

# Disarmament Of Nuclear Weapon: Whether A Utopian Concept?\*

Satya Kam Sharma

Assistant Professor (Law), Galgotias University, U.P.

**Abstract:** Disarmament is a very complicated and gigantic problem in the modern period. As the world advanced in the field of science and technology so it did in the field of weapons development. More and more destructive and dangerous weapons are being created. Most powerful of them is the Nuclear Weapons, to which no other conventional weapon match. Disarmament has been discussed for several centuries but plans for its implementations have failed because no State whose participation was essential was willing to pay the price that is required. The idea of disarmament is not new and may be traced through the writings of Sully, William Penn, Rousseau and Kant.

**Keywords:** Nuclear Weapon, Utopian Concept

## I. INTRODUCTION

Having succeeded in developing nuclear weapons during the last days of World War II, The United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the legality of which has never been questioned<sup>1</sup>, thus carrying the world into the nuclear age. Despite U.S. hopes for a monopoly on these weapons, the Soviet Union carried out a successful nuclear test in 1949, the U.K. in 1952, France in 1960, and China in 1964. All these countries have since manufactured and stockpiled a great number of nuclear weapons. The increase in nuclear weapon states magnifies the danger that weapons will be used in error, that the technology will leak to other parties, and even of plunging the entire world into nuclear war. The devastating effects of nuclear weapons have further added to the urgency of the problems of disarmament.

The International Peace Conference at Hague in 1899 is the first great landmark in the field of disarmament because it was invoked for the specific purpose of limiting armaments by national agreement. The Covenant of the League of Nations dealt at length with the reduction of armaments.

Nuclear disarmament has been a constant preoccupation of the international community ever since the emergence of nuclear weapons. Over the years it has come to be recognised that nuclear war constitutes the greatest single peril to the survival of mankind pressing item on the disarmament agenda. Problems of security and disarmament have become matters of vital concern to the international community after the WWII.

There are many steps taken for the disarmament of the Nuclear weapons. The Charter of the U.N. does not speak of reduction but of "Regulation" of armaments. The first important endeavour of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament was to adopt on January 24, 1946 a resolution which established the U.N. Atomic energy commission. Then was establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1957. other treaties such as Partial test Ban Treaty(1963), Outer Space Treaty(1967) , Non Proliferation

Treaty (1968), Comprehensive Test Ban treaty(CTBT) in 1995. There are treaties between Russia and US for Nuclear Arms Reduction Treaty in 1993.

India has also played its role in the efforts of disarmament of nuclear weapons. For example the Rajiv Gandhi action plans for nuclear disarmament at UN General Assembly in 1988.

But the question remains whether the complete nuclear disarmament of nuclear weapons are possible? Nobody not even the individual, least chance of a nation will be ready to give up its arms capability. The very nature of human to dominate the other will be in its way. Moreover what about nations sovereignty, what about the cross checking of stockpile of weapons? Many more concerns are there in regard to nuclear disarmament. The recent are the terrorist's activities and 'non state actors'. Even suppose for a while the whole nuclear weapons are destroyed, will it be possible for the knowledge from the minds of scientist be destroyed; he can create it again any time.

This paper argues on the practical approach that the nuclear weapons cannot be totally removed from the earth, it's a utopian concept. At the best the weapons could be regulated by various national and international mechanisms of checks and balances.

## II. WHY DISARMAMENT?

Weapons or the thing which inflict harm to others or destruction has been used by the human being since it appeared on this earth. It may be as simple as a piece of stone or a stick. Not only the human being but the other creature use means to harm the others. The harm to other may be due to survival of itself or the group or it may be also to dominate the other to its submission. The animal or in many cases plants, the means remained to the extent which nature provided. But human being was different. They began to create various methods or say instruments which were better and effective (effective in the sense creating more harm with use of less physical energy) in order to protect themselves or to destroy others. In this race of creating more and more

<sup>1</sup> Richard Falk, Lee Meyrowitz and Jack Sanderson, "Nuclear weapons and International Law", *IJIL*, vol.20 (1980) pp.541-595 at 542.

powerful instruments man have arrived to this point in time were it could destroy the very existence of human race on the earth with just a click of a button.

