

# CSS International Relations: arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation

This topic sits in the International Relations papers under the headings of international security, the nuclear question and the role of international regimes. Examiners want precise definitions, accurate treaty knowledge and a clear argument about why agreements succeed or fail. Pakistan's position is almost always tested.

## 1. Definitions: arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation

### 1.1 Arms control

**Arms control:** cooperation between potential adversaries to limit, regulate or restrain the development, testing, deployment or use of weapons, in order to reduce the likelihood of war, the damage if war occurs and the cost of preparing for it.

Arms control accepts that weapons will continue to exist. Its aim is stability, not abolition. Limits on numbers, bans on certain tests, hotlines and verification visits are all arms control. The idea was developed in the early 1960s by Thomas Schelling, Morton Halperin and Hedley Bull.

### 1.2 Disarmament

**Disarmament:** the reduction or complete elimination of a category of weapons, either by one state acting alone (unilateral disarmament) or by agreement among several states (multilateral or general disarmament).

Disarmament has a moral and idealist tradition reaching back to the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907 and the League of Nations Covenant (Article 8). "General and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control" became the formal UN goal and appears in Article VI of the NPT.

### 1.3 Non-proliferation

**Non-proliferation:** measures to prevent the spread of weapons, especially weapons of mass destruction, their delivery systems and the materials and technology needed to make them, to states or non-state actors that do not already have them.

- **Horizontal proliferation:** the spread of weapons to new states or actors.
- **Vertical proliferation:** the growth in the size or sophistication of the arsenals of states that already have them.

Critics from the Global South, including Pakistan and India, have long argued that the international regime is strict about horizontal proliferation but weak on vertical proliferation, which is the heart of the "discrimination" argument against the NPT.

**Exam tip:** In a definitions question, always contrast the two terms. A one-line contrast that earns



marks: "Arms control manages weapons to make deterrence stable; disarmament seeks to remove the weapons themselves." Then give one example of each, such as SALT I (arms control) and the Chemical Weapons Convention (disarmament of a whole category).

## 2. Why states engage in arms control

### 2.1 The three classic aims

Schelling and Halperin (1961) set out three objectives that remain the standard framework:

1. **Reduce the risk of war.** Stable deterrence, crisis communication (the US-Soviet Hotline of 1963 followed the Cuban Missile Crisis) and limits on destabilising weapons reduce the chance of accidental or pre-emptive war.
2. **Reduce damage if war occurs.** Limits on numbers and types of weapons lower the destruction of any conflict.
3. **Reduce the cost of preparing for war.** Arms races are expensive. Agreements release resources for development.

### 2.2 Other motives

- **Escaping the security dilemma:** when one state arms for defence, its rival sees a threat and arms in response. Transparency and verification can break this cycle.
- **Freezing an advantage or locking in parity:** states sign when limits favour them or codify a balance they can accept.
- **Prestige and legitimacy:** being seen as a responsible state helps access to technology, trade and diplomatic support.
- **Humanitarian concern:** the bans on landmines, cluster munitions and nuclear weapons (TPNW) were driven by the suffering these weapons cause.

### 2.3 Why it is difficult

- **Verification:** states fear cheating. "Trust but verify" (Reagan's phrase in the INF era) captures this.
- **Relative gains:** each side worries that the other gains more from the deal.
- **Linkage:** arms control is often hostage to wider politics, as when the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 stopped US ratification of SALT II.

## 3. Cold War treaties

### 3.1 Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), 1963

Signed in Moscow in August 1963 by the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom, a year after the Cuban Missile Crisis. It bans nuclear test explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water, but allows underground testing. It reduced radioactive fallout, a major public health concern. France and China, then developing their own weapons, did not join and continued atmospheric tests.

### 3.2 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), 1968

Opened for signature on 1 July 1968 and in force from March 1970. It is the cornerstone of the nuclear order and rests on a "grand bargain" of three pillars:

1. **Non-proliferation (Articles I and II):** nuclear-weapon states (NWS) must not transfer weapons or help others acquire them; non-nuclear-weapon states (NNWS) must not acquire them.
2. **Peaceful uses (Article IV):** all parties have an "inalienable right" to nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Article III requires NNWS to accept International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards to show that material is not diverted to weapons.
3. **Disarmament (Article VI):** all parties undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on ending the arms race and on nuclear disarmament.

