

An Appraisal of the Politics of Disarmament During the Cold War

Unekwu Friday Itodo and Abraham Templeman

Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria

Abstract

The years after the Second World War marked the beginning of the cold war characterized by the arms race. This arms race became dangerous that there was fear that there will be another major war after the second world war. The fear of the outbreak of another major war led to the clamour for the elimination and the destruction of weapons of mass destruction capable of causing great harm to humanity. The central focus of this paper is to interrogate how the campaign for nuclear disarmament, was successful during the cold war era. The research is based on the zero sum games theory of international relations. The researchers employed historical (output) analysis because the study is a reflection of the arms race during the cold war era by examining documents and facts concerning the study period. The study found that, though there were frantic efforts to curtail arms proliferation by the non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS), these efforts have not been successful because of the actions and inactions of the nuclear weapon states (NWS). The paper, therefore, concludes that there was hardly any tangible evidence in the reduction of arms proliferation. To this end, the paper recommends that for the menace to be eradicated, the dichotomy of (NWS) and the (NNWS) be abolished and the norm, evaluation, and monitoring process must be the same for all parties to the treaty of non-proliferation and the parties should set a clear time frame within which any actions must be completed.

Keywords: Appraisal, Disarmament, Cold War, Politics

Introduction

The arms race during the cold war era emerged from countries with conflicting foreign policy trust. A foreign policy primarily follows national interest to protect the interest of the originating nation in the international arena. It is one of the finest tools at a country's disposal to pursue its national interest. A very good foreign policy would glaringly lead a country in fulfilling its national interest and acquiring its rightful place in the comity of nations. Foreign policy can be pursued peacefully by dialogue or forcefully by annexation and wars.

Peaceful pursuit of foreign policy in the form 'dyad', 'triad', 'trading bloc', 'commercial

zone' and 'open regionalization' has been used to describe a new pattern of international interactions.¹

Territorial expansion can be achieved through a peaceful form. For instance, in 1803, the United States bought a massive chunk of North America, pegged at about 827,000 square miles. The acquisition nearly doubled the national domain for a mere \$15 million.² The forceful pursuit of foreign policy exists in the

¹ Bellios, R. S. and Hearnly, R.S (Eds). *The Growth of Regional Trading bloc in Global Economy*. Washington, D.C. National Planning Association, 1990.

² Lee, R. *The True Cost of the Louisiana Purchase*. *Slate*. 2017. Retrieved 10/10/2019
from: [slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/history/2017/03/how_much_did_the_louisiana_purchase_actually_cost.html](https://www.slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/history/2017/03/how_much_did_the_louisiana_purchase_actually_cost.html)

form of colonialism (Africa and Latin America), wars (e.g. World Wars, Franco-Prussia War, Cold War), and, recently the promotion of terrorism by states, e.g. in Iran (Hezbollah, Houthis).

Accordingly, nations whose foreign policies are in the form of 'dyad', 'commercial zone', and 'open regionalization' have had smooth relations with other countries. This is because their foreign policy trust did not take cognizance of the 'two-person zero-sum' game principle of international relations: a situation where player A and B have opposing interests. As the two players have opposing interests, they are completely antagonistic and the sum of their game cancels each other.³ In a two-person zero-sum game, the win of one actor is the loss of the other; i.e. if A wins 10, B loses 10; and the sum is zero.

As was the case, the countries in the opposing block during the cold war era East (communist) and west (capitalist) were involved in the 'zero-sum' principle of international relations. Each block wanted to benefit maximally without considering the interest of the other countries on one hand, and countries who already possess nuclear weapons did everything possible to stop countries without nuclear weapons from possessing nuclear weapons. The security benefits of the NPT meant that states will be willing to make the non-proliferation obligation conditional on the achievement of specific disarmament measures. However, some states that pressed hard for disarmament in the non-proliferation treaty negotiations also harboured nuclear weapons aspirations. It was crystal clear that,

anxiety about disarmament during the NPT's negotiation was fundamentally a matter of politics.

Conceptual Clarification

Cold War

The term was first used by the English author George Orwell in an article published in 1945 to refer to what he predicted would be a nuclear crisis between "two or three major nations, each with its own weapons of mass destruction in just a few seconds."⁴ American economist and presidential adviser Bernard Baruch in his speech at the State House in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1947 used the term to describe the conflict of opinion between western countries and the Soviet bloc.⁵ The Cold War often refers to political instability and military conflict between nations that will not end in a full-fledged war, especially the one that existed between the United States and the Soviet Union after World War II.⁶ The Cold War is also seen as the tensed political, military, and ideological conflict between nations that did not end in armed conflict such as conflict after World War II between the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., and its partners.⁷ For the ongoing work, the definition of military and associated terms is adopted. According to the dictionary of military and associated terms, "the Cold War is a state of international conflict in which political, economic, technological, psychological,

⁴ Encyclopaedia Britannica. Cold war: international politics. 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War>

⁵ Dictionary of Unfamiliar Words by Diagram Group. Diagram Visual Information Limited. 2008.

⁶ American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Copyright © 2016 by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. Published by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Wikipedia. Games theory.

⁷ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zero-sum_game Company. Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary. 2010 K Dictionaries Ltd. Copyright 2005, 1997, 1991 by Random House, Inc

³ Efanodor H. O. *Theories of International Relations*. 2017. Retrieved on 13/01/2020 from: https://www.eduniversity.edu.ng/oer/lecturenotes/theories_of_international_relations

military, and military action against the tense wars involving the common military forces is achieved to achieve national goals.⁸

Disarmament

Disarmament has been described by different scholars in different ways. Disarmament to some is the complete elimination of all weapons, as encouraged by scholars and occasionally by the government; and to reduce and limit national weapons in accordance with international agreements via international forums such as the League of Nations, in the past, and the United Nations, in the present.⁹ This definition gave credence to the advice of scholars, thinkers and government agencies on armament and the need for non-proliferation. Disarmament also refers to the reduction or limitation of size, equipment, weapons, etc., of the military, navy, or air force.¹⁰ This definition is not far from the first, but it dwells specifically on the reduction of conventional forces like the army, navy and the air force. Disarmament simply means an act of laying down arms, especially reducing or eliminating military forces and national weapons.¹¹

It is the process of plummeting, limiting, or abolishing munitions. It is largely referring to a nation's military or particular kind of weapons.

