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This chapter examines efforts to

- Promote general and complete disarmament of all weapons or at least all weapons of a particular type;
- More modest yet important efforts at arms control

In those areas where multilateral efforts have been made to control certain types of weapons, the realm of international security regimes is studied.
Disarmament and Arms Control

- As a result of the presence of international anarchy, States have a tendency to feel vulnerable in the international system.
  - How to deal with uncertainty & insecurity:
    - through international cooperation
    - by increasing military power and national arsenal
- For international relations, weapons control is not a new issue.
  - The idea of disarmament has been around for quite some time.
Very rarely are states willing to disarm on their own, and ambitious plans of total disarmament have failed in the past.

Disarmament is reducing to zero either all weaponry in national arsenals or all weapons of a particular type or kind,
- i.e. biological or chemical weapons.

Alternative view in the international world is opposite of disarmament.

The idea of *si vis pacem, para bellum*, or "if you wish peace, then prepare for war," is actually more common.
Disarmament and Arms Control

- Total disarmament is often viewed as unattainable.
- Arms control is more often emphasized.
- Arms control - a negotiation process aimed at producing agreements on weapons & their use.
- Many agreements involve
  - placing limits on the numbers
  - types of weapons used
  - the geographic deployment of troops
  - the use of arms and other aspects
- Once instituted, these agreements constitute international security regimes.
States may enter arms-control agreements for strategic purposes:
- Curb arms race competition
- Achieve economic savings from reduced military expenditure
- Lessen the risk of war
- Reduce damage should war occur
- Enhance regional and global security
- Gain other advantages

Examples for arms control regimes
- Naval Limitation Treaty
- Since the late 1950s, there have been a large number of arms control agreements.
There are three broad, overlapping approaches to arms control:
- Quantitative and qualitative restrictions
- Geographic or spatial constraints
- Functional measures as confidence – and security – building measures and improved communications.

View Table 9.1, 9.2, 9.3, pp. 228 – 231 for major arms control treaties and agreements.

Once treaties and other agreements are completed, states must consider the realm of arms control verification and compliance.
Arms Control, Verification, and Compliance

- There are functional approaches to limiting armaments, including confidence and security-building measures (CSBMs).
- These are agreed-upon mechanisms among states aimed at improving security over time by building trust including,
  - notice of military exercises
  - allowing observation of exercises, etc.
- Communication is also an important step in arms control.
  - direct communication can be extremely important in times of crisis.
  - efforts to improve communication can be understood as one aspect of CSBMs.
Many of these agreements depend on verification of compliance. Verification of compliance simply means making sure that the parties are living up to the agreement. Arms control agreements have involved nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, ballistic missiles, chemical weapons, and biological weapons. In the realm of nuclear weapons, there is a relation between arms control and military doctrines concerning deterrence, war fighting, and defense.
Verification and Compliance

- Verification of compliance is achieved through,
  - open admission of violations
  - on-site inspections
  - reports by reliable human intelligence sources
  - national technical means (NTM) of verification
    - advanced technical-intelligence capabilities on ground stations, aircrafts, ships, and satellites or other space vehicles.

- Alleged violations are presented in diplomatic exchanges.
Finite or minimum deterrence is one method of deterrence. The applicability this doctrine is questioned in the case of India and Pakistan, and other new nuclear weapons states.
Alternative Deterrence Doctrines

- Finite deterrence means that a country maintains a relatively small amount of nuclear or other weapons of mass destruction for use in making deterrence threats.

- The drawbacks to this approach are that it typically leaves the state relatively weak militarily and vulnerable to preemptive destruction.

North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD)
Assured destruction, on the other hand, requires substantially more weapons, to assure that a state could withstand a first strike and then strike back.

Deterrence by denial requires the largest arsenal in order to convince adversaries that there is no chance that they would win a fight with the armed state.

Extended deterrence involves threats to protect allies and the use of force if that threat fails.
Finite or minimum deterrence is important today because there are several countries with just a few nuclear weapons.

When a state possesses very few weapons of mass destruction, they are likely to attack countervalue sites or sites such as population centers.

There are not enough weapons to attack military (counterforce targets) first. When states have second strike capabilities, or the ability to use weapons of mass destruction after they have been hit themselves, they are more likely to strike counterforce targets first.

