

I.

Introduction:The Origin, Purpose, and Scope of the Study

In a period marked by East-West alignments, animosity, and anxiety, the Cold War dialogue on arms control and disarmament was permanent and beneficial. Sometimes interrupted by tragic events, sometimes blocked by political end-runs, the exchange was never completely severed. The dialogue, which included many participants in North America, Europe, and other areas of the globe, resulted in the negotiation, entry into force, and implementation of major arms control and disarmament agreements and measures.

In the late 1980s, few analysts predicted the break-up of the Soviet Union and other events signaling the end of the Cold War, but several well-known policy makers confidently predicted that arms control was in a period of decline, if not on its way to its demise. Happily, the analysts and policy makers were wrong in both cases. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the attendant reduction in East-West tensions has led to the signing of the CFE, CWC, START-I, START-II, and CTB treaties and the Vienna Documents, among other significant agreements and measures in the Post-Cold War era. Not only were reports of the demise of arms control "greatly exaggerated," but if the concept of control of arms extends--and it does--beyond "traditional" arms control agreements such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) to confidence-building measures and other measures associated with nonproliferation and conflict management, then arms control remains in good health, as determined by the burgeoning number of actual, proposed, and potential agreements and measures.

Given the number and importance of these nonproliferation, arms control, and disarmament (NACD) agreements and measures--whether under consideration, proposed, in negotiation, signed, or in the process of implementation--policy makers and the educated public might agree that it is important to have a clear understanding of their purposes, advantages, and limitations, so as to be able to judge whether they are in the best interest of a signatory. And yet, while NACD agreements are considered vital to national, regional, and international security, governmental officials who must participate in their preparation and negotiation, or who must confront daily the impact of their country's obligations under their implementation, will not find a full, pragmatic analysis on the subject of evaluating such agreements. There are, of course, articles and books which concentrate on a specific treaty or analyze a particular aspect of bilateral, regional, or international diplomatic relations. There are also political analyses by various individuals, groups, or institutions who bring to the analytical process their own philosophical biases in the process of arguing the advantages or disadvantages of proposed agreements. The purpose of this report is to help fill this gap by providing a generally-applicable set of criteria for evaluating potential arms control agreements or measures.

In this study, the many factors from which evaluative criteria can be derived are examined in order to develop a set of comprehensive criteria; the factors have been based on authoritative judgments and historical examples. The detailed criteria set forth in the form of a check-list in Chapter II are intended for use by arms control specialists. The short list of evaluative criteria