same support as in western country.

And the same question, but this time about representation from an academic perspective with your publications and your visibility as an as an academic. Would you say that your voice is heard? I mean, we're talking about activists from Africa. Now we're talking about you as an academic from an African country, would you say that via your publications or your talks and these things, you are being heard? More than an activist, perhaps?

Ian Fleming Zhou: So, I think to a certain extent, not to an extent that I would feel. I just feel like there is already schism, between me as academic and an activist from Africa, compared to an academic and an activist from Europe or North America. There is already something that separates us. The systems

that have separated us. So certain opportunities that my other colleague on the other side of the globe might have, I would not be afforded those opportunities.

Robin Möser: I see.

Ian Fleming Zhou: It boils down now to issues of inclusion in the field issues and diversity issues as well as the systemic issues that create the barriers within the field. And just another point. Now, as an academic if I had been asked to present at a conference, there have been cases where they are like "Oh, the visa process will be so hard for us to go through this, so we are not just going to do it. We would rather have you do it visually." And then someone who's already in the Global North, they will be like "OK, you can come and do this this in person."

Robin Möser: I mean, I benefited from the same system when I did my research in South Africa and I was allowed to get a travel grant. I came to South Africa to do research in Pretoria's National Archives and these kinds of things. Other people could not come to Germany for their research...

Ian Fleming Zhou: That's precisely the issue.

Robin Möser: But concerning another aspect, I want to know your take on that one: Do you think the gendered impact of nuclear weapons is being addressed in the debate? If so, more than in the past?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think the past few years, there's been so much talk on gendered approaches to Non-Proliferation and disarmament. And I think we need to get to gender into the disarmament program to change the agenda. And last year with the emerging voices network, we did a policy cycle, the essential threats policy cycle in which we did tackle the issue of gendered approaches in Non-Proliferation. So, I think in the past years there's been a focus on these issues. What concerns me however, is that it seems as if the field goes through phases, where something is very, let's say, trending at that time, and then everyone jumps on the wagon. And then a year later, everyone is forgotten. They've moved on to the topic. So, at this point, I do hope that these issues rather stay in conversation instead of just becoming "Oh, it's trending for now. So, let's just get on the wagon." Yeah, but we also have to push funders to fund discussions on these issues, because they didn't look the day, I've noticed that if the funders want this, it becomes a real thing.

Robin Möser: Yeah, this actually leads me to a point another respondent during one of my interviews mentioned. He said that Africans or African voices are brought in when it comes in handy for those who want to achieve something, but are sidelined or marginalized when it comes to issues, for example, NPT Article Six or the TPNW. Would you agree with that, and then maybe have an example yourself of this?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yeah, I do agree when it's beneficial for whoever they will be like, "oh, yeah, we want African voices." But generally, it's imperative that we hear African voices. There must be a considered effort to actually get African voices heard, also when they [the Global North] thinks it's not beneficial. Right now, it's like, they just need to choose one African to be a token representation matters, and just say, okay, there's Ian, let's Ian do it. So, we cannot be in such an environment where our voices are taken for granted when it's beneficial. And when it's not beneficial they're like "Ah, well, it's too much administration, too much bureaucracy, too much paperwork, so we can't have you." It has to be standard. So, it should also be the norm for African voices as well to be included. Because it's

beneficial all the time for diverse voices to be heard. Yeah. And it's not just beneficial in winter or summer, it's beneficial every single day, 365 days a year.

Robin Möser: And have you participated in the conference taking place on South African soil concerning the universalization of the TPNW in Africa last year in Pretoria?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I was there. It happened at the ministry of foreign affairs offices.

Robin Möser: Okay, so coming back to the question of cooperation. The one we skipped earlier, I just want to know, how do you cooperate with other activists on these issues, such as the Youth for TPNW? How does it actually work to team up are you invited?

