



Hovering Clouds of Arsenals across the Globe: Taking into Account Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty

Hafiz Rizwan Ahmad¹

Abstract

Nuclear politics is always a tricky business at international level. To understand the nuclear politics is not easy for the teachers, students, researchers and scholars of nuclear politics and global affairs. Arms Control doesn't mean to control or reduce the arsenals, it is sometimes to build arsenals to influence the opponent as two superpowers expanded their nuclear arsenals and raised the slogan of arms control. In this sense, the world witnessed hovering clouds of arsenals across the globe during the cold war era when USSR and USA plunged into conflict in Korean Peninsula, Cuban Missile Crisis and in European vicinity. Although numbers of agreements have been signed by powerful states to avoid nuclear tussles and they remained successful but the race between USSR and USA stimulated other countries to build nuclear arsenals. The bitter reality is that some countries achieved nuclear technology some trying to get like Iran. However, except nuclear issues there are several issues in global politics because now the world has become multipolar and more interestingly China is the emerging global power and influencing the states across the globe. On the other hand, number of treaties have lost their worth or been withdrawn such like INF Treaty and NEW START Treaty is going to expire in February 2026. The question is that what world leading powers learnt from history in sense of nuclear tussles? Because INF has been terminated and New START is also going to be expired. What would be next? What will be the consequences of the termination of INF at first hand and New START Treaty if it would be terminated? This research attempts to find out these main questions through descriptive analytical research Methodology.

Key Words: *Nuclear Politics, Arsenals, Threats, United States, Russia, China, INF, New START*

1 Introduction

Moves of nations states in global system are complicated to understand. States sometimes cooperate and plunge into conflict considering their strategic interest. They opt all available options in order to achieve their political, economic and strategic interest regardless of other actors in international system. The histories of the two main powers of the twentieth century, the United States and Russia, are similar, but conflict abounds. Their relationship had gone through various ups and downs in the past due to ideological clashes.

¹ Hafiz Rizwan Ahmad, MPhil Political Science, visiting Lecturer, Department of Political Science, The Islamia University of Bahawalpur

Although there was more confrontation than cooperation but both superpowers cooperated each other during the era of détente and numbers of agreements were also signed and ratified during the era of Cold War. Two states also made sure cooperation in space technology as both had sent a space mission collectively. However, Soviet Union occupied Central Asia and Eastern part of Europe and numbers of capitalist states were stood under the umbrella of USA and remaining states did not join any block which is known as NAM. Soviet pursuit of nuclear technology in 1949 triggered the arms race between USA and USSR and created an uncertain situation on the globe. Moreover, Korean Crisis, Sino-Soviet ideological clash, Vietnam War and Soviet invasion of Afghanistan heightened the environment of the Cold War.

Donald Trump, the president of the United States, just withdrew from the 'INF Treaty,' claiming that it would ensure not only the national security of the United States, but also European allies. INF is a Cold War-era pact that dates back to 1987, a watershed point in the arms race between the US and Russia, when both sides agreed to stop developing missiles with ranges between 500 and 5 500 kilometers. Russia, according to the US President, is not bound by the "INF Treaty." Russia, on the other hand, declared that it was committed to the INF Treaty and that it had not broken it (Service C. R., 2020).

Why do governments engage in war, according to international relations theories? Why do they work together to attain their objectives? The researcher is studying the dispute between the United States and Russia using the most popular theory of international politics, "Realism." This idea explains why people are conflicted by nature and why countries compete in the global order. This theory discusses the power structure (BoP), which describes how states attempt to obtain greater power in order to achieve balance of power (Molloy, 2006). Similarly, Stephen Walt claimed that states compete each other and developed their arsenals in order to balance threats posed by greater states (Walt, 2010). During Cold War two main pillars of international system US and USSR developed their nuclear arsenals.

1.1 Research Argument

Breaching weapons control accords is assumed to be far easier than signing them. Despite the United States accusing Russia of breaking the pact, rejecting arms control accords seldom improves and almost always jeopardizes another's security. This notion was disregarded by both Moscow and Washington. Indeed, the termination of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty and, as a result, the breakdown of the US and Russian nuclear weapons control architecture heralds anarchy and threatens not just the two nations, but also the whole globe. Aside from the immediate threat to Russia's security, the US departure from the INF Treaty has set off a chain reaction that threatens to destabilize the US-Russia nuclear weapons control mechanism. The pullout will also mark the start of a new chapter in the weapons competition between the US and Russia. As a result, the Treaty's departure will be widely seen as a return to Cold War conflict and weapons race. Rather than swapping indictments, the US and Russia should work together to establish further verification methods to allay mutual worries.

1.2 Research Questions

Researcher has attempted to answer the following questions in this paper.

1. Why has the United States taken the decision of withdrawal from the INF treaty and how this decision will trigger a new era of cold war tensions in global system?
2. What are the implications of the withdrawal from the INF Treaty for the maintenance of global peace and security in international system?

