CHAPTER-1

INTRODUCTION

Re-considering the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
The concerns of nuclear proliferation are not new. Albert Einstein remarked, "...The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus we drift to unparalleled catastrophe..."¹ President John F. Kennedy, in 1963, remarked, "...I am haunted by the feeling that by 1970 ... there may be ten nuclear powers instead of five, and by 1975, 15 or 20..."²

In the beginning of the 21st century, we have not yet experienced catastrophic nuclear use or war since Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After 45 years since Kennedy’s remark, we know only 9 nuclear weapon states (the US, Russia, the UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea). This is noteworthy because the knowledge and technology of making nuclear weapons are widely diffused, and today it is estimated that about 40 countries have capacities to build nuclear weapons. But Einstein’s logical prediction and Kennedy’s nightmare of nuclear proliferation and catastrophe have not yet realized. But, does it mean that their gloomy prospect was just a paranoiac nightmare? Why didn’t more rapid nuclear proliferation happen? There are several answers to these questions. Some claim alliances and extended nuclear deterrence provided by the US and the former USSR deterred nuclear proliferation. Others argue that super powers coordination effectively halted nuclear proliferation. It is also believed and debated that the NPT-based international nuclear non-proliferation regime played a significant role of halting the spread of nuclear weapons. However, the end of the Cold War and September 11 Terrorism drastically highlighted the problem of new nuclear waves. India and Pakistan did nuclear tests in 1998 and North Korea in 2006. By now Iran is suspected to proceed nuclear-weapons programme. Fundamentalist groups are also a matter of concerns of nuclear proliferation.

This research project aims to analyze, explain and understand the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT; the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons) in world politics. The Treaty was signed in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. The Treaty set three objectives: (1) nuclear non-proliferation, (2) nuclear arms control and disarmament, and (3) civilian nuclear cooperation. The NPT (about 190 member-states today) has been widely regarded as the basis of WMD/nuclear non-proliferation regime and as the most successful global security regime. However, the main problems and criticisms have been centered on the discriminative nature of the Treaty. The NPT set two categories of member-states: Nuclear-Weapon states (only for the US, Russia, Britain, France, and China) and Non-Nuclear-Weapon states (all other member-states). In spite of the impressive records of non-proliferation efforts especially in the early 1990s, it is widely debated whether the NPT and its non-proliferation regime can cope with "new nuclear proliferation waves" today.

This research project sets the following questions to be answered: Why did the NPT evolved into the global security regime? How and why did the NPT evolved as an international law in the international society? How does it reflect the dilemma of order/justice in world politics? How did the role and meaning of the Treaty in the area of nuclear non-proliferation, arms control, and disarmament? What is the limit and possibility of the NPT? Scholarship and policy-circle have hardly reached any substantial consensus about the NPT.

Being based on philosophical, theoretical, and methodological pluralism, this research aims to analyze, explain and understand the NPT through the comparative lenses of Realism, Liberalism, and the Grotian/International Society theory. This thesis argues that both Realist theory and Liberal theory enhance our explanation and understanding of
the NPT as an international security regime, but the Grotian theory provides a better alternative picture of the NPT as an international law in the international society. By comparing three theoretical perspectives, this research is expected to provide a better and comprehensive perspective to explain and understand the complex role and meaning of the NPT in world politics.

AN OVERVIEW OF THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

The definition of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) is the abbreviation of “The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons”. It is also called as “the Treaty on the Nuclear Weapons Non-Proliferation”. The NPT is an international treaty/agreement which was opened for signature in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. Today, the Treaty has about 190 membership-states, close to universal in the international society.

Status of United Nations member countries

![Graph showing the status of United Nations member countries](image)

- **Member states**: 30, 58, 83, 149, 156, 190
- **UNSC**: 11, 11, 11, 15, 15, 15
- **UNSC P-5**: 5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5
Status of the NPT member countries

The NPT defines two types of member-states: "Nuclear-weapon States (NWS)" and "Non-nuclear-weapon States (NNWS)".

- **Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS):** are those that have exploded a nuclear device *prior to 1 January 1967*, and comprise five states: the U.S. (1945), Russia (the former USSR, 1949), Britain (1952), France (1960), and China (1964). (Article IX) [P-5 members of the UN Security Council.]

- **Non-nuclear-weapon States (NNWS):** are those parties that have renounced the acquisition of nuclear weapons, and comprise all other member states.

- Other states which get nuclear weapons after 1967, by this definition, are not admitted as the NWS even though India, Pakistan, and North Korea openly declared it.

