

Disarmament: Obstacles on its Way

Gurjeet Singh*

Abstract:

The world is going to be mad of armaments after World War II including nuclear weapons. Thus, the contemporary world has enough explosions in terms of nuclear warheads that can vanish humanity within few minutes. To make the world a peaceful place, there is need to establish an appropriate and systematic check on the production, use, and processing of nuclear fuel rather than the production of weapons. The present study is an attempt to find the barriers on the way of attaining the goal of global disarmament as it has been hypothesized that there are several obstacles to achieve the goal of disarmament worldwide. In order to deal with the current research problem, the researcher has taken up historical, analytical and descriptive research methods because the nature of the study is found to be very complex. It is based on various primary and secondary sources. Therefore, the holistic approach was adopted to conduct the present study. The study concludes that however nuclear energy is very useful and can be helpful in achieving global energy needs and helpful in reducing the harmful effects of climate change as well, but there is an intense need to control the proliferation of nuclear energy in terms of armaments by states or any terrorist groups. The study strongly suggests a new approach to non-proliferation, which is not based on the power to force countries to give up their nuclear ambitions but on consensus of nuclear and non-nuclear states that nuclear arms need to be banned altogether and fissile material should be under multilateral control so that it could be utilized positively. This study tries to explore **the obstacles in global disarmament programme.**

Key Words: **Disarmament, Non-proliferation, Nuclear, Weapons, IAEA.**

Introduction: It is generally agreed that war is the least desirable method of settling disputes between nations. War does not eliminate differences and creates new problems which may develop into future wars as well. In this scenario, armaments play a very important role to boost up the conflicts between nations, as regard, most of analysts have discovered that armaments itself is a fundamental cause of war.

*Assistant Professor of Political Science, Ganga Degree College, Dhabi Gujran, Khanauri (Patiala)

Therefore, an increasing of arms in one state contributes two senses of insecurity, as a result of this arms increase, other states feel insecure and increase their military establishments. After the World War I, armaments increased the power of states, and small weapons had transferred into weapons of mass destruction, which were used in World War II by USA. After this horrible destruction whole world became mad for achieving the Weapons of Mass Destruction [WMD] and concept of more weapons more security was emerged [1].

It is evident that two world wars had brought untold sorrows of mankind and United Nations Organization came in power, to save the world from another world war which was fought by weapons of mass destructions and could remove the face on the earth. The UN was basically a result of Second World War, for peaceful settlement of international disputes and with primary purpose of avoiding another world war [2]. It was established on 24 October 1945 by 51 countries, as a result of initiatives taken by the governments of the states that had led the war against Germany and Japan. In this line, the UN set out the basic principles of international relations according to its charter. It had four purposes: of maintaining international peace and security; to develop friendly relations among the nations, to cooperate in solving international problems and in promoting respect for human rights, and to be a center for harmonizing the actions of states. Every nation-large and small, rich and poor with differing political views and social system had a voice and a vote in the process. Since 24 October 1945 the United Nations has grown from a plan on a paper to an important means of international cooperation and exists today as a living organization reflecting on the aspiration and the difficulties of the world society. Due to escalating progress, in 2006, 192 countries were members of the United Nations, nearly every state in the world [3].

The United Nations Organization has been established for resolving international problems and implementing international peace and security across the globe. The United Nations assemblies, where representatives of all nations sit together in a huge room, listen to the speeches and pass resolutions. The second most important organ of United Nations is Security Council in which five great powers and ten rotating member states make decisions about international peace and security. Dispatch of peacekeeping forces to trouble spot is the first and prime responsibility of the Security Council [4]. The UN secretariat is an executive branch, which takes place the whole administration of UN. All of these, Security

Council is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, and for restoring peace when it breaks down. After the Second World War, Security Council played an important role to combat WMD and maintain security in 64 years. Security Council has passed out 1400 resolutions, most of the resolutions are related to chemical radiological weapons. Resolutions 1540 a great milestone in the history of the UN. Apart from that, International court of justice is another most important organ of UN [5].