3. What will be the impact of the US withdrawal of the INFs on arms control between America and Russia

2 Case Presentation and Analysis

Arms control and conflict resolution are connected or related to conflict resolution. Both are beneficial in preventing war and ending disputes. It must be clarified when an arms control agreement is signed or adhered to by signatory states, as well as how many nations are acceding to the accord, which will be different for landmines than nuclear weapons. Disarmament, on the other hand, places a strong focus on the global level. Arms control deters threats to international peace and security by building a world order through the limitation or elimination of particular arms in the case of disarmament. However, this does not imply that arms control and disarmament will completely prevent war; rather, they aim to prevent and limit war in specific situations. Because war can be precluded or completely removed by limiting weapons and equipment, but the war will still be fought, the causes that may prevent the war from breaking are political, arms control, and disarmament.

The Antarctic Treaty, signed in 1959, safeguarded the whole continent of Antarctica from experimentation, installation, deployment, and disposal of dangerous weapons, as well as the establishment of military outposts, and permitted participants to utilise the Antarctic continent for scientific purposes (Rossenfel, 1998). However, unlike the INF Deal, this treaty does not address the reduction of weapons. LTBT 1963 also safeguarded the sky, outer space, and the oceans against dangerous weapons (Affairs U. N., 1963). Although both above agreements are significant in their nature but they do not prevent the superpowers to reduce the arsenals over the actual land of earth.

Third, in terms of space weapons control, the Outer Space Treaty of 1967 is all about space, outer space, and other planets. Finally, the NPT of 1968 is a historic treaty that permitted its signatories to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes while prohibiting the transfer of any nuclear weapons (Affairs U. N., 1968).

SALT I, on the other hand, is a notable pact that limits light and heavy ICBMs and talks about the control of submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), contemporary ballistic missile submarines, and an intermediate pact was added in SALT I 1972 for the treaty's execution (Regimes, 1972). Although this treaty may be a significant factor in arms control, SALT I does not mention the elimination of arms or WMDs; instead, it only mentions the limitation of ICBM construction, with no mention of missile ranges. This raises the question of whether missile ranges will be limited or not, as SALT I only restricts the development of early missiles in 1972.

SALT II was another arms control accord that required both the US and the USSR to decrease their stockpiles by limiting the range of their ICBMs to 5500 kilometers (Control, 2009, p. 6) Second, the number of ICBM launchers, SLBM, heavy bombers, and ASBM was to be restricted to 2400, and strategic offensive armaments were to be limited to 2250. Third, cruise missile ranges of 600 kilometers could not exceed 1320 miles. (Control, 2009, pp. 7-17). This deal may show being a watershed moment in world peace, but it was never approved, and it was supposed to limit nuclear armaments of two states in huge numbers, but it was never implemented.

However, the INF Treaty was advantageous not only to Europe but also to the rest of the globe since it saved the Earth from WMDs, such as atomic nuclear bombs, because it not only

decreased but even eliminated the arsenals of both the US and the USSR. The significance of the INF Treaty might be gauged by the time it took from signing to ratification: SALT II was signed in 1979 but never ratified, whereas the INF Treaty was signed on December 8, 1987 and went into force on June 1, 1988, only six months later (Service C. R., 1988).

Under article I of INF Treaty both US and USSR agreed to destroy IMRM and SRM and in article II explained the terms of intermediate and short-medium range missile of 5500-500 km including GLCM (Senate, 1988, pp. 1-2). Under article IV both agreed to destroy associated weapons or missile to the ICBM missiles or weapon mentioned in the first article (Senate, 1988, p. 2). Under the umbrella of INF Treaty USA and Soviet Union destroyed 2692 missiles until 1991 which showed the greater intentions of US and Soviet Union towards the global peace and security (Rossenfel, 1998). However, this treaty played a critical role in the elimination of WMDs as it contained the two superpowers to increase further military capabilities because elimination of WMDs at a large level was never done under any other agreement as it was done by INF Treaty. To oppose Russia, the White House has now withdrawn from the INF Treaty. However, such actions may not only fail to get the intended result of motivating Russia to return to INF Treaty compliance, but they may also enhance the disagreement and so arouse suspicions (David E. Sanger and William J. Broad, 2018).

History reveals that governments establish agreements to balance power in order to protect humanity and the international system's stability, and then disengage from such accords when the necessity arises. For example, the US signed the ABM Treaty in 1972 and then withdrew from it; similarly, the US struck a nuclear deal with Iran and then withdrawn from this recently. On the other side, the United States withdrew from the INF Treaty, demonstrating that the United States has withdrawn from a number of major accords that were critical to world peace.

Understanding or analyzing temporality is not a simple undertaking. Researchers, academics, and students of social sciences tend to examine historical events, leaders' decisions, and strong governments' actions. We addressed the historical ties between two superpowers, the United Governments and the Soviet Union, and their crucial relations throughout the Cold War era, as well as a critical condition of crisis between two great states or systems when the world was on the edge of anarchy in this chapter. On the other side, we spoke about the history of arms control papers that led to the signing of the INF Treaty. Finally, we discussed or studied the history of the INF Treaty and how crucial it was for the world to maintain peace and security in global system.