### Key events and membership in the NPT history

- **1968:** NPT is signed. (entered into force in 1970).
- **1970s:** Sweden (1970), Germany and Italy (1975), and Japan (1976) accept NNWS status.
- **1974:** India conducts nuclear tests.
- **1980s:** Turkey (1980), Egypt (1981), DPRK (1985), and Spain (1987) accept
NNWS status.


1995 The NPT REC decides the indefinite extension of the Treaty. 175 of the NPT’s 178 state parties were present at the 1995 NPT REC.

1998: India and Pakistan conduct nuclear weapons tests.


2004 Pakistani scientist A.Q. Khan’s secret nuclear bazaar (with North Korea, Libya, and Iran) is revealed.

[The NPT is the most universal treaty in its membership status close to the UN. It is also distinguished its discriminatory character between NWS and NNWS.]

The NPT’ three pillars (objectives)

To mitigate above fundamental discrimination, the balance of obligations and three pillars of the Treaty were agreed between NWS and NNWS in the 1960s’ negotiations of the Treaty at the UN. The NPT set three main objectives:

(1) to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology,

(2) to promote co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, and

(3) to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament. The NPT represents the only binding commitment in a multilateral treaty to the goal of disarmament by the nuclear-weapon states.
“Non-Proliferation” can be defined as actions taken to prevent the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) by dissuading or impeding access to, or distribution of, sensitive technologies, material, and expertise. This term was introduced in the 1960s.

“Disarmament” is the act of eliminating, reducing or depriving of arms or weapons systems, by unilateral, bilateral, plurilateral or multilateral measures and agreements.

- **Nuclear non-proliferation: (Article I, II, III)**

  Article I read, “Each nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; and not in any way to assist, encourage, or induce any non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices, or control over such weapons or explosive devices.

  Article II read, “Each non-nuclear-weapon State Party to the Treaty undertakes not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly; not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; and not to seek or receive any assistance in the manufacture of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

- **Civilian nuclear co-operation: (Article IV)**

  Article IV read, “all the Parties to the Treaty undertake to facilitate, and have the right to participate in, the fullest possible exchange of equipment, materials and scientific and technological information for the peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Parties to the Treaty in a position to do so shall also cooperate in contributing alone or together with other States
or international organizations to the further development of the applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, especially in the territories of non-nuclear-weapon States Party to the Treaty, with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

• Nuclear arms control and disarmament: (Article VI)

Article VI read, “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 treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.”

**The NPT' central bargains between the NWS and the NNWS**

To reduce the discriminatory character of the NPT, it is acknowledged that NWS parties and NNWS parties made “central bargains” or “grand bargains. The non-nuclear-weapon states (NNWS) promised the nuclear-weapon states that they would not acquire nuclear weapons. In return, the nuclear-weapon states (NWS) promised the non-nuclear-weapon states the promotion of civilian nuclear cooperation and progress on nuclear arms control and disarmament (Preez, 2005; Mccqwire, 2005). According to Walker, the central bargains between NWS and NNWS are indispensable in the NPT development and consolidation:

“...Affirmation of the NPT' bargains was an essential source among several sources of that growth and consolidation [in the 1980s and 1990s]. It certainly played a prominent part in the US-led campaign in the run-up to the 1995 NPT Extension Conference, whose aim was to achieve universal membership of the Treaty and give it indefinite life…” (Walker 2007:757-762).
The NPT-based non-proliferation regime

The NPT is widely acknowledged as the indispensable cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime. Boutros-Ghali claims,

"...The intrinsic worth of the NPT is enhanced even further by additional efforts that have been undertaken to thwart the proliferation of nuclear weapons. These agreements – whether in the form of treaties or resolutions, or concluded unilaterally, bilaterally or multilaterally – together form what is known as the nuclear non-proliferation regime. The system incorporates measures intended to make the acquisition of nuclear weapons less attractive and more difficult..."

(Boutros-Ghali, 1995:13)

The NPT-based non-proliferation regime incorporates various measures:

The supply side approach include

- Safeguards: States parties to the NPT have undertaken to accept safeguards on all source or special fissionable material in all peaceful nuclear activities within their territories, under their jurisdiction or control.
- Export controls: on equipment deemed to be sensitive and potentially destabilizing to the maintenance of international peace and security.

