



THE POLITICS OF 'POWER TO BLAME' AT OPCW AND PAKISTAN'S POLICY PURSUITS

Dr. Tauqeer Hussain Sargana, Assistant Professor, Department of Politics and International Relations, International Islamic University Islamabad (IIUI), Pakistan. tauqeer_taki@yahoo.com

Dr. Mujahid Hussain Sargana, Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Latafat Aziz, Senior Lecturer, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad, Pakistan

Dr. Muhammad Umer Hayat, Senior Assistant Professor, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Fawad Aslam, PHD Scholar, School of International Relations, Nanjing University, China.

Asim Muneeb Khan, Senior Lecturer, Department of Humanities & Social Sciences, Bahria University Islamabad, Pakistan.

Abstract

Purpose of the study: The aim of this study is to reevaluate the efficacy of OPCW to deal with the threats of chemical weapons. What influenced the so-called changes in OPCW that promulgated the notion of 'power to blame' is at the core to investigate the dilemma haunting the very stability of global security system. The post-2018 changes in the power structure of OPCW have negatively influenced the very consensus of great powers over the issue of chemical weapons. Pakistan being member of the organization was pushed to exercise 'abstain' in voting and maintained that 'Islamabad is against any kind of politicization in OPCW'. Therefore, the study has put forward the investigation to understand security dilemma of Pakistan and what lessons it shall learn from the evolving politics within the power ranks of OPCW.

Methodology: The research is deductive in nature and utilizes secondary data to unfold ongoing phenomenon that is descriptive and qualitatively subjective.

Main Findings: The study has contested the chemical weapons usage in Syria and Col. Sergei Skripal incident in London that in result brought the British government at the forefront to submit a proposal in Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) to enhance powers of the organization. As a result, an unprecedented historic voting took place in June 2018 during a special session of OPCW in Hague. The agenda of voting was to give the OPCW new rights and privileges to define the guilty side for chemical attacks. Subsequently, in November 2018 a special session of OPCW conference took place in Hague to implement the previously taken decision. The conference ended in favor of Britain led western consensus over enhancing the powers of the OPCW. This study as a result of objective investigation has emphasized that the post-2018 changes in the OPCW with that of inclusion of 'power to blame' has brought imbalance in the global security system.

Applications of the study: This paper makes the point that the enhanced mandate of OPCW has destabilized the international consensus over the issue of chemical weapons. Based on the global security architecture there is United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the one and only authorized organization to 'blame a country' for violations and impose punitive countermeasures. Russia along with China strongly supports the idea of UNSC as the most respected and qualified authority in the World to invoke 'blame' against the state-level cases. Only UNSC has the right to initiate investigative procedures and impose sanctions. In negation to likeminded alliance, the study generates the idea how international system can help address the challenges impacting global peace.

Novelty/ Originality of this study: This study has taken posture of international politics into consideration while contesting the very configuration of OPCW that had been resting over global security architecture. The study has highlighted the evolving dilemma of global division within OPCW extended powers that has given impetus to the idea of wrestling between the East and the West (East vs. West).

Key Words: chemical weapons, OPCW, Pakistan, Russia, global politics, foreign policy, blame game.

I. INTRODUCTION:

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) is an important instrument to curb the military activities in the domain of chemical agents that could be used as an instrument of war. The organization's portfolio came to limelight when frequent chemical attacks were reported in Syria. Though, the mandate of the organization was only to investigate and establish whether a chemical attack has happened or not; its relevance got impetus in the aftermath of Sergei Skripal incident in the UK, who was poisoned with a chemical agent 'novichok'. The Syrian chemical attacks and controversy over Sergei Skripal, a former Russian Colonel and

double spy, made Moscow the epicenter of chemical weapons blame-game. Moscow had been the defender of Syria against western claims that Bashar-ul-Asad regime is using chemical weapons against innocent civilians. Russian political-cum-diplomatic cover to Syria had given no help to western capitals to penalize Bashar-ul-Asad. The crises took quite a controversial landscape when the highly powerful body of UNSC was unable to allow western powers to punish Syria, where Moscow had been using its 'veto power'. The situation took a U-turn when the incident of Sergei Skripal happened in UK. Regardless of involving the OPCW to establish whether an attack has happened or not, the British authorities decided to enhance the powers of the organization with a new mandate to 'assign blame'. This turned down the secondary role of OPCW as an assistant organization to a parallel powerful body to the UNSC with a 'power to blame'. The bridge of 'veto power' was turned down and the majority led consensus took charge of the 'politics of chemical weapons'.