**Definition to learn:** Under the NPT, a nuclear-weapon state is one that "manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device prior to 1 January 1967". Only five states qualify: the United States, the Soviet Union (now Russia), the United Kingdom, France and China.

India, Pakistan and Israel have never joined. North Korea announced its withdrawal in 2003 under Article X, which allows withdrawal on three months' notice if "extraordinary events" jeopardise a state's supreme interests. South Sudan, independent in 2011, has not joined. Almost every other state is a party, which makes the NPT the most widely joined arms control treaty.

### 3.3 SALT I and the ABM Treaty, 1972

The Strategic Arms Limitation Talks began in 1969. In May 1972 Nixon and Brezhnev signed two agreements:

- **SALT I Interim Agreement:** froze the number of intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers for five years. It limited launchers, not warheads, so both sides kept adding warheads through MIRVs (multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles).
- **Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty:** limited each side to two missile-defence sites, reduced to one by a 1974 protocol. The logic was mutual assured destruction (MAD): if neither side could defend itself, neither could hope to win a first strike, so deterrence stayed stable.

The United States announced its withdrawal from the ABM Treaty in December 2001 and it took effect in June 2002, to allow national missile defence. Russia saw this as the first blow to the Cold War architecture.

### 3.4 SALT II, 1979

Signed in Vienna in June 1979 by Carter and Brezhnev. It set equal ceilings on strategic delivery vehicles and sub-limits on MIRVed systems. The US Senate never ratified it after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, although both sides broadly observed its limits for some years.

### 3.5 Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, 1987

Signed in Washington in December 1987 by Reagan and Gorbachev. It was the first treaty to **eliminate** an entire class of nuclear weapons: all ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges of 500 to 5,500 km. It introduced intrusive on-site inspections, a breakthrough in verification. The United States withdrew in August 2019, accusing Russia of deploying a prohibited missile (the

9M729); Russia denied the charge. The treaty therefore ended.

### 3.6 START I, 1991, and its successors

- **START I (1991):** signed in July 1991 by Bush and Gorbachev, months before the Soviet Union collapsed. It limited each side to 6,000 accountable warheads on 1,600 strategic delivery vehicles and created a detailed verification system. Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine gave up the Soviet weapons on their territory (Lisbon Protocol, 1992).
- **START II (1993):** would have banned MIRVed ICBMs but never entered into force.
- **Moscow Treaty (SORT, 2002):** 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed warheads, with no verification of its own.
- **New START (2010):** signed in Prague in April 2010 by Obama and Medvedev; limits of 1,550 deployed strategic warheads and 700 deployed launchers. It was extended in 2021 for five years to February 2026. Russia "suspended" its participation in February 2023, ending inspections and data exchanges, and the treaty reached its expiry date in February 2026.

## 4. Post-Cold War and multilateral regimes

### 4.1 Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), 1996

Opened for signature in September 1996. It bans all nuclear explosions in all environments. It will only enter into force when all 44 states listed in its Annex 2 (states with nuclear power or research reactors at the time) have ratified it. Several have not, including the United States and China (signed, not ratified), and India, Pakistan and North Korea (not signed). Russia withdrew its ratification in 2023, saying it wanted parity with the United States. Even so, its Vienna-based International Monitoring System already operates and detected every North Korean test. Since 1998 only North Korea has conducted nuclear tests.

### 4.2 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), 1993

Signed in Paris in January 1993 and in force from April 1997. It bans the development, production, stockpiling, transfer and use of chemical weapons and requires destruction of existing stocks. It is verified by the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) in The Hague, which won the Nobel Peace Prize in 2013. All declared stockpiles were reported destroyed by 2023. Its limits were exposed by chemical attacks in Syria. Pakistan is a party.

### 4.3 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC), 1972

Opened for signature in 1972 and in force from 1975. It was the first treaty to ban an entire category of weapons of mass destruction. Its great weakness is that it has **no verification body**: talks on a verification protocol collapsed in 2001. It relies on confidence-building measures and a small Implementation Support Unit in Geneva. Pakistan is a party.

