Seeking peaceful solutions to conflicts which seem to be a part of the international structure, has become not only the greatest need but also the greatest dilemma of the modern age. Conflict and discord are bred primarily by disparities on the one hand and indifference towards the political and economic conditions of the underdeveloped states or their exploitation on the other. A friction free world where different and diverse cultures would live in peace and flourish side by side remains a dream.

Some of the constraints which have continued to baffle advocates of disarmament all the world over have been (i) the prevailing political structures with their continued dependence on military might to preserve an out-moded concept of sovereignty coupled with the failure to envolve an effective supranational authority; (ii) the inadequacies of negotiating structures; (iii) the economic disparities, aggravated by inequitable and unfair distribution of resources and population; (iv) the prevalent divergence, in some cases acute, in approach to problems between developed countries on the one side and developing and under-developed countries on the other; and (v) the role of military-industrial-technological-bureaucratic complex.
PREVAILING POLITICAL STRUCTURES AND THE SOVEREIGNTY CONCEPT

In the context of international affairs the concept of "Sovereignty" connotes "the freedom of a state from external control", which implies not only the preservation of its traditional integrity and independence but complete non-interference in its internal affairs and in the organization and deployment by the state of its forces for the maintenance of that status.

Unfortunate as it may look from several angles, the international public law also continues to recognize the concept of sovereignty thereby providing international sanction to the right of every state to organise its armed forces for the sake of preserving its nationhood or sovereignty. This right is widely accepted and has accorded countries big or small, the freedom to militarize themselves to the highest possible levels within their reach, with the efforts made or the levels of militarization sought or achieved being often out of all proportion to their actual needs. There is hardly any country in the world irrespective of its size or resources, or the state of its economic development which does not claim the right, in terms of the international law, to acquire whatever weapons it chooses in its wisdom, whether conventional or nuclear, and to use them to
preserve itself from dangers which may be real or imagined. The presence of small countries armed with sophisticated weapons while millions of their subjects are dying and perishing from want of basic amenities (food, shelter and clothing) is not a rare phenomenon in the present world. National armies are maintained and equipped with great ostentation and paraded with pride while a blind eye is turned towards the more important needs of the country. This global militarization has been aggravated by an international arms race which in turn has resulted in a flourishing arms trade, adding a new and vicious dimension to an already complicated issue of ever escalating insecurity of nations. Advent of military regimes, repression of dissent, armed conflicts, inter-state boundary wars, unrest and instability are all in a way the outcome of the concept of sovereignty. The concept as it is, brooks no interference, no dilution and the states continue to guard jealously their unrestricted sovereignty and maintain their right to order their affairs in the manner they like, largely through greater militarization, without interference or even advice from some quarters. Militarization is fraught with the gravest dangers because without being put to use, armaments would rust and become obsolete and the trade in arms come to a standstill jeopardising thereby the economies of arms exporting countries. The sanction for their use is provided by the law of
nations which as already mentioned recognizes the inviolability of the sovereignty of states.

The emphasis on preservation of the "status quo" born out of the concept of sovereignty and its recognition by international law have not only tended to impede and thwart efforts at disarmament but have induced countries to go to war or engage in armed conflicts which in turn have the effect of undermining and diluting the concept of sovereignty or the very cause for which wars and conflicts are resorted to. They result, unless there is a complete stalemate, in loss or gain of territory or territorial adjustments and other changes which directly or indirectly impair the concept of sovereignty. Augmentation of a state's power and influence invariably means the loss of independence of the state against whom the policy of expansion through war is pursued. Nation states resting largely on a false sense of prestige and preservation of sovereignty refuse to recognise any authority to regulate inter-state relationships. There does not seem to be adequate realisation that the advent of the atomic age has changed many things. With the explosion of the bomb (August, 1945) the parameters of the problem of war expanded to include the world, the oceans and even the space. The advances in the field of weaponry together with developments in
science and technology and in the means of communication have shrunk the world into an easily vulnerable and an insignificantly small unit in which countries however big or small have become inter-dependent to such an extent that a fresh assessment is called for to see if sovereignty can still exist in its undiluted form and if the nation state- the political unit of the present day world - can exist in isolation and pursue policies of national interest to the exclusion of the interests of human-kind as a whole.