It is often taken to intend general elimination of weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear arms.

Disarmament is defined by the United Nations general assembly as the elimination of all WMD, coupled with the:

balanced reduction of armed forces and conventional armaments, based on the principle of undiminished security of the parties with a view to promoting or enhancing stability at a lower military level, taking into account the need of all States to protect their security.....has become a necessity for the survival of mankind and for the elimination of the danger of nuclear war.¹²

Therefore, disarmament is the act of reducing, limiting, or eliminating weapons. Disarmament is often viewed as a signal of complete annihilation of weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear weapons. Normal and complete disarmament means the removal of all weapons, including standard arms.¹³

Theoretical Framework

Game theory studies ways in which interacting choices of economic agents produce outcomes with respect to the references (or utilities) of those agents, where the outcomes in question might have been intended by none of the agents.¹⁴

The origin of the game's theory emanated from the writings of John Von Neumann. Games theory did not really exist as a unique field until John von Neumann published the paper on the Theory of Games of Strategy

⁸ Dictionary of military and associated terms. US department of defense. 2005.

⁹ The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. Disarmament: military policy. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/disarmament>

¹⁰ Dictionary.com. Disarmament. 2020.

www.dictionary.com/browse/disarmament

¹¹ The Free Dictionary. Disarmament. 2020. www.thefreedictionary.com/disarmament

¹² United Nations. Disarmament. Resolutions and Decisions adopted by the General Assembly during its Tenth Special Session 23 May - 30 June 1978. New York. www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/SSOD/A-S-10-4.pdf

¹³ Definitions. Disarmament. 2020.

www.definitions.net/definition/disarmament

¹⁴ Stanford encyclopedia. Games theory. First published Sat Jan 25, 1997; substantive revision Fri Mar 8, 2019. plato.stanford.edu/entries/game-theory/

in 1928.¹⁵ Von Neumann's original point used Brouwer's fixed-point theorem on continuous mappings into compact convex sets, which became a standard method in game theory and mathematical economics. His paper was followed by his 1944 book *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* co-authored with Oskar Morgenstern.¹⁶

The second edition of this book provided an axiomatic theory of utility, which reincarnated Daniel Bernoulli's old theory of utility (of money) as an independent discipline. Von Neumann's work in game theory culminated in this 1944 book. This foundational work contains the method for finding mutually consistent solutions for two-person zero-sum games. Subsequent work focused primarily on cooperative game theory, which analyzes optimal strategies for groups of individuals, assuming that they can enforce agreements between them about proper strategies.¹⁷ Games theory experienced a flurry of activity in the 1950s, during which the concepts of the core, the extensive form game, fictitious play, repeated games, and the Shapley value were developed. The 1950s also saw the first applications of game theory to philosophy and political science. It has since been used to analyze interaction between states in the international relations. The Nash equilibrium, named after the mathematician John Forbes Nash Jr., is the most common way to define the solution of a non-cooperative game involving two or more players. In a Nash

equilibrium, each player is assumed to know the equilibrium strategies of the other players and no player has anything to gain by changing only their own strategy.¹⁸

The nuclear stand-off between the superpowers during the Cold War was intensively studied by the first generation of game theorists, many of whom received direct or indirect funding support from the US military. Recently, a more skeptically alert and professionally historical study has been produced¹⁹ which provides scholarly context for the still more hair-raising memoir of a pioneer of applied game theory, participant in the development of Cold War nuclear strategy, and famous leaker of the Pentagon's secret files on the Vietnam War, Daniel Ellsberg.²⁰

They are two major kind of games theory. The non-zero-sum and the zero-sum, or strictly competitive. The non-zero-sum games implies that in any form of interaction between states, it is a win-win situation. The zero-sum game on the other part means every gain in expected utility by one player represents a precisely symmetrical loss by the other.²¹ This work is based on the Zero sum games theory of international relations. The zero-sum game is an idea from a game perspective. It derives its many uses in economic and political terms. In a zero-sum game, the benefits of one person result in the loss of another person (s) by the same amount. The net change for

¹⁵ Neumann, John von "On the Theory of Games of Strategy". In Tucker, A. W.; Luce, R. D. (eds.), *Contributions to the Theory of Games*. 1959. p. 13-42. ISBN 0-691-07937-4.

¹⁶ Mirowski, Philip "What Were von Neumann and Morgenstern Trying to Accomplish?". In Weintraub, E. Roy (ed.), *Toward a History of Game Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press. 1992. pp. 113-147. ISBN 978-0-8223-1253-6.

¹⁷ Leonard, Robert. *Von Neumann, Morgenstern, and the Creation of Game Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2010. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511778278. ISBN 978-0-521-56266-9.

¹⁸ Osborne, Martin J.; Rubinstein, Ariel. *A Course in Game Theory*. Cambridge, MA: MIT. 1994. p. 14.

¹⁹ Amadee, S. *Prisoners of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2016.

²⁰ Ellsberg, D. *The Doomsday Machine*. New York: Bloomsbury. 2017.

²¹ Stanford encyclopedia. Games theory. First published Sat Jan 25, 1997; substantive revision Fri Mar 8, 2019. plato.stanford.edu/entries/game-theory/

everyone involved is zero and no wealth is made or destroyed during practice.²²

A decision-making approach is based on the assumption of characterization of the character in a competitive environment. Each character tries to maximize profits or reduce losses under uncertain conditions and incomplete information, which requires each character to set order preferences, weigh the possibilities, and try to see what the other player will do. In a two-person zero-sum game, what one character wins, the other throw away; if A wins, B loses 5, and the sum is zero.²³

Zero-sum is a situation in the concept of a game where the profit of one person is equal to the loss of another, so the change in wealth or profit is zero. A zero-sum game can have a few or two players or more participants. In the financial markets, options and futures are examples of zero-sum games, apart from transaction costs. For everyone who benefits from a contract, there is an opposition party.²⁴ A zero-sum asset (if one gains, another loses) means that any result of the zero-sum condition is correct in Pareto. Generally, any game in which all Pareto's strategy is right is called a battle game.²⁵