The demand side approach include

- Security assurances: to non-nuclear-weapon States (NNWS) so that they do not feel compelled to attempt to procure nuclear weapons for their defence.
- Nuclear-weapon-free zones (NWFZ): A geographical area in which nuclear weapons are not allowed to be built, possessed, transferred, or tested.
- Nuclear disarmament: NWS has an obligation of nuclear disarmament under Article VI, which can not separate from NNWS’ undertaking of non-proliferation
### The nuclear non-proliferation regime

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Treaties, agency, group, regimes, and measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security assurances</td>
<td>Positive security assurances: UNSC Resolution 255 (1968), Negative security assurances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear-test-ban</td>
<td>The Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT, signed in August 1963,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treaties</td>
<td>Enter into Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Threshold Test Ban Treaty (TTBT, opened for signature in July 1974, entered into force in December 1990)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (signed in May 1976)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT, signed in 1996)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ABM Treaty (agreed in 1972)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The INF Treaty (signed in Dec 1987, entered into force in June 1988)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The START I Treaty (concluded in July 1991)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lisbon Protocol (concluded in May 1992)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The START II Treaty (concluded in January 1993)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we just sketched an overview of the NPT and its non-proliferation regime today. However, the Treaty has been challenges, criticized and even denounced in many ways. The meanings of the Treaty, both its importance and problems, will be extensively explained.

**THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE NPT IN WORLD POLITICS**

*Nuclear proliferation problems after the Cold War*

The problem of nuclear proliferation has become one of the most important agendas in international security after the Cold War. The risks and concerns of nuclear proliferation are regarded as increasing for the following reasons:

- The number, location, and character-of-government of proliferant countries is highly threatening.
- Terrorist organizations may use such weapons.
- The weapons of proliferants are likely to be neither safe nor secure.
- International norms against proliferation have been and are being eroded.
- Proliferation now includes delivery capability.
Motivations to proliferate will increase as alliances disintegrate.

Nuclear proliferation is regarded as undesirable because it increase the risk of nuclear war and use. An official of the Swiss used an analogy of game to show the aggravating risk of nuclear proliferation: “...Between two nuclear powers it’s a game of chess, among four, it’s bridge, among a dozen, it would be poker, roulette or any of those games controlled by chance…” (Georges Fischer 1969-70: 31).

Further nuclear proliferation pose serious challenges to the US world order based on unmatched conventional military power today. The proliferation of nuclear weapons means a proliferation of nuclear deterrents. President Clinton’s Secretary of Defense, Les Aspin outlined the problem in December 1993: “...During the Cold War, our principal adversary had conventional forces in Europe that were numerically superior. For us, nuclear weapons were the equalizer. The threat to use them was present and was used to compensate for our smaller numbers of conventional forces. Today, nuclear weapons can still be the equalizer against superior conventional forces. But today it is the United States that has unmatched conventional military power, and its is our potential adversaries who may attain nuclear weapons...” (Siracusa, 2008:109).

The NPT contributes to nuclear-nonproliferation

It is widely regarded that the NPT-based non-proliferation regime has played a significant role to deter (or at least delay) nuclear proliferation. UN Secretary General Boutros-Ghali emphasizes the contribution of the NPT to nonproliferation:

“...The NPT, together with the other measures that comprise the nuclear non-proliferation regime, has succeeded in stemming the proliferation of nuclear weapons and in reducing the existing nuclear arsenals. While the NPT was being negotiated there was much concern that failure to create a treaty would result in significant nuclear proliferation. Even after the NPT entered into force, skeptics
warned that there could by 20 to 30 nuclear-weapon States by the 1980s. That this has not occurred is not simply good luck. A cause-and-effect relationship is discernible. Today, more than ever before, the NPT remains the vital instrument it has always been..." (UN, 1995: 3-4).

Even though realists point out the weakness of the NPT to deal with further nuclear proliferation today, it is difficult to deny the various important role of the NPT to halt, reverse or delay nuclear proliferation. The NPT plays multiple roles to set a legal barrier, to create a norm, to set apart the suspect, to establish a forum for ongoing dialogue, and to provide a framework for verification (Bailey 1993: 12-14).

The NPT contributes to regional and global security environment

Furthermore, rather than evaluating the treaty in the narrow focus on nuclear proliferation, it need to be evaluated in terms of its contribution to broader and wider regional/global security environment. The NPT contributes to regional and international security in various ways as follow:

- the cornerstone of the global WMD non-proliferation regime, norm and practice;
- the most widely adhered to arms limitation and control measure
- the ultimate and strong obstacle to nuclear anarchy and arms race;
- a confidence-building measure (CBM) and a premise of security assurances;
- a forum for on-going negotiations, consultations, and consensus-making;
- a positive basis of present-day global or regional security, order, and stability.
THE PROBLEMS AND CRITIQUES OF THE NPT