The concept of "sovereignty" and the paramount concern of the states to preserve that concept with all its implications have impeded the progress of disarmament at various stages. The slightest attempt on the part of the negotiators to induce a sense of realisation or pragmatism which can, even remotely, be suggestive of the dilution of that concept is frowned upon as interference and is at once viewed with suspicion. Normally, the smaller the state the greater is its sensitivity to such attempts but even the bigger powers have considered such attempts to be abhorrent and unacceptable. The early disarmament negotiations failed because the super powers felt greatly concerned about their sovereign rights and even the semblance of control envisaged was looked
upon as interference. The Baruch plan is a case in point. The Soviet Union rejected the Plan on the ground that it would undermine the national sovereignty of the U.S.S.R. and amount to interference in the internal affairs of states. Later the Soviet Draft Convention came as a reaction to the Baruch Plan emphasising that national power came first and foremost and the international order second. The Soviet Union was not ready, at any cost to accept international control at that juncture is quite evident.

Khruschev's disarmament programme proposed in the fourteenth General Assembly Session (1959) and the plan for General and Comprehensive Disarmament in a Free and Peaceful world proposed by the Western Countries (The U.S., the U.K., France, Canada and Italy) in March 1960, though revolutionary in character met the same ignominious end, largely for the same reasons. It is ironical that while states big and small continue to hug the concept of sovereignty, the concept as such has suffered erosion in the sense that satellites in space keep a round the clock intruding vigil on their internal developments and organisation whether they like it or not. This is apart from numerous other devices

1. The BARUCH PLAN envisaged renunciation of national sovereignty in the area of nuclear weaponry and was meant to lead eventually to a renunciation of sovereignty over other kinds of armaments and to a renunciation of the sovereign right of nations to wage war.

See Chapter 3, DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS: A Review, pp. 84-86.
adopted by the bigger powers to exercise greater influence and control over the affairs of other states. The very presence of nuclear weapons in the hands of a chosen few has not only undermined the concept of sovereignty but snatched from the hands of nations their fundamental right of freedom of existence and survival. Powerful and ambitious countries in order to extend their influence on other parts of the world do not need to intervene or interfere directly. The power-wielding states can intervene in the internal affairs of a state without direct physical involvement. The supply of arms by the U.S.A. to Pakistan amounts to intervention in the internal affairs of India in the sense that a chain reaction is set off virtually compelling India to follow a course of action which given the freedom of choice, it would not adopt. The same element of 'power' proves the fallacy of the equality of all sovereign states which only the poor states tend to believe in as a boost to their self confidence. Equality of states in the prevailing political structures of the world has been reduced, as it is, to a myth perpetuated by the strong. The question arises as to what is it that the modern state is trying to protect and safeguard even at the cost of its own survival? Are these not the outmoded concepts which need replacement but continue to be given undue
importance? A certain amount of allowance could undoubtedly be made for the ancient nation states which had the option or the choice to preserve their sovereign status in the absence of technological advancement in the form of sophisticated weaponry of intercontinental range and the satellite technology which neither know nor respect traditional boundaries. In the case of the modern state it seems that it is the antiquated mind sets adhering to which nations have continued to cling on to the past traditions without realising the implications of the atomic age and the changes which have occurred on that account. Prevailing political structures have found themselves incapable of keeping pace with the unprecedented advancement. Any in-depth analysis of this problem is beyond the scope of this study. However, it is imperative at this juncture to take note of this fact and set our priorities right to carefully chalk out a course of action. Narrow nationalistic concerns based on competition and conflict need to be discarded in favour of the higher interests of human race as a whole.

A clear perception of goals and a judicious selection of means is called for. In a way atomic weapons have simplified matters to the extent of reducing the complex equation of nationalism to the lowest common factor of the 'Human Being'. It is the 'Human Being' who stands at the centre of everything-
it is his existence that is threatened and it is his survival that is the paramount compulsion of our times. He is the institution that needs to be cared for, nurtured and cherished and not the national sovereignty, an outdated concept which evidently is out of tune with times. Basic unit is the 'Human Being' stripped of his nationality, his religion, caste, colour and creed. The highest unit is the Human kind also stripped of unnecessary regalia. The concept of the world as one big family which would stand and fall together in the light of advancement in the field of nuclear weapons has imparted a certain amount of irrelevance to the concept of 'nation state' as a separate independent unit. The concepts of separate identities of various nationalities, religious ideologies and institutions created by protectionist thinking, seem threatened by present day realities. Einstein put his finger on the right spot when he declared¹-

"We know that the developments of science and technology have determined that the peoples of the world are no longer able to live under competing national sovereignties with war as the ultimate arbitrator. Men must understand that the times demand a higher realism which recognises that "no man is an island", that our fate is joined with that of our fellow men throughout the world. We must contrive to live together in peace even at the cost of great material sacrifice : the alternative is the death of our society."