The idea of Pareto's optimum remuneration in a zero-sum game raises the standard of selfishness, the penalty-resistance ratio, where both players always seek to reduce the opponent's pay at a desirable cost to him rather than a lesser choice. A punishment-opponent

level can be applied to zero-sum games (e.g. war game, chess).²⁶

If the full benefits of the participants are added and the amount of the loss is deducted, it will be zero. Therefore, cutting a cake, where taking a larger piece reduces the amount of cake available to others as it increases the available value of the giver, a zero-sum game if all participants measure each cake unit equally.²⁷

Zero-sum games can have a number of players, however, as long as the important explanation remains true: profits and losses between all players must be zero.²⁸ The Cold War nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union is an example of a 20th-century Zero sum games theory. The US use of nuclear weapons to end World War II led to a determined and soon successful effort by the Soviet Union to acquire such weapons, followed by a long-running nuclear arms race between the two superpowers. Arms races involve a more general competitive acquisition of military capability. This is often measured by military expenditure. This was observed among countries engaged in enduring rivalries, which may sometimes appear to follow each other's military spending levels, especially during periods of heightened tension.²⁹

In the games theory, each country has a choice between a high or low level of arms. Each country's most-preferred outcome is assumed to be where they choose high arms and their rivals low, gaining a clear military advantage. Their least-preferred outcome is the reverse.

²² Reed E. What Is a Zero Sum Game and Why Is It Important in 2019? The Street. <https://www.thestreet.com/politics/what-is-a-zero-sum-game-14818535>

²³ Allan, P and Schmidt, C. eds. *Game Theory and International Relations: Preferences, Information, and Empirical Evidence*. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1994; Viotti, P. and M. Kauppi, eds. *International Relations Theory*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1987.

²⁴ Kerton, W. Zero-Sum Game. Investopedia. 2020. www.investopedia.com/terms/z/zero-sum-game.asp

²⁵ Bowles, S. *Microeconomics: Behavior, Institutions, and Evolution*. Princeton University Press. 2004. pp. 33–36. ISBN 0-691-09163-3.

²⁶ Wang, W. Pooling Game Theory and Public Pension Plan. 2015. ISBN 978-1507658246. Chapter 1 and Chapter 4.

²⁷ Wikipedia. Games theory. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zero-sum_game

²⁸ Reed E. What Is a Zero Sum Game and Why Is It Important in 2019? The Street. <https://www.thestreet.com/politics/what-is-a-zero-sum-game-14818535>

²⁹ Sam Perlo-Freeman. "Arms Race." *Encyclopedia Britannica*. 2020. www.britannica.com/topic/arms-race

However, the second best outcome for each is where both choose low; if no advantage is gained, it is assumed to be cheaper and more secure to avoid the arms race. However, in the case of the United States and the Soviet Union, each player's "dominant strategy" was to choose high arms, as whichever choice the rival has made, they do better by choosing high than low. This outcome illustrates the Nash equilibrium — named after American mathematician and economics Nobelist John F. Nash—in which each player has chosen the optimal strategy in a noncooperative situation or Zero-Sumgame (compare positive-sum game), given the other player's strategy.³⁰

Arms Build-up During the Cold War and the Politics of Disarmament (1945-1960)

During the second half of the 20th century, these two superpowers United States and the Soviet Union competed for the development and accumulation of nuclear weapons. Four years after the U.S. successfully launched the first bomb, the Soviets built their own. By blocking the core of foreign policy, both sides have worked to increase their arm stock. This has led to the U.S. spending \$ 6 billion during the cold war on its nuclear weapons program, which contains tens of thousands of nuclear warheads, while Russia had only a small amount.³¹

Although the arms race was designed to increase the security of each empire, it retreated in many cases. For example, in the 1950s, the Soviets issued nuclear threats to Western allies, including the British and French during the Suez disaster.³² Tensions

were high, and as a result, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962, was a turning point in history when two nations rush to collect the world's most dangerous weapon: the nuclear bomb.³³

The political and economic beliefs of the USA and the Soviet Union sparked the Cold War. NATO and the Warsaw Pact were established. Both competed in the arms race and both sides competed for more nuclear weapons than the other. They also try to make their weapons more powerful. Each side aims to achieve the potential for a first strike. This was, for example, the USA's ability to reduce all nuclear power in the USSR before they re-launched nuclear weapons back in the USA. Because of the secrecy surrounding the number of nuclear weapons in general, both countries believe that one was at a crossroads. The USA believes that there was a 'Missile Gap' in the 1950s and greatly increased spending to try to achieve that. And on the part of the Soviet Union, spending on weapons also increased.

In summary, the annual weapon development between the two nuclear powers shows that in 1949 the USSR tested its first atomic bomb. This was followed in 1952 with the USA tests of its first hydrogen bomb while in 1953 the USSR tested its first hydrogen bomb. While in 1957 the USSR had its first intercontinental ballistic missile test, the USA had its first arch of the American continent test in the same year.

By the end of the 1950s, more than 300 nuclear tests had been conducted, mostly in the air.³⁴ The aim was not just to assemble more

³⁰ Sam Perlo-Freeman, "Arms Race," <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009050000.003>

³¹ Chyba, C. F. "Moving Toward Security," *Science*, **317**, 5838, (2007)

³² Gavin, F. J. "Same as It Ever Was: Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War," *Int. Security*, **34**, 3, (2009).

³³ Nick, M. Nuclear Arms Race During the Cold War, 2017. Submitted as coursework for PH241, Stanford University, Winter 2017. <http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2017/ph241/nick2/>

³⁴ Hudson, K. 60 years ago, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was founded. Here's what we've achieved over the decades. CND. 2018.

weapons than the other side, but to establish more efficient systems. The first atom bombs were introduced, but these could be slow and dangerous and would have to have air buses deployed around the world. The introduction of nuclear heads by missiles became a reality in the 1960s, with intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and intermediate ballistic missiles (IRBM). Both the USSR and the USA launched missile technology that could launch rockets into space. This opened up new opportunities for the delivery of nuclear weapons.³⁵ With the advent of weapons, they may have been better equipped to start wars, rather than prevent them.