Contested and confused debates on the NPT

Contemporary debates on the NPT are contested and confused in many ways from the inter-national level to the domestic politics level, from hawkish realism to dovish utopianism. In international politics, the NWS and the NNWS are deeply divided as we can observe at the NPT Review Conferences. The NWS expect to conserve the current nuclear status quo, but justify that NWS do their duties and obligations of progress in nuclear arms control and disarmament. But even the position of five NWS (the US, Russia, Britain, France, and China) is not identical. The NNWS hope the NWS make clear progress in nuclear arms control toward nuclear disarmament, criticizing that NWS has not performed but totally uncommitted to their duties and obligations. But even the position of the NNWS is also divided from the industrialized NNWS of the close US allies (Japan, Germany, and Canada) and the industrialized NNWS (Norway, Sweden, and Austria), from developing NNWS (Egypt, Indonesia, Mexico, Brazil and so on) to other smaller developing NNWS (a majority of the international community). The most controversial cases include Israel and Iraq in the Middle East, North Korea in East Asia, India and Pakistan in South Asia. The US-India nuclear deal causes intensive debates on the legitimacy, effectiveness and future of the NPT-based non-proliferation regime.

The perception of the NPT is often not identical even at the level of domestic politics as we can see the intense debate on the NPT in the US and India. The perceptions of the NPT are too varied and diverse to reach any solid and meaningful consensus. (Pilat and Pendley, ed. 1990; Dhanapala with Rydell, 2005).
At the level of ideology and theory, we can find a huge gap between realists and liberals, between hawks and doves, between strategic analysts and peace studies. We will examine various ideological/theoretical approaches in detail this research.

**Discrimination: nuclear-haves and have-nots**

Most criticisms of the NPT are centered on the problem of discrimination. The NPT differentiates between two types of states - Nuclear-Weapon States (NWS) and Non-Nuclear-Weapon States (NNWS). The special status of the NWS is officially admitted only for the five great powers (the US, the former USSR/Russia, the UK, France and China) which conducted their nuclear tests before 1st January 1968. The rest of other states can join the Treaty only as the NNNW which is disadvantageous status. This was apparent at the time of concluding the Treaty. According to Burn, "...Two sides - one nuclear, the other nonnuclear, that is, states possessing nuclear weapons and others not possessing such weapons - may be said to be concluding the treaty. There is not, of course, and cannot be identity of views within each of these sides on the significance of such an agreement..."

Being discriminative, the Treaty legitimizes the status of nuclear-weapon states, and creates a class system of nuclear "haves" and "have-nots". The Treaty legitimately allows nuclear-weapons-state parties (nuclear haves) to retain their weapons while exacting a vow from non-nuclear-weapons states (nuclear have-nots) that they will refrain from acquiring them. Also, the non-nuclear-weapons states, in their efforts to prevent proliferation, do not share the fruits of nuclear technology. This imbalance has led to contentious arguments among parties, which intensify at five-year intervals when the NPT is subject to review by its members. Since the creation of the NPT treaty in the late 1960s, many voices strongly denounce its hypocrisy and discrimination of the NPT
as “the nuclear imperialism”, “the nuclear hegemony”, “the nuclear cartel”, “the nuclear cult”, “the nuclear apartheid” (Singh, 1998). The first NPT Review Conference showed the dissatisfactions of the non-nuclear weapon state parties on this discrimination.

“...The [1975 NPT Review] Conference has revealed profound differences in the understanding of the meaning of the NPT. It became clearer than ever before that the nuclear-weapon powers consider the NPT as an end itself, while all, or almost all, other parties look at it as a transitional stage in a process of nuclear disarmament...” (SIPRI, 1976:391).

The NPT Review Conference have debated on three major topics, which comes from this discriminative nature of the Treaty: (1) access to nuclear technology by the non-nuclear-weapon states, (2) disarmament by the nuclear weapons states, and (3) provision of security assurances to the non-nuclear-weapon states (Bailey, 1993). These problems have never satisfactory solved. Rather these issues will remain the source of disputes between the NWS parties and the NNWS parties at the NPT RevCon for the foreseeable future, or they might become the source of disintegration of the Treaty-regime.

**Indian critiques**

The Treaty has been fiercely criticized since the time of its creation. Indian critiques have been the most stanch and far-sighted in retrospect. Here, we note the critiques by Indian Ambassador Azim Hussein and leading scholar Subrahmanyam:

1. The treaty did not ensure the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons but only stopped the dissemination of weapons to non-nuclear weapon states without imposing any curbs on the continued manufacture, stockpiling and sophistication
of nuclear weapons by the existing nuclear weapon states.

2. The treaty did not do away with the special status of superiority associated with power and prestige conferred on those powers which possessed nuclear weapons.