In June 1954, the great scientist also sent a message to the annual assembly of the United World Federalists, in which he said: ¹

"The events of the last few years have made it very clear that the only way to avoid general disaster is the way of a supranational organisation of peace. The surrendering of unlimited sovereignty is a small price to pay for the survival of mankind. I am optimistic enough to believe that the time is not far off when even the most conventionally conditioned minds will understand that protection cannot be sustained by large armament."

More than four decades have passed since this statement was made and even today in 1989, our international society continues to be characterised by militarized nation states with stock-piles of conventional weapons and/or nuclear arsenals and still unwilling to shed or surrender their adherence to the concept of unlimited sovereignty. It is significant that the proliferation of nuclear weapons and nuclear capability have multiplied the poles of power, and the peripheral powers have willy nilly come to accept the hegemony of the nuclear powers which are providing them with nuclear protection or shield. The regional organisations like the NATO and the WTO are manifestations of this phenomenon. It is unfortunate that into this already complex phenomenon

has penetrated the competitive ideology of the capitalist and the communist regimes, as also the religious bigotry of ambitious leaders of unsuspecting innocent masses. The ideological differences, religious bigotry and extreme nationalism are reflected in the debates on disarmament making it difficult to arrive at any consensus on the very concept of disarmament or the methods to achieve the same.

In the words of J.William Fulbright¹-

"Extreme nationalism and dogmatic ideology are luxuries that the human race can no longer afford. It must turn its energies now to the politics of survival. If we do so, we may find in time that we can do better than just survive. We may find that the simple human preference for life and peace has an inspirational force of its own, less intoxicating perhaps than the sacred abstractions of nation and ideology but far more relevant to the requirements of human life and human happiness."

It appears that the biggest constraint to disarmament efforts lies in the minds of men which have not kept pace with the avalanche of advancement that has befallen the human race since August 1945. This advancement has ironically herded all diverse cultures, creeds, ideologies and countries poles apart in terms of economic and technological advancement, into one single flock whose main concern is survival rendering the age old concept of sovereignty and the prevailing political structures out of tune with the present day realities and compulsions.

ABSENCE OF EFFECTIVE SUPRANATIONAL AUTHORITY AND INADEQUACIES OF NEGOTIATING STRUCTURES

The presence of competing states recklessly arming themselves; concern and emphasis misplaced in more ways than one, on the concept of undiluted sovereignty; conflicting ideologies persisting obstinately inspite of a clearly visible amalgamation of ideas; ambitious leaders pushing the innocent unsuspecting masses towards death and destruction etc. appear to be matched by the absence of any world-wide authority which can monitor or control negotiations, enforce disarmament, halt the arms trade and prove to the world the irrelevancy of ideological, sentimental, religious or nationalistic concerns in the light of the paramount question of human survival, happiness and peace.

The Covenant of the League of Nations did lay down that the Council of the League would prepare plans for the reduction of armaments, taking into account the geographical situation and special conditions of each state. The League was also entrusted with the task of supervising trade in arms and ammunition with the countries in which control of the traffic was necessary in common interest. However, all efforts made towards control broke down in the face of German rearmament. The United Nations Organisation subsequently set up in 1945, with great hopes stands crippled with the power of 'Veto' conferred on the big five.
The inadequacy of international negotiating structures has been demonstrated time and again. In 1945, the U.N. General assembly established an Atomic Energy Commission and the Security Council set up a Commission for Conventional Armaments composed of its eleven members and Canada. Both suffered set-backs and the efforts to establish an authority to control atomic weapons also encountered Soviet opposition. An International Disarmament Organisation proposed to be set up by both the super powers never came into being. Similarly, the Eighteen Nation Committee achieved practically little. In 1977, France suggested the creation of a world agency for satellite surveillance. However, nothing worthwhile could be achieved and the concept of disarmament was superceded by the concept of arms control. A number of arms control agreements did materialise during the post-war years on bilateral, multilateral or regional levels, achieving only limited results.\(^1\) An effective strategy for disarmament on more general and comprehensive terms remained far from being achieved. The reason for this can be found primarily, among other things, in the inadequacies of negotiating structures which so to say, have lacked teeth. Also, as is evident from the past record, all negotiations in the post-war years were restricted to a number of states and the problem of disarmament, which is essentially a global problem, was sought to be

\(^1\)See Chapter 3- DISARMAMENT NEGOTIATIONS: A REVIEW. pp. 79-132.
tackled within narrow confines. The negotiating structures were thus inadequate in the sphere of its operations and in the extent of its coverage. This has been brought out by Hedley Bull—

"The doctrine that disarmament, to be effective, must be general and comprehensive, takes as its starting point the proposition that the arms race is general and comprehensive. The present international society is a world-wide one, and is a single military theatre. No power, group of powers or region can be isolated from military contact with the rest of this society. Consequently a disarmament agreement to which only some powers are party, e.g. a regional agreement, will not stop the arms race, and will be difficult to negotiate".