The first step in the disarmament arena was undertaken by the United Nations atomic energy commission establishment in January, 1946 by general assembly resolution. The main purpose of organizing such a commission was to control atomic energy to limit its use for peaceful purposes, the elimination of atomic energy and other weapons of mass destruction and to establish an inspection and enforcement system to safeguard against invasions. In this line, a treaty on Non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, (NPT) voted by the General Assembly in June 1968, came into force on 5th March, 1970. The main objective of this treaty was to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear states [6]. Thus, United Nations played an important role to control the armaments across the world.

What is arms race?

Firstly, the arms race today is no longer a competition in quantities only, but predominantly a race in modern technology- in product improvements and sophistication. Implicit in this is a rapid rate of weapon modernization, continuously introducing new variables into the military contest and constantly disrupting presumed conditions of strategic stability. Moreover, the complex nature of contemporary armaments and the technological advancements on a broad front of weapon systems made it almost impossible to evaluate progression and shifts in the balance of forces. It evades exact measurement and invites subjective and arbitrary judgments, leading to worst case analyses and overreaction. Secondly, with technology becoming the focal point in armaments, the dynamics of the arms race has changed profoundly. Thirdly, the magnitudes and proportions of the destructive power of modern arms have reached unprecedented levels. This is primarily due to second and third generation improvements in nuclear weapons but new technology has also amplified both operational efficiency and the; destructive, lethal power of conventional weapons to an extraordinary degree. Fourthly, socio-political and economic motives and driving forces behind the arms race have grown greatly in influence

and power, in step with the transformation of the industrial society, the changed role of the state, the centralization of authority, abundance constituencies behind armaments, and the polarization of the international community [7]. Thus, arms race is destructive in nature and the issue requires serious attention in order to maintain international peace and harmony and for improving socio-economic status of the states.

Disarmament: Obstacles on its way

At the end of Second World War bloodbath abandoned all human considerations and the USA threw two atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki— in August 1945, completely devastating these two cities and killing large number of people. At Hiroshima, 66,000 people were killed and 69,000 were injured. At Nagasaki, 39,000 people were killed and 25,000 were injured. The emergence of nuclear weapons caused a big impact on the nature of international relations in the post second world war period. As a result, other nations tried to develop nuclear weapons quickly, because it gave a great boost to national power while acting as a deterrent. It has been estimated that there are more than 50,000 nuclear warheads in the world. The total explosive power of the world stock of nuclear is about equal the one million times that of the Hiroshima bombs. The peace education and a few statesmen of the world protested against the nuclear bombs, which may eliminate the human race from earth. Since 1945 the disaster of a third world war has been avoided, but at what price has this been achieved? For how many days have the guns been silent throughout the world? Although the field of conflict has shifted towards the poor countries, children, whose lives are no less precious than anyone else's are still dying as a result of war. Yet the nations, that in this twentieth century also have scarified more than 100 million human beings on the altars of war, continue, as if caught up in the gears of a runaway machine to dissipate a vast proportion of their genius, of their energy, of their resources, on the manufacture of lethal weapons, ever more sophisticated and devastating. To these nations, the question of disarmament represents an unavoidable challenge. If a proportion of the material and human resources devoted to prepare for war were assigned to cause of development, it would suffice to change the face of the earth, lessen the widening gulf between rich and poor countries, and reduce the areas of poverty within countries. The financial grant that is deprived because of armaments in the fields of nutrition, health, literacy, the development of education, the training of scientific and technological personnel, the establishment of research centers, cultural development and

the safeguarding of the environment are curbed or even blocked, solely for the lack of material resources. This brings about new situation of tension. The arms race is not only troubled with the most terrible danger to human life, it also determines investment choices and sets a premium on economic structures which, having become essential to the life of nations subsequently make it all the more difficult to carry out the conversion of the arms industry to non-military activities [8].

Disarmament is the need of the hour and based on peace and tranquility. It is a serious problem that needs to be solved on a priority bases and one that will benefit mankind immensely. The numerous studies carried out both within the United Nations and outside have conclusively proved that the achievement of disarmament would have manifold affects not only in the field of international politics but also in the economic, social and cultural spheres. Such a development would have a particularly great and revolutionary effect on people's awareness and on the world's present system of education and schooling. It is now fully recognized that the elimination or substantial reduction of expenditure on the production of armaments will make it possible to increase monetary grants of considerable amounts for social and cultural needs like education, health, science and the arts and so on [9].

