Arms Control: The Economic, Military and Political Issues

Benjamin Isah, King Kekwop

University of Jos, Nigeria

Abstract- **The world is washed by the waves or tides of armament. The demand to own weapons of mass destruction in which nuclear weapon is inclusive, is on high increases. Simultaneously, the states in the international system are yearning for the controls of arms which to them will help in the cushioning of war and related security problems in the international system. As a result, many nations have entered in agreement and signed a number of arms control treaty either bilateral or multilateral. With the present of United Nations and other Regional Governmental organizations that serves as an agent of implementation of these treaties and agreement, there is still high proliferation of weapons in the international system which has also increase the rate of insurgency and terrorism. What could be the reason behind this problem despite the arms control international security policy? The answer is within the economic, military and political issues. The paper argued that nations believed that their ability to secure and obtain a weapon of mass destruction and other related weapons is signifies their military strength and therefore, they can go to any length to achieve such an aim. It was also discovered in this research that some nations find it difficult to adhere to the policy of arms control due to internal/domestic political issues. Additionally, it was argued in this manuscript that some nations' economy depends to a certain level on the production of weapons and military hard-wires. Telling such nations to reduce the or stop that activity is like telling Nigeria and other nations who heavily depend on oil to reduce or stop the production of weapons. In conclusion, it was recommended in the paper that for arms control to take it full cost in the international system, there is need for states to fully cooperate and obey the terms and conditions of treaties of arms control irrespective of the interest in domestic political and economic issues.**

Key Words: **Arms Control, Economic, Military and Political Issues**

I. INTRODUCTION

The global system is washed by the waves or tides of armament due to the demand of military power by states for defense, deterrence and other purposes that is of important to many nations. According Ventura (2018), it is noted that approximately, total number of 875 million guns is in circulation in the world, and more are expected . Additionally, there are almost a number of 15,000 nuclear weapons globally. When compared with the past account, there is a reasonable fall in the number of nuclear war-heads which was accounted to be over 60,000 in the Cold War era, however the present number of nuclear weapons available globally can still have a destructive effect on the world. Throughout the world in the post-World War II era, there was war somewhere.

Therefore, war is a can be termed as a serious issue in the world and armaments as a means through which war is waged becomes a substantial part of the problem. For the earlier mentioned reason, arms control serves as a means in which wars are limited, or at least to check the effects of war and check the proliferation of weapons among nations in the international system.

The study of arms control is of intense interest to many scholars and intellectuals of strategic and peace studies. War is an important global concern and limiting or eradicating it (if possible) can be of great value and worthy of striving by many nations. There are number of methods and strategies that can be used to minimize war: arm control is one of these methods. Arms control has direct impact on humanity as a whole and individual respectively. Therefore, this work is centered on arms control in relation to economic, military and political issues.

II. THE CONCEPT OF ARM CONTROL

Arms control is a form of international security cooperation, or "security regime," aimed at limiting, through tacit or explicit agreement, the qualities, quantity, or use of weapons (Timothy, 2000). The concept of arms control was used to mean many things in the global or international politics: it involved the act of reducing or total removal/eradication of weapons or anything that can lead to using them.

According to Shahzad (2018), arms control can simply be defined as the limitations of quantity or quality of certain types of weapons. Griffiths & Callaghan, Terry, (2002) gave us a little elaboration on the concept of arms control: they see arm control in relation to banning certain classes of weapons and weapons system, placing upper limit on the number of weapons states may possess, limiting the size and destructive power of weapons, banning the production of weapons that will increase the likelihood of war, and stopping or at least slowing the development of new technologies.

Arms control is supposed to solve the problem of a security dilemma in international system where states increase military capability through the invention of different types of weapons with the aim of building their military strength based on the belief that nations have to be militarily and politically stronger in order to be relevant in the international system, because the two mentioned factors are important tools for nations realization of their national interest through foreign

policies. This view has made others states to stockpile more of a certain weapons which easily increase tension in the international system and threatening the states security at large even while the states seek to increase its security by increasing military power to gain a certain level of deterrence (Ventura, 2018).

Due to The invention of new weapons, more especially Weapons of Mass Destruction, the confusion becomes more troublesome due to the facts that nations tried to make an attempt and take advantage of one another for greater achievements, most a times before rules and competition are in place with clarification, over driving arms races. This can some how be seen in a partial form during the early stage of Cold War which had a great tension that would have lead to war over Berlin and Cuba, and the arms race which was driven by fear of been in the disadvantage sidesuch as the "bomber gap." The Cold War experience also showcases the potential need for the prevention of security challenges which have the potential of bursting into war.