“Global security is pivotal for the survival of each person in the global system”. Vasconcelos explains, “It is the fact of globalization and multipolarity that allows us communicate of global security that hinges at the up to keep and protection of the sanity of the global system which assure that possibilities to be had at present do not float away in destiny or the absence of fear that moderate situations available at present do no longer pass extinct” (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, pp. 467-468).

Despite the apparent degree of destruction that nuclear weapons cause, the world continues to use them as strategic deterrence equipment, and calls to prevent nuclear warfare and ensure its effective control have grown over time. However, Washington and Moscow are many of the top nuclear battle lords in contemporary global circles, as early as Kristiansen and Norris predicted that Russia own a stockpile (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, pp. 474-475).

Unfortunately, countless troubling conditions threaten the global system's continued survival in modern times, ranging from the threat of terrorism to environmental challenges, nuclear proliferation, and other traumatic conditions that call for additional organization among great powers to be able to correctly manage, if not holistic way resolve as undisputedly, America and Russia are not exceptional cases to some of the arguable (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, p. 468).

The adversarial relationship between the United States and Russia is particularly complicated in light of contemporary issues that threaten the international gadget's long-term existence. As a result, the confrontational sample of relationship seriously requires sound and rigorous educational contemplation; however, literature that attempts to examine this strand of state of affairs as it relates to international security and establishes the contestant of a new Cold War is much scarcer.

According to theoretical perspectives, the global system is anarchic by nature, and this is unavoidable due to the inability of a sovereign body to modify and direct the behavior of nations on the matter of one another, making distinct activity vital in inter - state relations contributing and to enact and fulfill the ones interests; states are compelled to accumulate power, and the battle of interest and warfare for strength makes opposition ineluctable; states are pressured to accumulate strength, and the battle of interest and warfare for strength makes opposition (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, p. 470).

Because of the United States' exit, the INF Treaty, which had been a shining star in the spectrum of arms control or weapons disarmament, has now lost its luster. However, this pact demonstrated or paved the way for future weapons control agreements, since both superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, agreed to sign another historic document for the maintenance of world peace within a year of its ratification. However, the INF Treaty serves as a watershed moment in the conclusion of the Cold War amongst major players in the world's bipolar order.

This was not the first time in history that the United States informed Russia of its intention to withdraw from an international weapons control pact; in 2001, the United States informed Russia of its intention to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. The size and construction of each country's Anti-Ballistic Missile systems were regulated by this bilateral pact, which had been in place for over 30 years. The ABM constraints laid forth in the pact have been recognized as a capstone in restricting the unfettered rush to expand and deploy strategic ballistic missiles built for nuclear weapons conveyance by prohibiting both states from being immune from a retaliatory ballistic missile assault. The US departure from the ABM Treaty, on the other hand, became the first time in modern history that the US has rejected an international accord (Axton, 2009, p. 125).

For over 30 years, the Cold War has been ended. For the time being, significant battles between superpowers look unlikely. However, the proliferation of nuclear weapons and ballistic missile delivery systems is a current reality for some of the sector's poorer countries, and many will argue that Islamic religious extremism is filling the energy vacuum left by the collapse of socialist ideals, adding to the tensions within and among countries (Axton, 2009, p. 126).

Diplomatic engagement may be the most effective way to bring Russia into conformity with the INF Treaty. It entails raising the issue with Russia on a regular basis and keeping European allies up to date on facts about the infringement and Russian responses. As a result, the

allies were able to raise the same challenge in their own conversations with their Russian counterparts, demonstrating solidarity and increasing diplomatic pressure. However, a variety of financial penalties have already been imposed in response to Russia's no longer clandestine engagement in Ukraine, and it may be difficult to come up with new ones that are tailored especially to Russian non-compliance with the INF Treaty. Military measures sprang to mind immediately. However, the most of them are opulent and contentious with NATO partners (Horlohe, 2015, p. 103).

According to arms specialists, the benefits of abiding to the INF Treaty much exceed the need for the US to declare the "extraordinary instances" that have compromised "it's flawless interests" and withdraw from the treaty. Because putting the INF Treaty into doubt would jeopardize America's already unstable arms control agenda, a technical breach by an SLCM launch from the 'wrong' launcher could not avoid this check. If INF fails, Republicans in Congress may turn their attention to New START as a political prize (Horlohe, 2015, p. 104).

However, the US has committed to the INF Deal in order to bring Russia into compliance since withdrawing from the treaty may pose problems for the US and put other accords in jeopardy. With the MTCR member states, the US would lose the most credibility and impudence. Increased proliferation of ballistic and, in particular, cruise missiles might hamper military stability in specific crisis circumstances, such as in the Persian Gulf, for the US military. It would demand a significant increase in missile defense spending. However, the US has officially withdrawn from the INF Treaty, which may cause issues not just for the US, but also for Russia and western allies of America.

Without the INF Treaty, all those questions and conflicts of interest that were laid bare throughout the 1980s, while NATO struggled with its dual track response to Soviet intermediate range nuclear missiles, could resurface sooner rather than later in the international system. It is interesting to note that the question of "extended deterrence" might be returned to the agenda at a time when the US wants to make good on its "pivot to Asia," on the one hand. In contrast, the most plausible military possibilities that land-based intermediate-range missiles could provide to the US Army are in relation to the People's Republic of China (Horlohe, 2015, p. 104). However, the US has other military manner at its disposal to take their place.

