

---

# **IMPLEMENTING THE PROHIBITION ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS: A STUDY OF DISARMAMENT UNDER INTERNATIONAL LAW**

---

Swikriti Vinaya, Symbiosis Law School, Hyderabad

## **ABSTRACT**

The ever rising uncertainty and threat with respect to nuclear weapons from countries like North Korea, Iran and many non-state actors such as terrorist outfits and radical organizations form a major predicament of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and it is about time that the international community seriously acts upon the issue of disarmament and complete prohibition of nuclear and biological weapons. Since the end of World War II there have been efforts worldwide, to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons but have not been fruitful. The indiscriminate, massive destruction that a single bomb can cause is greater than the sense of security that it offers. The possession, use, acquisition of nuclear weapon should not be encouraged under any circumstances due to the humanitarian crisis that it presents. Nevertheless, international law, even today, does not ban nuclear weapons completely. The Nuclear Weapon States paid mere lip service to ‘disarmament’ and ‘non-proliferation of nuclear weapons’ and have not taken any concrete measures to achieve 100% disarmament. The humanitarian threat from the nuclear weapons outweighs the security advantage that it provides to the select few. International Humanitarian Law prohibits the use, possession and acquisition of nuclear weapons but it continues to be sought. Due to the risk posed by these weapons of mass destruction, various proposals have been formulated to prevent another Hiroshima and Nagasaki from happening. This research project deals with the issue of denuclearization and outlines the efforts undertaken by the international community to achieve disarmament. It also ascertains whether the efforts have been successful and the causes for the same are elucidated. Lastly, relevant conclusions are drawn and suggestions are given.

**Keywords:** Nuclear weapons, Chemical and Biological Weapons, Disarmament, United Nations, Cuban Missile Crisis.

## INTRODUCTION

Nuclear, Biological and Chemical weapons, called as **weapons of mass destruction**<sup>1</sup>, are considered to be the most dangerous weapons on this planet. These weapons have the potential of killing millions and jeopardizing the environment and lives of the future generations through its long term effects. There is no particular definition for these weapons in any treaty or customary international law. For the general purpose, the National Defense has defined weapons of mass destruction as *“Any weapon or device that has the capability, to cause death or serious bodily injury to a significant number of people through the release, dissemination, or impact of toxic or poisonous chemicals or their precursors, a disease organism or of radiation or radioactivity.”*<sup>2</sup>

The term ‘weapons of mass destruction’ was coined for the first time in the year 1937, when nuclear weapons were not even developed, by Cosmo Gordon Lang with regard to aerial bombardment of Guernica, Spain. World War I was the first time when wide battlefield use of chemical weapons was seen. Later, it was traced in the atomic bombing that took place in Hiroshima and Nagasaki that ended the World War II. The term was even used for nonconventional weapons during the Cold War. Trinity, the first nuclear weapon test conducted in the year 1945 which is even marked as the beginning of the atomic age.

The effect of nuclear weapons were also tested on naval ships through various tests called

‘Operation Crossroads’. Some analysts have argued that nuclear and biological weapons do not belong in the same category. It is said that chemical weapons have limited destructive potential than nuclear and biological weapons. Nuclear and biological weapons have the unique ability to kill large numbers of people with very small amounts of materials and thus, could be said to belong in a class by themselves. These weapons have catastrophic long term effects. Disarmament is the best protection against such dangers. The prospects of nuclear disarmament have grown since the end of the Cold war. The danger that nuclear weapons will be used again, either intentionally or accidentally, will exist for as long as they remain available.

---

<sup>1</sup> Defined by U.S. Code.

<sup>2</sup> Un.org. (2019). Nuclear Weapons – UNODA. [online] Available at: <https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/> [Accessed 13 Mar. 2019].

## **SIGNIFICANCE OF NUCLEAR DISARMAMENT**

There exist a number of reasons as to why nuclear disarmament is crucial. These weapons and their related facilities and components are attractive targets for terrorists. These are considered to be the ultimate instruments of terror and mass destruction and have no legitimate military or strategic utility and are useless in addressing any of today's real security threats such as terrorism, climate change etc.<sup>3</sup> Any use of such weapons would violate IHL because they would indiscriminately kill civilians and cause long-term environmental harm. Nuclear weapons pose a direct threat to people everywhere. The abolition of nuclear weapons is an urgent humanitarian necessity. The effects of radiation of these nuclear weapons would cause suffering and death many years even after the first explosion. Nuclear Disarmament is the act of eliminating the use of nuclear weapons. There are a number of bilateral and multilateral treaties and arrangements that aim at reducing the use of nuclear weapons in every possible way. The first among these were the resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946 which established a Commission to deal with problems related to the discovery of atomic energy among others. Apart from that, these range from several treaties between the United States of America and Russian Federation as well as various other initiatives, to the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Missile Technology Control Regime, the Hague Code of Conduct against Ballistic Missile Proliferation, and the Wassenaar Arrangement.

The United Nations Secretariat also supports the efforts aimed at the non-proliferation and total elimination of nuclear weapons. It considers nuclear weapons in the framework of "disarmament to save humanity."<sup>4</sup> This Agenda also supports extending the norms against nuclear weapons, and in that regard appeals to States that possess nuclear weapons to affirm that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. Finally, the agenda proposes preparing for a world free of nuclear weapons through a number of risk-reduction measures, including transparency in nuclear weapon programs, further reductions in all types of nuclear weapons, commitments not to introduce new and destabilizing types of nuclear weapons, including cruise missiles, reciprocal commitments for the non-use of nuclear weapons and reduction of the role of nuclear weapons in security doctrines. To further the agenda, concrete

---

<sup>3</sup> Icanw.org. (2019). Arguments for nuclear abolition | ICAN. [online] Available at: <http://www.icanw.org/why-aban/arguments-for-a-ban/> [Accessed 13 Mar. 2019].

<sup>4</sup> Rebecca Johnson, "The Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons: An imperative for achieving Disarmament", vol.25(2014) , pp 59.

actions are proposed.

## **IMPLEMENTATION OF DISARMAMENT OVER THE YEARS**

Nuclear weapons are one of the most dangerous weapons and can massacre millions of people and destroy an entire city in one go, jeopardizing the natural resources and lives of future generation by its catastrophic effect. The past three decades have witnessed a rise of the treaties addressing disarmament issues. A timeline of several key treaties and international convention related to disarmament is as follows:

### **A. Partial Test Ban Treaty, 1963**

The treaty was signed on 5 August, 1963 by the representatives of United States, Soviet Union and Great Britain. The aim of this treaty was to prohibit the testing of nuclear weapons in outer space, underwater or in the atmosphere. The discussion regarding the ban on nuclear testing started somewhere in the mid-1950s. The initial parties to this discussion were US and Soviet Union. The objective behind this discussion was two-fold:

- The officials from both the nations believed that nuclear arm race was reaching a dangerous level.
- Public protest against test of nuclear weapon was strengthening.

The main objectives of the treaty are:

- To prohibit nuclear weapons tests or other nuclear explosions under water, in the atmosphere, or in outer space.
- To allow underground nuclear tests as long as no radioactive debris falls outside the boundaries of the nation conducting the test.
- To ensure that the signatories to work towards achieving complete disarmament, putting an end to the armament race, and an end to the contamination of the environment by radioactive substances.

In the year 1996, the UN General Assembly adopted Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Signed by 71 nations including those possessing nuclear weapons, the treaty prohibited all kinds of nuclear test.

**B. Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of nuclear weapons, 1968**

NPT is one of the landmark international treaties. The objective of this treaty was to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy by preventing the use of nuclear weapons. The other objective of this treaty was to achieve complete disarmament. Including the P-five, a total of 191 states joined the treaty.

**C. Seabed Arms Control Treaty, 1970**

Due to the advancement in oceanographic technologies, there were increased concerns that seabed may be used for nuclear related military installations. Two drafts were submitted jointly by US and Soviet Union on 7 October 1969 to Committee on Disarmament. During the conference, coastal states raised their concerns about the rights of smaller states and violation by powerful states. The main objective of the treaty was prohibiting the parties to the treaty from implanting or placing on the seabed or oceans floor or in the subsoil, beyond a 12-mile territorial zone, any nuclear weapon or any other type weapon used for mass destruction.

**D. Biological Weapons Convention, 1972**

It is a legally binding treaty, which restricts use of biological weapons. BWC was opened for signatories in April, 1972 and was enforced on 26 March, 1975. Currently, there are 182 signatories to the treaty. The objective of the convention was to destroy or divert the agents, toxins, weapons, equipment and means of delivery to a peaceful purpose. The purpose of the convention is not to ban biological and toxin weapons but to abide by the 1925 Geneva Protocol which prohibits the use of such weapons.

**E. Chemical Weapons Convention, 1993**

The aim of the convention is to prohibit all kind of weapons which cause mass destruction. It aims at achieving this by prohibiting development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, retention, transfer or use of chemical weapons by the parties. The important element of this treaty was incorporating 'challenging inspection'. The significance of this incorporation was that if any state party doubts another state party's compliance, it can request for a surprise inspection. The terms give the right of surprise inspection to the party at anytime and anywhere which cannot be revoked by another party.

## **F. Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, 1996**

CTBT aims at banning all nuclear explosions by each signatory. The treaty was first discussed in Geneva conference on disarmament which was later adopted by UN General Assembly. It opened for signatories on 24 September, 1996. Around 182 countries are the signatories of this treaty. CTBT is the last barrier on the way of nuclear development. It restricts the creation of new nuclear weapons and development of the existing ones. The treaty also helps in preventing human suffering and environmental damages caused by nuclear testing.

## **A STUDY OF THE CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS**

The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 is an account of how John F. Kennedy and Nikita Khrushchev almost blundered into a nuclear war through the crisis management approaches of their advisory systems, but then managed to extricate themselves using personal diplomacy and old-fashioned political horse-trading. The crisis was unique in a number of ways, featuring calculations and miscalculations as well as direct and secret communications and miscommunications between the two sides. The US and the Soviet Union were on the brink of nuclear war, the evening that President Kennedy announced a “quarantine” on Soviet ships carrying weapons heading towards Cuba. It can be said that this crisis was just one step away from another Nuclear war or World War III. It was so close to the end of civilization in Cuba due to a nuclear war. This danger still persists. The danger is not of the North Korean leader Kim Jong Un launching an attack or US launching an attack rather it is a danger that it will blunder into a nuclear war that can wipe out the human race and destroy the planet. Use of nuclear weapon can cause large scale deaths, destruction, suffering and long term impact similar to that caused by the atomic bombs used in 1945 on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is said that nuclear weapons should be stigmatised, banned and eliminated before they abolish us.<sup>5</sup> After the Cuban missile crisis, there were a number of proposals, agreements and steps taken to address this problem. The NPT, regarded as the cornerstone of non-proliferation, recognised that it would be impossible to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons unless states that already possessed them pursued nuclear disarmament in good faith. The opinion that the Cuban missile crisis could be averted without the use of nuclear weapons despite their existence and therefore the holding of nuclear warheads will act as a deterrent and

---

<sup>5</sup> Heinz Fischer, Federal President of Austria at the High Level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament, New York, 26 September 2013.

prevent wars in foolhardy. With the rise of terrorism and terror attacks, nuclear weapons are a imminent and persistent threat. Also, the Nuclear Posture Review in 2010 named two primary threats to US national security, the first being the Nuclear Terrorism as the most immediate and extreme danger” and second is the nuclear proliferation.<sup>6</sup> For nuclear peace to hold, deterrence and fail-safe mechanism must work every single time. The majority of the world’s countries, however, remain interested in security from nuclear weapons by pursuing the threefold agenda of nuclear disarmament, nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear security. After the Cuban missile crisis, nuclear weapons are considered to be the common enemy of humanity. Their existence is a sufficient guarantee of their proliferation and someday again, their use. Nuclear disarmament is a necessary condition of nuclear non-proliferation.

### **AN IMPEDIMENT IN ACHIEVING COMPLETE DISARMAMENT: THE CASE OF IRAN**

Iran became one of the signatories to the NPT in the year 1974. During the period of 1975-76, Iran started the production of nuclear weapons i.e., after signing the treaty. It came into focus in the year 2002 when previously undeclared nuclear facilities became the subject to IAEA inquiry. Being a signatory of NPT, Iran waived its option of developing weapons. Yet, Iran has in recent years been facing hurdles to exercise its legal rights because of IAEA suspicion based on lack of transparency and absence of full reporting.<sup>7</sup>

- **Development of Nuclear Weapons**

Even after various breaches of transparency necessities, the only reason why Iran is secure is that it is not concluded by IAEA that whether that the offence is of diverting nuclear technology or material from its declared facilities towards military purposes. There are various reasons for Iran to develop nuclear weapons. Some of them being as follow:

- It has two nuclear weapon powers in its neighborhood i.e., Israel and Pakistan. Both the countries are non-signatory to NPT.
- Israel is a strategic partner of US with undeclared nuclear weapons capability and remains the strongest regional adversary of Iran after the fall of the Saddam Hussain

---

<sup>6</sup> Anna Peczei, “The Best Options for Nuclear Posture Review”, Strategic Studies Quarterly, Vol. 11, pp 73.

<sup>7</sup> Thomas E. Doyle II, “Moral and Political Necessities for Nuclear Disarmament: An Applied Ethical Analysis, Vol 9, 2015, pp 33.

regime in Iraq.

- Iran has always inspired to become the leading regional power in West Asia.
- Iran has a longstanding hostile relationship with the US.

Currently, Iran has complete nuclear fuel cycle capabilities including uranium mining, milling, conversion and enrichment facilities. Iran's extensive enrichment program, which could be used to produce highly enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon is controversial. The IAEA board of Governors found Iran in non-compliance with its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement in 2005, and the UN Security Council passed seven resolutions demanding that Iran halt its enrichment and reprocessing activities.

- **Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA)**

P5 along with Germany and Iran signed JCPOA in July 2015. The plan restricts Iran's civilian nuclear enrichment programme. The agreement requires that uranium enrichment at Fordow and Natanz be restricted and a heavy-water reactor, at Arak, have its core rendered inoperable. In order to address the concerns, Iran can construct and operate a clandestine enrichment facility similar to Natanz or Fordow, the agreement empowers inspection of fuel cycle for 25 years. It also allows IAEA inspector to inspect Iran's uranium supplies from mining stage through waste disposal, and monitor all centrifuge production facilities. Finally, the JCPOA set up a procurement channel to be examined by a joint commission that will allow Iran to obtain the materials it needs to operate its nuclear facilities under the guidelines of international nuclear supply regimes.<sup>8</sup>

- **Current Status**

On 8 May 2018, Trump announced that US would withdraw from JCPOA and will re-impose nuclear-related sanction on Iran. The reason given for withdrawal was that the deal was defective at its core, and also stated that Iranian authorities support terrorism and ballistic missiles. On the other hand, UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres stated that he was not satisfied by the decision of US and was in support of the continued implementation of the JCPOA.

---

<sup>8</sup> Paul H. DeForest, "The Matrix of Biological Disarmament: Strategy, Law and Technology, Vol 9, 1990.



## **THE FAILURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS TO ACHIEVE DISARMAMENT**

The UN has been working towards achieving complete disarmament since its inception but it can't quite be said that it achieved the goal. One of the prominent reasons for it being, the cold war between the US and the erstwhile USSR and the self-serving practices by the P-5 led to further proliferation of nuclear weapons. The efforts directed towards disarmament were not always fruitful. Art.26 of the UN Charter calls for "the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources". It outlines the functions of the Security Council as formulating plans to be submitted to the members of the UN for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments." During the Cold war, the five (P-5) countries, the US, Russia, UK, France and China, started efforts to curb the proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The adoption of the NPT and the CTBT was an effort to stop the spread of nuclear weapon capability to new countries. But these treaties were discriminatory and were serving the interests of the P-5 as they tried to perpetuate the nuclear power status and the supremacy of the P-5 only. On the other hand, non-nuclear nations became virtually defenseless. This insecurity led to the further growth of the nuclear weapons, as other countries also tried to acquire nuclear weapons. Israel and South Africa developed Nuclear Warheads. In May 1998, India developed nuclear capability by carrying out five underground nuclear tests at Pokhran on 11 and 13 May, followed by Pakistan which launched its own tests shortly afterwards. Critics argue that NPT cannot stop the proliferation, as a country using nuclear reactor for peaceful purpose of electricity generations may secretly develop nuclear weapons. On the other hand, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council have 22,000 nuclear warheads and have shown reluctance to disarm their stockpile.

The point of departure for any particular analysis of the UN's involvement in the disarmament process is the lack of political reality that characterized the attempts on the part of the non-aligned group to place the UN in the central position in the global negotiating process. This proved to be unsuccessful because it ignored the different perception which the superpowers have maintained as to the world structure for negotiating disarmament. The particular political groupings of the UN, as is pointed out above, did and still do perceive the role of the UN in the negotiating process differently. There is no doubt that when different perceptions exist, they apply to what constitutes appropriate disarmament machinery. What also emerges is the appearance of strong disagreements over the use to which the machinery should be put; the

agenda and the form the institution building of the particular disarmament machineries takes. This is what actually happened to the United Nations. Purporting to bring back the UN into the mainstream of the negotiations, the non-aligned group adopted and followed the unrealistic view that it could be done by the superimposition on the UNO of their own perceptions, which were connected with a strong belief in egalitarian principles. Actually, the principle of democratization, in its extreme form, was not only pursued in order to reduce the scope for the superpowers or the major powers within the UN but also it amounted to the rejection of any centrifugal tendencies of other forums, like the bilateral institution of SALT-START. The efforts for an over-centralization of the business of negotiating disarmament on the UN was intended to strengthen the Organization and, simultaneously, the position of the non-aligned states in the global negotiating process. This explains why the UN Organization would not cooperate with other forums. Furthermore, the pursuit of egalitarianism, in the interest of democratization, led to the formation of the UN disarmament machinery in such a way that its establishment was alienated from the real international power structure. It seems that as the result of the democratization, the UNO went far beyond the realities of the international political system and underestimated the role of the major powers. Consequently, the UN was found in a situation in which the non-aligned group attempted unilaterally to democratize the Organization's machinery concerning a matter for which it did not have the power to achieve the solution it demands. This led to the creation of a new political context within the Organization wherein nuclear disarmament was expected to flourish.

As has been admitted, even by states belonging to the non-aligned group, the obvious reason for the failure of the negotiations in the UN and the CD is that its work can be effective only if it reflects the international power structure. However, up to the present time it does not do so. 'The leading military powers particularly the two superpowers', Sweden noted, 'have not demonstrated readiness or even willingness to exploit the rich potential of and needs in the present situation'. Neither the SSOD-1 of the UNGA which restructured the multilateral disarmament machinery of the UNO towards egalitarian principles, concepts and practices nor the second or the third special session on disarmament led to a rapprochement. The divergent approaches as to the precise role of the UN in the negotiating process of the three political groupings of the UN, the East the West and the non-aligned, have been maintained for over a decade. As a consequence, there has not even been a beginning of a concrete frank dialogue between the three groupings, which could result in a common determination of the definite position of the UN in world negotiating structure. As a matter of fact, in the absence of such

determination, the maintenance and the perpetuation of those fundamental differences taken together with the systematic efforts of the non-aligned group to superimpose its own approach in the realm of the UN, has resulted in a growing disenchantment with the work of the Organization in the field.<sup>9</sup>The world today is at a very dangerous level of nuclear weapons stockpile. Even after all the treaties and agreements for disarmament, in 2016, the nuclear warheads with the United States were 6,970; Russia 7,300; France 300; UK 215; China 260; Israel 250-400; India 110-120; Pakistan 120-130 and North Korea with more than 14. The world community needs to wake up from its reverie and take measures that will help achieve complete disarmament because the threat is imminent and the stakes are very high.