Ian Fleming Zhou: With some of these ones it's based on invitation. You're right. And let me talk about the EVN. I'm already part of the emerging voices network. And what the EVM does, is that they have funded policy cycles every year, they run like three or two. And then based on interest, you choose which policy cycle you want to participate in. And then BASIC will select the people who should be part of those policy cycles. So that's how it works. And then in some instances, it's been through like, right now, there was one I think it's called the Asian Leadership Network and because I'm part of EVM, they asked me to come and be a discussant at one of the conferences. Okay. Yeah. So, in certain instances, you are invited and in other instances, I was already part of the network. Then you just participate.

And because I'm also on the on the board of the emerging voices network as well, we come up with themes that we want to focus on publicly. So, that means we are going to drive to see, okay, what are we going to be focusing on for that particular year? So there are also some influences that one might have.

Robin Möser: And is there a corporation among the emerging voices on, say, a topic that you want to focus on and do you consult other people about the focus?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yeah. We actually cooperated with Youth Plowshares. Yeah. Funny enough, when we did the Peaceful Uses of the NPT, I think it was South Korea, it was United Nations Office of disarmament and EVM. Okay, it was an adventure, the cooperation between three groups.

Robin Möser: Okay, now, we're nearing the end of the interview. And I have three more questions. And the first one is, and you may indicate whether you're talking as an activist or academic, is how do you define impact in your field? And can you give an example of impact that you achieved or that you regard as a prime example of impact in the field of nuclear proliferation and disarmament?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think what I define as impact is putting forward an issue and getting conversation started around that issue, and advocating for that issue continuously until a resolution comes. Like, for me, it's been peaceful uses, and particularly its operation in nuclear power plants and the protection of nuclear power plants during armed conflict. It's something that I started in 2022, after seeing what was happening in, in Ukraine, around the Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plants. And when I was the chair of the Peaceful Uses Youth Group, I made sure that the paper would focus on the Zaporizhzhia nuclear power plant and the protections of nuclear power plants overly in an armed conflict. Because that was something that was already lacking. There isn't really something constraining in the NPT, there is no explicit language on the protection of nuclear power plants during armed conflict. So, since then, I've continued advocating for this issue. I presented at The Hague on this issue. I presented it a PONI in California. And at the Lawrence Livermore Lab on this issue again, so it's an issue that I have continued

whenever I get a chance. So, that's me as an activist, however, also as an academic, I am writing papers on that.

Robin Möser: Yeah. So, the impact is also seeing the topic being addressed and giving it a platform.

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yeah. Because when we wrote the policy paper in 2022, it was actually published by UNODA. At the time, the president of the review process he managed to see it and then he responded to the paper, he responded in person. And then also Rafael Grossi responded to the paper as well. And Robert Floyd as well. Oh, also another thing that was, I think, monumental, was when I did the fellowship with the CTBTO. We focused rather on annex two states and what are the reasons behind them not ratifying. And it's something that I've continued to advocate for as well. So that is that the more numbers within the CTBT countries sign and ratify the CTBT. And there was also an opportunity to present to Robert Floyd as well. And it's when people who enforce these issues actually hear you, your ideas, it's always inspiring.

Robin Möser: Okay, so this leads me to the next question and it's a bit related: What would you define as success in your field? And can you give an example of success?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I think in the past year, because of my PhD, I have learned to have a more wider understanding of what success is. I don't know if I told you what my topic is on for my PhD. It's whether economic sanctions have been successful in non-proliferation hot spots such as in North Korea. Anyway, coming back to this. So, what I would define as success is, obviously implementation of the policy. If you write a policy paper you want it to be implemented. Yeah, however, also getting it to the powers that are to see that policy paper. It's one thing you write a policy paper, and then it gets published by whichever publishing house and then nothing. But then it's another thing for you to write a policy paper, then it gets seen by people who actually have the authority to enforce it or implement whatever you say. And also, the different types of where was the paper published? The amount of weight a paper that's published on, let's say, United Nations Office of Disarmament website who have compared to a paper that is been published on another scientific journal. Yeah, it's totally different, in my opinion.