At the beginning of 21<sup>st</sup> century humanity finds itself faced with a dilemma of either its achievements in the scientific and technological sphere, accompanied by social renewal on the principles of justice, will open before it new and unprecedented opportunities, or these achievements, misdirected at arms stock piling and at improving means of sowing death and destruction, will wipe out life and civilization from the surface of our planet. That is the lesson that comes forcefully to us after the fateful bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

The result of the Manhattan Project was the production nuclear weapon which was tested in Alamogordo, New Mexico. The test was known as Trinity Test. Then the dropping of nuclear bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on August 5 and 9, 1945 resulted in the death of over 250000 people. This was the beginning of nuclear age.

We have crossed over the twentieth century and are now in twenty first century. It was the most bloodstained century in history. Fifty-eight million perished in two World Wars. Forty million more have died in other conflicts. In the last nine decades, the ravenous machines of war have devoured nearly one hundred million people. The appetite of these monstrous machines grows on what they feed. Nuclear war will not mean the death of a hundred million people. Or even a thousand million. It will mean the extinction of four thousand million: the end of life as we know it on our planet Earth.<sup>2</sup>

Ever since the end of the Second World War, the arms race has been continuing at a galloping pace.<sup>3</sup> According to 1980-81 figures, there were more than 50000 nuclear warheads in existence with aggregate explosive power equivalent to 15 million kilo tonnes of TNT- or one million Hiroshima type bombs, i.e. approx. 3 tonnes of TNT for every living soul. Thus the existing nuclear arsenal is capable of killing every human being not once but several times over. It is estimated that out of the total of approx. 50000 nuclear warhead, 25,000 – 30,000 are reportedly in the hands of the United States and 11,000-15000 with the Soviet union, since 1968, the total number of strategic warheads alone has increased from 4500 to 92000 for the united States and from 1000 to at least 6000 for the Soviet Union.<sup>4</sup>

A most urgent task before humanity at this moment is to make all efforts to eliminate the threat of nuclear war and eventually, of all forms of war. It is a task that has to be carries out at various levels, political, economic and cultural since the nuclearisation process or the nuclear arms proliferation affects, in one way or another, those three aspects of society.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Speech of Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi at the United Nations General Assembly. New York, June 9, 1988

<sup>3</sup> Joseph Benjamin, "Struggle for Nuclear Disarmament" *Indian Quarterly* vol. 43 (1987) pp. 213-233 at 213.

<sup>4</sup> "Disarmament and development", Lok Sabha secretariat (new delhi, 1986) p.4

<sup>5</sup> G. Paul, "Ideology of Nuclear Weapons", *Social Action* Vol. 49 (1999) pp.121-155 at 121.

### III. MEASURE TAKEN FOR DISARMAMENT:

#### i. Efforts of the World:

The US helped Britain and France in acquiring nuclear capability; it looked the other way when Israel acquired nuclear weapons or South Africa acquired them, its economic and military assistance helped Pakistan acquire nuclear weapons while it put roadblocks for others.<sup>6</sup>

It has been rightly observed, by an eminent author:

"Disarmament effort have been many, the successes few and limited. There has never been an approach to what Cohen calls 'effective disarmament.'<sup>7</sup>

#### League Of Nations And Disarmament-

The covenant of the League of Nations dealt at length with the reduction of armaments. The League of Nations writes Philip Noel Baker,<sup>8</sup> is the first attempt in history to furnish the international society of nations with the permanent and organic system of international political institutions. This attempt was an outcome of the world war." The horrors of war shocked the minds of men, so that they looked forward to the creation of an international order based on respect for law. Since the League of Nations was the child of the First World War, it was quite natural for its framers to secure the reduction of armaments. The Covenant, therefore, provided that League Council, with the assistance of a Permanent Advisory Commission, would formulate plans for reducing arms. The covenant recognised that the maintenance of peace required the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligation."<sup>9</sup> In 17 June, 1925 Geneva Protocol or Protocol for the Prohibition of the use of Asphyxialy Poisonous or other Gases and of Bacteriological Methods of war was signed on.