In 1948, the UK government announced that Britain would build the next nuclear weapon and detonated its first bomb in 1952. In the mid-1950s, there was a rising tide of anti-nuclear propaganda and public concern was mounting which led to the emergence of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND). The core of the CND foundation took place in November 1957, when author JB Priestley wrote an article for *New Statesman* calling for the development of both weapons.³⁶ During the cold war, the campaign against nuclear disarmament was carried out by, The Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) and International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace, but the activities of CND were more pronounced and global. Realizing the importance of politics, the founders, thought it wise to go political because through that, they could achieve their aim quickly. The CND became the largest and

most common political movement associated with two waves of massive violence against British nuclear weapons, blocking American nuclear facilities in Britain during the late 1950s. They participated in protests and demonstrations organized by the Subcommittee on Human Rights. The 1958 Easter March to the Aldermaston nuclear power plant in Berkshire attracted 10,000 supporters and in 1959 and 1960 saw numbers close to 100,000.³⁷ This led to the subsequent action on disarmament.

The Politics of Disarmament, the Non-Proliferation Treaty (1960-1990)

The fear of weapons of mass destruction and campaigns to stem nuclear proliferation prompted nations to seek arms control. The mandate of the non-proliferation treaty was enshrined in the UN General Assembly sponsored by Ireland in 1961, considering a simple agreement between the nuclear-armed nations (which would promise not to pass their arm, or help others to build) and non-nuclear-armed nations (which would promise not to receive weapons, or build their own).³⁸ In practice, however, critical negotiations on a non-proliferation treaty could not begin until the superpowers pledged to follow one. It mandated mutual US-USSR dialogues to kill off plans for a NATO multilateral nuclear force (MLF), whereas leaving in place NATO's existing nuclear arrangements - a very critical process that was not completed until the end of 1966.³⁹ As soon as the superpowers were on board, the next task was to build a treaty that would be fundamentally acceptable to their

<https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/campaign-nuclear-disarmament-cnd-weapons-trident-cold-war-hydrogen-bomb-a8215281.html>

³⁵ Bbc. Reasons for the emergence of the Cold War. 2020.

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zfwydm/revision/9>

³⁶ Priestley, J. B. Britain and the Nuclear Bombs. *Newstatesman*. 2007. <https://www.newstatesman.com/society/2007/02/nuclear-world-britain-power>

³⁷ Cannon, J. Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. *encyclopedia.com*. 2019. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law/political-science-and-government/political-parties-and-movements/campaign-nuclear-disarmament>

³⁸ UN General Assembly Resolution 1665(XVI), 4 December 1961.

³⁹ Brands, H. 'Non-Proliferation and the Dynamics of the Middle Cold War: The Superpowers, the MLF, and the NPT', *Cold War History*, 7:3 (2007).

various blocks - a much harder task for the United States than in the Soviet Union, for obvious reasons. private negotiations began in late 1966; in August 1967 they were able to present the same frameworks for drafts of a non-proliferation treaty to the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC). In the final draft, article VI is the most striking and brought to the full glare the double standard of the United States and the reality of the politics of disarmament.⁴⁰ Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) states:

Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.⁴¹

Article VI of the non-proliferation treaty is the product of a coalition between the two political realities at the heart of the NPT 'negotiation'. First, it allows some states to possess nuclear weapons while preventing others from doing so is fundamentally unfair. Second, it does not specify the steps to be taken to achieve disarmament, nor does it set a deadline for any action to be taken - except for the general desire to end the 'arms race' as early as possible.⁴² The implication of these twin facts is that NPT remains (in many countries, most of the time) a great deal better than nothing. As many have pointed out, without the introduction of Article VI it would have been very difficult, and perhaps not possible, to

effectively negotiate a non-proliferation treaty that a sufficient number of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons would be signed.⁴³ What this mean is that this part of the treaty (article VI) was accepted because most countries had no other choice.

It was also agreed during the negotiations that the obligation of non-proliferation could not be made subject to the implementation of certain anti-weapons measures. As Christopher Ford, among others, aptly put it, such 'communications' are apparently tried and rejected.⁴⁴ Both India and Sweden proposed versions of the 'package agreement' in which non-proliferation obligations will be bound to the agreement on specific arms and weapons control measures, including negotiation of the fissile material cut-off treaty (FMCT) and a comprehensive test ban treaty (CTBT), as well as mutual arms control.⁴⁵ The United States, the United Kingdom, and the USSR make it clear, however, that persistence in these measures could undermine the non-proliferation agreement. This was a real political issue that was visible to all players in the negotiations whether they liked it or not. Jorge Castañeda makes it clear:

To stipulate that the non-proliferation treaty should include specific disarmament measures to be implemented by the nuclear powers in the immediate future would be tantamount to opposing the very existence of a nonproliferation treaty.⁴⁶

Accepting the NPT, in other words, meant acknowledging that the value of non-

⁴⁰ Harries, M. "International Security, Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI." *The Royal Institute of International Affairs Chatham House*. London, 2015. Chathamhouse.org

⁴¹ ENDC. Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Article VI.

⁴² Harries. "International Security, Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI."

⁴³ Dunn, L.A. "The NPT: Assessing the Past, Building the Future", *Nonproliferation Review* 16:2 (July 2009), p. 160.

⁴⁴ Ford, C. "Debating Disarmament: Interpreting Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons", *Nonproliferation Review* 14:3 (November 2007), pp. 405-6.

⁴⁵ Harries. "International Security, Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI....."

⁴⁶ ENDC/PV.331, paras.18.

proliferation was so high that it was inappropriate to hold a treaty agreement with specific arms control and disarmament measures. The United States and the United Kingdom argued that the agreement was intended to form part of a comprehensive arms control framework and that the inequality in the context of the agreement was not intended to be permanent. The common restraint during the ENDC negotiations, which was heard in both nuclear and non-nuclear weapons is similarly stated, that the NPT was 'not the end of itself'.⁴⁷

The NPT period was set at 25 years. The first limit of the NPT period was 25 years and was somehow a valve of political pressure, which allows for the 'sacrifice' of non-nuclear weapons that the treaty has at least some conditional requirements.⁴⁸ The valve was closed in 1995, further exacerbating NPT's inherent instability. The result was the turning of the political crisis into a permanent state of affairs.⁴⁹ This makes it even more important for nuclear weapons states to find ways to avoid reinforcing the idea that NPT is a tool to permanently stabilize the division of the world into nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. The NPT can only be implemented if the basic law for the purpose of a nuclear-free state is maintained, but that seems unlikely because the agreement was only political and seemed to have been hijacked by NATO.