OPCW: Syria and the Incident of Sergei Skripal

The Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) came into force on April 29, 1997 with ratifications of 193 states party to its draft ([OPCW, 2019](#)). Only Israel has not ratified the treaty though have signed the draft; whereas, South Sudan, Egypt, and North Korea stayed completely out of the premises of CWC ([OPCW, 2015](#)). These three states have neither signed nor ratified the CWC. In September 2013 Syrian President Bashar-ul-Assad wrote a letter to the then United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon to confirm his country's willingness to join CWC. The letter was received in UN headquarters on September 14, 2013. Syria through this letter offered an immediate observance of its obligations under the treaty as opposed to the 30 days stipulated in the treaty. Though, under the treaty it has to follow the 30 days' rule. Finally, Syria acceded in the treaty on October 14, 2013 while agreeing to complete destruction of its chemical stockpile including the weapons. The Spokesperson of the United Nations Secretary General issued the following statement on September 14, 2013:

The Secretary-General, in his capacity as the depositary of the 1992 Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, has today received the formal instrument of accession to the Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic... Pursuant to the Convention, any State may accede to the Convention at any time. The Convention will enter into force for the Syrian Arab Republic on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of this instrument of accession, namely on 14 October 2013... The Secretary-General welcomes the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention ([United Nations, 2013](#)).

As required by the convention, the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) supervised the destruction of Syrian chemical weapons ([OPCW, 2016](#)). The mild but important role of the organization has been taken over at a bigger stage and we are observing quite an interesting political discourse. The international consensus once united against the prohibition of chemical weapons is now shaky and exposed to global pressure. This happened in the context of almost 50 time's different chemical attacks in Syria ([Gladstone, 2018](#)) and more recently in London where a double agent Col. Sergei Skripal was poisoned by chemical agents called 'novichok' ([BBC, 2018](#)). The chemical attacks in Syria took the investigation towards United Nations Security Council and were vetoed by Russia ([Sengupta, 2017](#)). The Skripal case has been revolving around OPCW with potential impact on the organizational neutral portfolio. The hotchpotch with that of Russian continuous negation of extended role of OPCW regarding power to blame had witnessed its peak in June 2018 at the OPCW when efforts from the Great Britain were initiated for its greater portfolio along with enhancing organizational powers not only to investigate but also to instigate the potential attacker. This had opened a new paradigm and the tussle began between power spectrums of East and West.

Oliver Meir and Ralf Trapp in their article appeared in *The Bulletin* had also pointed towards this tendency, while maintaining that, "the initiative could further polarize the CWC membership. For good or bad, the search for new mechanisms to attribute responsibility for chemical weapons use cannot be separated from the conflict between Russia and the West" ([Meier & Trapp, 2019](#)). Pakistan as a responsible member of the international community had shown reluctance to stand on any side as it had opted for 'abstention' during the June 2018 voting to enhance rights and powers of the OPCW ([Shahabuddin, 2018](#)). Maintaining her

objective neutrality in the organization particularly on the so-called 'power to blame', Pakistan even in November 2018 special session raised her concerns aligning itself with Russia and China. The upcoming paragraphs of the study would highlight some of the important aspects of associated controversies around enhanced powers of the chemical watchdog.

What's the Matter at OPCW?

