IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)
Volume 25, Issue 6, Series 7 (June. 2020) 27-34
e-ISSN: 2279-0837, p-ISSN: 2279-0845.
www.iosrjournals.org

Implications of Nuclear Weapons Development on the Bilateral Relations of States

[1]Mamefe D. Wanogho, M.Sc. &[2]Fidelis Allen, Ph.D.
[1,2]Department of Political & Administrative Studies
University Of Port Harcourt
[1]efewanogho@gmail.com, 08032544461

ABSTRACT
This paper examines the interplay between realism (as seen in the quest for countries to develop and possess nuclear weapons) and idealism (as seen in the activities of multilateral agencies in the United Nations system that aim to enhance cooperation by state actors in the international arena). Based on qualitative data, systematically derived from secondary sources, the paper argues that contentions exist between countries around the securing or building of nuclear weapons. States have tried to buildup nuclear weapons, regardless of whether the Cold War has ended. Relations between nations have been strained by the quest of nuclear weapons advancement by countries. The work suggests, among others, the dismantling of nuclear weapons under multilateral international supervision.

KEYWORDS: Nuclear weapons, Cold war, Bilateral Relations, Nations.

Date of Submission: 02-06-2020 Date of Acceptance: 17-06-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

The development of nuclear technology and its weaponization has had a tremendous impact on global peace and security. The impact of nuclear weapon is so profound that it is has been said of being the single most important factor that brought the Second World War to a definitive end, as is evident in the statement attributed to the Japanese leader: "Japan's Emperor Hirohito announced his country's unconditional surrender in World War II in a radio address on August 15, citing the devastating power of "a new and most cruel bomb" (Onion, 2009). The global power balance came to be effectively defined in terms of which countries possessed nuclear weapons and to what extent and capacity.

It was not very long after the weapons contest between the United States of America (USA) and the outdated Union of Soviet Socialist Republic (USSR) kicked in, that the ideological fight between the East and the West ascended the front burner of global affairs. While the ensuing period of the Cold-War that followed was largely an ideological clash between socialism and capitalism; the quest for nuclear armoury by the key contending forces was at the heart of the arms race and with it; competition to gain an edge or maintain a delicate balance of power. The world faced imminent obliteration by warring parties, if the use of nuclear weapon and its proliferation was not halted.

Following the end of the Second World War, state actors in the international system have, through the instrumentality of worldwide associations and global regimes on nuclear weapons, bought into settlements and agreements relating to the turn of events, ownership, and utilization of nuclear weapons.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has been at the forefront of regulating nuclear innovation since 1957 when it was created, to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The central idea guiding the IAEA is that, beyond halting the nuclear arms race; nuclear technology, where it exists, should only be deployed towards peaceful ends. The United Nations argued that "for more than fifty years, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has filled in as the world's nuclear controller. IAEA specialists work to check that shielded nuclear material is utilized distinctly for tranquil purposes" (United Nations, 2015).

In the face of a so-called Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD) for the contending parties in the Cold War and even for those who were non-aligned, it was clear that some measures of control had to be emplaced to curb the arms race, with particular reference to the development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. This need gave birth to the establishment in 1968, and ratification in 1970, of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), which marked a new era of global regulation as far as nuclear technology went. Baylis, Smith and Owens (2011,

p. 59) indicate that "the worldwide nuclear measurement expanded with the coming up of other atomic weapon states: Britain in 1952, France in 1960, and China in 1964".

Progressive worries at the spread or multiplication of atomic weapons prompted the exchange of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968, where states that had atomic weapons invested to end the weapons contest, while the nations who didn't, vowed not to create them. Despite successes of the NPT, by 1990 several states had developed or were developing nuclear weapons, notably Israel, India, Pakistan, and apartheid South Africa (Baylis, et al., 2011).

It is imperative to note that since the use of nuclear bomb by the United States against japan in 1945, and subsequently finishing the pacific boondocks of the Second World War, which set up for the inevitable end of threats in the war, there has been no recorded utilization of atomic weapons in conflict circumstances between countries.

This is the result of an active international effort against nuclear non-proliferation. In addition, calculations of the huge and devastating consequences of a nuclear war has been a check on parties in conflict. In other words, Mutually Assured Destruction could very well be the result of such warfare.