One way to understand the disarmament debate in the NPT era, then, is pure politics. Negotiation was a game played by nuclear

weapons against non-nuclear-weapon nations. Japan, Italy, and other Western countries, which, in consultation with the United States, have accepted the difficulty of agreeing on disarmament measures as part of the NPT itself, but still want a full political commitment to reducing arms to recognize the sacrifice on the side of non-nuclear weapons. The only politically reasonable outlining for a plan in which nations forswear the nuclear option - even if they intend to pursue it - is one based on a commitment to the future goal of combating nuclear weapons, which was completely non-existent. Harries states that Western states vocal about non-proliferation, they were pushing the United States to provide nuclear guarantees. According to Harries:

Then, the political demands of the treaty bargain clashed with the hard demands of strategy. West Germany, for example, was simultaneously agitating for disarmament commitments while pressing the United States into allowing it a greater say in the nuclear defence of NATO. Japan, similarly, while pushing the superpowers to make clear their commitment to disarmament in the text of the NPT, was negotiating with the United States over the parameters of extended deterrence. The same tension exists today, as NATO members confront the dilemma of an NPT process in which the political dynamic leads them to push for alternative routes to nuclear disarmament, while in the realm of security policy they are engaged in NATO discussion over the appropriate mix of conventional and nuclear forces required to deter an increasingly assertive Russia.⁵⁰

⁴⁷ United Kingdom (ENDC/PV.326, para.54); USSR (ENDC/PV.325, para.43); Burma (ENDC/PV.337, para.15); Ethiopia (ENDC/PV.323, para.13)

⁴⁸ Shaker, M. *The Non-Proliferation Treaty*, Vol. II, p. 858

⁴⁹ Harries, "International Security, Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI."

⁵⁰ Harries, M. "International Security, Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI."

The above shows clearly that, the signing of the non-proliferation treaty by NATO and capitalist nations was just a charade and a high wire politics to cage the NNWS state and the communist states from possessing nuclear weapon.

The Politics of Disarmament, the US Double Standard Stance (1990-2020)

This is obvious in the politics of disarmament today. The United States is seen as the major campaigner against nuclear proliferation in the world. However, this campaign is majorly against non-NATO nations and her non-allies, especially the communist states like North Korea in Asia and Iraq and Iran in the Middle East who are the major foes of her main ally in the Middle East, Israel. South Korea possesses some level of nuclear missile and Israel also possess a high level of a nuclear weapon. However, the United States of America has not deemed it fit to police Israel in the Middle East and South Korea in Asia, but ought to fight Iraq, Iran in the Middle East, and North Korea in Asia against arms build-up. Since World War II, Japan has become a nuclear power, and it has been said that it could be "turning screws" on nuclear weapons, powerful weapons, knowledge, and materials to build a nuclear bomb. However, Japan has always avoided any desire to have nuclear weapons.⁵¹

However, in 1982, scientists at the South Korean Atomic Energy Research Institute conducted a study in which they released several milligrams of plutonium. Instead of the United States condemning the practice, she insisted that South Korea does not attempt to reconstruct plutonium by any means. In

exchange, the US agreed to transfer reactor technology and provide financial assistance to South Korea's nuclear power program. It was revealed in 2004 that some South Korean scientists continued certain studies. For example, in 1983 and 1984 the Korea Atomic Energy Research Institute conducted chemical research into the management of recyclable fuel.⁵² Later, in a study at the same facility in 2000, scientists recommended 200 milligrams of uranium at a nearby weapons range (up to 77 percent) using laser enrichment.⁵³ The South Korean government said the study was conducted without his knowledge.⁵⁴ While 77% of enriched uranium is usually not considered a weapon, the research could be used to develop a nuclear weapon.⁵⁵ An HEU with 20% or more purity is applicable to the weapon,⁵⁶ this event and previous plutonium emissions were not reported to the IAEA until the end of 2004.⁵⁷

The above position of the United States made China and Russia play a spoiler role and protect North Korea, and Iran who are her main allies in Asia and Middle East respectively. For over three decades, U.S. foreign policy concern has been a global nonproliferation regime, but it has not yielded any reasonable result mostly due to the actions of China and Russia.

In terms of negotiations, the constant challenge has been to coordinate the US position on North Korean policy and that of other key regional actors. Although China opposes North

⁵¹ Wikia. Japan and weapons of mass destruction 2014. military.wikia.org/wiki/Japan_and_weapons_of_mass_destruction?~:text=Beginning%20in%20the%20mid-

⁵² Kang, J. "South Korea's Nuclear Surprise". Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. January 1, 2005.

⁵³ "Washington Post: Breaking News, World, US, DC News & Analysis" www.washingtonpost.com

⁵⁴ Barbara Demick, "South Korea experimented with highly enriched uranium / Incident could complicate arms talks with North", *Los Angeles Times*. www.sfgate.com/politics/article/South-Korea-experimented-with-highly-enriched-2728185.php

⁵⁵ Federation of American Scientists: Uranium Production Archived 2016-07-12 at the Wayback Machine. fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/uranium.htm

⁵⁶ Kang, et al. "South Korea's Nuclear Surprise".