The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) being the primary international body keeps an eye over military usage of chemical agents. In June 2018 a special session was convened on behalf of United Kingdom to give more power to the organization encompassing new rights and privileges to define the guilty side for chemical attacks ([Press Association, 2018](#)). There are almost 193 member states party to OPCW and "according to the OPCW rules, a two-third majority of the members present, minus abstention, is needed to adopt the proposal" (XinhuaNet, 2018a). Around 82 states voted in favor of the UK led proposal and 24 voted against the resolution whereas Pakistan was among those who preferred to 'abstain' ([OPCW, 2018](#)). The British proposal proposed that:

The Secretariat shall put in place arrangements to identify the perpetrators of the use of chemical weapons in the Syrian Arab Republic by identifying and reporting on all information potentially relevant to the origin of those chemical weapons in those instances in which the OPCW Fact-Finding Mission in Syria determines or has determined that use or likely use occurred, and cases for which the OPCW-UN Joint Investigative Mechanism has not issued a report ([The Wire, 2018](#)).

The resolution was successfully adopted on June 27, 2018. The British proposal argued that "new powers were needed to deal with repeated chemical attacks in Syria" ([The Wire, 2018](#)). This got impetus in the aftermath of chemical attacks happened in London that targeted the double agent Sergei Skripal who have been a Colonel serving in Russian intelligence. Col. Sergei also became an agent for the British intelligence agency and was captured by the Russian authorities. Later in 2010, he was handed over to the British authorities under a spy exchange agreement ([Parfitt, Weaver & Taylor, 2010](#)). According to Britain, Russians have tried to kill Col. Sergei along with his daughter and thereafter the mantra of diplomatic crises erupted ([Erickson, 2018](#)). As a result almost 150 Russian diplomats were expelled from Britain and United States ([The Straits Time, 2018](#)). The same numbers of diplomats were also expelled by Russia ([Hille, 2018](#)).

Russia has denied the British government claims and tagged the June 2018 OPCW resolution an effort to manipulate the mandate of the organization. They categorically maintained that the British move is "beyond the mandate" of the watchdog and the members of the organization shall not become victim of an "artificially created crisis" ([Bet, 2018](#)). Russians though had not been able to convince majority of the members who however voted in favor of the measures. The resolution secured 82 votes to 24 that exceeded the required two-thirds majority needed. While cherishing the success British Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson said the resolution would "strengthen the ban on chemical weapons and prevent impunity for their use" ([Sanchez, 2018](#)).

The OPCW resolution was supported by United States, Germany and France; whereas the proposal was strongly opposed by Russia, Syria, and Iran. The plea of the negation from the Russian side was maintained on grounds that the attribution of authority to blame is against the vested mandate of the chemical watchdog. The watchdog was established in the aftermath of Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) as its implementing body and entered into force in 1997. The sole purpose of the body is to ensure destruction of the chemical weapons along with their complete prohibition. The traditional investigative responsibility of the organization only demands its technical supervision through fact-finding missions that establish whether a chemical attack happened or not. If happened, then what type of chemical agent was used in the attack. Expanding its power to blame is somehow contradictory to the original mandate and therefore brings political mingling into its neutral role.

Russian Deputy Minister for Industry and Trade Georgy Kalamonov criticized the British led proposal and said that "the only international body or international court who can decide who would be guilty when we are dealing with members of the United Nations is the Security Council" ([XinhuaNet, 2018b](#)). During his visit

to Turkey on April 03, 2018, the President of Russia Vladimir Putin showed his anger over evolving controversy in the OPCW, when he said that “Britain, the United States, two dozen other countries, and NATO have expelled a total of more than 150 Russian diplomats in response to the poisoning, and Moscow responded in kind” ([Pinchuk, 2018](#)). On the issue of Col. Sergei Skripal poisoning, Putin claimed that “the nerve agent [novichok] could have been produced by some 20 nations using materials that are available on the open market” ([Pinchuk, 2018](#)).

This perspective of Russian President seems more logical when it is contested with Gary Aitkenhead view of the situation. He is the Chief Executive of Britain's Defense Laboratory at Porton Down. Mr. Gary Aitkenhead said on April 03, 2018 that “scientists have not verified the precise source of the weapons-grade ‘novichok’ used in the attack because it was not the laboratory's job to say where the poison was produced... It is our job to provide the scientific evidence that identifies what the particular nerve agent is but it's not our job to say where that was actually manufactured” ([Maidment, 2018](#)).