Although states have not used nuclear weapons in conflict, since the Second World War, as well as success in the efforts to curb proliferation of nuclear weapons, there has been several threats of the use of atomic weapons. The Cuban missile crisis is considered as the closest to such cases, in which the world was at the brink of a nuclear war. Writing on the deterrent effect of the fear of the implications of an all-out nuclear war between nuclear powers, John T. Rourke (2009) averred that:

> Yet despite the intense rivalry, a mutual fear of nuclear war deterred the superpowers from direct confrontations. The wisdom of avoiding eyeball-to-eyeball crises was evident in the Cuban missile crisis (1962), one of the few times the superpowers did directly confront each other. The most alarming occasion of the Cold War happened when the Soviets started constructing atomic rocket locales in Cuba, and President John F. Kennedy gambled nuclear war to compel them out (Rourke, 2009: 46).

The Cuban Missile Crisis or October Crisis, "brought United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic closest to a full-scale atomic war" (Nte, 2015:98). The prominence of the Cuban Missile Crisis in the Cold War hostilities and its trigger-effect to an imminent full-scale war, with hindsight, x-rays the importance of nuclear weapons in international security. In fact, this situation came to the fore many years after it occurred and after the Cold War had effectively ended.

The attack of Iraq in 2003 by the United States and an alliance of nations without a United Nations Security Council goals was predicated upon the alleged ownership of atomic weapons by Saddam Hussein's Iraq. The India-Pakistani issue took an increased turn when the two nations sought after and obtained nuclear weapons' capacity after the end of the Cold War. Iran has been under series of sanctions owing to its foray into activities seen as geared towards developing the nuclear weapon, contrary to that country's avowed position that the ends of its nuclear programme are entirely peaceful. More recently, North Korea has received the flaks of the international community for its nuclear weapons programme which has culminated in nuclear tests against the extant regulations in the NPT and elsewhere, prohibiting same.

Against this background, this paper examines the effects of nuclear weapons development on bilateral relations of nations.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPON

In the article *Development and Proliferation of Nuclear Weapon*, Olav Njolstad (2003), the history of the nuclear weapon is traced to activities of scientists Albert Einstein and Leo Szilard. They had written a letter to the American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt to intimate him that Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was already working towards development of the nuclear weapon. In the letter - which was written in 1939 at the commencement of the Second World War - the scientists stated that the bomb would be of "unprecedented power".

Einstein and Szilard contended that "should the Germans be the first to develop the envisaged "atomic bomb," Hitler would have a weapon at his disposal that would make it possible for him to destroy his enemies and rule the world" (Njolstad, 2014). Being an unthinkable potential power to concede to a rival, President Roosevelt was easily convinced:

To avoid this nightmare, Einstein and Szilard urged the government of the United States to join the race for the atomic bomb. Roosevelt agreed, and for the next four and half years a vast, utterly secret effort was launched in cooperation with the United Kingdom. Code-named "The Manhattan Project," the effort eventually employed more than 200,000 workers and several thousand scientists and engineers, many of European background. Finally, on July 16, 1945, the first atomic bomb was tested in the midst of the Alamogordo desert in New Mexico. Its power astonished even the men and women who had constructed it (Njolstad, 2014).

Apart from the United States of America, other states that have developed the nuclear weapon are Russia, United Kingdom, France and China; which negotiated and signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968. Other countries sought and developed the nuclear weapon notwithstanding the existence of the NPT. These countries include Israel (an undeclared nuclear power), India, Pakistan, and North Korea.

Amanda Marcias (2016) writes that "according to a new report from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), nine nations — the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea — possess approximately 16,300 nuclear weapons in total". The defunct Soviet Union conducted its first nuclear test explosion in 1949, the United Kingdom (1952), France (1960), and China (1964).

Figure 1

World Nuclear Forces: 2014

Country	Year of first nuclear test	Deployed warheads*	Other warheads	Total 2014
USA	1945	1920	5380	7300
Russia	1949	1600	6400	8000
UK	1952	160	65	225
France	1960	290	10	300
China	1964		250	250
India	1974		90–110	90–110
Pakistan	1998		100–120	100–120
Israel	. .		80	80
North Korea	2006		6–8	6–8
Total		3970	12 350	16 300

Source: Marcias, 2016.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NUCLEAR WEAPON

Olav Njolstad (2014) traced the history of nuclear weapon to the activities of scientists, Albert Einstein and Leo Szilard. They had written a letter to the American President, Franklin D. Roosevelt to intimate him that Nazi Germany under Adolf Hitler was already working towards development of the nuclear weapon. In the letter - which was written in 1939 at the beginning of the Second World War - the researchers expressed that the bomb would be of "unprecedented power".