### 4.4 Ottawa Treaty (Mine Ban Convention), 1997

Signed in Ottawa in December 1997 and in force from 1999. It bans anti-personnel landmines and requires clearance and victim assistance. It came from a coalition of middle powers and NGOs (the International Campaign to Ban Landmines won the 1997 Nobel Peace Prize), which made it a model of "humanitarian disarmament". Major military powers, including the United States, Russia, China, India and Pakistan, stayed outside. Pakistan argues that mines are needed to defend long land borders and

accepts the weaker restrictions of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons instead.

#### 4.5 Arms Trade Treaty (ATT), 2013

Adopted by the UN General Assembly in April 2013 and in force from December 2014. It regulates the international trade in conventional arms, from small arms to battle tanks and aircraft, and requires states to assess whether exports could be used for serious violations of international humanitarian or human rights law. It does not ban any weapon.

#### 4.6 Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), 2017

Adopted at the UN in July 2017 by 122 votes and in force from January 2021. It is the first treaty to ban nuclear weapons outright: their development, testing, possession, use and threat of use. It was driven by the humanitarian initiative and the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN, Nobel Peace Prize 2017). No nuclear-armed state and no NATO member has joined.

#### 4.7 Treaty table

| Treaty         | Year signed or opened | Type                     | Main content                                        | Status and key point                                                             |
|----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| PTBT           | 1963                  | Arms control             | No tests in air, space or under water               | In force; France and China stayed out                                            |
| NPT            | 1968                  | Non-proliferation        | Three pillars; five recognised NWS                  | In force since 1970; extended indefinitely 1995; India, Pakistan, Israel outside |
| BWC            | 1972                  | Disarmament              | Bans biological weapons                             | In force since 1975; no verification body                                        |
| SALT I and ABM | 1972                  | Arms control             | Freeze on launchers; limit on missile defence       | ABM ended by US withdrawal 2002                                                  |
| SALT II        | 1979                  | Arms control             | Ceilings on delivery vehicles and MIRVs             | Never ratified by the US                                                         |
| INF            | 1987                  | Disarmament of a class   | Eliminated 500 to 5,500 km ground-launched missiles | Ended 2019                                                                       |
| START I        | 1991                  | Arms reduction           | 6,000 warheads, 1,600 delivery vehicles             | Expired 2009; replaced by New START                                              |
| CWC            | 1993                  | Disarmament              | Bans chemical weapons; stocks destroyed             | In force since 1997; OPCW verifies                                               |
| CTBT           | 1996                  | Arms control             | Bans all nuclear explosions                         | Not in force; Annex 2 states missing                                             |
| Ottawa         | 1997                  | Humanitarian disarmament | Bans anti-personnel mines                           | In force since 1999; major powers outside                                        |
| New START      | 2010                  | Arms reduction           | 1,550 deployed warheads, 700 deployed launchers     | Russia suspended 2023; expiry date February 2026                                 |

|      |      |                  |                                        |                                              |
|------|------|------------------|----------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| ATT  | 2013 | Trade regulation | Criteria for conventional arms exports | In force since 2014                          |
| TPNW | 2017 | Disarmament      | Bans nuclear weapons outright          | In force since 2021; no nuclear-armed member |

## 5. The NPT review process

### 5.1 How it works

Article VIII of the NPT provides for review conferences. Since 1975 they have been held every five years, with preparatory committee meetings in between. Decisions are taken by consensus, so a single state can block a final document.

### 5.2 Key conferences

- **1995 Review and Extension Conference:** the treaty was originally for 25 years. The conference extended it indefinitely, as a package with "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", a strengthened review process and a resolution calling for a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction. Arab states accepted indefinite extension partly because of that resolution.
- **2000:** agreed the "13 practical steps" towards disarmament, including an "unequivocal undertaking" by the NWS to eliminate their arsenals.
- **2005:** failed to agree a substantive final document.
- **2010:** agreed a 64-point action plan and steps towards a Middle East conference.
- **2015:** failed, mainly over the Middle East zone.
- **2022** (delayed from 2020 by the pandemic): failed when Russia blocked consensus over language on the Zaporizhzhia nuclear plant in Ukraine.