The nerve agent that Porton Down laboratory identified was ‘novichok’ that Moscow had developed during the Cold War. It seems that Britain based on the idea that ‘novichok’ belongs to Russia, have concluded that Moscow is behind the poisoning of Col. Sergei Skripal and his daughter. Mr. Gary further explained his apprehension that “his Porton Down laboratory just provided the scientific information to the British government, who have then used a number of other sources to piece together the conclusions that they have come to” ([Maidment, 2018](#)).

Maintaining the official tone of Moscow, the Chief of Russian Foreign Intelligence Agency (SVR) Mr. Sergei Naryshkin on April 04, 2018 also claimed that “the Skripal case was a ‘grotesque provocation’ staged by U.S. and British security services” ([Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty, 2018](#)). Expanding the Russian apprehensions, the top diplomat Foreign Minister Sergy Lavrov called the poisoning case an orchestrated fabrication and ‘mockery of international law’. He said that:

The so-called Skripal case has been used as a fictitious, orchestrated pretext for the unfounded massive expulsions of Russian diplomats not only from the U.S. and Britain but also from a number of other countries who simply had their arms twisted... We have never seen such an open mockery of the international law, diplomatic ethics and elementary decorum ([VOA News, 2018](#)).

The kind of political hassle that had erupted between Russia and Britain is somehow leading the international politics towards arms twisting phenomenon. States who are even nowhere in the discourse of chemical politics were ready to favor the OPCW vote and those who were relevant decided to abstain. It seems power politics did play its role in the OPCW voting.

Will OPCW become an arm-twisting platform for global powers?

After June 2018 verdict and voting of the members of the OPCW, the organization is now in a stronger position to direct the blame towards a potential violator in the aftermath of its investigations. It is important to mention that in November 2018 a special session of OPCW conference took place between 19th to 20th days of the month in Hague to implement the decision taken previously in June 2018 meeting of OPCW. This was immediately connected with fourth Review Conference of Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) ([OPCW, 2018](#)). The aftermath of the November 2018 conference, OPCW mandate was finally approved with required budget to instigate the enhance mandate of the organization.

Until June 2018 the organization has only cherished a limited mandate to identify whether a chemical agent was used in an attack. The aftermath of the voting brought new powers into its mandate that now allows the organization to identify the attacker, which in turn creates controversies. Who is behind the attack is a mandate that will most probably push the organization into political waters. Traditionally, the power to blame and take punitive measures was only vested in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). After the November 2018 voting this task is finally handed over to OPCW and Director General of the organization now exercises greater power with required budgeting. Russia is apprehensive of enhanced OPCW powers and has been raising her voice. For example, on November 22, 2018 Russian Foreign Ministry briefed the media that, “it cannot be ruled out that its [OPCW] conclusions might be used as a pretext for using force regardless of the opinion of the UN Security Council. The responsibility for undermining the OPCW rests squarely on the United States, Britain and France” ([TASS, 2018](#)).

In 2017, when the United States along with its close allies took the Syrian chemical attack into UNSC, Russian 'veto' effectively put stall on the UN-OPCW joint body in charge to probe the matter ([The Guardian, 2017](#)). Learning from this episode British government did not take the case of double agent Sergei Skripal to UNSC rather it avoided the traditional political setup and proposed to provide greater power to OPCW not only to establish the facts around chemical attacks but also identify the culprits behind it. That is why today there is greater pressure over Russia, that will not be able to revoke obvious fingers towards Moscow's involvement in the attacks. There could be enormous political, diplomatic, security and economic sanctions on Russia for not complying with the OPCW findings. This whole creates a mess around political order. Whether it's the system of UNSC that defines defiance of the states or it's the subordinated institutions of the United Nations that identify the violators; both domains are important pillars of international politics. The UNSC takes lead to define the defiance and plead the guilty whereas its subsidiary organs support the elite body to establish conclusions.