Einstein and Szilard contended that "should the Germans be the first to build up the imagined "nuclear bomb," Hitler would have a weapon available to him that would make it workable for him to wreck his adversaries and rule the world" (Njolstad, 2014). Being an unthinkable potential power to concede to a rival, President Roosevelt was easily convinced:

> To maintain a strategic distance from the unthinkable, Einstein and Szilard encouraged the legislature of the United States to join the race for the nuclear bomb. Roosevelt concurred, and for the following four and half years an immense, absolutely mystery exertion was propelled in participation with the United Kingdom. Code-named "The Manhattan Project," the exertion in the long run utilized in excess of 200,000 specialists and a few thousand researchers and designers, a large number of European make up. At long last, on July 16, 1945, the principal

nuclear bomb was tried amidst the Alamogordo desert in New Mexico. Its capacity surprised even the people who had built it (Njolstad, 2014).

Apart from the United States of America, other states that developed the atomic weapon are Russia, United Kingdom, France and China; which worked towards the establishment of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968. Other nations developed the nuclear weapon despite the presence of the NPT. These countries include Israel (an undeclared nuclear power), India, Pakistan, and North Korea.

Amanda Marcias (2016) posited that "as indicated by another report from the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI), nine countries — the United States, Russia, United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea — have around 16,300 atomic weapons altogether". The old Soviet Union directed its first atomic test blast in 1949, the United Kingdom (1952), France (1960), and China (1964).

Figure 1

World Nuclear Forces: 2014

Country	Year of first nuclear test	Deployed warheads*	Other warheads	Total 2014
USA	1945	1920	5380	7300
Russia	1949	1600	6400	8000
UK	1952	160	65	225
France	1960	290	10	300
China	1964		250	250
India	1974		90–110	90–110
Pakistan	1998		100–120	100–120
Israel	. .		80	80
North Korea	2006		6–8	6–8
Total		3970	12 350	16 300

Source: Marcias, 2016.

WHY NATIONS DEVELOP NUCLEAR WEAPONS

In the time succeeding the end of the Second World war, and the standardization of the non-proliferation regime of atomic weapons, the five extraordinary forces: the United States of America, United Kingdom, France, Russia (formerly USSR), and China; were undoubtedly the only countries with nuclear weapons capability. Following the end of world War II through the era of the Cold War, with its acute ideological divide and mutual suspicion among countries in both divides; it was natural for the Great Powers to scramble for nuclear weapon capability; not only as a means of power projection, but also as a deterrence to armed aggression by other nations.

Before now, during the decline of the Second World War and the subsequent years which were largely known for significant arms race by the world powers; and in the post-Cold War era of the present day; countries have protected their endeavours to create nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons have been developed under what could be described as ultra-secret circumstances, with countries masking their true intentions.

Whereas it is natural for states in the anarchic international system to pursue their national interests through taking steps to ensuring their survival, and in so doing, developing and advancing their military capabilities; nations have varied reasons for developing nuclear weapons capability.

According to Scott Sagan (1997), there are three principal models that explain why states pursue nuclear capability. These models, described as alternative theoretical frameworks, include:

The 'security model', as per which states construct atomic weapons to build national protection from outside dangers, particularly atomic dangers; the 'domestics governmental issues model', which imagines atomic weapons as political devices used to progress parochial local and bureaucratic interests; and the 'standards model', under which atomic weapons choices are made on the grounds that weapons procurement, or limitation in weapons advancement, gives a significant regulating image of a state's innovation and character (Sagan, 1997:55).

Traditional analysis of the motivations for nuclear proliferation has focused on the state and inter-state levels. For much of the post-Cold War period, the pattern of nuclear weapons acquisition established by the five nuclear weapons states, was considered to be the one most likely to be followed by any future proliferating state. Analysis of the motivational aspect consequently addressed the strategic, political, and prestige rationales that led these states to seek nuclear weapons.

The strategic motivation focused on the roles that nuclear weapons played in the Second World War and its immediate aftermath, when initially, they were seen as warfighting or war-winning arsenals. Later, attention shifted to the roles that nuclear weapons played in deterrence, leading to the assumptions that one of the principal motivations for acquisition was the deterrence of other nuclear weapons capable states. Similarly, the political and prestige benefits that nuclear weapons conferred on those states with the wherewithal to manufacture them, were also deemed significant.

