



RESEARCH PAPER

USA Allies and Geopolitics of Nonproliferation in Asia: An Analysis

Dr. Zahid Yaseen¹ Naila Afzal² Brig (R) Muhammad Amin SI(M)³

1. Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, GC Women University, Sialkot, Punjab, Pakistan
2. M. Phil Scholar, Department of Political Science, Minhaj, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Vice Chancellor BUET Khuzda, Baluchistan, Pakistan

DOI	http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2017(1-II)2.1
PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: August 11, 2017	Nuclear nonproliferation became a burning issue after the Nuclear explosion in 1945 when USA exploded nuclear bomb on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After WW II USA became the sole arbiter of the world and the piped the world into atomic race.
Accepted: December 15, 2017	Following USA, other European states also started testing nuclear weapons successfully. However when Asian states stated testing nuclear weapons, USA apprehended and feel the need of nonproliferation agreements, till now USA might fail attaining her goals regarding nuclear non-proliferation. The under discussion paper explores the dual policy of USA towards her ally states and Asia as USA foreign policy makers were deeply against for getting nuclear weapons of hostile states
Online: December 30, 2017	
Keywords: Geopolitics, Nonproliferation, US Allies	
Corresponding Author: zahid.yaseen@gcwus.edu.pk	

Introduction

The USA foreign policy makers are deeply against for getting nuclear weapons of hostile states. USA policy makers and lawmakers sometimes deeply disagree on precisely how to stop hostile states from getting nuclear weapons, with the regard of antagonism, they were agree on the global goal of nuclear nonproliferation. The USA allies like South Korea, Japan and other Asian allies feel threatened by China and North Korea who are getting missiles and giving nuclear threat. It is pertinent to examine the US strategic response in this regard.

USA Allies and Geopolitics of Nonproliferation in Asia

The USA foreign policy makers were against for getting nuclear weapons of hostile states. USA policy makers and lawmakers sometimes deeply disagree on precisely how to stop hostile states from getting nuclear weapons, with the regard of antagonism, they agree on the global goal of nuclear nonproliferation. The USA

allies like South Korea, Japan and other Asian allies feel threatened by China and North Korea who are getting missiles and nuclear arsenal.

Meanwhile, USA strategic thoughts are at stake and counterproductive. USA strategic thinking on this difficult and consequential issue is at risk of becoming confused, and even counterproductive. Key analysts are still framing the USA acceptance or rejection of nuclear proliferation potential for its Asian allies as a harsh option amid geopolitics and nonproliferation. Determined swaps in the national interest show the trend:

1. David Santoro in his brief essay on the Pacific Form of CSIS writes that USA has to choose nonproliferation in spite of geopolitics. He argues that, if South Korea and Japan obtain nuclear potential then USA must cut their financial aid of them because the acceptance or supporting their decision would be indefensible. Furthermore, he describes that nonproliferation is forbidden under the international law and has become an international norm. Essay provides a huge focus for USA nuclear strategy not keeping nonproliferation for USA allies could be a hopeless case.
2. A scholar of Center for a New American Security (CNAS), Elbridge Colby narrates the key issues regarding the USA's policy on nonproliferation. He argues, that USA foreign policy should be sponsored by flexible political decision relatively than limestone orders, guided by frequent recalculation and pursued such interior national intends in the light of varying international background and which measurements of selective goods are necessity to impose.

In addition, Santoro and Colby described that in future USA could face policy dilemma in Asia, their views seem deeply blemished ideas. Firstly, the lowest point of nonproliferation and geopolitics are exclusive alternatives rather as mutually or as adversary. Nuclear nonproliferation is basically concerns to geopolitics pro USA.

Nuclear nonproliferation is not only a virtual policy or an international norm. It also concerns military power especially a brutal and arbitrarily disparaging appearance of military power and is distributed globally amongst the USA its allies and rivals.

Two geopolitical characteristics have forced USA to promote nonproliferation through accord partnership. Foremost, USA works with its allies to promote nonproliferation. It ally's security, and defend their political solidity and armed interdependence. Secondly, it can be argued that when USA lengthens defense assurance against nuclear attacks on non-nuclear ally states that permit them to invest their limited assets which they could be spend on self-nuclear smack military instead on captious conventional armed potential and hence it would better to share with USA the alliance yokes of meeting further liable and invasive not as much of nuclear hazards.