⁵⁷ Barbara Demick, "South Korea experimented with highly enriched uranium

Korea's nuclear program and has voted in favor of a number of UN sanctions, Beijing has claimed to generally prioritized stability on the Korean Peninsula over denuclearization, and - especially before 2017 - has done little to enforce sanctions. South Korea's approach to North Korea has changed as the progressives and the hawkish alternate in power, and the policy preferences of Seoul and Washington have been at odds on important occasions. Japan's policy direction towards North Korea has often been in line with that of the U.S., but Tokyo's focus on tackling the decades-long captivity of its people by North Korea has at times contradicted the prioritization of nuclear issues in Washington. Russia has played less of a role in the Korean Peninsula than any other group but has sought to retain its seat and has at times threatened to undermine international efforts intended to suppress North Korea.⁵⁸

The United States has blamed China for North Korea's tough negotiations, saying China "helping with the process of denuclearisation as they once were," and has tied failed nuclear talks with Pyongyang in rising trade tensions with Beijing.⁵⁹ While there is no clear evidence that North Korea's resistance to negotiations was directly encouraged by Beijing, China-North Korea's relations were very smooth in the spring of 2018, with the leaders of both countries meeting three times from March to June. Anecdotal reports have suggested that China's imposition of sanctions against North Korea has slowed down after the talks. Russia and North Korea's romance increased after Pyongyang's diplomatic attack.⁶⁰

Prior to 2015 efforts, the United States participated in four formal nuclear and missile negotiations with North Korea: The Bilateral Agreed Framework (1994-2002), the bilateral missile negotiations (1996-2000), Six-Party Talks (2003- 2009), and the bilateral Leap Day Deal (2012). In general, the proposed formula for these negotiations was for North Korea to suspend, and in some cases paralyze, its nuclear programs or missiles to restore economic and communication cohesion.⁶¹

U.S. policy of economic and political sanctions on North Korea depends heavily on China. In addition to being North Korea's largest trading partner, accounting for more than 90% of North Korea's total trade since 2015 China also provides food aid and energy which are important support for the state and is one of Pyongyang's few political partners. Even while China feigns not to support Pyongyang's nuclear ambitions and also votes for the growing UNSC sanctions and appears to be maintaining stability in the Korean Peninsula, thus preventing the collapse of North Korea, all are political gimmicks to tone down bellicose political rhetorics. Because Beijing's fears of the catastrophic effects of a social catastrophe, the high number of refugees fleeing its borders, and the uncertainty of how other nations, especially the United States, will survive on the peninsula in the event of a power outage. China also sees the importance of North Korea's strategic position as a "distraction" between China and democracy and South Korea allied with the U.S.⁶²

⁵⁸ Wertz, D. Issue Brief: The U.S., North Korea, and Nuclear Diplomacy. 2018. The National Committee on North Korea (NCNK). www.ncnk.org

⁵⁹ Donald J. Trump, Twitter Post, August 24, 2018, 2:36 PM, <https://twitter.com/realDonaldTrump/status/1033045273361178624>

⁶⁰ Wertz, Issue Brief: The U.S., North Korea, and Nuclear Diplomacy.

⁶¹ Congressional Research Service. North Korea: U.S. Relations, Nuclear Diplomacy.

⁶² Derek Grossman, "China's Reluctance on Sanctions Enforcement in North Korea," Rand Corporation, January 3, 2018; U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 2017 Annual Report to Congress, November 15, 2017, pp. 333-338; Kent Boydston, "How Good is China at Sanctions Enforcement?" Peterson Institute for International Economics, May 5, 2017, at <https://piie.com/blogs/north-korea-witness-transformation/howgood-china-sanctions-enforcement>.

Beijing has often been an obstacle to U.S. policy goals, About North Korea. The imposition of severe sanctions on North Korea on international organizations, such as the U.N., is often blocked by China's seat at the UNSC, where Beijing often slows U.S. efforts. Punishment is North Korea. Chinese companies are often found to be violating sanctions against North Korea, and Chinese government sanctions have been unequal, with authorities often ignoring the violations.⁶³

However, according to many indicators, China in 2017 significantly increased its enforcement of UNSC sanctions, perhaps to convince the United States not to follow the Trump Administration's threats of a military strike against North Korea. In addition, Chinese trade and aid to North Korea are thought to be part of what would happen if Beijing decided to fully support North Korea, which may be due to Beijing's desire to emerge from the international community as a responsible leader instead of a powerful state aide. This thinking is an important factor driving the US and South Korean approach, which seeks to avoid advancing China when it feels compelled to provide more economic and diplomatic assistance to North Korea.⁶⁴

In the Middle East, the United States double standard is also pellucid. Iran's possible acquisition of nuclear weapons is now a major problem to NATO countries, as they believe it will seriously undermine regional power and increase regional arms races, let alone

undermine NPT's credibility with Iran's nuclear weapons capability.

Indeed, Iran's nuclear ambitions are one of the few issues that now form the transatlantic agreement, even if the strategies are different. Compared to Europeans, the United States considers sanctions against Iran extremely high and chooses a shorter timeline to place them if Iran does not comply with IAEA requirements. Both sides agree that Iran cannot be allowed to build its own nuclear fuel cycle, which would allow Iran to produce enough material to make weapons with a small fleet in a short period of time.

Political efforts to resolve Iran's nuclear challenge could only intensify if other regional groups, especially Israelis, often supported by the United States take steps to increase the non-proliferation agenda and improve security in the region. Suspicions of double standards should be examined in the context of the current threat to Israel and the belief that nuclear weapons provide a significant barrier to the protection of any threat. Iran's recent deployment of its Shahab-3 missiles, which are accessible to Israel and covered with banners calling for the destruction of Israel, only contributes to this security perspective, even though Iran's nuclear ambitions are complex and transcend the Israeli factor.⁶⁵

However, the perception among Arab groups and other developing countries that Westerners use double standards when it comes to discriminating against "acceptable" and "unacceptable" is real and needs to be taken into account. The US focus on Iran's nuclear threat to Bush's non-compliance with

⁶³ Congressional Research Service. North Korea: U.S. Relations, Nuclear Diplomacy,

⁶⁴ Dalia Dassa Kaye. Time for Arms Talks? Iran, Israel, and Middle East Arms Control. Arms control association. <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004-11/iran-nuclear-briefs/time-arms-talks-iran-israel-middle-east-arms-control>

⁶⁵ Takeyh, R. "Iran's Nuclear Calculations," *World Policy Journal* 20, no. 2 (Summer 2003).

international arms control agreements such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) has only reinforced this notion of double standards.⁶⁶

Israel imagined itself in a permanent battle for survival. It has established a national system that emphasizes its military and intelligence capabilities. From the beginning, Israel has developed world-class technology, especially in bringing fear and terror to any potential enemy. In the first half of its rule, Israel had shared the support of the United States, as its protector and military supplier, and Shah's Iran. When the violent Saddam Hussein took power in Iraq, both the Shah and Israel often cooperated in the use of technology, in the US and Israel. According to Aljazeera:

There is documented evidence that Israel supplied Iran with communications equipment and the supporting paraphernalia needed to allow both countries (and probably the US Central Intelligence Agency) to eavesdrop on Iraq.⁶⁷

The Iranian Revolution changed all that and since 1980, Israel and Iran have been divided. It is far from over, in fact, that there is a real danger of armed conflict between the two countries. What makes the world sit down is the fact that Israel is a nuclear power with delivery plans that could reach Iran - and Iran, according to Aljazeera, has only two years left to go on a nuclear strike. Aljazeera believes that Iran will be able to produce nuclear weapons in the next few months. For Jordan, Iraq, and Saudi Arabia - as well as the Gulf states - this is particularly troubling as any

arrows with nuclear weapons can fly high no matter who opens them.