Atomic weapons were viewed as the most current type of weaponry and their overseers were naturally managed a seat at the top table of worldwide undertakings. It is now more difficult to explain nuclear proliferation by focusing only on a single variable. Analysts have argued that it is necessary to consider a range of factors that may influence nuclear weapons acquisition.

These may include: traditional technological factors, the availability of nuclear technology, and a cadre of trained nuclear scientists who encourage acquisition; domestic politics, imperatives within a political party, or the domestic political situation may propel a state towards nuclear weapons; diplomatic bargaining that acquisition of a nuclear capability can be used to influence or bargain with both perceived allies and enemies; and non-intervention, that a nuclear capability can deter or prevent intervention by other states (Baylis, et. al., 2011:254).

As per the US Air Force Counter-Proliferation Center:

> Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs), of which atomic weapons are a definitive indication, have played significant, however frequently unsaid jobs (representative and genuine) in both elevating and interceding the elements of the Arab-Israeli clash. Israel didn't look for its atomic ability for authoritative desires or national eminence. Rather, David Ben Gurion's enthusiasm for these weapons, featured by his choice in the mid-to-late 1950s to build up an autonomous atomic impediment, was viewed as tending to the holy matter of national endurance, a definitive method to adjust the essential geo-political asymmetries in Arab-Israeli regular military force. The bomb was to be Israel's definitive protection strategy, empowering Israel to perpetrate a holocaust on its adversaries to forestall another holocaust on Israel. Dreading both territorial and worldwide repercussions, Israel from the start kept its mission mystery. In spite of the fact that it gained an atomic choice at some point in the late 1960s. Israel has not announced, tried, or made some other noticeable utilization of this choice, bringing about an obscure atomic arrangement (Schneider, 2007:78).

In a broad sense, the motivations for nuclear weapons can be categorized as:

1. Offensive
2. Defensive
3. Balancing
4. Social

States intrigued by atomic weapons for hostile reasons might be pulled into the dangerous force appeared using these weapons on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and the resulting advancement of intensity through the Cold War. Of specific concern is the chance of maverick states or psychological oppressor bunches acquiring the bomb. The probability of states seeking after atomic weapons for hostile designs is challenged; in any case, the chance of their utilization is apparently essential so as to set up the protective utilization of atomic weapons which is advanced by the current Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) (Glasencnik, 2012).

Guarded utilizations for atomic weapons, Glasencnik (2012) contends; are based around the possibility that they deflect clashes, and accordingly, constrain states to depend on elective methods for compromise. It is important that without the chance of these weapons being utilized, as on account of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, prevention would not have been a balanced thought process in atomic weapons proliferation.

This requirement for an impediment might be required in light of the fact that states dread their rivals' current or future capacities; or it might question the political will or ability of its partners to shield it in period of scarcity, particularly considering the partners' other political interests. This guarded use likewise prompts the idea of an offset of intensity. States may look for atomic weapons so as to adjust a specific state's capacity, evacuating the ability of one state to have total military predominance, with adequately unchecked force at either a worldwide or local level. This can be found in Russia's nuclear weapons contest with the United States in the late 1940s, and more recently with India and Pakistan.

> This ill-disposed want can regularly be connected to social factors between the states concerned. Notwithstanding the military concentration for proliferation, there are a few social reasons why states may seek after the improvement of atomic weapons, especially corresponding to character and force. Personality factors identify with the improvement of advances, and how they can get installed in a state's character, being compared with confirmation of their innovation and progression, or their improvement towards this objective. States benchmark themselves against the most recent advances and the atomic age has prompted recognitions that atomic innovation is at the stature of innovation, giving huge achievement and capacity to countries with this ability (Glasencnik, 2012).

Power and prestige is normally associated with a state's development of not only the nuclear weapon, but also, other military arsenals of high caliber. In the international arena, the political leadership and larger citizenry, have a sense of being on the same pedestal and equal footing with other state actors. In terms of estimation of the power of nations, the nuclear-powered states are incidentally the same as the nations believed to be strongest. In the same vein, the states already possessing nuclear weapons are interested in making nuclear weapons development, an exclusive feat and activity, and to that extent, are opposed to further proliferation by non-nuclear powers (Barnaby, 1998; Mearsheimer, 2001).