Basic Reasons for Disarmament

Due to the country's own international disputes, personal problems and their own interests, The arm race could not end. The possession of warheads definitely increases the probability that they will be used. As a result, an arms race increases the psychological insecurity of states rather than providing them with a sense of security against attack. This is perhaps the reason that some states have ratified agreements banning the use of destructive kind of weapons in wars, e.g., chemical and bacteriological weapons, and this is why the destruction and banning of nuclear weapons have been proposed. The unbridled growth of military industrial complexes in the major countries may give rise to foreign policy elites bound together by a common belief that their political and economic survival is synonymous with the national interest. Moreover, philosophically most solid argument is that war is morally wrong and by extrapolation so is the preparation of war. One can site numerous examples from history of war preparations and attendant arms race culminating in war. One such instance is the European arms race preceding World War I. A reduction in states armaments saves sizeable funds, which could be diverted to programs designed to

improve the general welfare of the states' citizens in the timeless dilemma of choosing between "guns and butter" the protagonists of arms reduction favors the latter. The economic reason for disarmament is closely linked with the social reason. Military expenditures also have profound social consequences. The problem of poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, housing and that of raising standard of living is not only confined to the developing countries. Political differences become obvious by the fear and suspicion which the arms race generates. Armaments which are supposed to provide security, in fact, provide the political difference. The common assumption is that world public in general favors disarmament. It is therefore, assumed that people at home and abroad are inclined to give sympathy and support to a government that proposes disarmament [10]. Thus, disarmament is helpful in reducing the sufferings and destructiveness of wars.

Disarmament is the first stepping stone to national security and world peace. Amongst the major powers a significant part of the national research and development effort currently serves military purposes. With disarmament it would thus become possible to encourage programs of basic scientific research in the fields which have hitherto been neglected, and to mobilize great scientific potential for the solution of the world's greatest problems associated with the economic development of under development countries. General and complete disarmament on the basis of an appropriate agreement between states would make considerably easier to over fulfill the planned improvement in the living standards of the working people. Disarmament would also open the possibilities for joint international ventures of even more ambitious kind, including the utilization of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, space research, the exploration of the Arctic and Antarctic and for the benefit of all mankind and projects to change the climates of large areas of the world. In addition, joint projects to assist the developing countries as well as programs of cooperation in the social and economic fields could be undertaken. These international projects could have a major impact on world living standards and civilization. It is evident that the resources freed by disarmament would not be large enough for the many claims upon them. Though it would take active decisions by governments in the light of national and international needs to set in motion program for employing the released resources, therefore, every nation will provide employment opportunities to its youth through disarmament without any fear. [8]. Thus, disarmament will work deep changes in the behavior of citizens. The development of social legislation, in varying degree to be sure

according to the different kinds of government, but an evolution seen throughout the world, has dispelled such fears [11].

The arms race now runs at a pace at which expenditures approach half a trillion dollars a year. The best brains that the evolution of man has produced are persistently occupied with the refinement of new means of destruction. It may be remembered that the first international peace movement started off with broad public support in the 1870. After the French-German war in 1950s saw fierce campaigns in the development of nuclear weapons. National security is the primary objective of national politics. Indeed, a cornerstone of the national state. Formerly, the objective of national security was met by military means. Since the Second World War, resource allocations to armaments have seen few restrictions, referring to needs of the security of the nation and its people, but since the 1970s national security can no longer be equated with military might. The ultimate purpose of national security is to secure the independence. So, a guarantee for national security; the arms race is one of the most imminent threats to the survival of humanity [12].

It is the matter of fact that several countries such as USA, Britain, Russia, China, France, Israel, South Africa, India and Pakistan have acquired dangerous nuclear weapons. Some world leaders and statesmen have been conscious of the urgent need for disarmament and arms control [13]. Disarmament would bind to have favorable effects on the development of international relations. The political agreement that would accompany an international disarmament program would in itself imply that nations were willing to reconsider their economic relations with one another. An important consequence of this would be a substantial increase in trade between the centrally planned economics and the rest of the world [14].