This is in fact not an issue of normal politics. The politics around UNSC is already so complicated and how its mandate has been manipulated is of no secret. But the real problem is associated with the emergence of politics at subsidiary organs of the United Nations. There are many international forums that assist the United Nations to uphold its mandate and the final authority that is vested in the system belongs to UNSC. States due to their political and economic strengths are capable to bargain and project their interests with powerful nations and somehow are able to get relief through UNSC decisions. If the issues are taken to the international forums that have 'power to blame' then the whole system of United Nations should be ready to receive political backlash and aftershocks. No state would surrender to institutions neither institutions have required political writ over sovereign states. When it comes to global actors or regional, the apprehensions become manifold. Have we forgotten what happened when UN inspectors reported that they have not found Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) in Iraq? United States unilaterally attacked on Iraq.

There are many situations when United Nations behaved like a paralyzed organization to act or to respond efficiently. This mainly happens when great power politics takes over the rationality. Are we Pakistanis not aware of the facts circumventing Kashmiri freedom struggle against atrocity, killing, torturing, rapping, and political suppression by the Indian forces? United Nations is the custodian of Kashmiri right to self-determination and is the only body to curtail Indian brutal actions. Weakening the UN portfolio would strengthen states like India, who are good enough to find likeminded friends. Contrary to the politics at UN, had we not seen manipulation in Nuclear Suppliers Groups (NSG) when it gave 'wavier' to India, a country against whom the NSG was established in 1974. How good are the Indian in manipulating the United Nations and international cartels and still are bidders to join the Security Council as permanent members. There is no trust on great powers role to lead peace and stability but what is believed to be trusted is the 'mandate of the United Nations' that civilized nations have vested in its covenant. It is the conduct of each and every single member of the United Nations that defines the future of this organization. Pakistan surrounded by regional and international circumstances had always wanted to find an appropriate way-forward to protect her national interest. That is why it did not surrender to the politics of great powers rather decided to stand with the system and ensured all necessary diplomatic actions to raise its voice at OPCW.

Pakistan: OPCW and 'Power to Blame'?

The convention is also signed and ratified by both Pakistan and India. The first step was to initiate a confidence building measure that came to play its part in August 1992 when both states signed a bilateral agreement for the prohibition of chemical weapons ([NTI, 2011](#)). Article-1 of the bilateral agreement between India and Pakistan stated that:

They undertake never under any circumstances: a) to develop, produce or otherwise acquire chemical weapons; b) to use chemical weapons; c) to assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in development, production, acquisition, stockpiling or use of chemical weapons ([NTI, 2021](#)).

Article-2 of the agreement also committed both the governments to sign the chemical weapons convention which India and Pakistan that the two joined in 1993. In 1992 both Islamabad and New Delhi were unable to join the convention as it was under discussion at United Nations and opened for signatures on January

13, 1993 ([OPCW, 2017](#)). Contrary to signing the convention, the bilateral agreement did not commit both India and Pakistan to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention. Pakistan signed the convention on January 13, 1993 and subsequently ratified it on October 28, 1997. India on the other hand signed the convention on January 14, 1993 and ratified it on September 03, 1996.

Under the declaration protocols at the time of signing the bilateral agreement in 1992 both India and Pakistan declared that there are zero stockpiles of chemical weapons with them. As a matter of fact, India lied to Pakistan while signing the bilateral agreement. This came to surface when India ratified the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) in 1996; it declared its chemical stockpile with military applications that were developed by its Defense Research and Development Organization (DRDO). This in fact gave birth to a controversy around bilateral agreement of 1992 that India breached and violated.

Pakistan is member of the OPCW and had maintained firm believe on the elimination of chemical weapons and their usage. It had signed the CWC in 1993 with a plea to discard the presence of such weapons in South Asia, whereas its neighbor India while signing the bilateral agreement had maintained massive stockpile that it revealed in 1996 before ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). Contrary to the good gestures of Pakistan, India until today had not valued such Pakistani efforts to keep the region safe from chemical weapons neither it had abandoned its stockpile. Though, Pakistan had respected the international concerns and ratified the convention but India preferred to dodge both regional and global consensus on chemical weapons.