But the arrangement failed as no one followed the reduction policy instead increased their arsenal which paved the way for the World War II.

#### The UN Charter:

The Charter of UN does not speak of reduction but of "regulation" of armaments. The provisions relating to disarmament in the UN charter are as follows:

1. After having determined "to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war" and for that end "to ensure...that armed force shall not be used, save in common interest."<sup>10</sup> The Charter goes on to empower the General Assembly to consider the general principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments and to make

<sup>6</sup>Savita Datt, "Nuclear Non-Proliferations" *Mainstream* vol. 42(29) (2004) pp. 15-16 at 15

<sup>7</sup> C.P. Schliecher, *Introduction to International Relations* (1954), p. 744.

<sup>8</sup> Encyclopedia of Social sciences, Vol. 9, p. 287.

<sup>9</sup> Article 8 of the Covenant of the League of Nations.

<sup>10</sup> Preamble of the Charter.

- recommendation with regard to such principles to the Members of the Security Council or to both.<sup>11</sup>
2. Secondly, but more importantly, it is further provided that in order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating, with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee referred to in Art. 47 plans to be submitted to the members of the UN for the establishment of a system of regulation of armaments.<sup>12</sup> Thus the Charter aims to provide security along with the regulations of armaments by granting military power to the UN under Art.43.
  3. Thirdly, the Charter makes the provision or a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council's military requirements for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of armaments and possible disarmament.<sup>13</sup>
  4. Fourthly in order to enable the UN to take urgent military measures, the Charter enjoins the Members to hold immediately available national air force contingents, for combined international enforcement action.<sup>14</sup>

But it may be noted that special agreements contemplated under Art. 43 have not materialised. The Military Staff Committee has ceased to function. As a matter of fact, it was never actively concerned with the regulation of armaments. From the outset the role of the UN as a control organisation has been at issue in disarmament negotiations. The first important endeavour of the General Assembly in the field of disarmament was to adopt on January 24, 1946 a resolution which established the UN Atomic Energy Commission. The UN General Assembly also adopted its first resolution, calling for the peaceful uses of atomic energy and elimination of weapons of mass destruction. Bernard Baruch was the first US representation to the Commission and he presented a proposal that the US would destroy its atomic arsenal on condition that the UN imposed control on development that would not be subject to UN Security Council veto. These controls would allow only the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The plan was passed by the Commission but not agreed to by the Soviet Union who abstained during the proposal in the Security Council. Debates on the plan continued into 1948, but agreement could not be arrived at. In 1948 the Commission decided to adjourn indefinitely.<sup>15</sup>

On June 24, 1946 the United States presented a plan known as the Baruch Plan, to the UN Atomic Energy Commission. The said plan envisaged the establishment by treaty and international Atomic Development Authority to own, operate, manage and licence all facilities for the production of atomic energy. The short the United States, "sought to retain the UN

Charter while at the same time urging the establishment of what in effect was limited world government to enforce atomic disarmament. The Soviet Union on the other hand, stuck firmly by the original Charter and his unanimity principle and wanted a general reduction of all armaments and the prohibition of the manufacture and use of atomic weapons. Consequently, a compromise was affected in the form of "Principles governing the General Regulation and Reduction of Armaments." This was passed unanimously by the General Assembly in 1946. Through this resolution the Security Council was directed to take practical measures to reduce and regulate armaments and to expedite the work of the UN Atomic Energy Commission.

The United States monopoly of atomic weapons ended in 1949. This naturally made the Baruch Plan irrelevant. The next important step was the establishment of Disarmament Commission by Commission and the UN Commission for Conventional Armaments.

Under the aegis of the UN an international conference for the peaceful uses of atomic energy was held in August 1955 at Geneva. Thereafter, the representatives of 81 States assembled at the UN headquarters in September 1956 to consider a draft for the statute of the IAEA. It was adopted unanimously on 23 October, 1956 and came into force from 29<sup>th</sup> July, 1957. According to the statute the Agency aims to seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity through the world. Its aim is to ensure as far as it is possible that assistance provided by it or its request or under its supervision of not such a way as to further any military purpose.