3. The treaty did not provide for a balance of obligations and responsibilities between the nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear-weapon states. While all the obligations were imposed on non-nuclear weapon states, the nuclear weapons states had not accepted any.

4. The treaty did not constitute a step-by-step approach toward nuclear disarmament.

5. The treaty did not prohibit one nuclear weapon state from assisting another nuclear weapon state by providing technical aid.

6. The long period of a quarter of a century provided in Article X of the treaty would appear to endorse and legitimise the present state of affairs and legalise, if not encourage an unrestricted vertical proliferation by the present nuclear weapon states.

7. Article VI did not create a juridical obligation in regard to the cessation of nuclear arms race at an early date.

8. The treaty imparted a false sense of security to the world.

9. It was discriminatory in regard to the peaceful benefits of nuclear explosions.

10. It was discriminatory in regard to the safeguards and controls which were all imposed on the non-nuclear-weapon states while none whatsoever were imposed on the nuclear weapon states.

11. The security assurances to the non-nuclear weapon states could not be a quid pro quo for the acceptance of the treaty. This must be obligatory for the nuclear weapon states.

(Quoted in Subrahmanyam, 1985-6: 1-2)
Subrahmanyam staunchly criticizes the flaws in the NPT:

“...In the present-day world the greater and more imminent threats arise out of the inadequacy of control over immense stockpiles of nuclear weapons in the nuclear weapon states, the reduction in reaction and response times flowing from vertical proliferation and the consequent increase in automation of decision-making, and the increased risks of terroristic diversion of nuclear devices and materials from the unsafeguarded military facilities in the nuclear weapon states. New developments in conventional weapon technologies are eroding on the nuclear thresholds. The use of nuclear weapons as international currency of power and their spatial proliferation around the globe have contributed significantly to interventionism by the nuclear weapon powers in the developing world and to the increased sense of insecurity in the latter. These are the real issues relating to nuclear proliferation and these are the issues by which the Non-Proliferation Treaty should be judged...” (Subrahmanyam, 1985-86: 19).

The statement of Ambassador Hussein was made in March 1968 and the critique of Subrahmanyam was written in 1985. But, most of these critiques are very relevant to the problems we face in the 21st century.

**The dilemma between order versus justice**

The NPT reflects the dilemma between order versus justice in world politics. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) can be regarded as efforts in dealing with the contending dilemma between order versus justice regarding nuclear weapons, security, and energy. The dilemma of order/justice is apparent on the issue of controlling nuclear weapons in world politics, Bull (1977) point out:
"...On the one pole, complete justice and equality can be achieved in a nuclear disarmament world or a fully nuclearized world where all states have nuclear deterrence rights and abilities. The former scenario seems to be desirable but not to be feasible in the foreseeable future, and the latter scenario seems to be too dangerous to be acceptable. On the other pole, a stable international nuclear order would be attainable in a partially nuclearized world where a nuclear club consists of strong powers and the rest of other weaker states remain to be a non-nuclear status..."

From liberal optimism to realist pessimism

Policy debates on the nuclear non-proliferation efforts after the Cold War were oscillated between "complacency and media-based hype" (Muller, 1997:62-71). Although the NPT overcame proliferation challenges and agendas by the mid-1990s, the situation surrounding the NPT regime has been deteriorating since then. Walker remarks: "Unfortunately, international relations are now so brittle that a repeated failure to find common cause and agreed solutions and to do so soon, can only lead to an even more destructive disorder. At present we seem headed for another 'Age of Extremes' Eric Hobsbawm's apt phase for the century just passed. ... [T]he urgent need for reinvestment in efficacy and legitimacy if a graver descent into disorder is to be avoided..." (2004: 4).

For proper understanding and evaluation of the NPT, we need to think over more fundamental problems of the NPT in world politics, Walker observes: "the present is one of those moments when fundamental questions about nuclear order need to be asked and answered. Unfortunately, they have tended to be driven out of sight as the attention of governments, think-tanks and the media have been obsessively drawn to the particular" (Walker 2007b: 757-762). The NPT needs to be re-examined in the wider and deeper context of international/world politics.
Thus the NPT-based nonproliferation regime has flaws as below:

• **Discrimination**: The NPT differentiates between NWS and NNWS. The NPT legitimates and consolidates the unequal hierarchy of nuclear “haves” and “have-nots”.

• **The NPT’ three pillars contain contradictions**: Peaceful nuclear energy can be turned into nuclear weapons. Thus, more nuclear energy states mean more nuclear weapons proliferation risks.

