Nuclear disarmament is something that States have mixed ideas on. Some believe it is a necessary course of action, while others are still in the mindset to continually produce nuclear weapons. While I once thought it would be possible for all nuclear weapons to be decommissioned and deconstructed, in the current political climate, I do not believe nuclear disarmament is achievable, although it is desirable, for any time soon. The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons leads the world to a plausible solution when it comes to moving forward against the continued use of nuclear weapons. Although it had the right idea, there is a multitude of factors within the treaty as well as outside that have stalled the advances to nuclear disarmament and instead pushed States to be more against the complete eradication of nuclear weapons.

The Treaty on the Non-proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is no longer sufficient. What started as a mutual agreement between States in the pursuit of safety from nuclear weapons has fallen and lost all power over countries that decided to hold on to the weapons that are more beneficial to them. The NPT set rules meant to stop the spread of nuclear weapons such as States will not give, encourage, trade, create, or force nuclear weapons onto a state with no nuclear weapons. It also states that the States will not seek to acquire more nuclear weapons from other states or create their own (United Nations). While these rules are what the treaty needs, there is
no way to force a state to comply with the rules as well as have a repercussion set for when it is broken. A state is free to join and leave, with this though comes the incident that states can leave once their desires change and cease all attempts at nuclear disarmament, even going back to production. Without any repercussions or way to monitor the treaty is being upheld, there is no way to secure the treaty being followed other than just trusting the States to follow it. The NPT has standards that they expect from those that sign the treaty, while it is not something that can be enforced they have the guidelines set to adhere to the safeguards instituted by the Atomic Energy Agency.

“Today, the Cold War has disappeared, but thousands of those weapons have not. In a strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of a nuclear attack has gone up. More nations have acquired these weapons. Testing has continued. Black market trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials abound. The technology to build a bomb has spread. Terrorists are determined to buy, build, or steal one. Our efforts to contain these dangers are centered on a global non-proliferation regime, but as more people and nations break the rules, we could reach the point where the center cannot hold” (Obama). President Barack Obama made these remarks in Prague in 2009, while ten years have passed the words he said still apply to today. With the threat of an aggressor having access to nuclear weapons, a country, especially the United States, would never decommission all of its nuclear weapons. Complete nuclear disarmament will never be achievable as long as the fear that an opposing power would have access to the knowledge or use of nuclear weapons. Currently, Russia has the most estimated nuclear warheads with 6,490; the US is a close second with 6,185 (Davenport). We are having strenuous ties with Russia who hold the most warheads in their arsenal as well as North
Korea announcing its withdrawal from the NPT in 2003 and then proceeded to test nuclear devices and nuclear-capable ballistic missiles (Davenport).

While the NPT has no way to enforce the rules and standards of the treaty, states will continue to go against the guidelines set. Changes can be made during a majority vote though to enforce such a thing would require cooperation from every state participating and would result in countries withdrawing from the treaty. As well as there is no way to monitor every state action when it comes to their nuclear research and disarmament practices, a significant factor to the continued hold on nuclear weapons is to guarantee safety. Just as in the Cold War, while States are slowly getting rid of their stockpiles, the chances of an outside terrorist group or opposition getting their hands on the materials to produce or use a nuclear warhead forces states to hold the same concept as they did in the Cold War. The threat of mutual destruction provides a safety net feeling for states. With these factors, I believe while complete Nuclear disarmament is a desirable course of action, it is something that is not a plausible or achievable goal for any time in the near future.
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