Timothy (2000) was able to identify three goals of arms control as follows: (1) to reduced the probability of war; (2) to lower its effects of destruction; and (3) to shortened the price of preparing for it. The first aim can be achieve through the act of encouraging military attitudes that enhance deterrence and defense which renders aggression unattractive; through the reduction of arm race which has the potentials of leading to the out break of war among and within nations; and by curtailing the unauthorized uses of force less liable to occur or to lead to war if they do. As for the goal of limiting damage when wars do break out, arms control restriction may ban the production, deployment, or use of certain military technologies. Finally, cost-savings can be achieved quantitatively or qualitatively with the help of arms limitation agreements. Such economies are an important policy consideration, this is aimed at restricting or controlling the use of resources from sinking into the production of certain types of weapons but rather to be used in promoting security in other way: such enhancing the welfare and social activities of the people.

Irrespective of how these aims and objetives are priotized, arms control has some important features. First, it is a form of political relationship which exist among actors in the international relations: majorly states: Unilateral arms control is a contradiction in itself (an oxymoron) due to the fact that nation can hardly decide by itself to control arms because it unusual, this because the major concern of many nations now is to build their and sophisticate their military defense in to be powerfully relevant and to also tackle the global threat of terrorism and other forms of insurgency. This does not in anyway disregards unilateral steps toward disarmament or arms control that a particular state may consider in order to draw out the relationship from others which might triggers a launch of an arms control process by the concern state, just that this unilateral act is rare, even though it exist, it will be more of illusion: The factor that determines unilateral arm control is the conception of an end-state involving mutual reductions, limitations, or other restrictions. Secondly, inter dependency is an important feature of arms control: the parties involved in it are highly sensitive to the positions and actions of one another, and they have to agree and comply to their decisions in regards to arms control which is also based on their beliefs and willingness to do likewise. Thirdly, arms control involves serious bargaining which might be done silently or explicitly because conflict and competition are part of bargaining which can not be overruled.

According to Timothy (2000), arms control can be seen in two forms: Rivalry specific and general arms control measure. In the rivalry specific form, nations that seems to be opponents or enemies, tried to control their competition in security through agreement that are geared toward shaping of their security relationship in order to have a more stable or at least lest costly military balance. The 1922 Washington Naval Treaty where United States, Britain and Japan agreed to reduced battleship fleets and to a ten year hiatus (gap) on new construction, with a placement of limits on battleship tonnage and armaments. is a good example of rivalry specific arm control. The aim and objective of that treaty was to stabilize the existing balance of naval forces at lower levels, and to intercept an arms race among the three states. Similarly, in 1972, at the peak of cold war détente, the United States and the Soviet Union promised during the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks agreement (SALT I) to reduce the number of ballistic nuclear missile launchers to a lower levels, and to abide by the rules and regulations which limits the deployment of strategic missile defense systems. While, general arms control measures, by contrast aspire to applies to a situations in which many nations are involved: With a wider sphere or area and a comprehensive principles and guidelines, they are meant to bring about a positive change which might affects the many of the strategic relationships in the international political system. A good examples of general arms control measures are the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. Those broadly signed treaties that were made known among other things were the prohibitions on the use of certain types of arms, such as "dum-dum" bullets, poisonous chemical weapons, or bombs dropped from balloons (Timothy, 2000).

III. HISTORY OF ARMS CONTROL

The search of peace for the entire international system has an ancient origin probably began to manifest during the Lateran council of 1139 (during Roman Catholic Regime) to the treaty of Westphalia. But the international system became disparate for peace after the out broke of the First World War after the world's experience of the devastating effects of war. It was during that time when the theory of liberal institutionalism and idealism gathered stamina. In her quest and thirst for peace, the international system established an International organization that was known as League of Nations vested with the role of maintaining peace and order

globally. There is no doubt about it, though not blatantly described but arms control was involved directly or indirectly as part of the strategies used by the League of Nations in limiting war in the international system. We can see that from the idealist perspectives where they stated that men are naturally lovers of peace and they don't want war, but they are driven into war by the military dictators. Therefore, for peace to be achieved, military dictatorship should be substituted with democratic institutions. Personally, I see the "de-militarization" of government as indirectly implying reduction of weapons in fighting warfare because war is term associated with the military.