• **The NPT’ “grand bargains” have never been fulfilled**: In order to reduce inherent discrimination between the NWS and the NNWS, the NPT assigns the NWS to pursue not only [1] non-proliferation, but also [2] nuclear arms control and disarmament and [3] peaceful nuclear co-operation. However, the apparent lack of progress raises frustration and mistrust in international society.

• **The limits of international law, regimes, and institutions**: Any international control of nuclear energy, technology or weapons is imperfect under the anarchical sovereign state-system today. The institutional problems in the NPT regime today include: technically safeguards, inspections, verification measures, politically compliance, implementation, confidence-building, efficacy, enforcement, non-membership and withdrawal.

• **Inability to deal with new proliferation challenges**: The NPT was created in the late 1960s. As such, it can hardly deal with new proliferation challenge such as non-state actors (terrorist and crime groups), so-called rogue states, or new proliferation waves in South Asia, West Asia, and East Asia.
RESEARCH RATIONALE

Any research must have originality whatever and something new and valuable. And the research project should focus on a sort of research problem with significance and meaning: (1) historical significance, (2) contemporary relevance, (3) theoretical relevance, or (4) necessity to be re-interpreted (SIS Research Manual, 2006). The problem of this research project has significance, relevance, and meaning as explained below.

(1) Historical significance

After the birth of the Treaty after a decade of negotiations in the 1960s, the NPT evolved into the foundation of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime during the Cold War period. Though the NPT is widely acknowledge as the most successful case of an international regime in security today, the study of NPT was rather ignored in the discipline except occasional reports and analyses of the NPT RevCon. UN Secretary General Annan remarks,

“...Multilateral efforts to bridle the dangers of nuclear technology while harnessing its promise are nearly as old as the United Nations itself. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons ... has proved indispensable: it has not only diminished nuclear peril but also demonstrated the value of multilateral agreements in safeguarding international peace and security...” (2005:37)

(2) Contemporary relevance

The NPT and its non-proliferation regime have been intensively debated since 1990s. Although the NPT-based non-proliferation regime overcame various challenges in
the early 1990s, especially its successful indefinite extension, it has faced various challenges since the mid-1990s till today: the South Asian nuclear tests in 1998; September 11 terrorism and rising concerns of nuclear terrorism; the revelation of Pakistani A. Q. Khan's nuclear black market in 2003; the US Iraq war on the claim of Hussain's nuclear programme (never proved) and Iranian nuclear issue; North Korean withdrawal from the Treaty in 2003 and their nuclear and missile tests and so on. Above all, the US unilateralism neglect their disarmament obligations and the five NWS are widely regarded that they are not serious about their arms control and disarmament efforts but they are improving and building up their nuclear arms. The US-India nuclear deal is internationally debated that it will damage the legitimacy and efficacy of the NPT further (though the US has been always inconsistent in their non-proliferation efforts evident in Israeli and Pakistani cases also). In this contemporary context, the debates are going on about what should be done to new proliferation wave, about the relationship between nuclear non-proliferation, civilian nuclear cooperation and disarmament, and whether the NPT and its non-proliferation regime remain effective and trustworthy as before. Annan says,

"... But today, the Treaty has suffered the first withdrawal of a party to the Treaty and faces a crisis of confidence and compliance born of a growing strain on verification and enforcement..." (2005:37)

(3) Theoretical and conceptual significance

The theoretical analysis of the NPT needs to be encouraged for proper understanding of the NPT. In spite of rich debates on international regimes between neo-liberals and neo-realists, the NPT and its non-proliferation regime has been regarded as an exceptional case. This research project has significance in concepts (international institution/regime theories, international law/society, and order/justice), and also in its
comparative theoretical approach (Realism, Liberalism, and the Grotian/ International Society theory).

(4) Necessity to be revisited because of new perspectives

Policy-oriented analyses are generally, by definition, biased either for states’ national interests or international organizational interests. Realism and liberalism are debating on the limit and possibility of the NPT-based non-proliferation regime. Both policy and theoretical debates hardly reach any meaningful answer to the complex problems of the NPT and its non-proliferation regime in international/world order. New alternative perspectives are required to explain and understand the role and meaning, the historical evolution and drastic change in the NPT in international/world politics.