Reduction and Elimination of Armaments

The objectives of disarmament will be better served by concentrating our efforts towards general and complete disarmament rather than disarmament by slow and gradual process.

- It was agreed that the process of disarmament should be rapid and general and complete disarmament should be achieved within 5 or 6 years as also suggested by the revised Clark-Sohn scheme on disarmament.
- As military balance of both blocs is nearly equal, some agreed percentage of reduction in armaments and military force should be laid down instead of fixing

special categories of weapons for different states of view of continued disagreement regarding qualitative and quantitative approaches to disarmament.

Acceptability of the Disarmament Proposals

- The uncommitted nations should make a concerted effort to prepare a draft treaty for general and complete disarmament which may be acceptable to both the blocs.
- They should use their persuasive influence with the two blocs in order to bridge their differences in their approaches to disarmament and come to a common agreement.
- Since the plan for disarmament would be applicable to all nations therefore all the existing states have to be associated with the drafting of the disarmament treaty and its implementation at all stages.
- It is felt that there is a great need for educating public opinion in all countries regarding the detailed program of general and complete implementation of disarmament.

The World Law Fund believes that all responsible efforts should be encouraged to find a solution to the problem of culminating war. The Fund, however, focuses its resources on the study of legal structures for the world community which is similar to the structures which maintain order within nations. It is believed that this initial development will ultimately lead to a program in which the educational institutions of all nations bring their vast resources to bear on the task of establishing a World order in which competing national armaments and warfare have been eliminated [15].

From the scientist's moment of stark comprehension that the bomb which they assemble might actually be used, the concern and participation of academicians from all disciplines as individuals, in groups in official and unofficial capacities have increased steadily so that the proportion of the academic community actively engage in the peace movement probably exceeds. The academic community recognized that the new weapons had radically altered the consequences of international violence and that only conscience and persistent planning would enable us to change our war prone system into a war prevention system, it has done a good deal to bring these facts to the attention of the entire world. In

the major universities, there may be one or two seminars, and in smaller schools an occasional individual may offer a special course. But until this year, it was rare to find that a course on war prevention was an ordinary offering in the social sciences, let alone in law or divinity. However, in different countries national movements of scientists started at different times, under different circumstances and with different incentives. Some embraced large numbers of the scientist community; other consisted of a few devoted individuals. In some countries the movements played a significant role in shaping role of national politics, exerting an influence not necessarily correlated with the numerical strength of the organization. The importance of this sociological phenomenon calls for a detailed analysis of the development and significance of all these organizations. The major portion of World peace through world law consists of a provision by comparison of the present United Nations charter and a proposed revision by scientists [16].

The United States' President declared in 2009 that the United States is committed to seeking "the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons." He qualified this commitment, by stating that "This goal will not be reached quickly perhaps not in my lifetime." He also added that "as long as nuclear weapons exist, the United States will maintain a safe, secure, and effective arsenal." In 2009, Russian President Dmitry Medvedev joined President Obama in expressing support for "a nuclear weapon free world." But, "the prevailing view in Russia's political-military leadership is that nuclear weapons play a key role in ensuring Russia's security." Indeed, Russia is replacing its aging strategic nuclear-weapon delivery systems although not at a rate equal to their rate of retirement. President Medvedev has argued that, "The whole world is doing this process will continue and our nuclear shield will always be effective and sufficient for protecting our national interest" [17]. Thus, acceptability over the disarmament proposals among nuclear powers of the world is one of the major issues need to be addressed.

Measures to be taken

There is a need to make sure that the world has becomes a safer place. First, there will have to be multilateral negotiations on a treaty or set of treaties a nuclear weapon convention (NWC) of some kind that will codify in law and practice both the prohibition of future acquisition and use of nuclear weapons and also the safe and secure elimination of the existing arsenals. Careful attention will be needed to ensure that all the existing warheads

and delivery vehicles are verifiably dismantled and eliminated, and how the fissile materials and other components should be stored or destroyed so that they cannot be stolen, reacquired or used for weapons in the future. All this must be done in ways that minimize the hazards for the environment and our health, and provide confidence against cheating or break-out. The Model Nuclear Weapon Convention developed some years ago by civil society scientists, lawyers and practitioners should not be equated or confused with this objective, but it offers an excellent overview of the issues that will need to be addressed.