The history of arms control can be broadly be classified into two major categories: the medieval era or period and the $19^{th}/20^{th}$ century era/period in which the aftermath of both First and Second World War, Cold War and Post-Cold war has brought about a certain number of treaties which were aimed at either reducing the production of weapons of mass destruction or the total eradication of these weapons. The medieval era can be traced back to the period when Rome was the super power and therefore states were operating under the leadership of the church (Roman Catholic) at that moment. Ventura (2018) researched that Roman Catholic Church spearheaded some of these early attempts as a supranational entity. This sort of arms control applied to multiple "proto-states" and also to all individuals under the authority of the Catholic Church. The Second Lateran Council of 1139 attempted to ban the use of crossbows amongst Christians. It was a clear failure. Later on there were attempts to ban expanding bullets and there was a clear distinction between what weapons could be used against civilized powers, where arms control agreements were made, and against the "uncivilized," which had virtually no restrictions. According to Ventura, some scholars believe that remnants of the earlier attitudes remain and there are certainly differing standards in practice between NATO countries and those in central Africa for instance. Modern arms control relies heavily on the state which did not emerge until quite a bit later. Arms control also became a matter of greater concern with the increased effectiveness of weaponry and the corresponding increase in the devastation of war.

Additionally, in 1899 during the Hague Declaration, the use of projectiles which are used for the sole purpose of spreading poisonous gases were prohibited . This Hague declaration was upheld by the Hague Convention of 1907 and the Geneva Protocol of 1925 respectively (Ventura, 2018).The Hague conventions and Geneva protocol were not officially scraped but nations were not operating on the agreement signed during the convention and therefore, they were ignored and abandoned. As a result, there was a need for a new agreements which came up later. This new agreement was inspired by the earlier conventions and protocols. There were more contemporary agreements, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention, were created mostly from scratch. Though the CWC is more effective than the earlier attempts at chemical weapons disarmament, the de-legitimization of

chemical weapons and the start of modern arms control and disarmament movements against new destructive weapons begins with the early Hague and Geneva agreements.

Second World War plays a significant function in the production of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). During this period, chemical and biological weapons were used and were dangerous than they were initially. The invention of nuclear weapons and other related sophisticated weapons was what ushered the entire international system in to a new era of arms control. Therefore, United Nation was committed to preventing wars and aggression. The nuclear triad, second strike capabilities, stock piling of nuclear weapons by the United States and Soviet Union during the cold war era and the increasing proliferation of nuclear weapons globally, led to the urgent need for the control of nuclear weapons. The arms control at that moment was majorly concern with the number of nuclear weapons states possessed, the quantity of the stock pile, delivery mechanism (which was major concern of START alongside quantity) and nuclear testing which ramps up tensions in the international system (Ventura, 2018).

When Soviet Union fall, that is during the Post-Cold War, the chances for the World War III were reduced but still there were existence wars on small scales that continued which made arms control as relevant as it was before. We can see that chemical weapons are back into spotlight due to the Syrian Civil War. Notwithstanding, the post-cold war era still remain the golden age for arms control. As a result of the importance of arms control, many treaties were signed by nations in regard to arms control and disarmament and in order to have peaceful world. In line with the aforementioned statement, Griffith and Callaghan (2002) summarized the treaties aimed at arms control and disarmament from 19-1998 as follows:

i. the 1925 Geneva Protocol banning the use of gas and bacteriological weapons;

ii. the 1959 Antarctic Treaty preventing states from using Antarctica for military purposes;

iii. the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention banning the manufacture and possession of biological weapons;

iv. the 1968 Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) limiting the transfer of nuclear weapons and allied technologies to non-nuclear states;

v. the 1972 Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT 1) controlling the development and use of anti-ballistic missile systems;

vi. the 1989 Conventional Forces in Europe (CAFE) Treaty limiting the number of conventions arms that could be deployed in Europe;

vii. the 1991–92 Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START 1) reducing the size of the superpowers' nuclear arsenals;

viii. the 1993 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) requiring that signatories destroy their chemical weapons stocks within a decade;

ix.   The 1998 Anti-Personnel Landmines Treaty (APLT).

IV. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF ARMS CONTROL

As stated earlier in the opening paragraph of the historical background of arms control, due to the world searching for peace, there were many theories that came up, trying to proffer solutions to the aforementioned problem which was war or lack of peace in the international system. For liberalists and liberal intuitionalists, as a consequence of what that generation called "the Great War," there developed the conviction that armaments were the problem (or at least a significant part of it) and, as a result, that disarmament had to be the solution (William, E, 2012). The League of Nations Covenant, with its call for "reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety and the enforcement by common action of international obligations," exemplified this belief that arms control and disarmament were an essential component of the quest for order in the international system.