The study of the NPT is inseparably inter-related to the case studies of nuclear (non-)proliferation and the discipline of international relations/world politics in general. The study of the NPT and nuclear (non-)proliferation has the importance in social science and international relations as below:

- First, the sample, that is, the number of countries whose decisions about nuclear weapons we may want to study, is large.
- Second, the building of nuclear weapons is a complex task touching upon many of the subjects of study at the heart of social science and international relations.
- Third, the building of nuclear weapons has been proscribed by the nonproliferation regime. The decisions countries have made about the acquisition of nuclear weapons can thus serve as a test of the effectiveness of this particular regime, and of regimes and regime theory in general.
- Fourth, nuclear weapons were introduced at the same time bipolarity became the international order. It is argued that both nuclear weapons and bipolarity strengthen stability, and that the two have tended to reinforce each other. The world is moving away from bipolarity, however. (Davis and Frankel, 1993)
In sum, the NPT and its regime developed and evolved into “the most successful case of international security regimes” for almost 40 years’ history. But the NPT has been fiercely criticized and the debate on the NPT seems to lose its direction. It indicated that scholarships have not reached any consensus on nuclear proliferation and the NPT in theory, history, and practice. There are so different views of the NPT in nuclear issues. This research will address central problems of the NPT: its dynamics and evolution, its roles and functions, the reason of current crises in world politics.

RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

The aims are the most important in any research because “the aims act as an integrating link throughout a good thesis, setting out the intentions of the research at the beginning, and providing a focus for the results and conclusion at the end.” (Oliver 2004).

The main aims of this research project are:

• to analyze, explain and understand the NPT as an international security regime, focusing on its dynamics, evolution, roles and meanings in the issue-areas of nuclear non-proliferation, arms control, and disarmament in world politics;

• to analyze, explain and understand the roles and meanings of the NPT as a modern international law and society, which reflect the difficult and various dilemmas between order versus justice in international/world politics.

The scope of the study is centered on the evolution, dynamics, role and meaning of the NPT, especially non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament (NACD) issues in international/world politics. The period to be analyzed is from 1958 to 2000, but

---

3 The word “scope” is originated from Greek skopos ‘target’. It means “(1) the extent of the area or subject matter that something deals with or to which it is relevant, (2) the opportunity or possibility for doing something.”
events after 2000 are also considered as far as it is important to the contemporary context of the NPT after the Cold War. The evolution of the NPT is analyzed in relationship with states, great powers, international regimes, and international society/system although a comparative theoretical approach shed light on different dimensions and actors in the NPT. Realist theory focuses on states and state-relation/system, liberal theory focuses on states, state-relation/system, and the concerns of non-state actors including NGOs, individuals, humanity. Both theories will debate on the process of the NPT as the basis of the international non-proliferation regime.

Grotian/ International Society theory focus on the NPT as an international law in the society of states (international society), where great powers, and statesmen play their significant role, especially their relationship with various order/justice in empirical and normative terms. This study deal with these problems, issues and meanings of the NPT, which international theories shed light on.

This research set specific objectives in the chapters as below:

- To review the theoretical, historical, contemporary context of the NPT and nuclear proliferation problems in world politics; to find out the gap therein; and to set up the main research questions (Chapter 2: The Literature Review);
- To review great debates in IR especially the debate on methodology, to clarify the three grand IR theories of Realism, Liberalism, and Grotian (international Society) theory, to discuss the key ideas of international institutions/regimes and international law/society, and to explore theoretical pluralism and classical approaches to IR as the research method (Chapter 3: Methodology);
- To explain and examine the dynamics, evolution, role and function of the NPT as an international institutions/regimes in international politics (Chapter 4 and 5).
• To investigate the meanings, roles and evolution of the NPT as a modern international law and society, and to examine the legitimacy and efficacy of international nuclear order, which reflect the dilemma between order versus justice in contemporary world politics (Chapter 6);

• To compare the three theoretical perspectives on the NPT with empirical examinations and normative concerns (Chapter 4, 5, and 6)

This research is expected to contribute to our understanding of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, one of the most important issues in international security and world politics. It is also expected to enhance “understanding the systems, institutions and processes” of the NPT and its non-proliferation regime in international/world politics.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

For understanding of the NPT, this research will seek answers to a set of questions:

• Why did the NPT evolve into a global security regime? (to analyze, examine and explain its dynamics, development, and evolution)

• How did the NPT work and function in world politics? What is the limit and possibility of the NPT? (to analyze and examine its roles and meanings)

• How did the NPT evolve and function as a modern international law in the international society?

• How do the NPT and the international nuclear order reflect the difficult dilemma between order versus justice at various levels and aspirations in international/world politics?
RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

• The NPT evolved into the global international security regime because the five NWS (great powers) found common interests in non-proliferation (Realist explanations), and because a majority of the NNWS also found common interests in nuclear non-proliferation and civilian nuclear cooperation with expectations of progress in nuclear arms control and disarmament (liberal explanations).

• The NPT worked highly effective in the area of nuclear non-proliferation, and functioned moderately in civilian nuclear cooperation and nuclear arms control, and least effective in nuclear disarmament efforts.