During the Cold War when UK and France did nuclear explosions, this vital geopolitical change made USA to pursue such strategy through which other treaty allies could be banned from getting nuclear power especially those states that were in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and could be threatened by USSR. Policy makers of USA complex circumstances of Asia that can be threaten USA security interests.

The Geopolitics of Nonproliferation towards Europe

USA has effectively supported the nuclear nonproliferation for over 50 years, as ally state of USA tried to produce nuclear weapons after UK in 1954 and France in 1960. However, USA is facing several challenges in pursuing other ally states of NATO from getting nuclear power after UK and France. Today USA decision makers by self-told that how it is difficult to forbid treaty allies from getting nuclear power, especially to Asian partners. It is important to know that how USA strategist controlled the nuclear potential proliferation during the Cold War.

Policy makers of USA assumed that the antagonistic and complex circumstances of Asia can threaten USA security interests. However, it seems that they ignored the peril of nations that goes deep beyond the geopolitics and nonproliferation.

After the nuclear explosion of UK and France, USA devoted her much efforts in the late of 1950s and early of 1960s for the prevention of emerging more nuclear states from NATO treaty allies. Ultimately, in April 1961, President Kennedy passed National Security Action Memorandum Number 40 (NSAM 40). President Kennedy directed that USA should extended its security guarantee of nuclear deterrent for NATO allies and discourage more ally states from producing nuclear weapons.

The USA would persist to discuss any critical situation for avoiding

1. Nuclear armed Medium Range Ballistic Missile (MRBM) military or national ownership.
2. Any weakness of command or control of USA in excess of these military endeavours.
3. Any change of necessary resources by NATO states from nonnuclear programs for the defense of alliance.

The Committee of USA Economic and political formulated the armed policy in Europe and the decision of president. Dean Acheson the former secretary of state chaired the advisory body, and reevaluated the relations between USA and Western Europe was tasked by the Kennedy. Acheson and Albert Wohlstetter

American strategists and analysts at RAND Corporation, and Robert McNamara who had served as secretary of Defense and representative were on the committee. They drafted the policy guidance for the National Security Council of White House were along with the American strategist Albert Wohlstetter, an influential analyst at the RAND Corporation who served as Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's representative on the Committee, authored draft policy guidance for the White House's National Security Council. It provided the foundation for NSAM 40.

Wohlstetter in his article 1961 in Foreign Affairs is about the negotiations of the Acheson Committee. He narrates in the article the consideration of geopolitical sort in retrospect could finished through the decision of President Kennedy by preventing the emergence of further nuclear states or multiple nuclear militaries. He appreciates the tireless efforts of President Kennedy to control the USSR efforts to increase nuclear arsenals. He further writes:

1. Firstly, struggle for deterring nuclear power like USSR can demand constant efforts because the demand for deterrence could change during the action taken by alliance of treaty NATO or USA.
2. Secondly, if many members of alliance have got access to nuclear weapons or multiple NATO nuclear armed forces could risk for separating the political cohesiveness and armed interdependence of coalition, and probably could stimulate the USA for desertion of its treaty ally. Additionally Wohlstetter described:
3. He further argues that the critical situation with NATO can deteriorate the USA security guarantee in the condition of nuclear attack in the future. If NATO alliance successfully deterred the USSR then it would be tough to justify the USA commitment for the containment of USSR. If European nuclear powers might fail to convince USSR then they have to convince the USA Congress for front wall deterrence. Europeans be surrendering something of enormous value for something that may be worth little or nothing. Sponsored of nuclear flow as well as advocates of a European sock power are indeed proposed as attraction the opportunity of falling USA military over the world. He argues that if Europeans are separated from USA then it would merely reduce the immediate stakes of USA and would make easy for USSR as a certain attack against Europe not USA.