Somehow, Moscow's violation provides a means for the US to commit a crime by refusing to join the "INF Treaty" and adopting a competitive stance against China's cruise missile system (John Bolton and John Yoo, 2014) President Trump said that citing China was part of his justification for withdrawing the US from the INF Treaty. "Perhaps we will negotiate a different solution, including China and others," President Trump suggested in a State of the Union address in 2019 (House, 2019). Why did the President urge that another international agreement on WMD limitation or reductions be started? It's worth noting that China has been investing in "ground-based intermediate-range missile systems" that serve in part to create an anti-access/place denial (A2/AD) bubble, which is a good way to complicate efforts to function inside a theatre of operations, let alone enter it, to protect an ally, with the help of the US. (Montgomery, 2014, pp. 132-134).

"China possesses the most dynamic and diverse ballistic missile programs in the world," according to a 2013 US National Air and Space Intelligence Center paper, citing the DH-10 missile as an example (Lanoszka A. , 2019, p. 56) the DH-10 missile, for example, can reach targets at a range of 1500 kilometers. Furthermore, it appears that Moscow and Beijing have

formed an alliance, as evidenced by their collaboration in economic, commercial, and military drills. (Korolev, 2018). On the other side, Russian decision-makers have expressed worry over China's missile development during the previous decade; nevertheless, Russia is now free to deploy intermediate-range conventional and nuclear capabilities to bolster its deterrent measures against China (Blank, 2012, pp. 45-46).

Some detractors feel that such an approach is inappropriate because of technological limitations in the existing framework, if America continues to develop "land-based intermediate range missile systems," (Vaddi, 2019). East Asia may become destabilized if America tend to deploy the "land-based intermediate range missile systems" may give rise to destabilization of East Asia because of technical challenges in the existed structure (Lanoszka A. , 2019, p. 56). This proposition could be arguable because technical concerns will mitigate the effects of destabilization. If Guam is chosen as the location for the deployment of "land-based intermediate range missile systems," then these will be less dangerous for China, and China may conclude that the US is spending dollars on more expensive systems with questionable strategic value.

In an ultimate efforts to settle the "INF Treaty" issue, Washington and Kremlin policymakers negotiated in January 2019 in which Russia offered the Americans the opportunity to inspect the "9M729 missile" because it is exempt from "INF Treaty" obligations, but in exchange, America would have to show that "the MK41 launcher" in Romania is not being converted to launch "INF range cruise missiles," but that offer was rejected by Washington, and efforts to resolve the INF agreement (Service C. R., 1988, p. 2). Andrea Thompson stated that missile verification would not allow Washington to determine the distance that a missile can travel, and that the destruction of the "9M729" is the best way for Moscow to return to compliance that they can verify. On the other hand, the US provided technical information that the "MK41 launcher" in Romania could not launch lethal weapons in terms of missile technology, while the US provided technical information that the "MK41 launcher" in Romania could not launch offensive weapons in terms of missile technology (Service C. R., 2020, p. 2).

After the United States officially withdrew, Russian President Vladimir Putin declared that Russia would abandon its obligations under the "INF Treaty" and expand its "IMRM," which includes "a land-based, sea-based Caliber cruise missile, and hypersonic IMR and SMR missiles to deter the latest US system" (Service C. R., 2020, p. 2) However, he signaled that Moscow would set up "IMR missile system" in Europe and Asia if US install those kind of weapons in those continents (Service C. R., 2020, p. 2).

President Trump has stated that the US wants to replace the "New START Treaty" with a new trilateral nuclear weapons agreement that would include Russia, China, and the US as participants. On the other hand, some US officials have stated that the "New START Treaty" is of little importance to them, but some analysts are skeptical that China would not negotiate on the issue because it has a shorter range missile than the US and Russia (Lanoszka A. , 2019, pp. 4-5). Although no decision has been reached to abrogate the New START treaty, it appears that the United States will withdraw from another significant arms restriction instrument in order to improve its nuclear technology.

Some arms professionals suggested to do amendment in "New START Treaty" and a dense expert of "Atlantic Council" a think tank, Matthew Koenig argued and suggested, "They're constructing new strategic systems which have been no longer even imagined when New START emerge as first negotiated, so, we need to have a difficult verbal exchange with

them on whether or not these things are included or not before extending,” (Lara Seligman Robbie Gramer, 2019, pp. 4-5). In an address, John Bolton stated that “New START Treaty” was unlawful or wrong from the first day yet Donald by knowing the stamen of Bolton, send a delegation to Geneva to negotiate to extend the “New START Treaty” (Lara Seligman Robbie Gramer, 2019, p. 5).