Pakistan is a responsible nation that keeps an eye over political orchestration of institutions. This type of orchestration is not new for Islamabad to trap her as after losing so much of its economy and sacrificing thousands of lives in the war against terror, what Pakistan had been listening from the so-called friends. For the record it had not been appreciation rather a mantra of 'do more'. OPCW is an important body but changing the mandate originally assigned to it is somehow politically mandated. Pakistan has extended her concerns about the use of chemical weapons on innocent people in Syria and irresponsible acts involving an attempt to kill double agent like Sergei Skripal but that does not suggest becoming a stooge to great power politics. Pakistan's abstention in June 2018 OPCW voting reflected this behavior.

China did not abstain nor India. Both voted against the UK proposal. So did Iran and Syria. Pakistan's abstention was to ensure neutrality of the organization as Islamabad does not want to play any role in the political orchestration of the OPCW. Furthermore, it wanted time to deliberate her diplomatic options to study the behavior of the organization's legal mandate, which was earlier on consented by the member states at the time of signing and ratifying the CWC. Pakistan's immediate acceptance to the idea of powerful western block that may want to use OPCW against Russia could have exposed diplomatic immaturity. Pakistan's long time standing with strengthening of global norms along with international law would have become pray to power politics. Wasn't Pakistan voted against Trump's decision to move its Embassy to Jerusalem when United States was categorically denouncing each and every single state going against its stance? Pakistan did well and must continue to support global cause of peace and ensure that her diplomatic power is sided with those who are in need or at-least are bidders of global norms vested in international law. The idea is to showcase Pakistan's pragmatic foreign policy without creating a pulse of weakness. On this matter of OPCW, Pakistan at the end stood with Russia and China through voicing her legal concerns over politicization of the organization.

II. CONCLUSION:

Unprecedented historic voting took place in June 2018 during a special session of OPCW in Hague. The agenda of voting was to give the OPCW new rights and privileges to define the guilty side for chemical attacks. It is important to mention that Pakistan abstained in voting and provided official explanation that 'Islamabad is against any kind of politicization in OPCW'. In this regard interesting are the following facts. According to recognized global security architecture there is United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the one and only authorized organization to 'blame a country' for violations and impose punitive countermeasures. UNSC is the most respected and qualified authority in the World for state-level cases. UNSC is the historic product of creating international mechanisms of solving global problems. One can argue about the effectiveness of UN, because some international disputes are still unresolved like Kashmir, but

this is the system and it works like this. Only UNSC has the right to initiate investigative procedures and impose sanctions. In November 2018 a special session of OPCW conference took place in Hague to implement the previously taken decision with that of sanctioning the required budget.

It's quite common that UNSC members have different opinions about particular issues and disagree sometimes regarding principal matters. Moreover, out of 15 members 5 poses veto privilege to block uncomfortable decisions. In practice it leads to situation, where western group of members insist on sanctions against a country on same allegations and China/Russia use veto because of lack of proofs or unreliable information sources. For many years western block has been looking for ways out of this dead end. Since Syrian conflict has started this East-West in UNSC, rivalry dramatically escalated.

In June 2018 voting in OPCW more than half of OPCW members voted for west-proposed idea to give this organization additional right to define the guilty side in chemical attacks. Remarkable fact was that most of these voters were small countries, which is not easy to find on the World map. All of them actually were under pressure of some influential states without possibility to refuse. This was in fact an arm-twisting strategy of the western capitals.

It is important to mention that Pakistan abstained in voting and provided official explanation that Islamabad is against any kind of politization in OPCW. Many countries also preferred to abstain due to the same reasons. Unfortunately, the problem is that according to OPCW voting procedures all the abstained voices are not counted and the percentage of "YES" and "NO" quickly changes to "YES". At the end of the day the June voting created a precedent, which now makes ground for changes in global security architecture. So the decision has been taken and ground is created. Next step is to implement it.

Islamabad must learn lessons from this whole episode and continue exercising an appropriate policy that corresponds with the national interests of Pakistan. Below are mentioned few of the arguments that should be enough to help the policy makers to take pragmatic decision at the OPCW forum.

i. First Pakistan has to understand clearly that OPCW is a quite different organization and will get might and power of UNSC. This will lead to collisions, confrontations and political stalemate giving hype to international instability.

ii. OPCW had a reliable reputation of highly technical organization, which provided expertise on alleged use of chemical agents. The task of OPCW has been to find out the facts, summarize them and prepare a report. Reports included only the following positions:

- Chemical weapon was or wasn't used,
- Type and name of the chemical agents,
- Time and place of the attack,
- Proofs that victims died because of use of the mentioned chemicals.