III. METHODOLOGY

Data for this work was sourced from secondary sources. The nature of the concept under discourse, being an issue that developed historically, is most suited to be researched from secondary data. Existing data proved to be better than attempting to generate fresh data. The requisite data for this study is sourced from documentary sources, including, textbooks, journals, research reports, archival records, mass media, encyclopedias, government policy documents, non-governmental organizations and intergovernmental organizations statistics, special publications by global institutions such as the United Nations, international treaties and conventions, conference proceedings, reports, files, unpublished dissertations, policy statements, pamphlets, videos, photographs, films and others.

IV. DISCUSSIONS

A consistent idea that cuts over the two-sided connection between nuclear outfitted states is that of positive commitment. Regardless of whether the countries are recorded foes on either side of the ideological partition like the United States and Russia, regional enemies like India and Pakistan, or even customary partners with obviously coterminous interests like the United States, France, and the United Kingdom; nuclear armed states have been proven to have some measure of bilateral engagement of some sort.

A notable indication of compatibility between nuclear powers is their subscribing to a common global regime on nuclear weapons under the management of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Bilateral treaties and agreements that aim to diffuse tensions between otherwise adversarial nations are a veritable source of engagement and cooperation, as parties would have to exhibit some degree of transparency in their nuclear programmes to build mutual trust between them.

It is worthy of note that the job that nuclear weapons play in global politics and security is evolving. Essentially, this evolution is reflected in contending ways for two unique groups of nations. For rich, militarily astonishing countries; atomic weapons are expecting a tinier job in security framework. Propelled standard military capacities are more isolating and more usable than atomic weapons. Alternately, nations that cannot safeguard themselves against these propelled Western military abilities may consider nuclear to be as progressively significant, or alluring, for their security (Howlett, 2005; James & Michael, 2011). These differentiations are braced by the path that, in the past decades, two dictator pioneers who gave up atomic and different weapons of mass obliteration (WMD) programs - Saddam Hussein and Muammar Qaddafi - were expelled and executed,

while two others - Kim Jong Un and Bashar al-Assad - have used their obliged WMD ventures to help the endurance of their regimes (Elbridge, 2012).

These elements pose difficulties for U.S. non-proliferation approach, confuse U.S. relations with the Middle East and Asia, and will go about as an irritation in the U.S.- Russia relationship.

> The perspective of various powers adversarial to the United States, in any case, is out and out various, as continuous history has uncovered:
>
> - In March 2003, the United States assaulted Iraq, prodded by the conviction that Iraq had dynamic WMD improvement programs.
> - In December 2003, perceiving how hazardous it had as of late advanced toward having a WMD improvement program, Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi hit an arrangement with the United States and agreed to give up its atomic and compound weapons programs.
> - About four years later, in September 2007, Israel shelled an inadequate Syrian atomic reactor that was as far as anyone knows being worked for non-tranquil purposes with North Korean assistance.
> - North Korea drove its first atomic test in 2006 (Samuel and Robert, 2008).

There is evidence of invasion of countries through unilateral or multilateral actions on the premise of thwarting a nuclear weapons programme. In some cases, as was the case in Iraq, it was found that the reason adduced for the American-led invasion, was not authenticated during and after the actual invasion. Relations between Israel and Syria has been characterized by recriminations on either side regarding a supposed Syrian nuclear weapons programme. Israel has launched unilateral strikes on military facilities in Syria.

> Since March 2003, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein has been expelled and hanged. Libyan pioneer Muammar Qaddafi has been removed by the Libyan people with wide Western assistance and butchered by a swarm in his own old neighborhood. In addition, Syrian pioneer Bashar al-Assad has - adequately, as of this creation - thwarted Western intercession, in his own special country somewhat by finding a way to use his leftover heaps of concoction weapons. At that point, in North Korea, the country encountered a quiet organization change from late 2011 to mid-2012 when Kim Jong Un became Supreme Leader following the end of his father, Kim Jong IL (U.S. Division of Defense, 2012).

The leadership of countries that harbour and crave a nuclear weapons development programme, - particularly Iran and North Korea - may adhere all the more persistently to those aspirations. Having watched what occurred in Iraq, Syria, and Libya; such leaders now get that, regardless of the roadblocks and impediments put forward by the IAEA and nuclear weapon countries, those who obtain atomic or other WMD capacity, have increased latitude to put down internal dissent and create mischief in their areas. Perhaps more fundamentally, they may logically acknowledge that giving up an atomic or other WMD program may be a death penalty.