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC SYSTEMS

Economic disparities are yet another constraint which have impeded efforts at disarmament. Traditionally the international economic systems like the political systems have been dominated by the super powers. It is the super powers which have, all along set the rules of behaviour, laid down values which they have sought to implement and chosen ways and means to punish or reward the weaker powers to suit their convenience. Their policy has been guided by considerations of : (i) determining their own interest, (ii) ensuring the survival of existing international systems that reflect their values, (iii) providing aid and help for the poor and the weak with

political strings attached thereto. On the other hand the under developed countries having come out of the yoke of the erstwhile colonial powers which exploited them to the maximum, harboured no sympathy for them and sought to change the patterns of exploitation in their own favour by demanding increasing amounts as support or aid from the industrialised countries. Wide gaps remained, however, between the needs of the poor and the aid that trickled from the industrialised countries. Internal challenges and unrest faced by the developing countries aggravated the problems, and frustrations surfaced on the international scene. Hence the demand for a New International Economic Order. The developing countries in order to express their disapproval and resentment of the existing state of affairs have followed according to a 1988 project on global inequities certain strategies which have escalated the confrontation between the North and the South. These strategies include the following:

1. Building coalitions such as the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and the Organisation of Arab Petroleum Exporting Countries (OAPEC) to withhold raw materials.

2. Building regional coalitions, as illustrated

result is distrust which makes the economic structures receptive to conflicts. This poses one of the most challenging constraints to disarmament efforts and negotiations. While it is a truism that the poor nations should work harder to achieve economic security, the fact that the policies followed by the developed countries, jeopardise any such action on the part of the poor, remains. In order to maintain the status quo, the industrialised countries pursue policies which aid and instigate unrest and instability in various parts of the world. The policy of instigating an arms race is a case in point. The indirect involvement of super powers in conflict areas is quite apparent. In such cases arms supplied by them are used to the detriment of the local populations and tested for the benefit of the powers which supply them. The amounts earned through sales of armaments for which the demand is never ending are used by the supplying power on the one hand for further research and development in the field of armaments and on the other to sustain their already over-burdened economies. In the words of Sergiu Verona, a specialist on disarmament questions at the Institute of Political science, Bucharest (Romania):

"The present international order is facing several mutually related developments. The


continuation of the world economic crisis has intensified the struggle for a partition of the world, for new zones of influence and zones of interest and for positions of domination by different states and groups of states. In this struggle all kinds of weapons are being used, peaceful and non-peaceful, economic as well as military. The continuation of the arms race and its acceleration are contributing greatly to the aggravation of this state of affairs. It constitutes an obstacle to the normalisation of international life which is necessary if the crisis is to be overcome and world economic and political stability to be improved. It is necessary therefore to emphasise, that progress in the field of disarmament is intimately related to the promotion of a new international economic and political order. Radical changes in the structure and pattern of international relationships and the establishment of a new international economic order will facilitate a breakthrough in the current deadlock, in the common concern of all states irrespective of their size and position in the prevailing hierarchy of power".

ARMS RACE AND ARMAMENT DYNAMICS

While the advocates and protagonists of disarmament contend with the constraints and the impediments, the arms race goes on. In this context to think of disarmament is something of a contradiction in terms. The continuous proliferation of the arms themselves and their increasing sophistication and lethality thus constitute in themselves a major constraint to disarmament.
Underlying the current arms race are the new dynamics and momentum the armaments have come to acquire. Arms race in the present times has ceased to be a race in quantities. It is a race in technology; in the improvement and sophistication of already developed weapons. Inherent in the technological advance is the greatest threat to international strategic stability. With newer and better weapons coming in, the balance of power is under constant challenge which leaves the powers concerned no other alternative but to produce more and better armaments to tilt the balance in their own favour. Implicit in this has been not only, the increase in destructive capability and lethality of new armaments but also an unprecedented improvement in operational efficiency. Socio-political and economic motives for the arms race have also grown stronger over the years. The reasons for this can be found in "the transformation of the industrial society, the changed role of the state, the centralization of authority, the abundance of means, the explosion of technology, broader and stronger corporate constituencies behind armaments and the polarization of the international community." Yet another dimension to the arms race lies in the horizontal proliferation of armaments. The motives for this lie in the necessity 'for finding means to sustain the economies of the weapon.

producing countries. The effects of the ever expanding arms trade are far reaching in as much as these weapons are found in all corners of the world, aiding, abetting and feeding conflicts and rivalries.