There have been various measures taken for nuclear disarmament

Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963): this treaty prohibits nuclear tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. But France and China have refused to sign this treaty.

Outer Space Treaty (1967): the treaty on Principles governing the activities of States in the Exploration and use of outer space including the Moon and of other Celestial Bodies of 1967 popularly known as Outer Space Treaty which banned nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction from outer space and provided for the demilitarization of celestial bodies.

Non Proliferation Treaty (1968): This Treaty prohibits spread of nuclear weapons. It came into force on March 5, 1970. India has refused to sign this treaty on the ground that it is discriminatory and unequal. In May 1995 in the Review Conference of Treaty for the Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons held in New York, the treaty has been extended unconditionally for an indefinite period. Yet another review conference of the NPT was held in May 2000. Under the treaty only five countries the US, Russia, Britain, France and Cuba are permitted to have nuclear arms. The other parties to the Treaty have to renounce nuclear weapons.

An important development, however, took place on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2000 when during the review conference the five nuclear powers agreed to an unequivocal undertaking to

<sup>11</sup> Article 11, Paragraph 1, of the UN Charter.

<sup>12</sup> Article 26.

<sup>13</sup> Article 47, Paragraph 1.

<sup>14</sup> Article 45.

<sup>15</sup> B.S. Chimni, "Nuclear Weapons and International Law : Some Reflections", *IJIL*, vol.37 (1997) pp.250-261 at 255.

totally eliminate their nuclear arsenals. The agreement specified no time table and it was pointed out that it would take many years to achieve a nuclear free world.

The treaty on the Prohibition of the placement of Nuclear weapons and other weapons of Mass Destruction on the sea bed and Ocean floor and in the sub soil thereof or Sea bed treaty, 1972. The importance of this treaty as a disarmament measure lies in the fact that it has been predicted that the total potential for war in the future will be largely determined by its under sea component.

Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) the object of these talks between US and USSR was to find a way for both sides to agree on plan that would limit and perhaps some day reduce their vast nuclear arsenals.

Special Session Of General Assembly On Disarmament In 1978. The General assembly decided to hold a special session on disarmament in 1978 and a preparatory commission was also established. The General Assembly held its tenth special session devoted to disarmament in 1978 at UN Headquarters.

Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) in June 1995, a conference was held in Geneva to adopt the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). This treaty contains a comprehensive plan to prohibit nuclear tests. This treaty seeks to remove the shortcoming of the Treaty on Non Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. But so far as the questions destroying of existing nuclear stockpiles is concerned, this treaty does not contain any time bound programme. Comprehensive test Ban treaty review conference was held in Vienna in the first week of October 1999. It reemphasised the need for ban on test of nuclear weapons by the nations and urged the others to sign it.

#### ii. **India and the Disarmament Efforts**<sup>16</sup>.

In May 2008, India rekindled the disarmament debate by hosting an international conference on "Towards a World Free of Nuclear Weapons," in June 2008. This conference was a transparent attempt by New Delhi to assert its position as the world's oldest crusader for nuclear disarmament when the debate to eliminate nuclear weapons had gained momentum internationally, following two op-ed articles by the American "Quartet" calling for a world free of nuclear weapons. Walking a fine line between responsibility and realpolitik, India's efforts towards achieving universal nuclear disarmament has often been dismissed as rhetoric and a sham, especially after the 1998 nuclear tests.

While presenting a six-step approach towards nuclear disarmament in April 2008, India's Permanent Representative to the UN, Nirupam Sen, reaffirmed that the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan (A World Free of Nuclear Weapons) was "the most comprehensive initiative on nuclear disarmament." Can India then help transform it's (and the world's) rhetoric into reality?