To put it simply, every additional nuclear installation is an extra potential security gap. The revival of interest for nuclear power and the accompanying growth of demand for nuclear fuel, also in parts of the world that have done without so far, create an urgent need for more effective regulation to exclude unauthorized use of nuclear material, while allowing any country that so wishes to benefit from the use of nuclear energy. It does not take position for or against an increase in the use of nuclear energy, which remains the privilege of individual countries. However, if nuclear energy is to be an acceptable option, related proliferation and security issues will need to be addressed. But the necessity to review the way the world manages its nuclear activities is also related to the ever more apparent strain on the non-proliferation regime and its cornerstone, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). As noted, the existing monitoring and verification mechanisms can no longer guarantee that all dangerous fissile material is safely stored from terrorist groups and technological developments have actually made it easier to turn fuel for nuclear reactors into highly enriched uranium for military use.

Role of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

The non-proliferation treaty (NPT) and the non-proliferation regime has arguably been a success. It has largely prevented nuclear weapon technology from spreading beyond the recognized nuclear weapon states. In 1960s more than twenty countries were believed to have military nuclear programs. Today the number is down to ten, if we include Iran and North Korea. Brazil and Argentina gave up development of nuclear arms in the 1980s. Soviet Union successor states Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan similarly relinquished their nuclear capabilities in the early 1990s, returned all remaining nuclear weapons on their territory into Russian custody and acceded to the NPT as non-nuclear weapon states. South Africa admitted to owning nuclear weapons after having decided to abandon its military

nuclear program altogether. Russia and the United States have produced 95 percent of the world's nuclear weapons, considerably cut down their arsenals over the past three decades. Countering the threat of non-proliferation is one of the central elements of the European Union's external policies. In 2003 the European Union adopted a separate Strategy against Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction, which led to numerous initiatives to promote nuclear safety. Europe also took the lead in finding a diplomatic solution for the nuclear ambitions of Iran, in which High Representative Javier Solana's assiduous personal diplomacy played an enormous role. But more should be done, because the global non-proliferation regime might collapse if we do not move forward. Even though there is a high level of awareness of the risks of nuclear proliferation among member states, there is as yet no emerging European consensus on how to tackle them. The European Union needs to move its ambition up one level and aim for a new global consensus on nuclear management and disarmament. Significantly, the debate in the United States is going in the same direction. The January 2007 Wall Street Journal article by four of the grand old men of American foreign and security policy Shultz, Perry, Kissinger and Nunn is an unmistakable indication that there is a bi-partisan support for a thorough review of the American approach to nuclear issues. President Barack Obama announced that he will make disarmament a central element of US nuclear policy. In his inaugural speech he said "with old friends and former foes, we will work tirelessly to lessen the nuclear threat." America's change of leadership offers a window of opportunity to develop momentum around a new non-proliferation agenda. The European Union should actively seize this opportunity. Change is in the air and the new administration in Washington needs to know that the European Union is on board to forcefully take the non-proliferation agenda forward [18].

Since the first atomic bomb was dropped on Hiroshima in August 1945, and 45 years since the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) entered into force in 1970, the global non-proliferation regime is under unprecedented stress. The Review Conference recently concluded in 2015 that NPT Review Conference was a failure of historic proportions and the international nuclear order will now find it hard to get back on its feet, both normatively and functionally. Indeed, most of the regime's key pillars-non-proliferation, nuclear disarmament, and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy are under immense stress, contributing to a systemic crisis [19]. As we can take example of Iran and North Korea, both countries have evaded their obligations

as NPT signatories. North Korea even withdrew from the NPT in 2003. Although active diplomacy, in which the European Union played a leading role, kept negotiations with Teheran going, the Iranian government continues to defy demands to halt its military nuclear program and allow international inspections of its nuclear facilities. In 2005, at the five-yearly review conference for the NPT, the participating countries could not reach agreement on how to move forward and strengthen the treaty, a worrisome sign they may be losing faith in the global non-proliferation regime [18]. In order to achieve the goal of non-proliferation, the world needs a new approach. The countries should not be forced to give up their nuclear ambitions but there is required to get consensus of them to ban the nuclear arms altogether so that fissile material can be brought under multilateral control.