On the other hand, Russia expressed interest in extending the "New START Treaty," and Moscow warned that if the treaty expires, it will have to pay a high price because it will bring more catastrophic consequences, and further demonstrated that if the peace accord expires, it will have to pay a high price because it will bring more devastating results, and further noted that if the treaty expires, it will have to pay, “If no one looks like extending the settlement—New START— properly, we would not interested to do it then” (Lara Seligman Robbie Gramer, 2019, pp. 5-6).

On the one hand, there is indeed a potential danger of a new arms race between the US and Russia because Russia has stated that it would be interested in initiating an arms race if the US does not want to extend the "New START Treaty." On the other hand, critics raised their voices about the termination of the "INF Treaty" that threatened worldwide protection because the US considered Russia with a propaganda victory" (Lara Seligman Robbie Gramer, 2019, pp. 5-6). Third, Arms control analysts say that now Russia can blame US for the death of “INF Treaty” because US withdrew from the agreement at first (Fiona S. Cunningham and M. Taylor Fravel, 2015) (Borger, 2018) while NATO has unanimously expressed its support for the United States policies regarding “New START Treaty”.

However, the rising requests for state collaboration to prevent or resist the epidemic or threat that threatens the global system are incomprehensible. Because the United States and Russia are two of the world's most powerful countries, collaboration between the two is a critical aspect in protecting humanity from new threats. Although collective security is a difficult undertaking to accomplish, it is necessary and sufficient to ensure international security.

Collective security may be a possible method of resolving fundamental issues if the major countries are ready to work together on issues of extreme importance to everybody. However, there are some issues that cannot be resolved without the involvement of the United States and Russia, such as the conflict in Syria, Ukraine, the future of nuclear proliferation, and the containment of Iran and North Korea. It should be noted, however, that when extremely good powers come together to solve fundamental problems, it can help, but it does not always imply that the issues can be solved through collective security (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, p. 474). Therefore, “no state that has the ability to offer for its own protection might rely on collective protection, However, collective security is a useful compliment to the self-help gadget and for small states it is the simplest feasible path” (Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie, 2018, p. 474).

Some challenges, like fire, are not only destructive to the international community, but they will also burn humanity if they are not resolved, such as Iran's and North Korea's nuclear programs, which cannot be halted without Russian and American collaboration. Thus, nuclear issues in global system are hovering clouds of nuclear arsenals on the glob and a major threat to global peace and security.

The United States and the Soviet Union limited their weapons by 80 percent under agreements, treaties, protocols, or conventions; however, such historic documents are now in

jeopardy, and a new arms race is on the horizon as a result of tensions between Moscow and Washington, as well as developments in China's military power and expansion of North Korea's nuclear technology, rather than the expiration of the "New START Treaty." Murray proposed that the Kremlin and Washington should agree to extend the New START era by five years, and that the US should ensure that discussions with Moscow and Beijing are held in order to avoid a mistake (Murray, 2019, p. 5). However, if China has built up the nuclear missiles which were prohibited under INF Treaty, not only US but Russia would build the missiles if china is getting prohibited arsenals.

Before withdrawing from the INF, the US decided to respond to Russian violations of the pact, and in 2018, the US Senate passed a military bill for fiscal year 2018, authorizing \$65 million for the development of GLCMs that are forbidden under the INF (Tennis, 2017, p. 26). This bill permits the US to spend \$25 million to create an IRM-GLCM system, which might breach the INF Treaty. Furthermore, the Senate bill could require President Trump to provide a record of Russia's compliance within fifteen months, reducing the expenditure to expand the New START era (Tennis, 2017, p. 26). On the other hand, Russian response was that when it was asked about the development of the Senate, Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov stated, "We need to apprehend what it manner and examine that facts and Russia keeps its dedication to all international agreements" (Tennis, 2017, p. 27).

Because the Russian army is armed with "nuclear weapons" and the installation of the "9k720 Iskander" at Kaliningrad constitutes a bigger danger to Eastern Europe, European governments are particularly concerned about Russian army exercises alongside Eastern European countries (Anderson, 2018) (Audenaert, 2019, p. 2). In 2018, NATO and western allies criticized the use of deadly Novichok weapons on Sergei Skripal in Salisbury, as well as Russian engagement in Syria (Audenaert, 2019, p. 2).

Currently, NATO's ballistic missile defense is unable to protect Europe from "Russian nuclear missiles." As a result, NATO defense planners must consider the full impact of the new protection environment on each tradition and nuclear capability that allows for deterrence and defense in a global system (Audenaert, 2019, p. 7). If Moocow's latest weapons pose a threat to Europeans, then Europeans must take this seriously and make the financial investment necessary for protection at this critical juncture in history: Europeans should be less reliant on America for protection because they have a collective security mechanism in place.

However, there is little doubt that the United States and Russia have a significant effect on global security. Both nations have failed to respond effectively to global peace in recent years, and their bilateral relationship is clearly certain to have a spill-over effect on global security, necessitating an urgent need for them to act responsibly in their relationship in order to maintain peace and security in the global system. Nations must understand that there are areas of collaboration that are critical to both states, and cooperation in these areas should be maintained. The balance and control of strategic armaments is an area where the US and Russia must talk and take steps to ensure world security and cooperation.