Thus, a paradox exists in that arms control means that states are more likely to strike civilian targets as opposed to military targets.

Alternative Deterrence Doctrines
Assured destruction was the dominant way of thinking in the 1960s and 1970s. When both sides of a conflict have second-strike capabilities, a situation of mutually assured destruction (MAD) exists. In this situation, neither state is willing to attack first because they will be destroyed themselves. The United States and the Soviet Union in the Cold War is a good example.

Distinctions between deterrence and defense of the 1950s and 1960s led to consideration of the idea of
- Damage limitation – civil defense plans, military counter measures, antiballistic missiles
- First-strike capability
- Second-strike (counter attack) capability
Weapons Proliferation

- Weapons proliferation is the spread of weapons and weapons systems to countries not previously possessing them (horizontal proliferation), or the accumulation of more and more weapons or weapons systems by particular countries (vertical proliferation).

- The five major areas of concern:
  1. Nuclear or radiological weapons
  2. Chemical weapons
  3. Biological weapons
  4. Ballistic missiles
  5. Advanced conventional weapons systems
Weapons Proliferation

- The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the linchpin of the international non-proliferation regime.
- Other conventions exist which limit the use and development of biological and chemical weapons, which are much cheaper and easier to produce than nuclear weapons.
  - Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC)
  - Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BWC)
- Attempts to curtail the surest and fastest way to deliver such weapons is ballistic missiles include Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) of 1987.
# Weapons Proliferation

The Global Arms Market

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Leading Suppliers</th>
<th>Export Volume (US$ Billions)</th>
<th>Global Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. United States</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. United Kingdom</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Russian Federation</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ukraine</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. France</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Germany</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. China (PRC)</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Israel</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Italy</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Leading Recipients</th>
<th>Import Volume (US$ Billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Egypt</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. India</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Israel</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. China</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. South Korea</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: International Institute for Strategic Studies
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- Efforts by the U.S. tended to enjoy bipartisan support in the last half century than in the present.
- In recent years, there has been greater skepticism, particularly from the conservative right.
- Nevertheless, the U.S. continues to selectively pursue arms control
  - with the Russian Federation
  - on reduction and control of nuclear weapons
  - curbing proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMDs)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arms Control</th>
<th>Military (Force-Employment) Doctrines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Transfers</td>
<td>Minimum or Finite Deterrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countervalue Targets</td>
<td>Mutually Assured Destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterforce Targets</td>
<td>Weapons Proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collateral Damage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSBM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Review – How much do you understand?

1. Which of the following is an example of an arms control regime?
   A. the Naval Limitation Treaty
   B. the United Nations
   C. NATO
   D. all of the above
Review – How much do you understand?

2. CSBMs are?
   A. conflict structuring bilateral mandates
   B. covert/subversive ballistic missiles
   C. confidence and security building measures
   D. continental surface-to-surface ballistic missiles
3. The largest number of arms control agreements fall under which category?

A. functional mechanisms such as communications
B. quantitative or qualitative restrictions on armament
C. geographical limitations on the use of forces or arms
D. CSBM
Review– How much do you understand?

4. Mutually assured destruction occurs between two states that have which characteristics?
   A. one with first strike-capabilities and the other with second-strike capabilities
   B. both with first-strike capabilities
   C. both with second-strike capabilities
   D. a nuclear power and a non-nuclear power
Review – How much do you understand?

5. Original countries involved in the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) included?
   A. Britain, the U.S., and the Soviet Union
   B. Britain, France, and the Soviet Union
   C. Italy, France, and Japan
   D. Japan, China, and the United States
Review– How much do you understand?

6. The linchpin of the international non-proliferation regime is the?
   A. START Treaty
   B. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
   C. HRRT Treaty
   D. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)
Review – How much do you understand?

7. A state which emphasizes finite deterrence might be likely to strike?
   A. countervalue targets.
   B. using conventional weapons only.
   C. numerous targets at once.
   D. counterforce targets.
Review– How much do you understand?

8. International security regimes are aimed at
   A. enhancing regional and global security.
   B. lessening the risk of war.
   C. reducing the damage if war should occur.
   D. all of these answers