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conferences

Diplomats gather every five years at conferences to review the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), but they do not seriously discuss the substantive conditions necessary to achieve the verifiable and enforceable elimination of all nuclear arsenals. These conferences, operating by consensus rules, have often been unproductive. The sixty-five-member Conference on Disarmament, established in 1979 as a result of a UN General Assembly special session on disarmament to serve a multilateral negotiating forum, is currently moribund. Representatives of nuclear-weapons states pay lip service to the principle of nuclear disarmament, but none of these states has an employee, let alone an inter-agency group, tasked full time with figuring out what would be required to verifiably decommission all its nuclear weapons. Non-nuclear-weapons states have not really engaged with the challenge either, in spite of their disarmament rhetoric. They have tended to view disarmament as something that the nuclear-weapons states should undertake and report back on when it is accomplished.

The need for non-nuclear-weapons states to join a debate over the details of nuclear disarmament is great. The global diffusion of the technology and know-how to produce fissile materials threatens to overcome the existing regime to prevent the 'diversion of nuclear energy from peaceful uses to nuclear weapons.' Fear of nuclear proliferation is motivating some nuclear-weapons states to take nuclear disarmament more seriously, but neither non-proliferation nor the abolition of nuclear weapons can be achieved without the active cooperation of non-nuclear-weapons states [20].

Achieving a nuclear weapons-free world is a “joint enterprise” that brings together all states possessing nuclear weapons, as well as non-nuclear weapon states with advanced civil nuclear programs. The challenge of making nuclear disarmament a “joint enterprise” has recently become more acute. On 27 October 2016, the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly adopted resolution L.41, with the support of 123 states, most of which are frustrated by the slow progress on nuclear disarmament. The resolution paves the way for talks on a nuclear weapons ban treaty in 2017. Hopefully, (negotiations on) a ban treaty would help to advance nuclear disarmament. This will depend to a large degree on whether the international community will be able to develop and pursue a shared agenda for abolishing nuclear weapons [21].

In the nuclear field, preventing Iran from abandoning the non-proliferation treaty (NPT) to ‘go nuclear’ will be a real test of the international non-proliferation community. Failure to achieve this would set further precedents for nations to fall back on international treaty commitments. International success, on the other hand, would by analogy strengthen the NPT and help to limit further proliferation. The other challenge for the NPT regime will be to find ways to accept the realities of the 21st century. Continuation of old norms and definitions could make the NPT outdated or harm its credibility. The real challenge for the arms control community will be to create conditions under which all nuclear weapon-capable states should commit to universal nuclear disarmament in a step-by-step manner. This is a tough challenge, but it is an essential tenet of non-proliferation that cannot be abandoned. As suggested above, working towards a comprehensive no first use commitment by all the nuclear weapons convention (NWS) might be a first step. The next step, depending on how technology management initiatives succeed in prohibiting the possible misuse of other potentially dangerous technologies, would be a dialogue on no-use or disarmament, in the interests of global stability.

Moreover, a future global energy solution will largely involve nuclear power, and thus international cooperation in this field is vital for ultimate global energy conservation and the avoidance of an ecological disaster. Universal nuclear disarmament could help creating the right framework for nuclear energy cooperation based solely on technological and commercial parameters. In addition to existing measures to prohibit the further spread of nuclear weapons, universal respect for the comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty CTBT and the conclusion of a fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) could not only limit the

spread of nuclear weapons to new aspirants, but also limit research and development of a new generation of weapons that might bring about new dangers. If the world resigns itself instead to further applications for nuclear weapons, notably in space, it could soon find itself back under the constant threat of 'nuclear winter' or other unknown dangers [17].