In addition, military notified geopolitical deliberation eventually is driving the USA by using the polygonal planning of NATO to enlarge an alliance and has widen USA guarantee for security in conjunction with nuclear attack. USA has forbidden the other Western European allies to follow UK and France in regard of getting nuclear weapons. Nonproliferation policy of USA has faced a number of challenges yet it is pursuing during the Cold War.

The Geopolitics of Nonproliferation in Asia Today

Today, among the Asian treaty allies of USA is appearing a small but increasing concept that the clear control of nuclear weapons are suggested them advance day dues earlier apparatusfor conference a wide sort of threats by means of nuclear forces opponents. Quoting recent instances following events are worth examining in this regard:

1. Almost immediately in December 2012 North Korea conducted a Nuclear Capable Ballistic Missile and in February 2013 launched its third nuclear warhead test. An Asian Institute for Policy Studies had conducted a survey in South Korea found that 66.5 percent population of South Korea believed in developing their own nuclear weapons.
2. Policy maker of South Korea Mr. Chung Mongjoon in April 2013 described that they believed in possessing nuclear arsenal. Furthermore, he argued that China and North Korea should understand that if Pyongyang is insisting on possessing nuclear arsenal then South Korea also has the option.
3. After conducting nuclear and missiles tests,in the aftermath of North Korea's missile and nuclear tests, in April 2013 in a column of the Japan Timesalleged that foreign minister was going to conduct secrete studies on the development of nuclear potential.
4. Former Japanese Prime Minister, Naoto Kantold journalists that in Japan everyone was independent if someone had the ability to produce its own plutonium; they would not tell openly but would desire to produce their own nuclear arsenal in the case of any threat.

It can be further noted that, Indian Ocean compromised of major nuclear states like China and Russia and three de facto nuclear weapon like Pakistan, India and North Korea. However, some USA political analysts have elaborated that if South Korea or Japan has also get nuclear power then USA would maintain an extra ordinary proliferated Asia. Moreover, in this case both would be arming against China and North Korea, it appeared comprehensible that in such circumstances USA should logically verify and justify the bigger good of upholding the USA alliances.

Today, among the Asian treaty allies of USA there is a brief but increasing concept that the clear control of nuclear weapons suggested them advance day dues earlier apparatusfor conference a wide sort of threats by means of nuclear forces opponents.

The desire for getting nuclear arms in USA Asian treaty allies could create two interconnected challenges groups for the USA and its treaty allies that could be very difficult to manage for USA.

The antagonism among Japan and South Korea has appeared today more intensive than the hostility during the Cold War between West Germany and France. For instance during the second world war Bonn and Paris in spite of lasting hostilities had manage after signing treaty of Elysee in 1963 to hold joint Franco-German cabinet of semiannual meetings. But now a day, it is difficult to think that Tokyo and Seoul could do something mutually. So it should not surprising situation for USA, if one rivalry or nearest Asian ally state has got nuclear power in the consequence other state will also do so. In USA point of view, there could be a great competition in producing delivery vehicles and nuclear weapons between South Korea and Japan. Indeed, and it can expect that each of them could compete with North Korea and China. If not more so.

The building of nuclear warheads of South Korea and Japan could be danger for disarmament strikes particularly for Chinese nuclear military. For a number of years, France and UK were struggling with the tight spot of weakness to a preclusive initial smack of USSR after building their own nuclear warheads. Late strategist of USA Albert Wohlstetter was observed on this point in 1961:

UK abolition of its expensive plan for the Blue Streak missile had cleared the cognizant change from an optimistically autonomous deterrent to the greatly less determined autonomous involvement to the deterrent and it cannot without any major cause.

Primarily, disarmament strike could be vulnerable because Tokyo and Seoul who are investing much on their defense for improving possession nuclear warheads and their control and command, and hence far from critical non-nuclear military procurements assets that might assist to defend joint security benefit with USA. The mesh effect could be to damage Japanese and South Korean armed assistance with the USA in conference additional urgent and invasive fewer than nuclear coercion.