• The NPT evolved as an international law to set common understanding, interests, norms, and rules concerning nuclear non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament, and civil nuclear cooperation among member-states in the international society. The legitimacy, efficacy and trust of the Treaty in the international society lies in common understanding among state-parties, the central bargains between the NWS and the NNWS, the balance of obligation and the NPT’ three pillars, and trustful verification and enforcement mechanism (Grotian/International Society theory).

• The NPT reflects the dilemma between the necessity of equality, security and justice and the reality of unequal power balance, the demand for a status-quo international non-proliferation order and the call for progress and change toward nuclear disarmament world order/justice (Realism, Rationalism, and Revolutionarism).
METHODOLOGY

International theory is a useful tool to explain and understand world politics. To grasp the complexity and depth of world politics, pluralistic theoretical dialogues and historical understanding are helpful to overcome ideological straitjackets and prejudice. Above all, both empirical and normative aspects are important in theory and practice of world politics.

This research is based on theoretical pluralism (the three Grand IR theories: Realism, Liberalism, and Grotian/International Society theory). This research takes traditional/classical approaches (Bull), with referring to insights from rationalistic approaches such as neo-realism, neo-liberalism, and the studies of international institutions/ regimes.

International Society (Grotian) theory is a humane-approach, which focuses on international society/ law. Legitimacy is a key to order, justice, and efficacy in any stable world order. Grotian theory encourages a dialogue between Realist, Revolutionary, and Rationalist tradition, all of each approach highlight various dilemmas between order and justice. The Grotians assume the importance of great powers and states-men whose policy-decision making and responsibility matters to the NPT in the international society and world politics.

The evolution and function of the NPT is complex and complicated. Realism and Liberalism would offer different explanations and narratives of the NPT. Grotian theoretical pluralism helps explain and understand the complexity and depth of the NPT in world politics. The NPT need to be re-interpreted in a more balanced and comprehensive picture with normative concerns.
ROADMAP

Chapter 2 reviews the literatures of nuclear issues in world politics, nuclear (non)proliferation, arms control, and disarmament, and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. By reviewing the literatures, it identifies the research agendas and questions of the NPT: its complex dynamics, evolution, roles and meanings in world politics.

Chapter 3 discusses methodology and the research design. This research is based on pluralism in history, theory, and approaches. It uses three “grand IR theories” (Realism, Liberalism and the Grotian/ International Society school) to analyze the NPT in world politics. Each grand IR theory has its theoretical strength to explain and understand world politics. The complexity of the NPT can be comprehended by a dialogue between theories, together with referring to history and empirical facts.

Chapter 4 analyzes the realist explanations of the NPT. Realists argue that the NPT reflects great powers’ interests to preserve the nuclear status-quo order at best. Realists are skeptical of the NPT’s objective of nuclear arms control and disarmament.

Chapter 5 examines the liberal explanations of the NPT. Liberals claim that the NPT is the product of the international society including both great powers and lesser powers to prevent further nuclear proliferation, and to proceed to nuclear arms control and disarmament.

Chapter 6 explores the Grotian/ International Society theorist perspectives on the NPT. The Grotians regard that the NPT should be understood as an international law in the international society. The legitimacy, trust, and efficacy of the NPT are owed to member-states’ common understanding, norms and rules. A dialogue between the Hobbesian, the Kantians, and the Grotians advance our comprehending of the complexity of the NPT, especially of the dilemma between order and justice. The roles of great powers and states-men did and do matter to the evolution of the NPT.

The concluding chapter summarizes the arguments, findings, and significance of
this research. It also evaluates how much this research achieved the aims and objectives, and limits of this research. It will suggest possibilities for further research.

CONCLUSION

This chapter explained the overview, aims and objectives, main research questions, methodology and design of this research project. Controlling of nuclear weapons has posed a difficult problem in world politics since its birth of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was signed in 1968 and entered into force in 1970, and evolved into a global security regime by the mid-1990s. However, it faces criticisms, problems, challenges, and crises today. In this context, we identified the main questions of the research: to analyze the dynamics, evolution, and roles and functions of the NPT in world politics. This research also explores the meaning of the NPT in the international society in the context of order/justice in international/world politics. In order to answer these research questions, this research adopts the three grand IR theories (Realism, Liberalism, Grotian/International Society school), in a classical/traditional approach. Although this research are based on Bull's classical/traditional approaches or Weberian interpretative approaches, it refers to the concepts and ideas (international institutions, regimes, international society/law, order, justice) developed in the debate by scientific approaches such as neo-realism and neo-liberalism. This research is expected to contribute to our explaining and understanding of the NPT in international politics.