Independent India's foreign policy, in its early years, was shaped by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru's idealistic world view. In 1940, Nehru stated that, "both because of our adherence to the principle of non-violence and from practical

considerations arising from our understanding of world events, we believe that complete disarmament of all nation states should be aimed at, as in fact an urgent necessity, if the world is not to be reduced to barbarism." China's nuclear test in 1964, two years after the Chinese invasion in 1962, set the stage for India's nuclear weapons programme. Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri gave the green signal for a peaceful nuclear explosion in 1964, yet, in his speech in Parliament he also maintained that India would never make the bomb.<sup>17</sup>

India conducted its first nuclear test in May 1974, with four major developments in the decade from 1961-1971 having shaped India's decision to test. First, the psychological impact of India's humiliating defeat in the Sino-Indian border conflict in 1962 followed by the Chinese nuclear test in 1964 required that India exercised its nuclear option.

Second, India's attempt to obtain security guarantee from the West were rebuffed. Third was the emergence of the NPT as a discriminatory nuclear order<sup>18</sup>. Fourth was Pakistan's clandestine weapons programme with Chinese assistance after the Indo-Pak war in 1971.

After Pokhran-I, India continued to defend its goal of nuclear disarmament. In 1988, at the third Special Session on Disarmament (SSOD III), Rajiv Gandhi spoke about a "world free of nuclear weapons" and presented the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan seeking a "binding commitment by all nations to eliminate nuclear weapons in stages, by the year 2010." In the same year, however, amidst reports of a growing Sino-Pakistan nuclear nexus, Rajiv Gandhi also gave the go ahead for India's weapons programme

The NDA government tested in 1998 and justified this on the basis of threats to national security; yet, Prime Minister Vajpayee reiterated India's commitment to nuclear disarmament which was subsequently included as India's principle objective in the Draft Nuclear Doctrine. India continues to argue on both sides of this issue, hence its position on nuclear disarmament is largely regarded as rhetoric. Having said that, it should be noted that the pursuit of disarmament in the US and elsewhere has also been two-sided and rhetorical.

First, there is a school of thought that believes pursuing nuclear disarmament is chasing a chimera. According to this group, the Quartet's initiative is an attempt to restore some credibility into the international nuclear regime before the NPT review conference in 2010. The international system has always operated on the realist paradigm where national interest remains the principal force motivating nation states and changes in the world order will only result from national interests and not through idealism. The Western powers have not taken any real responsibility to eliminate nuclear weapons after the end of Cold War; they have been retained for their influence and prestige.

Moreover, the US, Russia and China have strengthened their nuclear capabilities. India, therefore, should not spend its diplomatic capital on pursuing chimeras and instead enhance

<sup>16</sup> See, Dr. S. Rajen Singh, "India's Response to Nuclear Non-Proliferation Measures" *India Quarterly* vol.58 (2002) pp.31-92.

<sup>17</sup> Raja Menon, *A Nuclear Strategy for India*, (New Delhi, 2000)

<sup>18</sup> Savita Datt, "Nuclear Non-Proliferations" *Mainstream* vol. 42(29) (2004) pp. 15-16 at 16

its deterrent posture. Nuclear weapons may not serve military purposes but they continue to have political utility; otherwise, there is no reason why France and Britain have retained their nuclear arsenals.

Then there are the pacifists who, in stark contrast to the nuclear proponents, support disarmament on moral grounds. Nuclear weapons defeat the very spirit of humanity, and world peace cannot be attained through the bomb. For the pacifists, disarmament is not chimerical; seeking security and political influence by developing nuclear weapons is. These weapons do not serve any military, political or economic objectives. In fact, by diverting economic investment from development to defence, they only serve the interests of the elites. Moreover, the expenditure involved in developing and maintaining nuclear weapons is in addition to the expenditures incurred on supporting and strengthening conventional forces. Therefore, it is an unnecessary burden on the national economy. A departure from the two groups is a section of strategists and academics who believe that global nuclear disarmament is desirable but not feasible. According to them, the US and Russia are at the top of the nuclear chain and they will have to lead the process of weapons elimination before other states can follow suit. India cannot lead the process nor can China because their nuclear arsenals are nowhere close in size to those of the US and Russia, and it would not make much difference if they did give up their weapons.

