
A Critical Review of "Chips for Peace": Lessons from "Atoms for Peace"

Amritanshu Prasad
Indian Institute of Technology, Madras

With
Howard University & Apart Research

Executive Summary

The "Chips for Peace" proposal, aimed at promoting the safe and equitable development of AI chips, carries significant potential for fostering international collaboration in AI governance. However, this initiative risks replicating the failures of the "Atoms for Peace" program by favoring a partisan approach. Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" initiative, despite its innovative vision of peaceful nuclear development, faltered because it prioritized U.S. geopolitical interests over global equity. This alienated non-aligned nations and inadvertently facilitated nuclear weapons proliferation. If "Chips for Peace" focuses on the U.S. and its allies at the expense of inclusivity, it may repeat the same mistakes, undermining global trust and cooperation. This memorandum offers a historical analysis of "Atoms for Peace" to provide actionable insights for "Chips for Peace," advocating for an inclusive, multilateral approach to AI chip governance.

Keywords: AI governance, compute governance, multilateral policymaking

1. Introduction

The "Atoms for Peace" program, introduced by President Eisenhower in 1953, aimed to mitigate nuclear weapons proliferation by promoting peaceful uses of nuclear technology. Its central idea of a uranium bank and the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) reflected a bold vision for international cooperation. However, the program's implementation revealed deep flaws. It prioritized the containment of Soviet influence, sidelining non-aligned nations, and its selective sharing of nuclear technology exacerbated global inequities. This partisan execution undermined the program's stated goals, eroded trust, and accelerated nuclear proliferation in several regions.

Today, the "Chips for Peace" initiative seeks to address the challenges of AI chip governance in a similarly charged geopolitical context. AI chips, much like nuclear technology, are dual-use: they enable transformative advancements but can also be weaponized. The initiative, however, risks adopting a similar partisan focus by prioritizing U.S. and allied nations in its strategy. This approach not only alienates non-aligned nations but also increases the likelihood of resistance, limiting the effectiveness of any proposed governance framework.

2. Analysis

To draw meaningful parallels between "Atoms for Peace" and "Chips for Peace," this memorandum relies on historical analysis, policy evaluation, and contemporary assessments of AI governance challenges. The historical failures of "Atoms for Peace" are crucial for understanding how partisan approaches to dual-use technology governance can undermine global trust and lead to unintended consequences.

The "Atoms for Peace" initiative, while initially celebrated, was ultimately co-opted as a tool of Cold War geopolitics. Its implementation largely excluded nations that were not aligned with U.S. interests, fostering a perception of nuclear governance as a means of cementing American dominance. This alienated countries in the Global South and the non-aligned movement, which sought equitable access to nuclear technology. The program's lack of stringent safeguards enabled nations like Israel, India, and Pakistan to leverage the peaceful atom narrative to advance their weapons programs, highlighting the inadequacy of its enforcement mechanisms. By privileging allies and ignoring the broader global community, "Atoms for Peace" not only failed to curb proliferation but also deepened global inequalities.

Similarly, the "Chips for Peace" initiative faces the challenge of balancing national security with global equity. Its current focus on U.S.-led governance risks alienating key players, particularly those in the Global South and non-aligned nations. Such an approach not only limits the reach and legitimacy of the initiative but also increases the risk of parallel, unregulated AI chip development. Without an inclusive and transparent governance structure, "Chips for Peace" could replicate the failures of its predecessor, exacerbating mistrust and heightening global competition.

3. Results

Drawing lessons from "Atoms for Peace," the "Chips for Peace" initiative must adopt a genuinely inclusive framework for AI chip governance. This requires moving beyond a U.S.-centric model to engage all nations, including those outside traditional alliances. A multilateral governance structure, akin to an expanded and improved version of the IAEA, is essential. Such a body must prioritize universal inclusion, robust safeguards, and equitable access to AI technologies.

An international alliance for AI governance, which I propose naming the "International AI Development and Safety Alliance" (IAIDSA), could serve as the cornerstone of this effort. Unlike the partisan roots of "Atoms for Peace," this alliance would ensure equal representation and participation from all nations. It would establish transparent mechanisms for monitoring and verifying AI chip production and distribution, mitigating risks of misuse while fostering global trust. This approach would also promote technology transfer and capacity building in

underrepresented regions, addressing the inequities that have historically plagued dual-use technology governance.