Countries have for quite a while, looked to atomic weapons as sureties of national power. In any case, the previous decade has seen the advancement of an unmistakable relationship between nuclear projects and national leaders' personal destinies. It is entirely expected to expect that the drive by leaders to pursue nuclear weapons capability, would certainly pitch their countries against other countries who subscribe to the nonproliferation school.

Governmental nuclear issues, blended with existing challenges in both the Middle East and Asia, will constrain the United States to play out an irksome multilateral political, propitiatory, and military exercise in cautious control in these locale.

Albeit minimal confirmation sponsorships the hypothesis that Iran's procedure with atomic desires and North Korea's creating atomic capacity could touch off regional 'proliferation falls, 'the two countries' exercises are presumably going to propel the United States to work all the more industriously to ensure its on edge companions and accomplices in the Middle East and Asia that it will stay with them, even regardless of hostile, atomic equipped powers (Richard, 2012). This weight has quite recently led the United States to respond by broadening its political, optional, and political duty, as the arguable number one hegemon; much as it propelled its responsibility in Europe following World War II. Yet, the world circumstance is considerably more complicated at this point.

In the Middle East, the United States sought to achieve its goals of deflecting Iran from making nuclear weapons, restricting Israel, at least from an overt nuclear weapons enterprise, and comforting agitated but cooperative Arab states, even as the medium and long stretch aftereffects of the Arab Spring and its ramifications for U.S. relations and impact in the locale remain unclear. In Asia, the United States is grappling

with approaches to stop North Korea from utilizing its nuclear ability, and to console its partners in the district – with particular reference to South Korea and Japan – without disturbing the very sensitive U.S. relations with China.

Third, U.S. relations with Russia will continue being unfavorably influenced by the partition over the estimation of atomic weapons and their activity in widespread governmental issues. Forces, for instance, Russia's normal military have raised the activity of atomic weapons in its security math. This pattern is reflected in Russia's progressing project of modernizing and improving its nuclear armoury. The main manifestation of this gap so far has been U.S.- Russian pressures over ballistic rocket guard, however it has other ramifications also (James, 2012).

Iran and North Korea, traditional antagonists of the United States, have been rightly or wrongly accused of plans to make nuclear ballistic rockets that could impact on U.S. allies in the Middle East and Asia, and, later on; possibly the territory of United States itself. The U.S. response has been to deal with an incessantly improving ballistic rocket-protect structure that would shield the United States and its allies.

Russia, incapable to manufacture a practically identical framework all alone, stresses that a U.S. rocket shield could dull the viability of its own vital nuclear powers. Russia fears this would unsettle the consistent impediment relationship that has existed between the United States and Russia for more than 50 years (James, 2012). Ballistic rocket barrier has turned into a noteworthy bone of conflict in U.S. - Russia relations which, at whatever point left unsure, could decrease particular bilateral investments around areas of shared energy, headway in atomic arms control trades, counter-dread mongering, computerized security, and the historically contentious relations of both nations as it pertains to Afghanistan and Pakistan.

Also, the association between the United States and China will be of colossal geopolitical consequence for the twenty-first century, and no issue in that relationship will be more prominent for the United States than guaranteeing its inclinations and those of its allies while keeping agreements and security in the Asia-Pacific zone. Despite the fact that contention tolerantly appears to be far-fetched now, it can't be precluded and may turn out to be progressively likely, in the event that a degeneration ensues. With the two sides having and seeming set to hold impressive nuclear weapons stockpiles, such a contention would be hugely hazardous and conceivably crushing. Discovering approaches to limit the probability of war and the utilization of nuclear weapons is consequently an essential obligation of the political authorities on the two sides of the Pacific (Deutch, 2005).

American nuclear strategy is normally connected with different U.S. political, external, and security interests, far and wide. Propelled ordinary weapon abilities have helped countries, for instance, the United States deemphasize atomic weapons; yet those limits may cause nations that can't fight on the bleeding edge combat area to adhere to their atomic quest. This dynamic will have noteworthy flood impacts past atomic approach to join the full extent of outside and security procedure in the Middle East, Asia, Russia, and somewhere else (Aseltine, 2016). To explore this delicate minefield, the United States should practice cautious tact, prudence, and in some cases restraint in the utilization of military power. The long stretch interests of the United States will be served by an approach that cutoff points or drives into the past, the connection that was made over the earlier decade between closures of atomic weapons programs, completing frameworks, and taking so-called tyrant leaders' lives.