### 5.3 Main fault lines

1. **Disarmament gap:** NNWS say the NWS have not honoured Article VI.
2. **Middle East:** Israel's undeclared arsenal and the unfulfilled 1995 resolution.
3. **Compliance cases:** Iran's programme (the 2015 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, from which the United States withdrew in 2018) and North Korea's withdrawal and tests.
4. **Peaceful use versus safeguards:** developing states resist extra obligations such as the IAEA Additional Protocol being made mandatory.
5. **Outsiders:** India, Pakistan and Israel cannot join as NWS without amending the treaty, and will not join as NNWS.

## 6. South Asia and Pakistan's nuclear position

### 6.1 Path to nuclearisation

- **1974:** India tested a device at Pokhran in May 1974, calling it a "peaceful nuclear explosion". Pakistan, still recovering from the 1971 war and the loss of East Pakistan, saw this as an existential threat and accelerated its own programme.

- **1974 onwards:** Pakistan proposed a South Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone at the UN General Assembly, and in later years offered simultaneous accession to the NPT by India and Pakistan, mutual IAEA inspections and a bilateral test ban. India rejected these, arguing that its security concern was China and that the problem was global, not regional.
- **May 1998:** India conducted tests on 11 and 13 May. Pakistan responded with tests in the Chagai Hills on 28 May and in the Kharan desert on 30 May 1998. 28 May is marked in Pakistan as Youm-e-Takbeer. UN Security Council Resolution 1172 (June 1998) condemned both tests and called on both to join the NPT and CTBT.

## 6.2 Pakistan's doctrine and command

- **Credible minimum deterrence:** Pakistan's stated aim is to deter aggression, especially India's larger conventional forces, not to compete number for number.
- **No no-first-use pledge:** Pakistan keeps the option of first use because nuclear weapons offset conventional inferiority. India declared a no-first-use policy in its 2003 doctrine, with "massive" retaliation.
- **Full spectrum deterrence:** from around 2013 Pakistan described its posture this way, covering strategic, operational and tactical levels. Short-range systems such as the Nasr were presented as a response to India's "Cold Start" limited-war concept.
- **Command and control:** the National Command Authority (2000) with the Strategic Plans Division as its secretariat. After the A. Q. Khan network was exposed in 2004, Pakistan introduced the Export Control Act (2004) and a Strategic Export Control Division to show its commitment to non-proliferation.

## 6.3 Pakistan in the global regimes

- **NPT:** Pakistan calls it discriminatory and will not join as a non-nuclear state. It argues that its weapons are a reality the regime must accommodate.
- **CTBT:** Pakistan has not signed but maintains a unilateral moratorium on testing and has said it would not be the first in the region to resume tests.
- **Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty (FMCT):** at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, Pakistan has blocked a work programme on a treaty that would only stop future production. It wants a fissile material treaty that also covers existing stocks, since a cut-off would freeze India's larger stockpile advantage.
- **India-US civil nuclear deal and the NSG:** the 2005 deal and the NSG waiver for India in September 2008 allowed India nuclear trade outside the NPT. Pakistan called this an exception that weakened the regime and the regional balance. Both states applied for NSG membership in 2016; Pakistan argues for non-discriminatory, criteria-based entry rather than a single-country exception.
- **CWC and BWC:** Pakistan is a party to both and presents this as evidence of responsible behaviour.

## 6.4 Bilateral confidence-building measures

- **Agreement on the prohibition of attack against nuclear installations (1988):** lists of facilities are exchanged every 1 January.
- **Lahore Declaration (February 1999):** committed both sides to confidence-building measures

and reducing the risk of accidental or unauthorised use.

- **Pre-notification of ballistic missile tests (2005)** and an agreement on reducing the risk from nuclear accidents (2007).
- **Hotlines** between the Directors General of Military Operations and the foreign secretaries.

Pakistan's 1998 proposal for a **Strategic Restraint Regime** linked three elements: nuclear restraint, a conventional balance and resolution of disputes, especially Kashmir. Crises such as Kargil (1999), the 2001-02 standoff, Pulwama-Balakot (2019) and the clashes of May 2025 show how quickly escalation can occur under the nuclear shadow.

#### Worked example: building Pakistan's case in an essay

Argument: Pakistan is a responsible nuclear state that the non-proliferation regime should engage, not isolate.

1. Security logic: weapons acquired in response to India's 1974 and 1998 tests and conventional asymmetry.

2. Record of offers: South Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone, simultaneous NPT accession, bilateral test ban, Strategic Restraint Regime.

