

Unified Journal of Political Science and International Relations
Vol 1(2) pp. 007-013 January, 2016.
<http://www.unifiedjournals.org/ujpsir>
Copyright © 2015 Unified Journals

Original Research Paper

Denuclearization: A Veritable Strategy for the Promotion and Sustenance of Global Peace

DR. F.S.O. OSAGHAE

Department of International Relations and Strategic Studies, Igbinedion University, Okada, Edo State, Nigeria.

Accepted 4th January, 2016.

This paper attempted an anatomy of the variability of denuclearization as a strategy for the promotion and sustenance of global peace. To achieve this, denuclearization and global peace were conceptualized, the different strategies that have been adopted to denuclearize partially or wholly, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally constituted the focus of the discourse. Moreover, the effects of denuclearization were looked at from the view of the utility of nuclear weapons as the most predominant strategy for deterrent to aggression by the nuclear possessing nations. The cases of denuclearization such as strategic offensive Reduction treaty and Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties were classified as either partially or wholly motivated in relation to the attainment of a nuclear free world. The conclusion was that if nations – nuclear and non – nuclear possessors alike exercise absolute fidelity in the implementation of the strategies of denuclearization, nations will begin to look for other means instead of nuclear to acquire and maintain exceptionalism in the family of nations – the international system.

Key Words: Denuclearization, exceptionalism, proliferation, Nuclear and non-nuclear possessors, Aggression.

INTRODUCTION

The concerns for the consequences of the development of nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons of mass destruction (WMO) are generally understood to be global in nature. Hence it is needful for a recourse to the culture of peace which provides an alternative to the escalating cycle of violence in the world which requires among others, an understanding and respect for all people, their cultures, civilization, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations: awareness of the increasing global interdependence between people and nations; abilities to communicate with others and readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving the problems of his/her community, country and the world at large.

Undoubtedly, the termination of the cold war, triggered an Arms Race that justified the development of assorted weapons of mass destruction (WMD) that brought mankind to the brink of mutual assured destruction (MAD) and a nuclear holocaust. This has not led to a corresponding decrease in nuclearization or the emphasis on denuclearization in all the countries worldwide. Despite the avowed commitment of many of the leading nuclear states to several Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT), Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) and more recent agreements on reduction of nuclear weapons stockpiles and prevention of proliferation, the numbers of countries that possess these weapons have increased (Oyeshola: 1998:14 - 16).

Due to the scale of violence, wars and the inherent fears of the aftermath of the likely use of Weapons of Mass Destructions (WMD) that began immediately after the end of the Cold War, the United Nations began to call for a transition from the culture of war to a culture of peace. This led to a series of actions and publications which emerged from the conclusion of the "Seville statement on Violence", drafted by leading Scientists from around the world during the United Nations International Year for Peace in 1986 whose contention was that the same species that invented war are capable of inventing peace since wars begin in the minds of men, it is also in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed. By extension, the same people that invented nuclear are also capable of bringing about denuclearization (Faleti, 2010:76 - 77).

Conceptual Overview

The highlight on the difference between denuclearization and Non-proliferation will give an indebt comprehension to this discourse. Simply put, denuclearization refers to the gradual disarmament of nuclear weapons by countries that possess them. While non-proliferation is the prohibition of the spread of nuclear weapons by nuclear possessing countries to non-nuclear possessing countries (Hornby, 1995: 24). By these definitions, the possessors of nuclear weapons constitute the means and non-possessors of nuclear weapons are the ends. For the two concepts, the swing of the nuclear pendulum is one way directional, from the means (nuclear possessors) to the ends (non-nuclear possessors). Thus, both concepts are nuanced and will be used in this paper interchangeably (Ray, 1998:125).

Broadly speaking, denuclearization is a conscious effort directed at renouncing weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by states which possessed them. In other words, it is the prevention of nuclear weapons' capability to nations that do not possess them. Or it could be a deliberate policy to prohibit the acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by non-nuclear states. Also, it can be defined as a process of preventing a nation(s) from the permeation and or supplying nuclear weapons to other nations (Deutsch, 1998:52). Obviously, by denuclearization, non-nuclear possessing country cannot embark or allow any nuclear weapons or materials in its territory or region. Similarly, a nuclear possessing country should embark on the total renunciation of nuclear weapons of mass destruction of any kind.