For liberals, peace is the normal state of affairs: in Kant's words, peace can be perpetual (Burchill, 2005). Harmony and cooperation among people are the products of law of nature. That means it an inherent part of mankind. in another words, man is by default a harmonious and cooperative creature. This implies that is not in the nature of man, therefore, it is irrational. Liberalist believed that mankind is perfect therefore, they believed that war the blemish spot of war can be clean from the experience of mankind.   When one observed the above statement systematically, one will get to understand that war is not a product of mankind therefore it should be eliminated. This also indirectly implies that weapons should be eliminated because they are the product of warfare.

One thing is common with Rousseau, Kant and Cobden, to Schumpeter and Doyle, they all believed that wars were artificially created by military dictators and governments that are undemocratic in order to achieve and satisfy their own personal interests. Wars were constructed by a 'warrior class' who have the nature and desire to conquer and win more territories for the expansion of their political power bent on extending their power and wealth. According to Paine in The Rights of Man, the 'war system' was contrived to preserve the power and the employment of princes, statesmen, soldiers, diplomats and armaments manufacturers, and to bind their tyranny ever more firmly upon the necks of the people' (Howard 1978 cited in Burchill, 2005). Wars provide governments with excuses to raise taxes, expand their bureaucratic apparatus and increase their control over their citizens. The people, on the other hand, were peace-loving by nature, and plunged into conflict only by the whims of their unrepresentative rulers.

For liberals such as Schumpeter, war was the product of the aggressive instincts of unrepresentative elites. The warlike disposition of these rulers drove the reluctant masses into violent conflicts which, while profitable for the arms industries and the military aristocrats, were disastrous for those who did the fighting. For Kant, the establishment of republican forms of government in which rulers were accountable and individual rights were respected would lead to peaceful international relations because the ultimate consent for war would rest with the citizens of the state (Kant 1970, cited in Burchill, 2005).

Therefore to deduce from the perspective of both liberalist and liberal institutionalist, it is clear that they both rejected war. War is inhuman and so with anything that motivates and triggered it. Availability of weapons can cause and triggered war. Therefore arms control and disarmament are important in the achievement of peace in the international system.

V. THE ECONOMIC, MILITARY AND POLITICAL ISSUES OF ARMS CONTROL

Efforts made in achieving arms control agreement, more especially the one that involves multiple actors, consist of the combination of legal, political, economical and strategic consideration. Moral aspect can also be added to the mentioned elements. Arms control treaties and conventions, attempt to use the framework of international Law to commit countries to relinquish or limit special types or classes of weapons- unnatural acts of sovereign states. Beyond these stated objectives, however, arms control agreements and the process which produced them has broad implications for the entire structure of international relations (Flowerree, 1984).

While a variety of motivations impel nations to seek arms control agreements, a common thread of perceived national-self-interest runs through each. The inspiration may be genuine alarm over the multiplication of weapons of mass destruction or of those perceived to be dangerously destabilizing. In addition, more crass considerations may be uppermost in a country's calculations such as an attempt to prevent a potential adversary from catching up the development of certain types of weapons. If the risk of embarking upon a particular arms control endeavor seems negligible, a principal motivation may be to improve the position of nation or group of nations in the never ending global propaganda battle (Ibid).

In discussing the economic and military issue of arms control, the concept of military industrial complex is of paramount importance. In another words, the economy of arms control is in the military industrial complex. While the domestic political activities of states, covered to a certain degree the political issue engulfed in arms control. This is due to the facts that states in the international political system are major players and they determine the international security strategy through treaties and agreement: either bilateral or multilateral treaty. Therefore, in this session, we shall be

answering questions like what happens in the military industrial complex and how does it relate to economic issue of arms control? What role is the military industrial complex playing in the issues of arms control?