In addition, Israel has a complex and tested missile program called Arrow, which could trigger Iran's first possible strike. The problem with Israeli neighbors is not technology but where the rubble could fall if Arrow was never used,⁶⁸ and no international law enforcement action was taken against Israel. Enforcement of treaties and agreements regarding weapons of mass destruction is being used by organizations such as the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Association (IAEA), and the economic and military powers of other countries. For example, fear of the storage of chemical and/or biological weapons in Iraq was the main reason for the war in Iraq in the 2000s, led by the U.S. government. In some cases, crippling barriers have been imposed on countries that try to build weapons of mass destruction, such as North Korea,⁶⁹ but Israel remains untouched because it has the United States as its allies.

Conclusion and Recommendation

From the above discussion, it is germane to note that, the non-proliferation treaty which ought to be the main norm for nuclear disarmament and arms proliferation failed even before it was signed because article six of the treaty provision was skewed in favour of the superpowers and the nuclear states against weak states and the non-nuclear states and the United States of America who claim to be the policeman of the world and number one campaigner against nuclear arms proliferation has maintained a double standard of allowing her allies to possess weapons of mass

⁶⁶ Kaye, D.D. Time for Arms Talks? Iran, Israel, and Middle East Arms Control.

⁶⁷ Aljazeera. Iran in arms race with Israel: Military analyst says there is a real risk of armed conflict between Tehran and Tel Aviv. 2009. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2009/8/6/iran-in-arms-race-with-israel>

⁶⁸ Aljazeera. Iran in arms race with Israel: Military analyst says there is a real risk of armed conflict.

⁶⁹ Hgkpl. WMD Law - Weapons of Mass Destruction Law. 2020. www.hgkpl.org/weapons-mass-destruction.html

destruction and fighting to stop non-ally nations who strive to possess weapons of mass destruction.

It is obvious that, the politics of nuclear disarmament is the continuation of the Cold War because while the United States of America is taking the fight to communist nations producing nuclear weapons and mostly allies of China and Russia, China and Russia have also taken necessary steps to shield their allies and maintain communist sphere of influence. For the fight against weapons of mass destruction to be fruitful, the norm, evaluation, and monitoring process must be the same for all parties to the treaty and they should set a clear time frame within which any actions must be completed.

Certain steps can be taken to improve disarmament. Regionally, the United States should encourage its Israeli counterpart to join the non-proliferation agreement. Israel could move forward with other arms control measures, such as ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and CTBT

(building on its recent signing of a property agreement with the CTBT Organization) and joining the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC). At any Review Conference, Israel can also confirm its commitment to join the NPT in the future unconditionally. The United States should encourage Israel to take these steps by providing assurances that political reforms in regional arms control will go beyond the actual focus of installing a comprehensive plan to transforming the region's security and political relations in the region.

In addition, because one cannot separate nuclear weapons control from other weapons of mass destruction in the Middle East, a complete method is essential if arms control is to be a serious endeavor in the region. In particular, Egypt and Syria should be encouraged to join the CWC. While Syria is unlikely to move forward with the CWC until Israel's stance on the NPT changes, Syria may take other non-proliferation measures, such as securing the BWC and CTBT and registering for The Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation.

Bibliography

Books

Amadae, S. *Prisoners of Reason*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2016.

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company. 2016.

Allan, P and Schmidt, C. eds. *Game Theory and International Relations: Preferences, Information, and Empirical Evidence*. Brookfield, VT: Edward Elgar, 1994.

Belios, R, S. and Heartly, R.S (Eds). *The Growth of Regional Trading bloc in Global Economy*. Washington, D.C. National Planning Association. 1990.

Bowles, S. *Microeconomics: Behavior, Institutions, and Evolution*. Princeton University Press. 2004. pp. 33–36.

- Brands, H. 'Non-Proliferation and the Dynamics of the Middle Cold War: The Superpowers, the MLF, and the NPT', *Cold War History*, 7:3. 2007.
- Chyba, C. F "Moving Toward Security," *Science*. 2007. Pp. 317-5838.
- David E. B. and Rose, R. *The British General Election of 1959* (1960)
- Derek Grossman, "China's Reluctance on Sanctions Enforcement in North Korea," Rand Corporation, January 3, 2018; *U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, 2017 Annual Report to Congress*. November 15, 2017, pp. 333-338;
- Dictionary of military and associated terms. US department of defense. 2005.
- Dunn, L.A. 'The NPT: Assessing the Past, Building the Future', *Nonproliferation Review* 16:2 (July 2009), p. 160
- Ellsberg, D. *The Doomsday Machine*. New York: Bloomsbury. 2017.
- ENDC. Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Article VI.
- ENDC. Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Article VI. /PV.331, paras.18.
- Erickson, P. *The World the Game Theorists Made*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 2015.
- Ford, C. 'Debating Disarmament: Interpreting Article VI of the Treaty on the Non-2010 K Dictionaries Ltd. Copyright 2005, 1997, 1991 by Random House, Inc
- Shaker, M. The Non-Proliferation Treaty, Vol. II, p. 858
- UN General Assembly Resolution 1665(XVI), 4 December 1961.
- Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons', *Nonproliferation Review* 14:3. 2007. pp. 405-6.
- Gavin, F. J. "Same as It Ever Was: Nuclear Alarmism, Proliferation, and the Cold War," *Int. Security*, 34, 3, 2009.
- Harries, M. "International Security. Disarmament as Politics: Lessons from the Negotiation of NPT Article VI." *The Royal Institute of International Affairs Chatham House*. London. 2015. Chathamhouse.org
- Harrison, R.S. *Irish Anti-War Movements*. Dublin: Irish Peace 1986. pp. 59-61.
- Kavanagh, D. *The Politics of the Labour Party*, Routledge, 2013.
- Kang, J et al. "South Korea's Nuclear Surprise¹ⁿ", *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. January 1, 2005.
- Mirowski, Philip "What Were von Neumann and Morgenstern Trying to Accomplish?". In Weintraub, E. Roy (ed.). *Toward a History of Game Theory*. Durham: Duke University Press. 1992. pp. 113-147. ISBN 978-0-8223-1253-6.
- Mondale, W. F. "Building a Safer World." *Arms Control Today*, 14, 1, (1984).
- Neumann, John von "On the Theory of Games of Strategy". In Tucker, A. W.; Luce, R. D. (eds.). *Contributions to the Theory of Games*. 1959. 4. pp. 13-42. ISBN 0-691-07937-4.
- Random House Kernerman Webster's College Dictionary.
- United Kingdom (ENDC/PV.326, para.54); USSR (ENDC/PV.325, para.43); Burma (ENDC/PV.337, para.15), Ethiopia (ENDC/PV.323, para.13) Wenliang Wang. *Pooling Game Theory and Public Pension Plan*. 2015. ISBN 978-1507658246. Chapter 1 and Chapter 4.