There are eight countries worldwide known to be nuclear possessors having successfully detonated their weapons at different times in history. Five of them are the permanent members of the United

Nations Security Council (UNSC). They are the United States of America (USA), the Russian Federation (the successor state to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic), the United Kingdom (UK), France and China. These nations are described as the nuclear club. The other three states known or believed to possess nuclear weapons are India, Pakistan and North Korea. Israel is also believed to possess nuclear but no known evidence of detonation. There are also countries said to possess nuclear weapons under the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) nuclear weapons sharing configuration. These countries are Belgium, Germany, Netherlands, Italy and Turkey. Altogether, one can say that fourteen countries are formally in possession of nuclear based weapons of mass destruction globally. Unarguably, there are countries surreptitiously possessing nuclear weapons and they may outnumber the known possessors. Also, there are countries that have the materials, expertise and technical capacity to quickly make nuclear weapons. Japan, Canada and South Korea are considered to be in this category. This poses real danger for the ecosystem and thus a testament to denuclearization significance (Gilpin, 1981:92).

CASES OF DENUCLEARIZATION

Historically, various strategies have been adopted at different times to control or regulate armament, disarmament, non-proliferation of nuclear weapons and denuclearization. Specifically, much concern has been expressed on the consequences of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). These worries range from the general notion that more fingers on the nuclear buttons raise the geometric probability of a war involving nuclear weapons (Aison, 2001: 23). Hence the international community has been making strenuous efforts to address the continuing challenges posed by nuclear proliferation. The different strategies adopted to tackle these challenges partially or wholly, unilaterally, bilaterally and multilaterally shall be the focus of this discourse. They are summarized below in three fold:

1. **Unilateral Strategy:** Many countries have unilaterally and voluntarily renounce and relinquish their nuclear weapons. South Africa developed nuclear weapons in the 1980s, but destroyed them before it started black majority rule in the early 1990s. Moreover, the former Soviet countries of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine transferred their inherited nuclear weapons from the Soviet Union when they gained autonomous status in 1991 to Russia in 1996, 1995 and 1996 respectively. Also, Libya reached an understanding to dismantle its nuclear weapons which were being believed to be in their embryonic stage. Algeria, Argentina and Brazil had nuclear programmes, but voluntarily halted them in the early 1990s.

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF UNILATERAL DENUCLEARIZATION STRATEGIES

Nations	Year of Treaty	Goal Attainment	Future Goal Attainment
South Africa	1980s	Renunciation/Denuclearization	Nuclear Free World
Algeria	1990s		
Argentina	1990s		
Brazil	1990s		
Kazakhstan	1995		
Belarus	1996		
Ukraine	1996		
Libya	2000s		

Source: Rourke, J.T. International Politics on the World Stage, 12th Edition, New York: McGraw – Hill, 2009. PP340 – 360.

2. **Bilateral Strategy:** This is an agreement between two countries either on the issue of armament control or reduction and limitation of strategic offensive weapons. For instance, in 1987, the United States of America and the defunct Soviet Union reached an agreement to eliminate missiles with a range between 500 and 5,500 kilometers. Also in 2002, both countries entered into another round of agreement and signed the Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty (SORT) aimed at reducing their arsenals of nuclear warheads and bombs estimated to be 2,200 by 2012. The faithfulness in the implementation of these series of bilateral strategies as to whether they were carried out as expected by the nations in question is not within the scope of this paper. It is pertinent to say that they were signed either to destroy and limit or to reduce the production of specified nuclear weapons. Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty I and II (SALT I & II) and Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty I and II (Start I and

II) are palpable exemplifications of bilateral strategies of anti-nuclearism. SALT and START I and II were two way strategic dialogue between the United States of America and the defunct Union of Soviet Socialist Republic to freeze the production of certain specified number of ballistic missiles, to reduce proliferation of nuclear materials and expertise and to restrict their signatories from deploying specified number of nuclear warheads such as Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), Submarine – Launched Ballistic Missiles (SLBMs) and Bombers. The Anti-Ballistic Missiles Treaty (ABM) of 1972 provides another good example of a bilateral arrangement between the United States of America and the defunct Soviet Union to limit the deployment of their National Missile Defense (NMD) systems. It is pertinent to say that SALT I and II and START I and II were signed and entered into force in the 1970s and 1990s respectively specifically to limit the production of nuclear weapons.

TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF BILATERAL DENUCLEARIZATION STRATEGIES

Treaties	Year of Treaty	Goal Attainment	Future Goal Attainment
ABM	1972	Arms Control	Partial denuclearization
SALT I	1972	Limitation	
SALT II	1979	Limitation	
INF	1987	Reduction	
START I	1991	Reduction	
START II	1993	Reduction	
SORT	2002	Reduction	

Source: Rourke, J.T. International Politics on the World Stage, 12th Edition, New York: McGraw – Hill, 2009. PP340 – 360.

3. **Multilateral Strategy:** This refers to a treaty that attracts the recognition and acceptance of virtually all the countries globally but initiated by few countries especially the Western developed nuclear superpowers. The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) have universal undertone in their application to controlling, restricting and curbing nuclear and non-nuclear weapons.

The IAEA is the world's centre of cooperation in the field of nuclear. It was set up under the auspices of the United Nations (UN) as World's "Atom for Peace" Agency in 1957. The organization works with its members and other cooperating partners globally to monitor, promote safe, secure and ensure peaceful use of nuclear materials.

The next in the series of multilateral strategies is the Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT). It was signed in 1963 by about 123 countries to prohibit nuclear weapons test in the atmosphere, in outer space or under water. While the NPT is an international treaty with specific objective to preventing the spread of nuclear materials, expertise and technology from nuclear possessing nations to non-nuclear possessing

nations. The treaty opened for membership in the 1970s and today about 190 parties have joined the treaty. It is important to note that this treaty recognized the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council as nuclear possessing states otherwise referred to as nuclear weapons states or nuclear club.

Also, is the effort at regulating and controlling biological and chemical weapons. They are worth mentioning here since they constitute weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Biological Weapons Convention held in 1972 readily comes to mind. It is a universal convention that bans the production, possession and use of germ-based biological weapons (Rourke, 2009:328). And again, within this discourse is the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR). It was established in 1987 to limit the proliferation of Missiles and specifically prohibits signatories to the treaty not to transfer Missile technology or missiles with a range not exceeding 300 kilometers (Rourke, 2009:348). Lastly, of the multilateral strategies is the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). It is an agreement to stop the manufacture and testing of nuclear. It is formed to embrace virtually all countries world wide and to establish a permanent moratorium on nuclear tests, an essential step towards denuclearization.

TABLE 3
SUMMARY OF MULTILATERAL DENUCLEARIZATION STRATEGIES

Treaties	Year of Treaty	Goal Attainment	Future Goal Attainment
IAEA	1957	Limitation/Arms Control	Partial Denuclearization
LTBT	1963	Denuclearization	Nuclear free world
NPT	1968	Non-proliferation	Partial Denuclearization
BWC	1972	Denuclearization	Nuclear free world
MTCR	1987	Limitation/Arms controls	Partial free world
CTBT	1996	Denuclearization	Nuclear free world

Source: Rourke, J.T. *International Politics on the World Stage*, 12th Edition, New York: McGraw – Hill, 2009. PP340 – 360.

As can be seen from the foregoing, all the unilateral strategies are veritable cases of denuclearization born by voluntary motivation. While the bilateral strategies are cases of limitations and or reduction of specified weapons between the two known cold war rivals. For the multilateral strategies, all but NPT and MTCR fall within the ambit of denuclearization.

EFFECTS OF DENUCLEARIZATION

With denuclearization, the utility of nuclear weapons as the most predominant strategy for deterrent to aggression will begin to efface. Nations will then depend on conventional weapons for their security instead of weapons of mass destruction. Moreover, there will be no nation with exceptional status merely by possessing nuclear. Other areas of socio-economic determinants will be vigorously pursued by nations in order to maintain exceptionalism in the international system. Also, nations may lose their national pride, especially the nuclear weapons possessors which see the possession of nuclear as a source of pride. For many countries Rourke (2009), expatiated that nuclear represents a tangible symbol of strength and sovereign equality. According to him, after Pakistan had successfully detonated its nuclear, there was a news paper publication captioned “Long Live Nuclear Pakistan”. In another article, he explained read “five nuclear blasts have instantly transformed an extremely demoralized nation into a self-respecting proud nation”. This infact is symbolic of national pride. And again, with sincere denuclearization, nations which raise substantial part

of their revenue from nuclear weapons and chemical manufacturing industries will look into other areas for funds. Lastly and in corollary to the preceding point, there will be loss of employment and businesses to dependants on nuclear based industries (Rourke, 2009:251).