The United States and China are obviously the biggest economies today, with a relationship that has been described in terms of professional career debates. With such a bad tempered and regularly opposing relationship, it may not be unreasonably long for the two nations to decline to military threats:

The connection between the United States and China will be of huge geopolitical ramification for the twenty-first century, and no issue in that relationship will be more significant for the United States than ensuring its inclinations and those of its partners and allies, while keeping up harmony and security in the Asia-Pacific district. Even though conflict mercifully seems unlikely at this point, it cannot be ruled out and might become increasingly likely if we are unwise or unlucky. With both sides possessing and appearing set to retain formidable nuclear weapons arsenals, such a conflict would be tremendously dangerous and quite possibly devastating (Colby and Denmark, 2013).

The Russian doctrinal adjustment to the post-Cold War security condition is to some degree unclear. The administration, Schneider (2013) insists, has all the earmarks of being centered on creating and handling low-yield weapons that are increasingly reasonable for strategic use; however the current structure of new rockets and warheads might be related with new vital nuclear payloads also. Writing on the prominence of nuclear weapons on the United States – Russian relationship, Schneider (2013) stated:

> Regardless of the reduced post-Cold war job of atomic weapons in the United States, the total crumbling of Russia's traditional military power since 1991, has really made atomic weapons increasingly integral to that administration's resistance strategy. The end of the ill-disposed relationship with the Soviet Union (and later, the Russian Federation) must be considered in the NPT (Schneider, 2013).

Writing on Indo-Chinese relations as it pertains to nuclear weapons, Rappai (1999) posited:

> Since the time China announced itself as a nuclear power on October 31, 1964; it attempted to extend itself as an altruistic pioneer of the Third World which is prepared to ensure the interests of the oppressed, in reverse nation's ailing in specialized capacity and political ability, to withstand the biased global request. It appears that the Indian tests have generally vexed its computations on two significant tallies. Initially, it sees a test in India going unmistakable as an atomic force – it thinks this will extensively debilitate China's situation as the sole head of the creating scene in the worldwide field. Furthermore, the Indian atomic tests have absolutely constrained it to reexamine its key observations. This doesn't mean any acceleration in military action by either side on their positions hung on their fringes or, as demonstrated in the high-sounding proposals from specific quarters that the two major Asian forces will undoubtedly be adversaries and raise alerts right away. Unexpectedly, this will force China to investigate its alternatives along fringes just as in different circles in managing India (Rappai, 1999).

V. CONCLUSION

The accessed and discussed data have shown that:

1. Conflicts exist between nations around the acquisition or development of nuclear weapons
2. Nuclear weapons proliferation adversely affects international security
3. Some states have developed nuclear weapons despite the existence of the nuclear weapons nonproliferation regime
4. Relations between nations have been strained on account of nuclear weapons development by nations

From the reviewed data, the effect of atomic weapons in worldwide governmental issues and security is developing. Essentially, these progressions are showing themselves in contending ways for two distinct groups of nations. For rich, militarily ground-breaking nations, atomic weapons are assuming a littler job in security frameworks. Progressed traditional military abilities are more segregating and more usable than atomic weapons. On the other hand, nations that can't shield themselves against these propelled Western military abilities are considering nuclear to be as progressively significant and alluring for their security. The current proliferation emergencies in Iran and North Korea and in lesser degree Israeli, Pakistani and Indian cases, cause fears of future proliferation in the Middle East and around the globe.

The way that, over the previous decade, two dictator pioneers who surrendered atomic and different weapons of mass obliteration (WMD) programs - Saddam Hussein and Muammar Qaddafi - have been toppled and slaughtered though Kim Jong Un has utilized his nation's WMD projects to help the endurance of his regime infers that the authority of nations that harbor atomic desire - especially Iran and North Korea - may keep on sticking harder to those aspirations. Having watched what happened as of late in Iraq, Syria, and Libya, dictator pioneers not disapproving of the way that having an atomic weapons advancement program includes the danger of military activity and devastating approvals. With these challenges, the prospects for the elimination of nuclear weapons are decidedly dim. This makes it obvious that the fight against nuclear proliferation may continue for a long time to come.