4. Discussion

The inclusive approach proposed for "Chips for Peace" offers significant advantages over the partisan model that undermined "Atoms for Peace," particularly by addressing the root causes of its failures. The "Atoms for Peace" initiative, while ambitious in its vision of promoting nuclear technology for peaceful purposes, suffered from its prioritization of U.S. geopolitical interests. By limiting meaningful participation to allied nations and focusing on countering Soviet influence, the program alienated non-aligned nations and created an atmosphere of distrust. This exclusionary approach not only weakened the program's legitimacy but also led to unintended consequences, such as the accelerated proliferation of nuclear weapons. Nations like Israel, India, and Pakistan, initially recipients of peaceful nuclear technology, later developed weapons programs—highlighting the inadequacy of the program's safeguards and the dangers of selective participation.

For "Chips for Peace," a similarly partisan approach would likely produce analogous outcomes, fostering mistrust and encouraging nations excluded from the initiative to pursue unregulated development of AI chips. An inclusive model, embodied in the proposed International AI Development and Safety Alliance (IAIDSA), would instead engage all nations as equal stakeholders, fostering a sense of shared responsibility and collective ownership. This inclusivity could significantly enhance global trust, encouraging cooperation rather than competition and ensuring that the benefits of AI chip advancements are distributed equitably.

The potential impacts of this inclusive approach are far-reaching. In the short term, it would build confidence among global stakeholders, creating a foundation for effective dialogue and cooperation. The "Atoms for Peace" program struggled to achieve such a foundation because its unilateral execution bred suspicion, particularly among non-aligned nations. By contrast, the IAIDSA framework's transparency and equitable representation would demonstrate a genuine commitment to global collaboration, providing a much-needed counterbalance to the rising tensions in AI governance.

In the medium term, the inclusive approach would mitigate security risks associated with AI chip misuse. The "Atoms for Peace" program's lack of robust and enforceable verification mechanisms allowed for the diversion of nuclear technology to military uses. Similarly, weak governance in "Chips for Peace" could lead to the development of autonomous weaponry or surveillance systems with catastrophic consequences. IAIDSA's robust safeguards, modeled after the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) but enhanced to address the specific challenges of AI, would reduce these risks by ensuring transparent monitoring, verification, and enforcement.

In the long term, IAIDSA would promote equitable access to AI technologies, fostering global development and reducing geopolitical tensions. One of the key failures of "Atoms for Peace" was its inability to bridge the gap between developed and developing nations. The program's emphasis on bilateral agreements with allied countries marginalized much of the Global South, perpetuating inequalities and leaving many nations feeling excluded from the promise of nuclear technology. To avoid this, "Chips for Peace" must prioritize technology transfer and capacity

building in underrepresented regions, ensuring that the benefits of AI are shared globally. By addressing these systemic inequities, IAIDSA would create a more balanced and cooperative international environment.

However, this approach also faces challenges. Achieving consensus among diverse nations will require significant diplomatic effort, particularly given the mistrust that persists from historical examples like "Atoms for Peace." The negotiations must carefully balance the interests of technologically advanced nations with those of developing countries, ensuring that the framework does not become a tool for dominance by a few. Additionally, ensuring the effectiveness of verification mechanisms will demand continuous innovation and investment. As AI chips evolve, so too must the governance structures designed to oversee their development and use.

Despite these challenges, the inclusive framework proposed here offers the best chance of avoiding the failures of "Atoms for Peace" and ensuring that "Chips for Peace" fulfills its potential. By learning from history and adopting a genuinely multilateral approach, this initiative can establish a new paradigm for global technology governance—one that prioritizes equity, transparency, and collaboration over unilateralism and competition.

5. Conclusion

The "Atoms for Peace" program serves as a cautionary tale for "Chips for Peace." Its failures, rooted in partisan implementation and exclusionary practices, highlight the risks of prioritizing geopolitical interests over global equity. To succeed, "Chips for Peace" must adopt an inclusive, multilateral approach that learns from these mistakes. By prioritizing transparency, equity, and collaboration, it can establish a robust framework for AI governance that benefits all nations and avoids repeating the historical failures of its predecessor. Time is of the essence, and immediate action is required to ensure that AI chips serve as a tool for global good rather than a source of division and conflict.

6. References

Weiss, L. (2003). Atoms for Peace. *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists Vol. 59, No. 6, pp. 34-44*, 10.2968/059006009

Mara Drogan, "The Atoms for Peace program and the Third World", *Cahiers du monde russe [Online]*, 60/2-3 | 2019, 10.4000/monderusse.11249

Lawfare. (2023). Chips for Peace: How the U.S. and its allies can lead on safe and beneficial AI.

<https://www.lawfaremedia.org/article/chips-for-peace--how-the-u.s.-and-its-allies-can-lead-on-safe-and-beneficial-ai>

Brookings Institute. (2019). Sixty years of "Atoms for Peace" and Iran's nuclear program.

<https://www.brookings.edu/articles/sixty-years-of-atoms-for-peace-and-irans-nuclear-program/>