Paradoxes of Nuclear Energy

It is evident that the arms race remains the main obstacle in the way of resolving global problems. It consists of immense amounts of the material and manpower resources so necessary for resolving topical tasks of social and economic development of all states. Many western politicians and scientists obviously tend to be little the terrific impact of the arms race on mankind's development, interpreting it at best as one of the many problems, which mankind is presently concerned about. As distinct from such a viewpoint, the Soviet Union and other socialist states regard disarmament as the basic problem of modern times. The arms race is having the malicious effect of hampering social and economic progress. Which could enable states to substantially enhance labor productively in industry, expand and make more efficient the services sphere and industry the rest and recreation of millions of people. Technological achievements could help them in resolving the most topical tasks of social and economic development within the shortest period of time. The most striking example today is the use of the greatest achievement of the human mind, penetration into the secrets of the atomic nucleus, both for providing practically inexhaustible power sources for mankind and for creating nuclear weapons threatening to destroy life on Earth [22].

Another paradox is the threat of nuclear terrorism that elicits much fear today especially in US, UK, France, Russia, India and Israel. This fear increases resistance in taking nuclear disarmament seriously, though it ought to be irrelevant to decisions about dramatically reducing the number and salience of nuclear weapons. It should be evident that retaining nuclear weapons is unnecessary and not helpful for pre-empting, deterring or retaliating against nuclear terrorism. The most effective way to prevent nuclear terrorism is to ensure that fissile materials or nuclear weapons cannot be obtained by terrorist organizations. Terrorist groups are highly unlikely to be able to produce fissile materials themselves. The United States and the G8 have established and funded important initiatives to improve the security of nuclear materials, and the international atomic energy agency (IAEA) and other nuclear-industry organizations are contributing to these and other nuclear-security

schemes. The Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, led by United States and Russia, now includes 70 partner states committed to improve accounting, control and physical protection systems for nuclear materials, enhancing the security of civilian nuclear facilities and taking other measures to prevent nuclear terrorism. To the extent that the risk of fissile-material diversion grows as the number of states and facilities producing the material increases. The world needs to adopt new rules to prevent the spread of weapons-usable fissile material production capabilities to additional states. It is important to note that taking nuclear abolition more seriously could help to overcome the resistance that key non-nuclear-weapons states have mounted to tighten rules on the spread of fuel-cycle capabilities. States with nuclear weapons still need to be convinced, however, that these weapons are not necessary deterrents against nuclear and biological terrorism. Officials in US, France, Russia, India and Israel have all at times identified state sponsorship of nuclear and biological terrorism among the threats their nuclear forces are supposed to deter. There is a very good reason to doubt that nuclear weapons could either deter or preempt a nuclear or biological terrorist attack [20].

Thus, proliferation of non-conventional weapons and nuclear arms in particular is still one of the greatest threats to global peace. The difficulty of countering nuclear proliferation is partly explained by the inherent link between military and civilian nuclear technology. While the latter is generally accepted, because nuclear energy may well play a growing role in securing the world's future energy needs and could arguably contribute to global efforts to fight climate change. However, development of military nuclear technology is for most countries prohibited by international law. It is evident that military and civilian nuclear technology essentially depend on the same basic ingredient: fissile material. Consequently, it cannot be excluded that the advanced civil nuclear facilities are military operations in disguise. Although it is relatively unlikely that terrorist groups acquire the means to deliver a nuclear device. Building a primitive nuclear or "dirty" bomb is not so complicated once you get your hands on enough fissile material. With renegade tactics, delivery is easy. The risk that nuclear material and technology, if it is inadequately secured, falls into the wrong hands would grow accordingly. And, the effects could be devastating.

Conclusion

The present study concludes that the proliferation of non-conventional weapons and nuclear arms in particular is still one of the utmost threats to global peace. In order to prevent the world from nuclear arms, there is a need for global consensus on non-proliferation regime but it can only be revived and strengthened step by step. The European Union can play an important role in this process with its partners in particular the United States and Russia. The European Union should employ active diplomacy to revive the system of security treaties across the globe, which includes the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), along with the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABM), the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), the Helsinki Convention and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START, which has expired in December 2009). The European Union should formulate clear and concrete proposals on its non-proliferation activities in order to establish a universal regime for the production, use, and reprocessing of nuclear fuel rather than the production of weapons grade uranium and plutonium [18]. The combination of establishing multifaceted fuel cycle arrangements and a reconfirmation of our common commitment to nuclear disarmament are two essential elements if this process is to be successful. There is an inherent link between military and civilian nuclear technology however the latter is generally accepted, as it may well play a growing role in securing the world's future energy needs. Moreover, it can play a vital role in global efforts to fight climate change. There is an issue of nuclear terrorism in few countries like US, UK, France, Russia, India and Israel. To deal with this problem, it should be ensured that fissile materials or nuclear weapons cannot be obtained by terrorist organizations because retaining nuclear weapons is unnecessary and not helpful for pre-empting, deterring or retaliating against nuclear terrorism. It is evident that terrorist groups are not able to produce fissile materials themselves. It is recognized that the elimination or substantial reduction of expenditure on the production of armaments will increase the amount of grants for world's social and cultural needs like education, health, science and the arts and so on [9]. It is evident that non-proliferation and the abolition of nuclear weapons demands joint effort because the objective of a nuclear weapons-free world cannot be achieved without active participation of non-nuclear states along with nuclear states. In this line, the world needs a new approach to non-proliferation, one that is not based on power to coerce countries to give up their nuclear ambitions but on consensus that nuclear arms need to be

