

## Going Ahead with Nukes

### What is the issue?

\n\n

\n

- ICAN being awarded the Nobel peace prize is a laudable sign for nuclear disarmament efforts. (Click [here](#) to know on ICAN and its treaty).

\n

- However civil society and governments are required to focus on practical steps to reduce the risks of nuclear weapons to make the above meaningful.

\n

\n\n

### Is ICAN's treaty effective?

\n\n

\n

- The U.S. President Barack Obama was awarded in 2009 the Nobel Peace Prize for offering a vision of a world without nuclear weapons.

\n

- This has hardly contributed to any reduction in nuclear dangers and in fact nuclear arsenals have only increased in several states.

\n

- Similarly, the Nobel Committee's choice of ICAN is more an awarding of ambition.

\n

- ICAN's Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons creates a legal basis for banning nuclear weapons among adhering states.

\n

- It only seeks to delegitimise nuclear weapons as tools of statecraft on the grounds of indiscriminate humanitarian effects and has actually not banned them.

\n

\n\n

### What makes nukes indispensable?

\n\n

\n

- Without nuclear weapons, States believe that there would be **more violence**, not less.

\n

- And **regional wars** would increase in frequency and lethality with catastrophic consequences.

\n

- States opposed to the prohibition treaty are located in Europe and East Asia which are shaped by the trauma of World War II.

\n

- States facing nuclear threats are particularly driven by potential **existential threats**.

\n

- E.g. South Korea supports the idea of acquiring nuclear weapons to counter the growing nuclear threat from North Korea.

\n

- It is such **international security problems** that the current nuclear prohibition treaty have trouble addressing.

\n

- Nuclear weapons and alliances backed by them are seen as **guarantee to security**.

\n

- Resultantly, none of the weapons possessors seems particularly concerned with the stigma created by the prohibition treaty.

\n

- The efforts that US, Pak, India, China and North Korea, etc are engaging in, to modernise their nuclear arsenals proves this.

\n

\n\n

## **What is the way forward?**

\n\n

\n

- Instead of increasing the number of states that join the prohibition treaty, efforts could be made globally to **reduce the sources of nuclear danger**.

\n

- This could aim at **mitigating security threats** that drive demand for nuclear weapons, and could legitimise nuclear deterrence.

\n

- Countries could be encouraged to route their investments to **economic or international political power** rather than towards weapons.

\n

- This could possibly work as an alternative means of international leverage or

suasion.

\n

- Stakeholders should thus find the right balance between nuclear disarmament (complete elimination of weapons) and nuclear deterrence (discouraging or inhibiting the use).

\n

- Without these the prohibition treaty of ICAN risks becoming merely a moral victory, rather than contributing to concrete steps.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n