On the other hand, and on a more positive note, denuclearization will halt the increasing growth of nuclear weapons if faithfully embarked on. Eventually, non-proliferation policies, programmes and nuclear prone movements will become irrelevant and insignificant in international polity. Another positive point is that denuclearization ensures that existing nuclear weapons in the hands of nuclear powers are gradually dismantled. No new ones resurface and non-nuclear powers are expected not to embark on nuclear programmes for military purposes. Furthermore, there will be no unhealthy rivalry between countries in the acquisition of nuclear arsenals. This undoubtedly will avoid the inevitable threat inherent in nuclear race. Also, the fear of nuclear war will be mitigated and or averted. The miscalculation that the leaders of nations are prone to may not be the order as they are expected to be engrossed with denuclearization. Besides, nations’ reliance on power relativism will be gradually reduced in international relations as they are denuclearizing. The power of a nation will then not be contingent on the amount of nuclear it possesses. Ultimately, denuclearization will make the world free and safe for living. Thus, when nations (nuclear and non-nuclear powers alike) are prohibited to possess

or construct nuclear weapons, human security will be guaranteed and global peace is easily attainable.

Concept of Global Peace

Miller and King (2003) define peace as a “political condition that ensures justice and social stability through formal and informal institutions, practices and norms”. For Evans and Newnham (1992), peace is a “political condition other than one of organized armed conflict that is often distinguished from a situation of non-war”. Czempliel (1996) expatiated peace as a “process pattern of international system, characterized by a tendency towards the preservation of individual existence on the basis of declining violence and the continuation of individual self-realization on the basis of increasingly equal distribution of development chances”. While Nwolise (2004) sees peace as the state of freedom from hostility, civil commotion, dissension, war and strife. According to him, this freedom implies a state of tranquility, quietness and calm.

From the view of the United States Department of Justice, peace is a “process of responding to diversity and conflict with tolerance, imagination and flexibility, fully exercising one’s responsibilities to ensure that all fully enjoy human rights.

For the concept of global, Hornby (1995) defines it as one covering or affecting the whole world. While Rourke (2009) describes global as referring to the world instead of its parts but as a whole which has many commonalities and connections that cut across political borders, national identities and cultural differences. Global peace therefore is a necessary condition embracing the whole world for security, production and development, hence anything disturbing the peace of a people or nation is a threat to social or national security (Nwolise, 2004:14). Global peace as noted by Rourke (2009), is at the same time a basic human aspiration and a process within which such aspiration is accomplished. As he explained, in whatever way global peace is defined, the concept points to a vision of perfect tranquility that serves as an ideal limit for the achievement of human ambitions as well as an indicator of the intermittently delicate tranquility of historical order.

There are two types of peace; the positive and negative peace. The latter refers to the absence of direct violence even where other forms of visible threats such as malnutrition does exist. While the former obtains in a situation where there is the absence of war and direct violence on the one hand and the active practice of social justice, good governance, protection of human security and the rule of law on the other. Global peace in this context includes the absence of war and direct violence and the conditions of social justice, economic equity and

ecological balance as they affect the whole world (Faleti, 2010:48 – 49).

CONCLUSION

Truly, nuclearization is a mixed blessing to human race. It is used as seen from the forgoing for peaceful and non-peaceful purposes. The latter refers specifically to the nuclear used to manufacture weapons of mass destruction for the purpose of deterring possible aggression. While the former among others is used to boost agricultural development, pharmacy, medical treatment and electricity generation. The focus of this paper is on the non-peaceful use of nuclear which calls for denuclearization. Global peace can be attained, secured and sustained when states cease to use force as the only strategy to pursuing their divergent goals. By extension, global peace is bound to be secured when states (especially nuclear possessing nations) renounce nuclear weapons as the most predominant strategy used in the pursuit of aggression deterrence.

As opposed to the spirit of denuclearization, Holstil (1992) postulates that decisions about the levels of armaments are based on estimates of the adversary’s current and expected future capabilities. These estimates as he puts it may or may not be accurate, to the degree that they are incorrect; the error is likely to be in the direction of overestimating the capabilities of potential adversaries. Such misperceptions provide substantial impetus for arms race and especially the quest for nuclearization. But with faithful denuclearization on the part of nations, the pursuit of arms race will shift entirely to conventional weapons. This underscores the significance of denuclearization. However, the writer is of the view that any country that does not embrace denuclearization for the purpose of global peaceful coexistence and maintains nuclear does not have the moral justification to impose or press for economic sanctions against any erring country. It is hoped that sincere denuclearization may meet the global desire for peace.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The followings have been recommended:

1. Nuclear weapons states and suspected nuclear weapon states should meet and sign a Nuclear Free World Treaty (NFW) to:
 - a. halt nuclearization;
 - b. stop the production of fissile materials for nuclear weapons;
 - c. embark on their destruction of nuclear Arsenals; and
 - d. set a target date for the complete destruction of nuclear weapons by their possessors, at least 15year moratorium.