In a post-Cold War world, the political value of nuclear weapons has declined markedly rendering them more a liability than an asset. Despite the changed political climate and the window of opportunity to restructure international relations away from reliance on nuclear weapons, many influential thinkers and military planners in the United States, NATO, the Russian Federation and in some other countries still believe in the integrity of nuclear deterrence . i.e. that stability and security would necessarily be jeopardized in the absence of nuclear deterrence. Such deeply embedded beliefs are extraordinarily resistant to new thinking or to change. They also reflect the reluctance of national security planners in the NWS to conceive of a security architecture that does not rely on nuclear arms.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union, defence planners have had to live with a shrinking of their bloated Cold War nuclear arsenals and have had to reduce their target sets in order to comply with START restraints. In the United States, present targeting requirements call for 2,000-2,500 deployed strategic nuclear warheads, with about 5,000 kept in reserve, along with some 500 sub strategic nuclear warheads, for a total of about 8,000 warheads. The arbitrary nature of the 1994 Nuclear Posture Review and of the 1997 Quadrennial Defense Review of the United States gives rise to questions about their governing rationales, which recommended continuing high levels of deployed nuclear forces together with a hedge. Against the possibility of a resurgent Russian Federation should its democratic reforms fail? Starkly put, the Russian Federation simply has little capacity to maintain

even 1,000 strategic nuclear warheads, much less the several thousands now permitted under existing START I and START II, and the proposed START III, agreements. Over the next ten to fifteen years, the Russian Federation is likely to go down to 500 operational strategic weapons.<sup>19</sup> If there are concerns about nuclear safety and security in the Russian Federation, should not that constitute an argument for getting rid of as many Russian warheads as rapidly as possible?

And if that is the case why is it that the Russian Federation is pressing for deeper cuts under a START III, going down to 1,000 or less deployed nuclear warheads? Reducing nuclear arsenals down to a few hundred requires a fundamental change in how the United States and the Russian Federation view the utility of deterrence. Unless Moscow and Washington recognize the sufficiency of an existential deterrent of 50,100 weapons, their nuclear forces will remain at relatively high levels.

#### IV. COMPLETE DISARMAMENT A UTOPIAN CONCEPT?

The biggest question is 'Can we really take away these weapons away from ourselves'? Can we delete what we have learned? Can we dis-invent the nuclear weapon? If the answer is yes then we can say that the nuclear weapons can be eliminated from the earth. No human creation can be dis-invented.

What about the Nature of the Bomb? Could it be that the bomb ever since it came into being has propelled policies and driven strategies? This leads us to several questions that follow: once the bomb was invented- could the NPT be non-discriminatory? Once the world got divided in to NWS and the NNWS- was it possible to apply the same yardstick to both? The only possibility was to divest those who have the bomb and stop others from acquiring the same – a bargain which NPT tried to negotiate and which was obviously unequal.<sup>20</sup>

The nuclear weapon states are aware that the possibility of using nuclear weapons to resolve any conflict among them or with other nations is very low or non-existent. It is, therefore, also accepted that nuclear weapons do not serve any other military objective, except for deterring nuclear weapons. Even if nations have doubts about a possible use being available for these weapons for whatever reason, what is the cost to achieve that end? In other words, it would be economically unsound, considering how interdependent the world economy has become.

Nuclear weapon states have an added responsibility to be 'responsible nuclear powers,' that is, they are expected to be wise enough not to use these weapons against anyone for military purposes. The nuclear club includes former world powers, current superpower and an aspiring world power. India, not a part of P5, is a declared nuclear weapon state that also aspires to regional/global power, and carries the historical baggage of championing the goal of disarmament. None of the other nuclear and aspiring nations (Pakistan,

<sup>19</sup> Pran Chopra, "Towards a Nuclear Free World", *Economic and Political weekly* vol. 28 (1993) pp.759-767 at 760.

<sup>20</sup> Savita Datt, "Nuclear Non-Proliferations" *Mainstream* vol. 42(29) (2004) pp. 15-16 at 16

Israel, North Korea and Iran) can afford to taint their image by using these weapons.