However, according to the researcher, the INF deal prevented the US from installing cruise missiles in Europe on the one hand, and on the other, Russia destroyed all missiles designated by the INF agreement, which the US likewise deleted. Both superpowers contained each other, but other nations such as India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea, as well as China, are

building or developing intermediate, short, or medium-range missiles that are forbidden under the INF Treaty and are not party members of the pact.

It's worth noting that the US has only faced a danger from Russian missiles in the past and present, failing to consider the threat posed by western European countries with intermediate short or medium range missile capability. It would be preferable for the US and Russia to include additional nuclear countries in the INF agreement, but the treaty has now expired, and a new international accord with multilateral party members is required to ensure the peace and security of not only Europe, but the whole globe.

On the other hand, it's worth noting why Russia didn't include the other nuclear technology group members in the INF agreement, and if it was always concerned about a danger from western European nations, or whether European governments were unable to produce missiles outlawed by the INF pact. Now, both the United States and Russia will have to reconsider their positions on arms control and propose a landmark agreement to reduce chemical weapons of mass destruction that includes other state parties such as the United Kingdom, France, China, India, Pakistan, Iran, and North Korea, among others.

Because the US defense budget is projected to be 494 billion dollars from 2019 to 2028, with an estimate of 1.7 trillion dollars before the arms race with China and Russia, the termination of the INF will put an end to a new arms race between Moscow, Beijing, and Washington in terms of nuclear missile technologies (Pranay Vaddi and George Perkovich, 2019, p. 1). Now, the INF agreement has been terminated, the United States' military costs may or may not increase.

However, NATO allies are concerned about the United States' weapons control strategy, as Washington has pulled out of the Iran-US nuclear deal and now the INF Treaty, with signs that the US may also pull out of NATO (Pranay Vaddi and George Perkovich, 2019, p. 2). Experts in arms control, on the other hand, said that the US backed Congress' decision and did not dispute the relevance of the INF, rather increasing financing for research into intermediate-range nuclear missiles or forces for its defense, along with its Asian and European allies (Arbatov, 2018, p. 1).

However, the collapse of the INF has had serious ramifications since it has put other nuclear treaties, such as the NPT, CTBT, and New START, in jeopardy. It has also weakened the US-Russia arms control structure, which could directly harm Russia's security if the situation worsens. If the situation worsens, other nuclear states, such as Turkey, India, Iran, Pakistan, Israel, South Korea, Japan, and European countries, will be forced to join the arms race for their own security. They'll have to create their own security system from scratch. Experts on arms control claim that collaboration between the US and Russia on arms control has hampered the arms control agenda, resulting in terrorists having access to nuclear technology sooner or later (Arbatov, 2018, p. 2). This will definitely in result of nuclear war.

SALT II never came into force, the CTBT was never approved by the US, the ABM Treaty died, and more recently, the INF Treaty died; if this pattern continues, the world will be forced into nuclear war. According to Mercy A. Kuo, one de jure state, China, and three nuclear defector nations, India, North Korea, and Pakistan, have the banned INF missile technology. If the US and Russia continue to violate international arms control conventions, customs, and principles, all four nations may develop nuclear ballistic missile technology (Kuo, 2019, p. 3). By convincing its Asian allies, particularly Japan and Taiwan, that missiles are necessary for

their security, the US might push its Asian allies, particularly Japan and Taiwan, to put its "ground based intermediate range missiles" on their territory in order to contain China.

The INF Treaty was not included in Russia's 2016 policy overview, indicating that the INF Treaty was not a priority for the country. On the other hand, it has stated that if the United States wishes to prolong the New START Treaty, it will do so, or if the United States wishes to begin an arms race, it will welcome it into the race.

Their lack of cooperation on arms control, on the other hand, has weakened the arms limitation or disarmament system and pushed the world closer to a new nuclear danger. Terrorists may gain access to nuclear technology as a result of their dispute over nuclear treaties, which will cause problems not only for the United States and its allies, but also for the Russian Federation.

3 Conclusion

Breaking "arms control" agreements is more easier than signing them, and it always poses a threat to one's country, but withdrawing from an agreement has seldom created a basis for amicable ties. The United States' withdrawal from the INF will undermine global security. Control of weaponry, constraints, and disarmament, it is anticipated, would not only extend the age of peace but also defend the world's security. Because WMDs offer such a significant danger, the INF agreement played a critical role in arms control efforts not just in the bipolar but also in the multipolar system. Although the INF treaty has a great deal of significance in the field of disarmament, it has prevented the two countries from obtaining lethal weapons for more than thirty years.

The United States shifted the balance of power in the arms control world. Despite the fact that the bipolar system was more peaceful than the multipolar system, the quest for dominance and power balance has always been a game of great powers. The European region is also strategically important for the United States and Russia. As a result, this study supports the dissertation's research thesis, which is founded on Realism's balancing power theory.

Western allies have remained deafeningly quiet about the collapse of a nuclear arms treaty, which has raised concerns among Western European states. Although the United States' allies backed Washington's decision, it's worth noting that Chinese authorities have made no public remarks on the INF Treaty. On the other hand, Russia has declared that if the US installs its ground-based missiles in the European zone, it would obtain the forbidden nuclear missile technology, heightening tensions in the European security system.