Secondly, USA faced a number of difficulties in managing nonproliferation in Asia than in Western Europe during the Cold War era after getting the nuclear armed of UK and France. During the Cold War for countering USSR threat, USA foreign policy makers had used successfully several techniques through NATO for increasing its ally states and extend its security guarantee against nuclear attack, USA forbidden the Western European and Asian partners to follow UK and France in the perspective of getting nuclear power. As compare to today USA having an irregular patchwork of mutual treaty predestined coalitions and non-agreement predestined defense corporation in Asia. USA efforts to curtail the penalty of associated nuclear proliferation could be more complicated in the dearth of NATO multilateral security planning in the region. Especially

1. If South Korea and Japan achieve access to the nuclear arsenal then it would be alarm not only for world but also deeply affect the USA armed

forces and geopolitical influence. No any other treaty ally of USA had got access to nuclear arsenal except France in 1960. If South Korea and Japan emerge as nuclear power then it would mean that USA has fundamentally been failed to provide security guarantee for its treaty allies of Asia. The USA turmoil policy over 50 years against nuclear proliferation on the base of treaty allies hence should seem to be USA geopolitical influence on Asia Pacific, Tokyo and Seoul have decline.

2. The USA foreign policy makers should have to adopt the tough decisions through bilateral defense agreements and cooperative armed operations, South Korea and Japan could stop from escalating nuclear arsenals. If Tokyo and Seoul decide to get the nuclear arsenal then it could be change the world and in the consequences could damage both the interdependence and cohesiveness of their own alliance with USA. It is expected that the USA foreign policy makers should strictly condemn of any Japanese decision for getting nuclear power, it was about 70 years proscription on acquiring nuclear arsenal that was prolonged when far-back seeing that the Japanese Constitution of 1947 and Atomic Energy Basic Law of 1955. Just like that if South Korea would able to get nuclear then USA foreign policy makers could seek to essentially modify the USA-Republic of Korea Mutual Defense Treaty that was signed in 1953.
3. USA security sharing allies in Asia and Middle East have to use USA lessened nuclear armed forces and on the other hand they would be justify for independence nuclear arsenal. If Tokyo and Seoul succeed to get nuclear power then USA should expect so from other signatories of the "Non Proliferation Treaty" (NPT) of 1968, including a few USA comrades referred to biased double standards and even reject the NPT. As contenders in the Middle East including Saudi Arabia and other Arab Gulf states who had been threatened prior by Iran who is driving rapidly nuclear arms making capacity by violating the NPT and several resolutions of UN Security Council. Asian treaty allies including the regions other states are advanced and growing nations by technologically. During the 1970s and 1980s Taiwan was also tempted for making nuclear bomb. Australia, Singapore, Indonesia and Vietnam were also partners for getting capability of nuclear bomb.
4. North Korea, China, Russia and other states may be nuclear breakout just like that of South Korea and Japan, and some associated collapse in the global nuclear order for proliferation while nuclear making states themselves are challenging states. Additional USA is expecting that Pyongyang including Pakistan and India are potentially growing the size of their nuclear arsenals capability. In the consequences the distribution of nuclear strategic forces might be threatened the USA interests over the world. Nuclear war could be conflicted from the hostility states of Asia,

Middle East and other challenging states. In roll the declined nuclear measurements of the global defense situation should seriously damage the recognized security guarantees of USA on the bilateral treaty based alliances and mutual defense association.

Additionally, if USA permitted to Japan and South Korea to get possessing nuclear arsenal, in such situation the whole region of Asia including USA treaty allied states would face security challenges so as for the security of international environment. On the other hand, the other friends and ally states would also demand for acquiring their independent nuclear arsenals. It is estimated that the current USA military is ill-resourced and ill-equipped for deterring the increasing demand of nuclear weapons in Asia. As an outcome the foreign policy makers of USA would have to face the complicated situation in meeting the increasing expenses of managing war matters and peace in rapidly growing nuclear proliferation world.

According to strategist, the USA and its allies should adopt the policy of sacrifice that requires avoiding the increasing nuclear warheads in Asia for the long-term costs surviving and managing. For instance USA and its ally states of NATO can work together for the demand of Chinese transparency regarding to civil and armed forces and missiles military. Chinese denigration on USA and its allies remains hollow when she refuses to providing transparency about her civil and nuclear capabilities. In addition the USA must have to make strong and modernize its nuclear strategic forces.