With the super powers engaged continuously in an arms race and in the game of upmanship, and with the compulsions motivating them, disarmament cannot be said to have much of a chance unless there is a radical transformation in the way of thinking and a greater realisation of the catastrophe that stares mankind in the face.

According to Marek Thee, the motives and courses of the armament dynamics stem mainly from the following:

(i) Imperial and national rivalries, power politics and expansionist schemes;
(ii) security dilemmas caused by aggressive and rapacious policies of neighbours or other powers;
(iii) system competition and ideological or religious enmity (cold war crusades);
(iv) profit or other vested interests of industry, the military, the state and the technological establishment;
(v) the technological momentum caused by freshness of science and technology, their impact on the art of warfare and weapon modernisation.

In isolation or in combination, all these factors can be found at the root of the conflicts raging in the world. The current arms race seems to have literally gone out of control due to the special characteristics of the armament dynamics like the:

(i) high intensity of action, reaction and over reaction impulses on the international level;
(ii) the threat postures inherent in the dominant military strategic doctrines and their autistic reinforcement,
(iii) the role, size, structure and mode of operation of military research and development or the technological momentum; and
(iv) the coalition of economic military, political and technological forces.¹

The outcome of all this is a race on the national level which reinforces the race on the international level.

THE MILITARY INDUSTRIAL TECHNOLOGICAL BUREAUCRATIC COMPLEX (MITBC)

Amongst the various phenomena which have tended to checkmate the progress of disarmament, mention needs to be made of the increasing role which the military power of a country, its bureaucracy and industrial establishments have come to play in the formulation of government policies and plans. From becoming the handmaiden of the political power, these

¹Merek Thee, op. cit., p. 70.
agencies have veered themselves into the position of dictating to the political power. According to John K. Galbraith-1

Influencing, perhaps controlling, government policy to-day is the military power. And this power is developed by a highly 'cooperative' relationship between the super powers by an interacting dynamic that serves the military power in each country. Each military establishment takes the action that requires responding or countering military action in the other country.

And then in reverse. This our military establishment must do, for it is what the other does, intends to do or could do. In such fashion, the military power in each country sustains the authority of that in the other country. And thus on to the eventual catastrophe. We speak of the need for greater cooperation between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. Yet we already have a form of military 'cooperation' at a highly developed level.

Not only do the military establishments all the world over sustain each other, they have also come to dominate the political and economic policies of their countries in response to those of other nations. The repercussions are felt in the internal spheres of state activity in as much as greater centralisation in governing processes, more repressive and autistic attitudes of the central governments, which have to

deny their populations (in certain cases) the basic amenities of life to arm themselves to the teeth, have been observed increasingly. In response to the military pressures and growing demand for greater militarisation, the research and development cells in the military sphere have come to acquire great influence and power. They have found great allies in the industrial and bureaucratic units which cater to these demands and flourish under such pressures. Eisenhower was rightly concerned when he warned against the military industrial complex saying that "We must be alert to the danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite."

Personal and group interests, profit motives, professionalism, status, diplomatic utility and so on lie behind the vested interests which the establishments mentioned have developed in the military strength. It is a well known fact that 'armaments, force structures and power politics have a decisive influence on the formation of governments, external and internal politics and the way our world is governed'.

The MITBC phenomenon is active not only in the western countries: the countries of the eastern bloc

are also affected by it. The socio-economic systems of the eastern bloc countries are controlled and dominated by the state. These states since the days of Stalin continued to follow his orthodox teachings which assert that heavy industry, the mainstay of defence production must have absolute primacy, prevailing over other industrial branches, including light industry, and the production of consumer goods. It is difficult to ascertain as to where the real influence lies, whether it is with bureaucracy, the generals or the technocrats. It is, however, quite evident that all of them exert influence somewhere along the line. Their influence carries weight and is reflected in the decision making processes.

Research and development in the military and the resultant technological explosion, are the major factors which have set the pace of arms race on this planet. The hasty irrationality of the R&D resembles the nervousness of human beings heading towards insanity. Military R&D has thus become a major challenge to genuine disarmament. Human-kind has been condemned to make the dual sacrifice by first paying for armaments through taxes and then by providing the potential victims.
Apart from the constraints mentioned above, there are many others pertaining to verification of disarmament measures, ignorance of the large mass of humanity regarding the major issues of our times, compounded by limitations of human mind which can stretch to a limit only and accept psychological pressures to a limited extent leading to actions unfavourable to its very own survival. These are formidable indeed. Whether mankind would accept defeat and annihilate itself or rise to the occasion and intelligently steer clear of the dangerous predicament is the major question of our times.