Online Material

- Bbc. Reasons for the emergence of the Cold War. 2020. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/bitesize/guides/zf-wydcn/revision/9>
- Cannon, J. Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. encyclopedia.com. 2019. <https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law/political-science-and-government/political-parties-and-movements/campaign-nuclear-disarmament>
- Congressional Research Service. North Korea: U.S. Relations, Nuclear Diplomacy, and Internal Situation. 2018. www.crs.org
- Daniel Wertz. Issue Brief: The U.S., North Korea, and Nuclear Diplomacy. 2018. The National Committee on North Korea (NCNK). www.ncnk.org
- Definitions. Disarmament. 2020. www.definitions.net/definition/disarmament
- Demick, B. South Korea experimented with highly enriched uranium / Incident could complicate arms talks with North". *Los Angeles Times*. www.sfgate.com/politics/article/South-Korea-experimented-with-highly-enriched-2728185.php
- Dictionary of Unfamiliar Words by Diagram Group*. Diagram Visual Information Limited. 2008.
- Dictionary.com. Disarmament. 2020. www.dictionary.com/browse/disarmament
- Efanodor H. O. *Theories of International Relations*. 2017. Retrieved on 13/01/2020 from: https://www.eduniversity.edu.ng/oer/lecturenotes/theories_of_international_relations
- Encyclopaedia Britannica. Cold war: international politics. 2020. <https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War>
- Federation of American Scientists: Uranium Production Archived 2016-07-12 at the Wayback Machine. fas.org/nuke/intro/nuke/uranium.htm
- Hg legal. WMD Law - Weapons of Mass Destruction Law. 2020. www.hg.org/weapons-mass-destruction.html
- Hudson, K. 60 years ago, the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament was founded. Here's what we've achieved over the decades. CND. 2018. <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/campaign-nuclear-disarmament-cnd-weapons-trident-cold-war-hydrogen-bomb-a8215281.html>
- Kaye, D.D. Time for Arms Talks? Iran, Israel, and Middle East Arms Control. Arms control association. <https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2004-11/iran-nuclear-briefs/time-arms-talks-iran-israel-middle-east-arms-control>
- Kent Boydston, "How Good is China at Sanctions Enforcement?" Peterson Institute for International Economics, May 5, 2017, at <https://piie.com/blogs/north-korea-witness-transformation/how-good-china-sanctions-enforcement>.
- Kenton, W. "Zero-Sum Game." *Investopedia*. 2020. www.investopedia.com/terms/z/zero-sumgame.asp
- Lee, R. *The True Cost of the Louisiana Purchase*. *Slate*. 2017. Retrieved 10/10/2019 from: slate.com/articles/news_and_politics/history/2017/03/how_much_did_the_louisiana_purchase_actually_cost.html
- Leonard, Robert. *Von Neumann, Morgenstern, and the Creation of Game Theory*. New York: Cambridge University Press. 2010. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511778278, ISBN 978-0-521-56266-9

Nick, M. *Nuclear Arms Race During the Cold War*. Submitted as coursework for PH241, Stanford University, Winter 2017. <http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2017/ph241/nick2/>

"Oxford Conference of Non-aligned Peace Organizations". Archived from the original on 2011-07-16. Retrieved 2009-03-13.

Ray Takeyh, "Iran's Nuclear Calculations," *World Policy Journal* 20, no. 2 (Summer 2003).

Aljazeera. "Iran in arms race with Israel: Military analyst says there is a real risk of armed conflict between Tehran and Tel Aviv." *Aljazeera*. 2009. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2009/8/6/iran-in-arms-race-with-israel>

Reed E. : What Is a Zero Sum Game and Why Is It Important in 2019?" *The Street*. <https://www.thestreet.com/politics/what-is-a-zero-sum-game-14818535>

Stanford Encyclopedia. *Games Theory*. First published Sat Jan 25, 1997; substantive revision Fri Mar 8, 2019. plato.stanford.edu/entries/game-theory/

The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. *Disarmament: Military Policy*. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/disarmament>

The Free Dictionary. Disarmament. 2020. www.thefreedictionary.com/disarmament
"Washington Post: Breaking News, World, US, DC News & Analysis"
www.washingtonpost.com
Wikipedia Free Encyclopedia. *Disarmament*. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Disarmament>

Wikipedia. *Games Theory*. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zero-sum_game

Wikia. *Japan and Weapons of Mass Destruction*. 2014.

military.wikia.org/wiki/Japan_and_weapon_s_of_mass_destruction#:~:text=Beginning%20in%20the%20mid-

- **Unekwu Friday Itodo** is of the Department of History and International Studies, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria. He can be reached at: ugbedeitodo@gmail.com
- **Abraham Templeman** is of the Department of History and International Studies, Kogi State University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria.