INTRODUCTION

Controlling of nuclear weapons has been an important agenda in world politics since its birth. The problem of nuclear proliferation has become more salient after the end of the Cold War. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been widely regarded as the cornerstone of international nuclear non-proliferation efforts. The NPT is an international treaty signed in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. The NPT set three main objectives: (1) nuclear non-proliferation; (2) nuclear arms control and disarmament; and (3) the peaceful use of nuclear energy. The legitimacy and trust of the NPT in international community reached its high peak in its history by the time of the NPT Review and Extension Conference held in 1995. However, the NPT has been criticized for its flaws and discrimination at every NPT Review Conference. Especially, the NPT has faced many challenges, problems, and criticisms since the mid-1990s. This dissertation aimed to analyze, explain and understand the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), especially to examine its dynamics, evolution, roles and meanings of the Treaty in world politics. For the analysis of complexity of the NPT, this thesis used three theoretical perspectives: Realism, Liberalism, and Grotian/ International Society theory. This chapter review the summary and findings of the research, and assess how the aims and objectives achieved. It also reflects the limits of the research and figure out the possibilities for further research.
SUMMARY AND FINDINGS OF THE RESEARCH

The problem of nuclear (non-)proliferation and the NPT have been widely debated in both policy and academic circles. But the debates on these issues are far from reaching some agreements or common understanding. In spite of considerable amount of research and analyses on the NPT and non-proliferation, most are too specific in current policy issues, or too biased in normative and ideological sense. By using comparative theoretical frameworks, this research aimed shed light on the fundamental aspects and complexity of the NPT in world politics from pluralistic perspectives.

Chapter 3 discussed research methodology and concepts. This research is based on philosophical and theoretical pluralism, which is characteristic of Grotian/International Society theory (notably Martin Wight and Hedley Bull) and Indian classical philosophy. Even though a Grotian classical approach is critical of positivism, behaviourism, and scienticism, this research explored these theories and concepts especially the Neo-Realist versus Neo-Liberal debates on international institutions/ regimes. Grotian/ International Society approach is interpretative, philosophical, historical, and normative. International Society and Law are the most important concept which is placed in between Realist competitive anarchy and Idealist cooperative world order. The classical approach is based on humanism, thus statesmen face policy choices and ethical dilemmas. Realism, Liberalism, and Grotian/ International Society theory have its own distinctive strength to explain and understand international and world politics. It can contribute to explain and understand the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
Chapter 4 discussed the liberal perspectives on the NPT. Liberal theory is based on core assumptions and values such as individual liberty, freedom, peace, cooperation, and progress in world politics. How do liberals explain the dynamics and evolution of the NPT? Contemporary liberal theory provides a variety of explanation of the NPT dynamics and evolution into the global security regime. Institutional liberalism explains that the Treaty and its non-proliferation regime were created and developed into the global security regime by the states' common interests and demands for nuclear non-proliferation, civilian nuclear cooperation, and arms control and disarmament. Republican liberalism (democratic peace theory) explains that the NPT and its non-proliferation regime were created and supported by the liberal democracy with advanced economies, which were basically status-quo and peace oriented. On the contrary, Cosmopolitan liberalism is rather critical of the NPT because the NPT is essentially based on the inter-state system, which is often against the fundamental interests of basic human rights, security, and humanity as a whole. On the role and meanings of the NPT, liberals emphasize the promise of the NPT for nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament (NACD), and civilian nuclear cooperation. The three pillars of the NPT and grand bargains between the NWS and the NNWS are so crucial to the legitimacy and efficacy of the NPT-based non-proliferation regime. The NPT regime can be progressively strengthened toward nuclear arms control and disarmament, which promise common interests in international security as a whole.

Chapter 5 examined the realist perspectives on the NPT. Realist theory is based
on core assumptions and values such as state survival, national security and interests, military power, competition and conflicts in anarchical international politics. How do Realists explain the dynamics and evolution of the NPT? Contemporary Realist theory affords a range of explanations of the NPT dynamics and evolution into the global security regime. Hegemonic stability realism explains that the NPT was created and evolved into the global non-proliferation regime, driven by the US hegemonic power and interests of the US to maintain the nuclear status-quo and dominance. Bipolar stability realism explains that the NPT was created and evolved into the global non-proliferation regime, supported by two superpowers’ coordination in nuclear non-proliferation to maintain their superior dominance during the Cold War. Contemporary defensive realism (moderate realism) explains that the NPT was created and developed into the global non-proliferation regime because a majority of member states (even if not all) found common interests and security in nuclear non-proliferation. On the contrary, contemporary offensive realism (strategic realism) is critical of the NPT and its non-proliferation regime because the NPT has no more meaning than symbol and states would go nuclear whenever and wherever necessary and possible under anarchical international politics. Then how do realists assess the limits and possibilities of the role and meaning of the Treaty? For realists, the NPT can work for maintaining the five nuclear states’ dominance of nuclear weapons at best. Among the three pillars of the NPT, nuclear non-proliferation serves best for the five nuclear-weapon powers, civilian nuclear cooperation for member-states works at moderate extent, and nuclear arms control and disarmament are no more than false promises and bargains. The NPT regime can serve nuclear dominance of the five great powers at best, or it will collapse if many states determine to seek for nuclear weapons.
Chapter 6 explored Grotian/ International Society perspectives on the NPT. Grotians see the NPT as an international law in the international society. The Treaty as a modern international set norms, rules, and practice of state parties in the international society on nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament (NACD), and peaceful uses of nuclear energy. International Society theorists seek a middle path between realist power politics and liberal idealism. International Relations can be best explained and understood by enhancing a dialogue between Realism, Revolutionarism, and Rationalism. Dilemmas between order versus justice in international/world politics are seen in the NPT Review Conference and the UNGA. Both legitimacy and efficacy, realist power politics and liberal constitutionalism is necessary for maintaining of international order. Statesmen face choices and moral dilemmas at various levels of individual, international, and humanity as a whole. Diplomacy and the great powers can contribute to international nuclear order if it has legitimacy and efficacy. What great powers and statesmen do matters to the course of the NPT in international/world politics.

We need to compare and assess these various theoretical explanations and understanding of the NPT. First, which theory best explains the dynamics and evolution of the NPT? Why did the NPT evolve into the global security regime in world politics? Realist theory correctly point out the importance of state power and interests in the dynamics and evolution of the NPT as a nuclear non-proliferation regime. But realists underestimate the normative aspects, legitimacy and efficacy of the NPT’s three pillars and central bargains between the NWS and the NNWS. Liberal theory rightly emphasizes the salience of liberal ideas and common interests of international security as a whole in the dynamics and evolution of the NPT as a NACD regime. But liberals
underestimate the conflicting and competitive nature of anarchical international politics, which makes durable consensus and trust extremely difficult. Grotian/ International theory is right in approaching the NPT from both realist power politics and liberal ideal and normative aspirations, and focusing on the legal and normative aspect of the NPT as an international law in the international society. The dynamics and evolution of the NPT depends on the international society consisted of states, especially great powers, which has the complex character of anarchical competition and cooperative world society.

Then, we examine the role and meaning of the NPT. How and how much did the NPT work in world politics? How was the role and meanings of the NPT? It is safe to argue that the NPT worked well in nuclear non-proliferation, moderately in civilian nuclear cooperation, but little in nuclear arms control and disarmament. These empirical observations confirm the realist view of the NPT, and to disprove the liberal expectation. Realists are sceptical of the role of the NPT more than the limited role of nuclear non-proliferation. Nuclear weapons cannot be eliminated in the anarchical international politics. Realists regard the NPT’s main objective is nuclear non-proliferation which serves the interests of the five NPT NWS and a majority of the NPT NNWS. In contrary, Liberals recognize the stagnation of nuclear arms control and disarmament efforts and new nuclear arms race. Liberals argues nuclear disarmament is feasible and desirable goals especially after the end of the Cold War. For Liberals, the NPT is based on the three pillars of nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament, and civilian nuclear cooperation, thus nuclear non-proliferation is not the end but the steps toward nuclear disarmament. Grotians recognize the limitation of the NPT to control nuclear weapons in the current anarchical international system. The NPT is an international law, which has only a limited role in the anarchical international society today. Grotians also
regard the relationship between legitimacy/efficacy and order/justice inseparably. The three pillars and central bargains of the NPT are the foundation of legitimacy and consensus in the international society, thus essential to maintain healthy and effective function of the NPT. The progress in nuclear arms control and disarmament can not ensure nuclear non-proliferation, but it is an indispensable legitimacy of the NPT-based international nuclear non-proliferation order.

Why does the NPT face crises and problems since the late 1990s onwards? How are the future prospects for the NPT and nuclear proliferation in world politics? What should be done? Liberals argue that the five NWS, especially the US and Russia, are not responsible to their nuclear arms control and disarmament obligations. Without any substantial progress in arms control and disarmament among the five NWS, the NPT has neither legitimacy nor efficacy to deal with new nuclear waves such as terrorism and revisionist regional powers. Liberals tend to predict two opposite courses: further nuclear proliferation and catastrophes or nuclear arms control and disarmament. Liberals argue the case for nuclear disarmament through the NPT. For liberals, the best policy is re-strengthening the traditional NPT regime by revitalizing the central bargains and three pillars of the NPT. On the contrary realists rightly emphasize the growing competition among the five NWS, the shift of power balance, and the diffusion of nuclear weapons technology. After the collapse of bipolar stability and a coming multi-polar world, the NPT-based traditional non-proliferation policy can not deal with new nuclear waves including the “rogue states”, rising powers, or terrorist groups. Realists predict various courses: nuclear non-proliferation optimism (hegemonic stability and defensive/moderate realism), nuclear proliferation pessimism (offensive/strategic realism), or nuclear proliferation optimism (rational deterrence realism). For realists, counter-proliferation is the best policy.
Comparison of Realist, Liberal, and International Society Approach to the NPT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variations</th>
<th>Realist Approach</th>
<th>Liberal Approach</th>
<th>International Society Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hegemonic stability, Bipolar stability, Defensive realism, Offensive realism</td>
<td>Hegemonic stability, Bipolar stability, Defensive realism, Offensive realism</td>
<td>Hegemonic stability, Bipolar stability, Defensive realism, Offensive realism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Approach</td>
<td>Institutional liberalism, Republican liberalism, Cosmopolitan liberalism</td>
<td>Liberal Approach</td>
<td>Liberal Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Society Approach</td>
<td>Realism (Hobbesian), Rationalism(Grotian), Revolutionarism (Kantian)</td>
<td>International Society Approach</td>
<td>International Society Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The source of dynamics and evolution</td>
<td>States’ security and political interests in non-proliferation</td>
<td>States’ common interests and demands (regime theory); Liberal democracies (republican liberalism) Interdependence and globalization</td>
<td>States’ common interests, statesmen’s understanding, ideas and judgement embodied in international law, rules, norms and practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key players</td>
<td>Great powers (especially the five NPT NWS)</td>
<td>States (member-states), international regimes/ institutions, liberal states, non-state actors</td>
<td>Great powers, especially the five NPT NWS, States, Statesmen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles and meanings</td>
<td>Nuclear non-proliferation for preserving the nuclear status-quo</td>
<td>The NPT three pillars: (1)non-proliferation; (2) arms control and disarmament; and (3) civilian nuclear cooperation for common interests</td>
<td>The NPT three pillars: (1)non-proliferation; (2) arms control and disarmament; and (3) civilian nuclear cooperation for common international cooperation for common interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Possibilities and limits</strong></td>
<td>Nuclear non-proliferation at best, or further nuclear proliferation</td>
<td>Either nuclear arms control and disarmament, or catastrophic nuclear proliferation</td>
<td>Cautious progress in NACD for international security as a whole, or further nuclear proliferation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The causes of current crisis today</strong></td>
<td>Great powers’ competition, the US unilateralism;, the inherent weakness of the traditional NPT regime to deal with new nuclear waves</td>
<td>Great powers’ reluctance in arms control and disarmament, the US unilateralism damage the NPT regime</td>
<td>Great powers’ reluctance in arms control and disarmament, the US unilateralism damage the NPT-based multilateralism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Desirable policy and direction</strong></td>
<td>New coercive non-proliferation policy: sanctions; counter proliferation; preventive intervention</td>
<td>Re-strengthening the traditional NPT regime based on the three pillars and multilateralism</td>
<td>Re-forming the NPT regime based on the three pillars, multilateralism and BOP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In preface of his classics *The Anarchical Society*, Hedley Bull emphasized the study of more fundamental sources rather than of the great mass of contemporary documentation such as the United Nations:

"...But to find the basic causes of such order as exists in world politics, one must look not to the League of Nations, the United Nations and such bodies, but to institutions of international society that arose before these international organizations were established, and that would continue to operate (albeit in a different mode) even if these organisations did not exist...

... the League and the United Nations, as Martin Wight once argued, are best seen as pseudo-institutions. I have also been influenced by the feeling that the United Nations, because of the great mass of documentation it engenders, has been overstudied, and that this tends to deflect scholarly attention away from sources of international order that are more fundamental." (Bull, 1977:xiv)

Keeping this Bull's advice in mind, this research project sought the answer to some fundamental questions about the NPT in world politics. Many researches have been produced in the discipline and in the study on the NPT. This research project has something to contribute to the discipline as follow.

First, this research would contribute to enhancing re-interpretation of the NPT in world politics. This research examined various approaches and the debate on its history, dynamics, evolution, roles and meanings. This research re-interpreted the NPT in its complexity and depth from both empirical and normative perspectives.
Second, this thesis examined theories of Realism, Liberalism, and Grotian/International Society in the case of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. Each theory has theoretical strength to explain the NPT, though the complexity and depth of the NPT cannot be explained by any single theory.

Third, this research explored a theoretical dialogue based on philosophical pluralism in the case of the NPT. The complexity and depth of the NPT are understood through theoretical dialogues between Realism, Liberalism, and International Society approach.

Furthermore, this research project would enhance theoretical pluralism and dialogues in the discipline of International Relations and Theory in general. This research was rather critical of rationalist (neo-realist and neo-liberal) approaches, but it also highly acknowledged to the conceptual development and sophistication of international security and regimes. By introducing the arena of international law, international/world order and justice, International Society approach of this thesis suggested to develop alternative approaches to the study of international relations and world politics.

In addition, this research would contribute to the current policy debate on the NPT and nuclear (non)proliferation, arms control and disarmament (NACD) issues in world politics. Neither hawkish coercive policy nor dovish weak policy is unlikely to succeed to stop and reverse nuclear proliferation. Rather owlish balanced policy with both hard and soft power combined is more promising.
LIMITATIONS OF THE THESIS

In spite of the findings and rationale of the research mentioned above, limitations of this thesis should be found in critical retrospect. First, the research topic, the NPT, was too broad in time, scope, and agendas. But, this is partly because the nature, scope, and history of the subject itself. The Treaty set multiple objectives from non-proliferation to arms control and disarmament to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. In addition, the NPT is sustained by complex networks of measures and initiatives. The Treaty has nearly 190 member-states. Attempts in controlling of nuclear weapons have more than 60 years' history, and the NPT itself is nearly 40 years old. The NPT is perceived in so different way as seen in Indian critiques, the US unilateralists, the UN multilateralists, developing countries and so on.

The methodology and approaches of this research were quite ambitious. Realism and liberalism are based on fundamentally different theoretical assumptions. In addition, both theories have a variety of school, such as classical realism, neo-realism, offensive/defensive realism. Furthermore, each theory explains the NPT quite differently. Although it tried to be rigorous in definition of concepts and theory, the date analysis may not be sufficiently rigorous. It might have been better if this thesis focused on only International Society approach to the NPT.

In spite of the emphasis on the International Society approach, this thesis could not fully develop the International Society/Grotian perspectives on the NPT. This is
partly because the classical/traditional approach is inter-disciplinary, normative and interpretative in nature, which does not have any standard research paradigm like scientific/behavioural approach. Furthermore, International Society approach requires not only rich historical knowledge but also good sense of judgement, which are well seen in the works of Martin Wight and Hedley Bull. I admit this thesis could not meet these requirements.

The modern institution of international law and society is based on political liberalism. As such, this thesis can be regarded as a defence of political liberalism. Other political philosophy such as conservatives, nationalists, utopians/Critical Theorists, or pacifists should be critical of international law approach based on political liberalism.

This thesis focused on conceptual and theoretical explanations and understanding of the NPT. It should have looked much more at the substance of the NPT itself, especially the details of diplomacy and empirical facts using diplomatic records and primary sources. These limitations suggest possibilities for further research on the NPT and IR.

POSSIBILITIES FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The study of the NPT and nuclear Nonproliferation Arms Control and Disarmament (NACD) in world politics is one of the most important topics in world politics. The issue of nuclear weapons proliferation will be crucial to states, individuals,
and humanity in world politics for the foreseeable future. Reflecting the literature review and the limitations of the thesis, some possibilities for further research on the NPT and IR theory can be identified as follow.

First, Grotian/ International Law and Society approach to the NPT and NACD seems to be promising. The NPT and proliferation problem can be analyzed by classical/ traditional approaches or inter-disciplinary approaches including political philosophy, history, international law, diplomacy, sociology, strategic and security studies. Martin Wight and other Grotian scholars often emphasize this inter-disciplinary character of international/ world politics. The study of the NPT and nuclear NACD in general needs less debates and more dialogues in many ways: between various nations and states, between empirical facts and normative philosophy, between theory and practice, between past, future, and present.

Second, diplomatic history should be explored on case studies of NACD. Not only the US and Russia and the other NPT NWS, but also India and the NPT NNWS including Japan, Canada, Sweden, Ireland, Austria and so on, deserves to be studied on their diplomatic approach to the NPT. The research on the NPT history is not as rich as policy analysis. It reminds me the comment of E. H. Carr that the study of international politics means diplomatic history.

Third, regional studies on nuclear (non-)proliferation should be more promising to explain and understand both state' behaviours and the international regime on nuclear-nonproliferation, arms control and disarmament. Kenneth Waltz argues the three images of causes of war: individual, states, international system. The dynamics
and evolution of the NPT and nuclear (non-)proliferation needs to be analyzed from Waltz’s three levels and also regional security dynamics. Suppose, the proliferation issues in South Asia, Middle East, or East Asia can hardly separate from the dynamics of the international non-proliferation regime based on the NPT.

Fourth, the NPT and its non-proliferation regime are based on the state-system, but it needs to deal with emerging non-traditional security issues such as proliferation to non-state actors like terrorist and crime organizations or enhancing civilian nuclear cooperation due to the increasing demands for energy, resources and environmental concerns.

Fifth, normative theory and approaches seems to be increasingly important to the NPT and NACD. The study of the NPT needs to be critically approached from alternative perspectives such as Critical Theory, Peace Studies, Cosmopolitanism, Humanism, Liberal globalization, Ecology, and so on. These critical alternative approaches should be the main task of academicians.

As Steve Smith correctly points out, the discipline of International Relations narrowly focused on the area of military and security issues during the Cold War. International Relations Theory was dominated by neo-realists and neo-liberals in North America in the 1980s (Smith, 1993, 2000; Hoffmann, 1977) After the end of the Cold War, the study of IR moves toward new directions, new agendas and new methods. First, the new direction pays more attentions to non-military issues such as human rights, humanitarian intervention, gender, culture, resource and environment, and so on. Globalization, global economy and finance, climate change, and global governance
have become the central issues in world politics. Second, the focus of security studies has been shifted from strategic studies on national defence to wider concepts of human security, social security, and even environmental security. These trends indicate the width and depth of problems our humanity faces today and tomorrow. Third, against the dominance of neo-realism and neo-liberalism in North America, post-positivism theories and social constructivism develop new alternative approaches, views, and directions.

The study of IR theory needs more dialogues between grand IR theories, and between scientific approaches and traditional/classical approaches. In spite of the similarity of concerns, the North American mainstream neo-neo debates on international regimes have almost neglected International Society theory and classical approaches in Europe. In this age of globalizing world, cultural encounter and identity politics, the study of international relations needs to explore philosophical and normative basis to deal with various increasing demands, justice, and issues. Although the International Society tradition is originated from the European international society, it seems to be fruitful to reflect on this classical approach to seek for wisdom to cope with increasingly globalizing and destabilizing international relations and world politics in the 21st century.

The future of nuclear weapons in world politics is quite uncertain and unpredictable. But one thing is sure: we have to live with nuclear weapons, or at least under the shadow of these absolute weapons. Since the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945, nuclear weapons have never been used. Since the creation of the NPT in the late 1960s, the pace of nuclear weapons proliferation has been slow down.
However, the possibilities and risks of nuclear proliferation and nuclear use seem to have been greatly increased today. It is sure that the discourse of nuclear proliferation is largely influenced by the US/Western concerns of maintaining the existing international order. But it is also true that the empirical facts, our common sense and wisdom alarm that nuclear proliferation poses serious and difficult challenges to peace and security in many ways. As long as we human beings are political animal, we have to cope with controlling nuclear weapons in world politics. The NPT is centred on this nuclear proliferation problem. The NPT and NACD agenda needs further research and analysis by enhancing a dialogue between new developments and old classics and traditions in world politics.

We can not deal with these complex nuclear problems without enhancing constructive dialogues in theory, history and practice. History without political theory bears no fruits. Political theory without history has no roots. This theoretical study on the NPT is just one of these attempts to enhance a dialogue to seek for somewhat reasonable answer to these troublesome questions we face in the international society today and tomorrow.