Therefore, dismantling nuclear weapons under international supervision, and ceasing the production of fissionable material for such weapons, will offer some assurance to the international community that new nuclear weapon states will not spring up overnight and this can be done by changing the technical rules of the NPT to involve banning all reprocessing of nuclear fuel, phasing out all use of high enriched uranium in research and isotope production reactors, and banning all enrichment of uranium above a level of, perhaps, 20 percent.

REFERENCES

[1]. Aseltine, W. (2016). The Management of Security Cooperation. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio: Institute of Security Cooperation Studies.

[2]. Barnaby, F. (1998). The nuclear arsenals and nuclear disarmament. Journal of Medicine, Conflict and Survival, No. 14.

[3]. Baylis, J., Smith, S., and Owens, P. (2011). The globalisation of world politics: An introduction to international relations (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
[4]. Deutch, J. (2005). A Nuclear Posture for Today. Foreign Affairs 84 (1): 49-60.
[5]. Elbridge, A. C. (2012). U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy and Policymaking: The Asian Experiencein "Tactical Nuclear Weapons and NATO", (ed.) Tom Nichols et al. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, 2012), 75–105.
[6]. Glasencnik, R. (2012). Why do states seek nuclear weapons: Can nuclear proliferation be prevented? Bekah's Blog. Retrieved January 22, 2018 from: https://bekahblade.wordpress.com/2012/11/28/why-do-states-seek-nuclear-weapons-can-nuclear-proliferation-be-prevented/
[7]. Howlett, D. (2005). Nuclear Proliferation. In: Baylis, J. & Smith, S. (eds.) The Globalization of World Politics. An introduction to international relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
[8]. James M.A. (2012). The Dragon Dance: U.S.-China Security Cooperation.in Global Ten: Challenges and Opportunities for the President in 2013, ed. Jessica T. Matthews (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2012), 121–23.
[9]. James, A. and Michael, G. (2011). Beyond New START: Advancing U.S. National Security through Arms Control with Russia. Washington, DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2011. Retrieved June 8, 2019 from: http://csis.org/files/publication/110824_Acton_BeyondNewSTART_WEB.pdf
[10]. Marcias, A. (2016). Nine nations have nuclear weapons: Here is how many each country has. Business Insider. Retrieved January 14, 2018 from: https://independent.co.uk/news/world/nine-nations-have-nuclear-weapons-here-is-how-many-each-country-has-a6827916.html
[11]. Mearsheimer, J. (2001). The tragedy of great power politics. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
[12]. Njolstad, O. (2014). The development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. The Norwegian Nobel Institute. Retrieved January 14, 2018 from: https://nobelprize.org/educational/peace/nuclear weapons/readmore.html
[13]. Onion, A. (2009). Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Retrieved July 4, 2020 from: https://www.history.com/topics/world-war-ii/bombing-of-hiroshima-and-nagasaki
[14]. Richard K. B. (2012). American Force: Dangers, Delusions, and Dilemmas in National Security.New York: Columbia University Press.
[15]. Rourke, T.J., (2009). International politics on the world stage (12th ed.). New York: The McGrawhill Companies.
[16]. Sagan, S. (1997). Why do states build nuclear weapons: Three models in search of a bomb. International Security Journal, Vol. 21. No. 3. MIT Press. Retrieved January 16, 2018 from http://www.iisdb.stanford.edu/pubs/20278/why-do-states-build-nuclear-weapons.pdf
[17]. Samuel, W.B. and Robert, M.G. (2008) National Security and Nuclear Weapons in the 21stCentury. U.S. Departments of Energy and Defense, Washington, DC, September 2008, 1.
[18]. Schneider, B. (2007). Middle East security issues: In the shadow of weapons of mass destruction proliferation. US Air Force Counter Proliferation Center. Maxwell: Air University Press.
[19]. U.S. Department of Defense. (2012). Annual Report to Congress: Military and Security Developments Involving the People's Republic of China 2012. Washington, DC, May 2012, 3.
[20]. United Nations 70th Anniversary. (2015). United Nations, New York. Retrieved November 2, 2017 from: http://www.un.org/un70/en/content/70ways

Mamefe&Fidelis. "Implications of Nuclear Weapons Development on the Bilateral Relations of States." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(6), 2020, pp. 27-36.