To start with, arms control is of advantage to many nations and of disadvantage to some nations particular to those countries that possessed modern military technology. Looking at United States as an example: manufacturing industries heavily relied on funding from the public sector in one form or another, and in particular on outlays for weaponry, even nearly, three decades after the end of the cold war. Roughly, it was estimated that 10% of the $2.2 trillion in factory output in U.S is channeled into the production of weapons sold mainly to the defense department for used by arm forces (Uchitelle, 2017). More so, the United States in terms of military expenditure, has the highest spending when it comes to military more than the next 45 highest spending countries in the world combined. The U.S. takes a total of 48% of the world's total military expenditure (Quinn, 2008). The United States spends on its military 5.8 times more than China, 10.2 times more than Russia, and 98.6 times more than Iran. According to Quinn, the Cold War has been over for years, but U.S are spending like World War III is on the near term horizon. Since the attack of September 11, United States has double her spending on defense. One will begin to wonder, in the midst of global demand for arms control. Why should the U.S be investing a huge amount of money in the defense industry for the production of military equipment and military hardwires? The answer is not far away from the realist perspective about the nature of the international system. U.S is one of the countries that believe in the realist assertion that military might is one of the factors that makes states powerful in the international system. And due tothe anarchical nature of the international system, there is need for nation states to defend themselves from enemies because conflict or even war is inevitable in an anarchical environment. Additionally production of weapons and military hardwires has significantly increase the economic capacity of the United States. Remove the weapons manufacturing from the economy of the United States, one might likely find out that he/she is removing a significant percentage from the U.S annual budget. How can one expect a country like this to strictly adhere to the treaties of arms control? Could be that United States and other super powers are being proactive to the unknown of the future? I think U.S realist orientation might have an answer to all these questions. It is likely that the country want to maintain its military position in the international system as a means of protecting the nation and it is also possible that weapons production contained an important portion of the nation's economy.

Another important issue surrounding the arms control is the political issue. Many nations were disappointed with the negotiated arms control which was practiced over the past two decades. This widespread phenomenon is found as much among proponents as among critics. This disappointment, caused largely by the decade-long failure to achieve telling limitations on strategic offensive nuclear forces, has spawned a veritable cottage industry of writings on the future of arms control, writings which seek new, more fruitful approaches to arms control or new recipes for success in given negotiations. Lavish attention has been given to the problem of rethinking, restructuring, restarting, fixing, or otherwise improving the prospects for and the effectiveness of negotiated arms control. Serious debate has erupted over whether the problem has been that arms control has been asked to do too much or too little. Analysts have struggled for new formulae that might permit the arms control impasse to be broken. A lot of public movement has centered within the perspectives that surrounded the idea that a comprehensive nuclear blockage is the most effective approachin enforcing restraint on the nuclear arms competition (Miller, 2016). Largely an undeniable fact is that: in any systematic way in the current disarray with respect to arms control is one overriding, fundamentally important reality: that the promise of arms control as an instrument of national security policy has been stunted as much by domestic political factors as by any other. Indeed, the lesson that emerges most strongly from the record of the past twenty-five years is that domestic political impediments to negotiated arms control regularly triumph over its substantive possibilities (Miller, 2016).

Domestic politics of many nations has played a significant role in the implementation process of arms control treaties. Note all nations are signatories to all treaties that concerned arms control. In another words, greater achievements for arms control have been prevented by domestic calculations and politics. Miller (2016) gave an example with President Kennedy where he desired to have a comprehensive test ban but settled for the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Reason was that he could not persuade the Joint Chief of Staff (JSC) to support the comprehensive treaty. Another example is that of President Nixon and National Security Assistant Henry Kissinger: they were unable to pursue a ban on multiple warheads (MIRVs) in SALT I in part at least because Secretary of Defense Laird and the JCS were strongly opposed, and Nixon and Kissinger felt that the price of gaining their support would be too high. More so, At the 1922 Washington Disarmament Conference the United States succeeded in incorporating a prohibition on poisonous gases into a treaty on submarines and noxious gases, but this treaty never entered into force. Three years later at the Geneva Conference on the Supervision of the International Traffic in Arms the United States proposed a prohibition on the export of gases for military purposes. The French then suggested that a ban on the use of poisonous gases similar to that included in the peace treaties with Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria be made the subject of a separate protocol (Flowerree, 1984). At Poland's suggestion the ban was extended to bacteriological weapons. The Protocol was signed on 17 June 1925 and is today the oldest multilateral arms control agreement still in effect. Prior to World War II a large number of countries, including all the major powers except the United States and Japan, ratified the protocol. Some,

however, did so with a reservation that they would not be bound by it if their adversaries failed to respect its provisions. Although Italy used poison gas in the Ethiopian War (1935), all participants in World War II refrained from employing chemical agents (Flowerree. 1984).