3. Institutions: National Command Authority, Strategic Plans Division, Export Control Act 2004, IAEA-safeguarded civil reactors.

4. Regime fairness: the 2008 NSG waiver for India shows selective treatment; criteria-based approach needed.

5. Acknowledge weaknesses honestly: the A. Q. Khan network, tactical weapons and the risk they add, the FMCT blockage.

Conclusion: a stable South Asia needs a regional restraint package, not pressure on one side.

## 7. IR-theory views

### 7.1 Realism

States live in anarchy and must rely on self-help. Arms control is possible only when it serves national interest and reflects the balance of power; it is fragile because states fear cheating and care about relative gains. Kenneth Waltz argued that the spread of nuclear weapons might bring stability ("more may be better") because nuclear deterrence makes war too costly, a view challenged by Scott Sagan, who stressed organisational accidents and weak command systems. The Waltz-Sagan debate is often applied to South Asia.

### 7.2 Liberalism and neoliberal institutionalism

Regimes such as the NPT reduce uncertainty, provide information through verification, lower transaction costs and create a shadow of the future that makes cooperation rational. The IAEA and OPCW are examples.

### 7.3 Constructivism

Ideas and norms matter. Nina Tannenwald's "nuclear taboo" explains why nuclear weapons have not been used since 1945 even when they might have given advantage. The TPNW and the landmines ban are attempts to build new norms by stigmatising weapons. Identity also matters: for Pakistan and India, nuclear weapons became tied to national pride and sovereignty.

## 7.4 Critical, postcolonial and feminist views

Critical and postcolonial writers describe the NPT as "nuclear apartheid", a hierarchy that lets five states keep weapons while denying others. Feminist scholars such as Carol Cohn have shown how technical "strategic" language hides human consequences. The humanitarian initiative reflects this critique by focusing on victims rather than states.

**Exam tip:** When asked "Has arms control failed?", use theory to organise the answer: realism explains the collapse of ABM, INF and New START; institutionalism explains the survival of the NPT and CWC; constructivism explains the nuclear taboo and the TPNW. A balanced conclusion scores higher than a one-sided one.

## 8. Exam outline answers

### Outline 1: "The NPT is discriminatory yet indispensable." Discuss.

1. Introduction: NPT 1968, grand bargain, near-universal membership; thesis: both statements are true.
2. Why discriminatory: 1967 cut-off creates two classes; weak delivery on Article VI; vertical proliferation; exceptions such as the 2008 NSG waiver; failed review conferences (2005, 2015, 2022).
3. Why indispensable: slowed proliferation far below 1960s predictions; IAEA safeguards; legal basis for action on Iran and North Korea; supports peaceful nuclear energy.
4. Pakistan's view: outside the treaty, wants recognition and criteria-based access.
5. Theory: realism versus institutionalism.
6. Way forward: renewed US-Russia limits, Middle East process, CTBT entry into force, fairer engagement with outsiders.
7. Conclusion.

### Outline 2: Arms control in South Asia: problems and prospects.

1. Introduction: two nuclear states since 1998, unresolved Kashmir dispute.
2. Problems: asymmetric conventional forces, doctrines (Cold Start, full spectrum deterrence, no-first-use debate), missile development, short warning times, terrorism-triggered crises, outside players (US-India deal, China).
3. Existing CBMs: 1988 installations agreement, Lahore 1999, 2005 missile notification, 2007 accident agreement, hotlines.
4. Pakistan's proposals: SANWFZ, Strategic Restraint Regime, bilateral test ban.
5. Prospects: regular dialogue, risk-reduction centres, missile restraint, crisis management, linking nuclear and conventional restraint with dispute settlement.
6. Conclusion: deterrence has prevented full war, but stability needs institutions.

## Quick check

1. Define arms control and disarmament, and explain one difference between them, with an example of each.
2. Distinguish between horizontal and vertical proliferation.

3. State the three classic aims of arms control set out by Schelling and Halperin.
4. Describe the three pillars of the NPT and name the article linked to each.
5. Explain why the ABM Treaty was thought to strengthen deterrence.
6. Explain why the INF Treaty was regarded as a breakthrough, and why it ended.
7. State why the CTBT has not entered into force.
8. Compare the verification arrangements of the CWC and the BWC.
9. Describe what the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference decided.
10. Explain Pakistan's position on the Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty.
11. Explain why Pakistan has not signed the NPT, and list two alternatives it has proposed.
12. Evaluate the claim that the TPNW strengthens the global non-proliferation regime.