2. All countries worldwide that have not yet signed and ratified the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) should do so without demur;
3. All countries should be allowed to possess nuclear for peaceful means such as for pharmacy, medicine and electricity generation;
4. The membership of International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) which is currently the centre of cooperation in the field of nuclear should be remolded democratically. The composition should reflect sub-regional and continental representatives;
5. IAEA should be allowed to visit countries unhindered without prior notice in the monitoring of suspected sites;
6. All countries to ensure great transparency in the acquisition and utilization of nuclear materials and any country tending to work at variance with the terms of the treaty should be sanctioned economically;
7. Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) should metamorphose into Nuclear Free World Treaty (NFWT) when there is substantial evidence that nuclear states are destroying their nuclear weapons since all countries – nuclear, near nuclear and non-nuclear states are expected to embrace a world devoid of nuclear weapons;
8. NFWT membership should be open to all members of the United Nations; and
9. Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) should be enforced more vigorously. This is synonymous to NFWT.

However, it is obvious that denuclearization will constitute a veritable strategy to meeting the global desire for peace. As revealed in this paper, weapons of mass destruction (WMD) are a real conundrum to the human race and this underscores the significance of denuclearization. Thus, if these recommendations are faithfully implemented by nations (Nuclear and Non-Nuclear Possessors alike) they cannot be controverted in the quest for global peace.

REFERENCES

- Boutros, Boutros-Ghali (1992) *New Dimensions of Arms Regulation and Disarmament in the Post – Cold War Era*, New York: United States.
- Boutros – Ghali Boutros (1995) *An Agenda for Peace*, New York: United Nations Press.
- Buzan, Barry (1983) *People, States and Fear*, Brighton: Wheatsheaf Books Limited.
- Czempiel, E (1996) quoted from Faleti, S.A (2010) *Education for Peace*, Lagos: National Open University Press.
- Deutsch, K. (1998) *The Analysis of International Relations*, New York: Routledge.
- Donnelly, J. (1998), *International Human Rights Rights, Dilemmas in World Politics*, Oxfors: Westview Press.

- Evans, G. (1993) *Cooperating for Peace: A Global Agenda for the 1990s and Beyond*, St Leonards: Allen and Unwin.
- Evans and Newnham (1992) quoted from Faleti, S.A (2010) *Education for Peace*, Lagos: National Open University Press.
- Faleti S.A (2010) *Education for Peace*, Lagos: National Open University Press.
- Gilpin R. (1981) *War and Change in World Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horby A.S (1995) *Oxford Advance Learner's Dictionary of Current English*, 5th Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holsti, K.J. (1992) *International Politics: A Framework for Analysis*, 6th Edition, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Englewood Cliff.
- Miller C. and King, M (2003) *A Glossary of Terms and Concepts in Peace and Conflict Studies*, Costa Rica: University of Peace Press.
- Moaz, Zeeu (2004) "The Mixed Blessing of Isreal's Nuclear Policy", *International Securit*, 28/2:44-77.
- Morgenthau, H. W (1985). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*, 6th Edition, New York: McGraw Hill Inc.
- Nwolise, O.B.C. (2004) *The Nigeria Police in International Peace-Keeping under the United Nations*, Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Oyeshola, D. (1995) *Essentials of Environmental Issues: The World and Nigeria in Perspective*, Ibadan: Daily Graphics Nigeria Limited.
- Palmer, N.D and Perkins H.C. *International Relations, The World Community in Transition*, 3rd Edition, New Delhi: CBS Publishers & Distributors.
- Ray, J.L. (1998) *Global Politics*, 7th Edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Rourke, J.T. (2009). *International Politics on the World Stage* 12th Edition, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- United Nations Development Programme (1989) *Register of International Treaties and other Agreements in the field of Environment*, Nairobi: UNEP.
- Waener, F. (1998) *The Environmental Effects of Nuclear War: Consensus and uncertainties*, Environment, 30 June.
- World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) *our common Future*, New York: Oxford University Press.