Conclusion

With the end of the Second World War USA foreign policy makers were apprehensive about nuclear proliferation. Although they were deeply against the getting nuclear weapons of hostile states but they could do nothing in the matter of their most hostility state USSR, when she did nuclear explosion. However, USA foreign policy makers and lawmakers were agree on the global goal of nonproliferation. Although USA begun its goal with its ally states but it comes to might failure when its ally states UK and France did nuclear explosion. It creates many hurdles in the way of China for becoming nuclear power. It banned North Korea and Japan who have desire for possessing nuclear arsenal. If deeply noticed USA nonproliferation strategy, actually it provides opportunity to USA and its ally states to continue to develop its explicit links nonproliferation and geopolitical alliances in India-Pacific region. While on the other end USA sophisticatedly supports Israel in developing nuclear technology. With immense support Israel acquired the capability of mass destruction weapons. According to USA foreign policy makers and its allies should seize the opportunity sooner or later.

References

- Albert J. (1961). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics. Nuclear Sharing: NATO and the N+1Country, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 355-387.
- Albert & Wohlstetter, R. (1947). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics, *Nuclear-Age Strategy*, pp. 26-35.
- Albert J. Wohlstetter. (1961). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics. Nuclear Sharing: NATO and the N+1Country, *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 39, No. 3, pp. 276.
- (April 24, 1961). *Policy Directive Regarding NATO and the Atlantic Nations*, National Security [Action] Memorandum No. 40, CONFIDENTIAL, declassified on May 4, 1977, DNSA No. BC02034, p. 8.
- Elbridge. A. (2014, February 28). *Choose Geopolitics Over Nonproliferation*. Retrieved September 9, 2014
- Elbridge.A , C. (2014, February 28). *Choose Geopolitics Over Nonproliferation*. Retrieved September 9, 2014, from <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/choose-geopolitics-over-nonproliferation>
- DAVID, S. (2014, January 30). *Will America's Asian Allies Go Nuclear?*. Retrieved September 9, 2014.
- David Campbell. (1990). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics, *Global Inscription: How Foreign Policy Constitutes the United States*, Alternatives, p. 280.
- Eli Lake. (2013). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics, Exclusive: How North Korea Tipped Its Hand, *The Daily Beast*. <http://2scottmontgomery.blogspot.com/2013/04/dailybeastexclusive-how-north-korea.html>
- Elbridge.A , C. (2014, February 28). *Choose Geopolitics Over Nonproliferation*. Retrieved September 9, 2014, from <http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/Choose-Geopolitics-Over-Nonproliferation>.
- Government of Japan, *The Constitution of Japan*, May 3, 1947, http://japan.kantei.go.jp/constitution_and_government_of_japan/constitution_e.html, and *Atomic Energy Basic Law*, Act No. 186 of December 19, 1955
- Jake, A. (2014, March 12). *Plutonium Fever Blossoms in Japan*, Retrieved September 9, 2014.
- Karl F. (2013). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics. The Fallout: South Korean Public Opinion Following North Korea's Third Nuclear Test, Asan Institute for Policy Studies. <http://en.asaninst.org/issue-brief-no-46-the-fallout-south-korean-public-opinion-following-north-korea-third-nuclear-test/>

- Kennedy, Paul. (1987). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict From 1500 to 2000*, New York: Random House, p. 439.
- Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea*, October 1, 1953 (entered into force on November 17, 1954).
- Nuclear Arms Card for Japan. (2013, April 29). *Japan Times*. Retrieved September 9, 2014, from <http://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2013/04/29/commentary/nuclear-arms-card-for-Japan/#.UybwT4UaJAR>
- Robert Zarat. (2009). From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics, Nuclear Heuristics: Selected Writings of Albert and Wohlstetter, *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*, July 1, 1968
- Wohlstetter, A. (1961). From Geopolitics to Geo-economics, Nuclear Sharing: NATO and the N 1 Country. *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. 39, No. (3), p 276.
- Zarat, Sokolski. (2009). *From Geopolitics to Geo-Economics*. Nuclear Heuristics: Selected Writings of Albert and Roberta Wohlstetter, Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institutes, pp. 268-300.