That's all. No accusations and no blamed suspects.

iii. OPCW then goes to UNSC that examine, define suspects and take decisions.

iv. The post November 2018 meeting, the OPCW has finally received the new wide authorities, it would now create imbalance and ambiguity. There are still numerous complaints about procedure violation during Syrian chemical attacks investigations. Outcomes of some of the reports lack proofs, the investigation were conducted without visiting the places of attacks, chemical samples from sites of attacks were collected not by the inspectors themselves, but by some unauthorized civil or military persons. So, the question of credibility is on the table.

v. It's easy to predict that without eliminating these weak points granting the OPCW super power abilities will be too dangerous. Who can guaranty that in today's unstable World this power would not be used against an imaginable country "X" to topple down its 'uncomfortable' government on fake allegations. Maybe tomorrow it is Iran or any other country becomes victim of OPCW enhanced power. Today Pakistan is considered as a friendly partner, but it doesn't take too much time to turn into a hostile regime.

vi. Controversy between key members of OPCW unfortunately only contributes to widening of misunderstandings, harms the OPCW reputation and could provoke some concerned countries to cancel their membership of OPCW. That would lead to loss of universality of the convention, loss of effectiveness and ruin the reputation.

Therefore, Pakistan should take more decisive stance and directly express its unwillingness to become victim of global politics.

REFERENCES

1. BBC. (2018, September 26). Russian spy poisoning: What we know so far. <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-43315636>
2. Bet, Martina. (2018, June 26). UK and Russia set for Showdown as Boris Johnson calls for boosting world chemical watchdog. *Express*. <https://www.express.co.uk/news/politics/979606/UK-and-Russia-set-for-showdown-as-Boris-Johnson-calls-for-boosting-world-chemical-watchdog>
3. Erickson, Amanda. (2018, March 26). The U.S. and Europe say the Kremlin poisoned Sergei Skripal. Russians don't buy it. *The Washington Post*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2018/03/26/who-poisoned-sergei-skripal-not-russia-russians-say/?utm_term=.2c82eeab35e8
4. Gladstone, Rick. (2018, April 13). U.S. Says Syria Has Used Chemical Weapons at Least 50 Times During War. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/13/world/middleeast/un-syria-haley-chemical-weapons.html>
5. Hille, Kathrin. (2018, March 29). Russia expels 150 diplomats and closes US consulate in retaliation against UK allies. *Financial Times*. <https://www.ft.com/content/1d7968e2-3379-11e8-ac48-10c6fdc22f03>
6. Meier, Oliver & Trapp, Ralf. (2019, June 20). Playing politics with chemical weapons? The UK's initiative on chemical weapons accountability. *The Bulletin*. <https://thebulletin.org/2018/06/playing-politics-with-chemical-weapons-the-uks-initiative-on-chemical-weapons-accountability/>
7. Maidment, Jack. (2018, April 03). Salisbury nerve agent 'probably state made' but Porton Down scientists unable to say it came from Russia. *The Telegraph*. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/politics/2018/04/03/porton-scientists-have-not-verified-precise-source-nerve-agent/>
8. NTI. (2021, March 07). India Pakistan Chemical Weapons Text. *Nuclear Threat Initiative*. https://www.nti.org/media/documents/india_pakistan_cw.pdf
9. NTI. (2011, October 26). India-Pakistan Agreement on Chemical Weapons. *Nuclear Threat Initiative*. <https://www.nti.org/learn/treaties-and-regimes/india-pakistan-agreement-on-chemical-weapons/>
10. OPCW. (2019, June 21). State of Palestine Joins the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. <https://www.opcw.org/news/article/state-of-palestine-joins-the-organisation-for-the-prohibition-of-chemical-weapons/>
11. OPCW. (2018, November 30). Fourth Review Conference, 21-30 November 2018. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. <https://www.opcw.org/documents-reports/conference-states-parties/fourth-review-conference/>
12. OPCW. (2018, June 26/27). Report of the Fourth Special Session of the Conference of the State Parties. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. https://www.opcw.org/fileadmin/OPCW/CSP/C-SS-4/en/css403_e.pdf
13. OPCW. (2017, November). Origins of the Chemical Weapons Convention and the OPCW. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. https://www.opcw.org/fileadmin/OPCW/Fact_Sheets/English/Fact_Sheet_1_-_History.pdf
14. OPCW. (2016, January 04). Destruction of declared Syrian chemical weapons completed. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. <https://www.opcw.org/news/article/destruction-of-syrian-chemical-weapons-completed/>
15. OPCW. (2015, October 16). Angola Joins the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. *Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons*. <https://www.opcw.org/news/article/angola-joins-the-organisation-for-the-prohibition-of-chemical-weapons/>
16. Press Association. (2018, June 26). Nations to vote on call for extra powers for chemical weapons watchdog. *Daily Mail*. <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/wires/pa/article-5890043/Nations-vote-call-extra-powers-chemical-weapons-watchdog.html>