banned altogether and fissile material be brought under multilateral control. Due to this, nuclear energy could be utilized in a positive way.

References:

1. Sharp, Walter R., and Grayson Kirk. *Contemporary International Politics*. Farrar and Rinehart, 1944.
2. Norman, D. Palmer, and Howard C. Perkins. *Disarmament and Banning Weapons of mass destruction*. USA: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.
3. Baylis, John, and Steve Smith. *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations*. Oxford University Press, 2005.
4. Goodspeed S.S. *Nature and functions of international of organization*. Oxford University Press, 1951.
5. Dick, Sheldon. *Keeping the peace: Multidimensional UN operations in Cambodia and El Salvador*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
6. UN General Assembly. *Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the Organization*. New York (2001).
7. Thee, Marek. "The Arms Race, Armaments Dynamics, Military Research and Development, and Disarmament." *Bulletin of Peace Proposals* 9.2 (1978): 103-120.
8. Prasad Surya Dathand Shukla Suman. *Disarmament education and peace*. The Associated Publishers, 1995.
9. Bogdanov Oleg Vasil'evich. *The role of the united nations its organs and programs in furthering disarmament and putting an end to the arms race*. Paris, April 1978. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0003/000327/032754eb.pdf>.
10. Malhotra, Vinay Kumar, and Aleksandr Anatol'evich Sergounin. *Theories and approaches to international relations*. Anmol Publications PVT. LTD., 1998.
11. Larson, Arthur. *A warless world*. McGraw-Hill, 1963.
12. Laszlo, Ervin, and Donald Keys, eds. *Disarmament: The human factor*. Proceedings of a Colloquium on the Societal Context for Disarmament, sponsored by UNITAR and Planetary Citizens and held at the United Nations, New York. Elsevier, 2016.
13. Basu, Rumki, ed. *International politics: Concepts, theories and issues*. SAGE Publications India, 2012.

14. Karunakaran, Kotta P. *Modernization of capitalism, communism, and world politics* [KP Karunakaran. Meenakshi Prakashan, 1974.
15. Thakurdas, Frank. *Essays in Political Theory*. Gitanjali Publishing House, 1982.
16. Rotblat, Joseph. *Scientists, the arms race and disarmament*. London: Taylor & Francis, 1982.
17. Mallik, Amitav. *Technology and Security in the 21st Century: A Demand-side Perspective*. Oxford university press, 2004.
18. Shayan, Fatemeh. "Peace and disarmament: A world without nuclear weapons." *Security Journal* 27.1 (2014): 122.
19. Happymon Jacob, *Rekindling the Disarmament Momentum*, The Hindu, September 21, 2015. <http://www.thehindu.com/opinion/op-ed/rekindling-the-disarmament-momentum/article7671223.ece>.
20. Perkovich, George, James Acton, and Carnegie Endowment. *Abolishing nuclear weapons: a debate*. Arms Control Today 39.3 (2009): 5.
21. Meier, Oliver, and Elisabeth Suh. *Reviving Nuclear Disarmament: Paths Towards a Joint Enterprise*. Berlin, German Institute for International and Security Affairs, 2016.
22. Wittkopf, Eugene R., and Charles William Kegley. *World politics: Trend and transformation*. St. Martin's Press, 1995.