1. Arms control is cooperation between potential adversaries to limit or regulate weapons so as to reduce the risk of war, its damage and its cost. Disarmament is the reduction or elimination of weapons. The difference: arms control accepts that weapons will remain and seeks stability, while disarmament seeks to remove the weapons. Example of arms control: SALT I (1972) froze launcher numbers but did not remove weapons. Example of disarmament: the CWC (1993) bans chemical weapons and required destruction of all stocks.

2. Horizontal proliferation is the spread of weapons to new states or non-state actors, for example North Korea acquiring nuclear weapons. Vertical proliferation is the growth of existing arsenals in number or sophistication, for example the addition of MIRVed warheads by the superpowers in the 1970s.

3. To reduce the likelihood of war; to reduce the damage if war occurs; to reduce the economic cost of preparing for war.

4. Non-proliferation (Articles I and II): NWS do not transfer weapons, NNWS do not acquire them. Peaceful uses (Article IV, with safeguards under Article III): the inalienable right to nuclear energy, verified by IAEA safeguards. Disarmament (Article VI): all parties pursue negotiations in good faith towards ending the arms race and nuclear disarmament.

5. Under mutual assured destruction, each side's cities remained vulnerable to retaliation. By limiting missile defences, the ABM Treaty ensured that neither side could launch a first strike and then shield itself from the response. With no hope of escaping retaliation, neither had an incentive to strike first, and there was less pressure to build more offensive missiles to overwhelm defences. Deterrence was therefore more stable.

6. Breakthrough: it was the first treaty to eliminate a whole class of nuclear weapons (ground-launched missiles with a range of 500 to 5,500 km) rather than cap them, and it introduced intrusive on-site inspections. It ended in 2019 when the United States withdrew, accusing Russia of deploying a banned missile (the 9M729), which Russia denied.

7. Entry into force requires ratification by all 44 states listed in Annex 2. Several have not ratified (for example the United States and China) or have not signed (India, Pakistan and North Korea), and Russia withdrew its ratification in 2023. Until all 44 ratify, it cannot enter into force, although its monitoring system already operates.

8. The CWC has a strong verification body, the OPCW in The Hague, which receives declarations,

inspects industrial and military sites and supervised the destruction of stockpiles. The BWC has no verification body; talks on a verification protocol failed in 2001, so it relies on voluntary confidence-building measures and a small support unit in Geneva. The CWC is therefore far more robust, though both depend on state cooperation.

**9.** It extended the NPT indefinitely, replacing the original 25-year term. The extension was a package: "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament", a strengthened review process, and a resolution calling for a Middle East zone free of weapons of mass destruction.

**10.** Pakistan opposes a treaty that only bans future production of fissile material, because India already holds a larger stockpile and such a cut-off would freeze that advantage. Pakistan wants a fissile material treaty that also addresses existing stocks. Because the Conference on Disarmament works by consensus, Pakistan has been able to block agreement on a work programme on the narrow version.

**11.** Pakistan says the NPT is discriminatory: it recognises only five nuclear-weapon states and would require Pakistan to give up its deterrent while India, its main rival, also stays outside. Its security depends on deterring a larger conventional neighbour. Alternatives proposed: a South Asian nuclear-weapon-free zone (from 1974), simultaneous accession of India and Pakistan to the NPT, a bilateral test ban, mutual inspections and a Strategic Restraint Regime (1998). Any two earn the marks.

**12.** For: the TPNW fills the legal gap left by Article VI by prohibiting nuclear weapons outright; it builds stigma and reinforces the nuclear taboo; it gives non-nuclear states a voice and draws attention to humanitarian effects and victim assistance. Against: no nuclear-armed state has joined, so no warhead has been removed; it may divide NPT parties and weaken consensus at review conferences; it has no detailed verification system for disarmament. Evaluation: it strengthens the normative side of the regime but not its practical or security side; its long-term value depends on whether the stigma it creates changes the behaviour of nuclear-armed states. A good answer reaches a judgement, for example that it complements rather than replaces the NPT.