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DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL.

What is disarmament?

Disarmament is the act of reducing, limiting, or abolishing weapons. Disarmament generally refers to a country's military or specific type of weaponry. Disarmament is often taken to mean total elimination of weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear arms. It’s the simple reduction or withdrawal of military forces and weapons.

Disarmament became a more urgent and complicated issue with the rapid development of nuclear weapon capable of mass destruction. Since the explosion of the first atomic bombs in 1945, the previous contention that armament races were economically inexpedient and led inevitably to war was replaced by the argument that the future use of nuclear weapons in quantity threatened the continued existence of civilization itself. During the post-World War II period, there were discussions at several levels aimed at limiting and controlling armaments.

ARMS CONTROL is a term for international restrictions upon the development, production, stockpiling, proliferation and usage of small arms, conventional weapon, and weapons of mass destruction. Arms control is typically exercised through the use of diplomacy which seeks to impose such limitations upon consenting participants through international treaties and agreements, although it may also comprise efforts by a nation or group of nations to enforce limitations upon a non-consenting country.

Arms control treaties and agreements are often seen as a way to avoid costly arms races which could prove counter-productive to national aims and future peace. Some are used as ways to stop the spread of certain military technologies such as nuclear weaponry or missile technology, in return for assurances to potential developers that they will not be victims of those technologies, some arms control agreements are entered to limit the damage done by warfare, especially to civilians and the environment, which is seen as bad for all participants regardless of who wins a war.

While arms control treaties are seen by many peace proponents as a key tool against war, by the participants, they are often seen as simply ways to limit the high costs of the development and building of weapons, and even reduce the costs associated with war itself. Arms control can even be a way of maintaining the viability of military action by limiting those weapons that would make war so costly and destructive as to make it no longer a viable tool for national policy.

Arms control aims to limit the number of weapons and to regulate their use by virtue of bilateral or multilateral agreements or arrangements. Disarmament, aims at the elimination of entire weapon system categories. The spread of weapons of mass destruction poses a serious threat to international security. Arms control and disarmament are linked with the implementation of concrete human rights and humanitarian law and a part of security policy.

Arms control agreements are supplemented by international export control cooperation, which has intensified in the recent years and which has become an increasingly relevant aspect of the fight against terrorism and human rights work.

The primary purpose of arms control is disarmament. While arms-control agreements often reduce the number of weapons available to states, proponents of disarmament argue that the more important function of such agreements is to tame adverse military-industrial complexes and to dismantle old attitudes and cultures of war. In addition to achieving anti-militarist objectives, the promotion of disarmament agreements provides opportunities to create new coalitions in favour of international and social justice while also freeing resources from wasteful military competition to pursue these peaceful agendas. By contributing to the dismantlement of militarist interest groups, arms-control agreements can advance the cause of peace.

The purpose of arms control, recognizing that dismantling militarist influence groups and redirecting resources toward pursuing social justice will take time. As a result, despite their expansive explanation of the cause of war, proponents of disarmament often support more limited arms-control measures, as long as those measures can be understood as part of a progressive program for dismantling weapons and militarist interest groups more generally. For example, the 1987 INF Treaty is often praised by advocates of disarmament for its “elimination of an entire category of weapons systems,” even though the treaty limits only land-based missiles of ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometres, and for only two countries. Whatever the treaty’s perceived shortcomings, many disarmament advocates see the INF as a good first step toward the more comprehensive elimination of nuclear weapons. Unlike disarmament, the policy prescriptions of stability arms control prefer immediate and permanent solutions to pressing military-technical problems. This is because most proponents of stability arms control locate the problem to be solved in the specific technical characteristics of the weapons and their interaction with other weapons systems.