The failure to comply of Russia and breach of the INF Treaty on the one hand, and the emerging powerful states of China in terms of nuclear and associated technologies on the other hand, forced Washington to withdraw from the international agreement of arms limitations INF in order to protect its strategic interests in Asia and Europe, as well as its own security. In chapter four, we use the realism theory of power balance to support our argument.

The United States and Russia have undermined international arms control structures, allowing terrorist organizations to get access to nuclear technology. We have arrived to the conclusion that the New START Treaty is in jeopardy because neither party is interested in extending this weapons control deal. We learned that the Chinese had nuclear missile technology that is forbidden under the INF. We believe it is a propaganda success for Russia, as they can now claim that the United States breached the nuclear pact on its own. Finally, we came to the

conclusion that the termination of the INF has ushered in a new era of the arms competition between the US, Russia, and China.

4 Recommendations

The current state of relations between Russia and the United States and NATO is not favorable to build collaboration, but it does need efforts to ease immediate concerns and set the stage for resolving major issues if both parties follow specific rules and satisfy certain criteria. The two countries may also begin to work on defining what a common Euro-Atlantic or new European protection structure might look like in the long run, in order to maintain peace, security, and prosperity in Europe; ameliorate Russia's security and monetary issues along its periphery; and safeguard US interests throughout Europe.

- Steps should be done to alleviate tensions between the US and Russia, as well as NATO, and this should begin with a discussion of a road map for weapons control.
- In order to maintain peace and security in the global system, both countries should strengthen their weapons control structures and avoid any misunderstandings.
- Both the US and Russian Federations should not shirk their obligations under international law or breach the international system's rules.
- Both the White House and the Kremlin must take advantage of any chance to de-escalate tensions over nuclear weapons.
- Both the US and Russia must seize every opportunity to reduce the confusion that surrounds their mutual intentions, and a speech must be delivered by both parties to resolve the difficulties.
- In the case of a misunderstanding or deception, NATO should be prepared to respond with suggestions based on its arms control agenda and confidence-building ideas on the negotiating table.
- Because it will be a means to respond to Russian aggression, the US government should engage with its NATO allies to dissuade Russia from presenting a danger or weakening NATO members.
- NATO must play a critical role in maintaining European peace and must make every effort to reach a new international accord with other nuclear nations.
- Both Washington and Moscow should refrain from accusing each other of violating the international land lock agreement and instead evaluate the relevance of weapons control.
- The United Nations should also play a crucial role in bringing nuclear-weapons states to the negotiating table and introducing its new nuclear-weapons-prevention accord.

References

- Affairs, U. N. (1963). *UNODA*. Retrieved 05 10, 2020, from [disarmament.un.org: disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/test_ban/text](https://disarmament.un.org/disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/test_ban/text)
- Affairs, U. N. (1968). *UNODA*. Retrieved 05 10, 2020, from [disarmament.un.org: disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/npt/text](https://disarmament.un.org/disarmament.un.org/treaties/t/npt/text)
- Anderson, M. S. (2018). Balance of Power. *Te Encyclopedia of Diplomacy* , 1-12.
- Arbatov, A. (2018, 10 26). *CARNAGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE*. Retrieved 07 14, 2020, from [carnegieendowment.org: https://carnegie.ru/commentary/77589](https://carnegieendowment.org/https://carnegie.ru/commentary/77589)

- Audenaert, D. (2019, 07). The End of the INF-Treaty: Context and Consequences. *Security Policy Brief*, 1-9.
- Axton, G. (2009). *Center For Strategic & International Issues*. Retrieved 06 04, 2020, from www.csis.com: https://csis-prod.s3.amazonaws.com/s3fs-public/110921_Axton10.pdf?w4pbQST3JB4J2xWVNJIjAlJRWm_zn691
- Blank, S. (2012). The Chinese and Asian Impact on Russian Nuclear Policy. *Defense and Security Analysis*, 28 (2), 36-54.
- Borger, J. (2018, 10 19). John Bolton pushing Trump to withdraw from Russian nuclear arms treaty. *John Bolton pushing Trump to withdraw from Russian nuclear arms treaty*.
- Burchill, S. (2001). Liberalism. In A. L.-S. Scott Burchill, *Theories of International Relations* (pp. 55-83). New York: PALGRAVE MACMILLAN.
- Control, B. o. (2009). *Archived Content*. Retrieved 05 09, 2020, from archivedcontent.gov: Treaty Text (/2009-2017.state.gov/t/isn/5195.htm#treaty)
- David E. Sanger and William J. Broad. (2018). *U.S. to Tell Russia It Is Leaving Landmark I.N.F. Treaty*. New York: New York Time.
- Donaldson, R. H. (2009, 07 06). <http://www.personal.utulsa.edu/>. Retrieved 06 3, 2020, from <http://www.personal.utulsa.edu/>: <http://www.personal.utulsa.edu/~robert-donaldson/summit.html>
- Fiona S. Cunningham and M. Taylor Fravel. (2015). Assuring Assured Retaliation: China's Nuclear Posture and U.S.-China Strategic Stability. *International Security*, 40 (2), 7-50.
- Flournoy, M. A. (1988). INF Treaty Embroiled in Constitutional Controversy. *Arms Control Today*, 18 (2), 19-26.
- Horlohe, T. (2015). The Mysterious Case of the Russian INF Treaty Violation. *Security and Peace*, 33 (2), 99-105.
- House, W. (2019, 02 06). *White House*. Retrieved 06 06, 2020, from whitehouse.gov: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-state-union-address-2/>
- Jezić, Z. (2005). The Non-Aligned Movement Yesterday and Today - in the Process of Globalization:Critical View. *Croatian/ International Relations Review*, 59-66.
- John Bolton and John Yoo. (2014, 09 09). *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved 06 06, 2020, from <https://www.wsj.com>: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/john-bolton-and-john-yoo-an-obsolete-nuclear-treaty-even-before-russia-cheated-1410304847>
- Korolev, A. (2018). On the Verge of an Alliance: Contemporary China-Russia Military Cooperation. *Asian Security*, 15 (3), 23-252.
- Kuhn, U. (2017, 01). Russia, NATO, and the INF Treaty. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 66-99.
- Kuo, M. A. (2019, 03 01). *The Diplomat*. Retrieved 06 14, 2020, from thediplomat.com: <https://thediplomat.com/2019/03/us-withdrawal-from-inf-treaty-impact-on-asia/>
- Lanoszka, A. (2019). The INF Treaty. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 13 (2), 48-67.
- Lanoszka, A. (2019). The INF Treaty. *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, 13 (2), 48-67.

- Lara Seligman Robbie Gramer. (2019, 08 02). *Foreign Policy*. Retrieved 06 03, 2020, from foreignpolicy.com: <https://foreignpolicy.com/2019/08/02/what-does-the-demise-of-the-inf-treaty-mean-for-nuclear-arms-control-intermediate-nuclear-forces-new-start-strategic-arms-limitation-nonproliferation-trump-russia-arms-control-explained/>
- Molloy, S. (2006). *The Hidden History of Realim: A Genealogy of Power Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Montgomery, E. B. (2014). Contested Primacy in the Western Pacific: China's Rise and the Future of U.S. Power Projection. *International Security* , 38 (4), 115-149.
- Murray, L. E. (2019, August 1). What the INF Treaty's Collapse Means for Nuclear Proliferation. pp. 1-5.
- Oluwatobi Aje and Felix Chidozie. (2018). US-Russia Relations: Challenges and Implications for a Global Security. *e-Governance Conference* (pp. 467-482). Ogun State: Department of Political Science and International Relations, Ota, Ogun State, Nigeria.
- Pranay Vaddi and George Perkovich. (2019, 01 30). *CARNAGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE*. Retrieved 07 14, 2020, from [carnegieendowment.org: https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/01/30/statement-on-inf-treaty-and-recommendations-for-managing-fallout-of-u.s.-withdrawal-pub-78249](https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/01/30/statement-on-inf-treaty-and-recommendations-for-managing-fallout-of-u.s.-withdrawal-pub-78249)
- Regimes, C. o. (1972, 05 26). ABM Treaty. *Treaty between United States of America and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM)* . Moscow, Moscow, Russia: Centre for Nonproliferation Studies.
- Rossenfel, C. (1998). *atomicarchive*. Retrieved 05 04, 2020, from [atomicarchive.com: http://www.atomicarchive.com/Treaties/Treaty3.shtml](http://www.atomicarchive.com/Treaties/Treaty3.shtml)
- Senate, U. (1988, May 27). INF Treaty. *INF Treaty TExt* . Washington, Washington, US: US Senate.
- Service, C. R. (2020, 01 02). *Federation of American Scientists*. (C. R. Service, Producer) Retrieved 06 04, 2020, from [fas.org: https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/IF11051.pdf](https://fas.org/sgp/crs/nuke/IF11051.pdf)
- Service, C. R. (1988, 6). *INF Treaty*. Retrieved 05 10, 2020, from <https://2009-2017.state.gov/t/avc/trty/102360.htm#narrative>
- Tennis, M. (2017). Senate Approval Threatens INF Treaty. *Arms Control Today* , 47 (8), 26-27.
- Vaddi, P. (2019, 01 31). *CARNAGIE Endowment for International Peace*. Retrieved 06 06, 2020, from [carnegieendowment.org: https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/01/31/leaving-inf-treaty-won-t-help-trump-counter-china-pub-78262](https://carnegieendowment.org/2019/01/31/leaving-inf-treaty-won-t-help-trump-counter-china-pub-78262)
- Walt, S. M. (2010). Balancing Threat: The United States and the Middle East. *Yale Journal of International Relations* , 10-16.
- Woolf, A. F. (2018). *Russian Compliance with the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty: Background and Issues for Congress*. Washington: Congressional Research Service.
- Ziegler, C. (2014). Russian–American relations: From Tsarism to Putin. *International Politics* , 51 (6), 671-692.