## CONCLUSION

According to its founders, the grand aims of the United Nations were to ‘save succeeding generations from the scourge of war’, and to promote international peace and security ‘with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and financial resources’. In adopting its historic first resolution in 1946, which committed the then member States to total nuclear disarmament, the General Assembly made a promising start towards fulfilling these aims but it could not be continued with the same zeal. The existence of mutual distrust among the states frustrates disarmament efforts along with the issues of national security and interest. Political rivalry and disputes also fuel arms race and disarmament commitments break down. Technological innovations and advancements in the military of a state induces the other states to procure arms and nukes leading to proliferation of nuclear weapons and ensuing nuclear arms race which was evident during the Cold War between the US and USSR and also between the two South Asian neighbors-India and Pakistan.

Our world now resembles nothing so much as an armed camp. The nuclear arsenals of the superpowers are hugely overstocked; some twenty five million men and women are under arms, and two thirds of these serve in the forces of developing countries, of which half have military governments. The annual cost of maintaining this global garrison is now approaching one trillion US dollars, and the adverse effects of what the late Barbara Ward called this ‘continuing haemorrhage of resources to the instruments of death’ are well known. In the developed world, the defence-based industries attract an increasingly disproportionate

---

<sup>9</sup> Peter Jones and Demetris Bourantonis, *The United Nations and Nuclear Disarmament: A Case Study En Failure?*, *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, Vol.13, No.1 (1990), pp.7-15, Tampere Peace Research Institute, University of Tampere, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40725140>.

percentage of both public and private investment, and human talent, thereby exacerbating the unemployment problem and throttling growth in the civilian sectors of our economies. The debt crisis of many Third World countries is, in large part, directly attributable to their expenditure on arms; expenditure which, in a sane world, should have been directed towards satisfying the unmet medical, nutritional, and educational needs. Perhaps just one simple statistic says it all. Each minute of every day we spend, world-wide, over one million US dollars are spent on defence whilst, in that same short time, some twenty children die from a wholly preventable combination of malnutrition and disease.<sup>10</sup> A major breakthrough in the achievement of disarmament is still a far-fetched dream that needs to be urgently acted upon. The urgency with which the world community needs to address the problem of disarmament is perfectly captured by a popular saying- *“If not now, then when? If not us, then who?”*.

## **SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Disarmament is a pressing international issue but the magnitude of the threat it poses is often taken for granted. The problems caused by the arms race are global ones and their solution must be sought by the world community, and not solely by the superpowers. By virtue of the fact that nearly every nation State in the world is represented at the UN, this organization is uniquely suited to this task. The General Assembly is ‘a permanent forum for disarmament deliberations and the main source of both initiatives and recommendations by the international community on the whole spectrum of disarmament-related issues’.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, it is only at the UN that we find the multinational machinery capable of making a reality of the dream of disarmament. The First Committee, the Disarmament Commission, and the ad hoc Committee on the World Disarmament

Conference are variously charged with the task of generating specific initiatives relating to security and disarmament, and the Conference on Disarmament is the ‘single multilateral disarmament negotiating forum’.<sup>12</sup>

The role of the UN should not be limited to that of merely discussing or attempting to negotiate disarmament. It should open up the possibilities for substantive negotiation on elements of an

---

<sup>10</sup> Bill Dailey, Disarmament at the United Nations, *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, Vol.78, No.311 (Autumn, 1989), pp. 295-305, Irish Province of the Society of Jesus, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30091389>.

<sup>11</sup> The United Nations and Disarmament: A Short History, New York: United Nations, 1988, p 9.

<sup>12</sup> Final Document, First Special Session of the General Assembly on Disarmament, 1978, United Nations, para 120. <sup>13</sup> Ibid at 2.

objective international system of verification and the establishment of an executive body for a systematic implementation of the international decisions. As a matter of primary urgency, the Organisation should work essentially by better management for a special type of consensus in order to rectify the present situation. It is this consensus that will enable progress to be made in the direction of the goals of the Charter. Hans J. Morgenthau observed “*Whether the issue is one of the overall ratio of the armaments of different nations or whether the issue is the standard for allocating different types and quantities of arms, these issues are incapable of solution in their own terms, so long as the conflict of powers from which they have arisen remain unsolved. The environment of hostility and distrust create difficulties in the way of disarmament.*”

There is a close link between military intervention and nuclear proliferation. Facing coercive politics and fearful of being invaded, especially by the US, former Soviet Union developed nuclear weapons for its security. India developed nuclear weapon capability because neighbor China had nuclear weapons which had attacked and fought a war against India in 1962. Therefore, disarmament requires a concrete policy to limit military intervention. K.J Holsti emphasizes on having self-imposed limits on violence. He argues that the tendency to equate arms control with formal international agreements may, however, lead to overly pessimistic conclusions about the feasibility of placing limits on procurement and deployment of arms. Self-imposed limits on violence are at times, more enduring than those found in the treaties and have even survived wars. With its universality, its structures, and the expertise of its constituent organizations, the UN has the potential to achieve its grand aims; what it needs, and needs desperately, is the constant and vigorous support of all people of goodwill.<sup>13</sup>

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

1. Bill Dailey, Disarmament at the United Nations, *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, Vol.78, No.311 (Autumn, 1989), pp. 295-305, Irish Province of the Society of Jesus, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30091389>.
2. Peter Jones and Demetris Bourantonis, *The United Nations and Nuclear Disarmament: A Case Study En Failure?*, *Current Research on Peace and Violence*, Vol.13, No.1 (1990), pp.7-15, Tampere Peace Research Institute, University of Tampere, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40725140>.
3. Dimitris Bourantonis, Democratization, Decentralization, and Disarmament at the United Nations, *The International History Review*, Vol.15, No.4 (Nov., 1993), pp.688-713, Taylor & Francis, Ltd., <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40106792>.
4. Heinz Fischer, Federal President of Austria at the High Level Meeting of the UN General Assembly on Nuclear Disarmament , New York, 26 September 2013.
5. Anna Peczeli,” *The Best Options for Nuclear Posture Review*”, *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Vol. 11, pp 73.
6. Rebecca Johnson, “The Humanitarian Impact of Nuclear Weapons: An imperative for achieving Disarmament”, Vol.25 (2014), pp 59.
7. Andrew O’Neil, *Nuclear Weapons and Non-proliferation Is Restraint Sustainable*, Vol. 5, No. 4 (Summer 2009), pp. 39-57.
8. Arsalan M. Suleman, *Bargaining in the Shadow of Violence: The NPT, IAEA, and Nuclear NonProliferation Negotiations*, 26 *Berkeley J. Int'l L.* 206 (2008).
9. Christopher Vail, *The Legality of Nuclear Weapons for Use and Deterrence*, 48 *Geo. J. Int'l L.* 839 (2017).
10. Mats R. Berdal, *The Security Council, Peacekeeping and Internal Conflict after the Cold War*, 7 *Duke J. Comp. & Int'l L.* 71 (1996).
11. Ramesh Thakur, *Nuclear Weapons a Progress Report*, Vol. 9, No. 4 (2013),pp. 11-20.

12. Scott Keefer, International Control of Biological Weapons, 6 ILSA J. Int'l & Comp. L. 107 (1999).

**LEGAL DATABASES:**

1. Hein Online
2. Jstor