In short, domestic factors constitute a large part of the explanation of why the harvest of arms control has been disappointing. This suggests that the prospects for successful arms control in the future will be contingent on finding ways to manage the political process in order to overcome or circumvent political impediments. These impediments, it should be noted, are not entirely negative, for they protect States from bad agreement. But they also deny it good agreements and prevent arms control from playing a more constructive role in international security policy (Ibid). . If, as most seem to believe, arms control can contribute to international system security by constraining threats, enhancing the stability of the military balance, and possibly reducing the risk of war, then nations interests will be served by the identification of strategies that will allow a wider latitude for arms control in the domestic arena. Since the impediments are many, and in many instances are inherent to the workings of the political systems of states particularly the superpowers, it will not be easy to identify such strategies. Until this problem is widely recognized and addressed, however, it will be impossible to move beyond the heretofore unsatisfying (though not totally a failure) record of arms control.

Production of major weapon systems is concentrated in relatively few states, in contrast to small arms production, which is relatively standard and widely dispersed. Although defense companies rely on domestic support through procurement and support for exports and so are not truly 'transnational', they have, nonetheless, internationalized, with major non-US defense companies also seeking to buy defense contractors in the US as a means of entering this large defense market. Companies are also changing their supply chains, reflecting internationalization. Governments are increasingly willing to recognize that the costs of high-technology research and development when combined with smaller national production runs have made it more necessary to make economies of scale through international collaboration and industrial restructuring (Dunne, 2014). Internationally, there is increasing US dominance, with US and European links developing and increasingly geographically dispersed supply chains. The old arms producers remain dominant, though they have restructured, becoming systems integrators, outsourcing to civil companies and internationally, and spinning in civil technologies and components, rather than spinning off innovations for the civil sector. There are a lot of new companies entering in the new security areas, some of whom do not know they are involved in arms production as their civil products are integrated into arms systems. New important players have emerged and there have been a considerable number of takeovers by the old primes to acquire expertise in new areas (Ibid).

Conclusively, arms control has played and still playing a significant role in the maintenance of peace in the international system. The world experienced peace for a couple period of time. Credit goes to the arms control treaties signed by nations at different levels. However, the world's concentration on the control of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction alone in the recent decade has significantly made the proliferation of small arms and light weapons to rise in a high speed. The third world nations are suffering from insurgency and all forms of internal terrorism due to the availability of weapons in the hands of the terrorists and insurgents. Therefore it is high time for the nations to come collectively and reaffirm their commitment of maintaining world peace by taking all aspect of arms control important. Additionally, nations should stop playing politics with the issue of arms control. International laws and treaties must be fully respected. Partial commitment to arms control treaties means partial success and this will place the entire international system on the risk of global insecurity: which of course many nations are into it already. With the enormous potential for destruction inherent in modem weapons, states, no matter how antagonistic, share the common objective of self-preservation. Despite past discouragements and the weaknesses of existing instruments, the effort to achieve effective arms control treaties will continue to play a significant role as governments seek ways to ensure the survival of their people.

REFERENCES

[1]. Burchill, S. (2005a). Liberalism. In *Theories of International Relations* (3rd ed., pp. 55–81). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
[2]. Burchill, S. (2005b). *Theories of International Relations*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
[3]. Dunne, J. P. (2014). The Military Industrial Complex. Retrieved March 4, 2021, from Researchgate website: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/46450061
[4]. Flowerree, C. C. (1984). The politics of Arms Control Treaties: A Case Study. *Journal of International Affairs*, *37*(2), 269–282. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/24356930
[5]. Griffith, M., & Callaghan, O, T. (2002). *International Relations : The Key Concept*. London: Routledge.
[6]. Griffiths, M., & Callaghan, Terry, O. (2002). *International Relations : The Key Concepts*. New York: Routledge.
[7]. Miller, S. E. (2016). Politics over Promise Domestic Impediments to Arms Control. Retrieved January 2, 2016, from International Security website: http://www.jstor.org/stable/2538563
[8]. Shahzad, S. . (2018). Arms Control and Disarmament-A Case Study for Pakistan Research Article Arms Control and Disarmament-A Case Study for Pakistan. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary and Current Research*, *6*(November 2018), 1324–1330. https://doi.org/10.14741/ijmcr/v.6.6.6
[9]. Timothy, H. (2000). Arms Control and Arms Race. In *International Encyclopedia of The Social Sciences* (2nd ed., Vol. 16, pp. 175–180).
[10]. Ventura, M. (2018). *Arms Control and Disarmament : Legitimacy , War , and Peace Arms Control and Disarmament : Legitimacy , War , and Peace*. Macalester College.
[11]. William, E, R. (2012). An Introduction to Arms Control. In *Arms Control: History, Theory and Practice* (Vol. 1, pp. 1–3). Retrieved from www.abc-clio.com