But there can be no guarantee that nuclear weapons will never be used. This perception derives from the unpredictability of human behaviour. Apprehension regarding the safety of Pakistan's nuclear arsenal, or political instability in any state which possesses nuclear weapons posits an ever present danger. Walmart' continue to pose proliferation risks with no evidence of his nuclear trafficking network having been dismantled.

The danger of terrorists getting hold of these dangerous weapons, especially fissile materials, is considered to be the most serious threat to the world. The probability of a nuclear exchange between strong powers is considered to be low, but is relatively higher in the case of poorer countries that have less to lose.

As long as nuclear weapons exist so do the possibility of nuclear accidents. This means that nations will have to incur increasing expenditure in securing weapons that are no longer war-fighting instruments. So much for the revival of disarmament debate, consider the curious case of why the debate may finally lead nowhere. Once again, there are real problems, but also those of perception. Consider the real ones. The first real problem is that if anyone is serious about eliminating nuclear weapons, then who will lead the process? Since the nuclear chain is top heavy with the United States and Russia possessing 95 per cent of the existing nuclear weapons, they must live up to their commitments under the NPT to eliminate their nuclear weapons.

Only thereafter can they expect other nations to follow. Second, how sound is the first argument have? In other words, not all nations possess nuclear weapons because the US and Russia have them. Will Iran give up its pursuit of nuclear weapons if the US, which is conventionally the most superior power and an ally of Israel, reduces its stockpile to zero?

This leads to the importance of addressing the security deficiency among nations. Tensions between states have historical, territorial, political, ideological dimensions and de-weaponization may not restore cordial relations among nations. Fourth, the absence of international verification means. Even if countries commit to disarm, how can this be verified? How does one build trust and cooperation between states to install a transparent verification system? Fifth, nations have to build a national consensus before committing to disarmament; it is very difficult to convince domestic constituencies (scientific, defence, political lobbies) that nuclear weapons are not attributes of the military and technological prowess of a nation.

The above arguments suggests that the nations would not give up the nuclear weapon capability and the non nuclear weapons state would aspire to get hold of nuclear weapon to be at par with the nuclear states.

Arms race is based on perception of threat by the nation. It's a speculation according to which the country prepares itself to defend. It's a reaction to each others fear, having a spiralling effect of enhancing ones arms capability. Moreover arms race between two nations leads to other country in fear perception, which forces to develop its arms capability to match to that extant. These leads to a chain reaction in the

world. So disarmament is very complicated. The question remains who will start first? Who is going to lead. For example the case of India, Pakistan and china. Each having fear of each other leading to arms race.

Moreover, till now the efforts in the field of disarmament have not been leading to any conclusion. The superpower countries have not shown an effective effort for disarmament of nuclear weapon. They are continuing with the research and development in the betterment of those weapons and developing more powerful weapons. All these circumstance leads to one conclusion that the disarmament efforts of nuclear weapons will remain a utopian concept.

#### V. CONCLUSION:

Nuclear weapons also possess symbolic value. They continue to be viewed as levers of power. Nations associate prestige, influence, and deterrent value to nuclear weapons. Disarmament is not just about eliminating nuclear weapons but also about devaluing the political power that nations derive from them. So it would be just impossible for the nations to give up the nuclear weapons. The various factors and the very human nature would be a hindrance in the completed disarmament of nuclear weapons. Says Admiral Raja Menon in his book *A Nuclear Strategy for India*, "An international system without nuclear weapons could be a system without armaments. Creating such a world, as Nehru wanted, is certainly a worthwhile goal, but is it Utopian or not is the question." So its will be remain ought norm which to present situation of the world would never be achieved and remain a Utopian concept.

Moreover United States and Russia will never give up their nuclear capability unless and until they have developed more superior weapon then the present, which have more destructive effect then the nuclear weapon.

The recent political developments in Pakistan were the Taliban and other non state actors are eying to hold on the nuclear sites has alarming effect on the disarmament efforts. These groups have no political boundary, or a fixed territory. Every country feels the threat that it may use against it, India has more reason to worry. So the complete disarmament of nuclear weapon will remain just a utopian concept.