Robin Möser: Yes, we again then talk about barriers of accessibility. Is it behind a paywall that prevents scholars to access it?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Yeah, open access publication. Which is weird, because they expect you to write and then they publish you and then you are not paid for anything and then they will still have a paywall. Like, why?

Robin Möser: Because you get the academic prestige.

Ian Fleming Zhou: Oh, God. But then there are other journals that you can publish in on the internet, they don't have a paywall.

Robin Möser: Okay, that brings me to my very last question. What are your main expectations for the future of the field, and where do you expect the nuclear field to go in the next 5 to 50 years?

Ian Fleming Zhou: I need us as the field to enforce what we preach or what we aspire to. The issue is just the aspirations that we talked about. And then we write a policy paper and then we present the policy paper and then that's it. I'm going to start with the diversity, equality and inclusion. Every website that you see from the UN to the think tanks, they say they are champions of diversity, equality

and inclusion. However, when it comes to actually the implementation of that lead to disclaimer they have at the bottom of the page of their webpage. The reality is not what they say they stand for, it's not like that. Yes, you might champion the DEI in the field, but are you actually doing it? No, you are not. So now it goes to show that, okay, if this is just the DEI, how many other policies are we just championing and then nothing is happening. So as a field, I think I would want us to actually start practicing what we are preaching.

Robin Möser: And in terms of nuclear risks and non-proliferation successes in the next years?

Ian Fleming Zhou: In terms of Non-Proliferation matters: Negotiations and diplomacy, let's get back to the table. Let's resurrect the spirit of operation that was built in the 1980s between Soviet Union and the US, which is Russia and the US now. Let's resurrect that to have dialogue. The US and Russia were literally in a Cold War and they still could sit down. There was so much animosity, but then they could still sit down and discuss issues. Now, no one wants to sit down and discuss issues. There is literally no intention, especially Russia, Russia has stepped out, Russia stepped out of the door. It does not want to sit down. So, we need to get back to that place where people could sit down and discuss issues without bringing unrelated issues to the discussion. Because what is derailing all these discussions? It's because of bringing unrelated issues. Or say, oh, okay, what about that and that, but "that" is not important at the moment. Let's focus on our frameworks. Let's focus on the norms, let's focus on what's at hand. Because if we are going to politicize the process based on what's outside, we will never go anywhere, we will literally never reach any consensus. Instead of making the world a better place where we reach global zero, we are not going to reach global zero. By doing that, no, we won't reach it. The world will just become unsafer. And parties who wants nuclear capability will be like "Oh, well, it's a free for all now".

Robin Möser: So would you, in a nutshell, describe your own perspective or outlook on the issue as positive or rather bleak?

Ian Fleming Zhou: Uhm, I would say I want to remain positive. Ah another point that I wanted to say. I don't think I touched on AI. Yeah, I just wanted to say, that's also another regulations. I know the UN Security Council, they just passed something on the issue, which is awesome. And this has to be, like the NPT is as well, they have to discuss the issue of AI. And at our Review Conferences technological issues change. The norms and the frameworks that we have, should also reflect that, that the climate is changing. But if we are complicit and say "Oh, well, AI..." Five years from now, it might be too late. So, it's actually a good thing what the UN Security Council just did right now. Hopefully, we'll continue on the trajectory of understanding what this means and putting more regulations, so that we don't fall into a doomsday situation. Now back to the question that I was about to answer. I think at the moment, I would say I'll always want to remain optimistic, even though there might be issues that are very concerning at the particularly with Russia. I believe that there is still room for a redo. Okay. Yeah, like there is still room for Russia to come back to the table. So, I want to remain optimistic about this. There is room for change. If it would happen once, I believe that it can still happen again. So, I think I'm 50 50 right now.

Robin Möser: Okay, let's end here. Let me switch off the recording unless you want to immediately contribute something. Otherwise you can edit it in the transcript later.