17. Pinchuk, Denis. (2018, April 03). Putin says hopes chemical watchdog meeting can put end to Skripal row. *Reuters*. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-russia-putin/putin-says-hopes-chemical-watchdog-meeting-can-put-end-to-skripal-row-idUSKCN1HA2DC>
18. Parfitt, Tom; Weaver, Matthew & Taylor, Richard Norton. (2010, June 09). Spy Swap: US and Russia hand over agents in full media glare. *The Guardian*. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/jul/09/russian-spies-swap-us>
19. Radio Free Europe-Radio Liberty. (2018, April 04). Russia Loses Vote By Chemical-Weapons Watchdog On New U.K. Poisoning Probe. <https://www.rferl.org/a/russia-skripal-poisoning-opcw-emergency-meeting/29145154.html>
20. Shahabuddin. (2018, August 17). OPCW Being Trudged 'Beyond its Mandate?'. *SASSI*. <http://sassi.org.pk/2018/08/17/is-the-opcw-being-trudged-beyond-its-mandate/#comments>
21. Sanchez, Raf. (2018, June 27). UK overcomes Russian resistance to strengthen OPCW chemical weapons watchdog. *The Telegraph*. <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/06/27/uk-overcomes-russian-resistance-strengthen-opcw-chemical-weapons/>
22. Sengupta, Somini. (2017, April 12). Russia Vetoes U.N. Resolution Condemning Syria Chemical Attacks. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/04/12/world/middleeast/united-nations-resolution-syria-russia-united-states.html>
23. TASS. (2018, November 22). Moscow warns OPCW's power to assign blame may serve as pretext for using force. <https://tass.com/politics/1031990>
24. The Wire. (2018, June 28). India Joins Russia in Voting Against West-Backed Move to Expand Powers of OPCW. <https://thewire.in/diplomacy/india-joins-russia-in-voting-against-west-backed-move-to-expand-powers-of-opcw>
25. The Straits Time. (2018, March 26). Countries to expel more than 150 Russian diplomats over nerve attack in Britian. <https://www.straitstimes.com/world/united-states/trump-expels-60-russians-closes-seattle-consulate-after-uk-chemical-attack>
26. The Guardian. (2017, October 24). Russia uses veto to end UN investigation of Syria chemical attacks. <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2017/oct/24/russia-uses-veto-end-un-investigation-chemical-attacks>
27. United Nations. (2013, September 14). Secretary-General Receives Syria's Instrument of Accession to Chemical Weapons Convention. *Meetings Coverage and Press Releases*. <https://www.un.org/press/en/2013/sgsm15279.doc.htm>
28. VOA News. (2018, April 05). Russia Calls Diplomat Expulsions 'Mockery' of Law. <https://www.voanews.com/a/russia-lavrov-skripal-case/4333721.html>
29. XinhuaNet. (2018a, June 28). OPCW votes in favor of proposal on expanding its powers. http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-06/28/c_137285164.htm
30. XinhuaNet. (2018b, June 27). Member states divided over British proposal on expanding OPCW powers. http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2018-06/27/c_137282889.htm