Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty Effectiveness Critical Analysis

Posted on October 7, 2022

The article by Matthew Fuhrmann and Yonatan Lupu examines whether the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, commonly known as the NPT, actually reduces the pursuit of nuclear weapons. The original review correctly identifies the central difficulty in answering this question. States do not join treaties randomly. A country already committed to remaining non-nuclear may be more willing to ratify the NPT, while a country seeking nuclear weapons may refuse or delay membership. If researchers simply compare members with nonmembers, they may mistake pre-existing preferences for a treaty effect. Fuhrmann and Lupu therefore construct a research design intended to estimate whether NPT ratification changes behavior rather than merely identifying states that were already unlikely to proliferate (Fuhrmann & Lupu, 2016).

The article presents two competing expectations. The “optimist hypothesis” proposes that NPT ratification reduces the probability that a state will pursue nuclear weapons or related technology. The “pessimist hypothesis” proposes that the treaty has little or no independent effect because national security interests, alliances, domestic politics, and technological capacity determine proliferation decisions. The study analyzes data from 1970 to 2000 and develops a three-stage method to test which explanation receives stronger support. The original essay concludes that the results favor the optimist position. That conclusion should be retained while recognizing that the study does not prove that the treaty prevents every case of proliferation or that all treaty obligations are enforced equally.

The Purpose of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

The NPT opened for signature in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. It is built around three broad commitments: preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, supporting peaceful uses of nuclear energy under safeguards, and pursuing negotiations toward nuclear disarmament. The treaty distinguishes between states recognized as nuclear-weapon states under its terms and non-nuclear-weapon states that agree not to acquire nuclear weapons. This unequal structure has always generated debate. Supporters argue that the treaty created a nearly universal legal barrier against proliferation. Critics argue that it preserves the privileges of existing nuclear powers while placing stronger restrictions on others.

The effectiveness question is therefore complicated. A treaty might influence behavior by creating legal commitments, inspections, diplomatic pressure, domestic political costs, and expectations of

cooperation. It might also fail when states perceive severe security threats or when powerful countries apply rules selectively. Fuhrmann and Lupu focus on whether ratification is associated with a reduced pursuit of nuclear weapons after attempting to account for the different preferences that lead states to join (Fuhrmann & Lupu, 2016).

The Optimist Hypothesis

The optimist hypothesis states that the NPT helps reduce nuclear proliferation. Several mechanisms can support this expectation. Ratification creates a formal legal commitment that governments, opposition parties, courts, bureaucracies, and international partners can invoke. It can strengthen domestic groups that prefer peaceful nuclear programs and make secret weapons activity politically costly. Membership also connects non-nuclear states with International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards and reporting systems designed to verify that declared nuclear material is not diverted toward weapons (“International Atomic Energy Agency”, n.d.).

Treaty membership can also signal intentions. A state that ratifies may reassure neighbors and reduce pressure for regional arms competition. Economic and technological cooperation may become easier when suppliers believe nuclear materials and equipment will remain under safeguards. Violating the treaty can produce sanctions, isolation, or loss of assistance. These costs do not make violation impossible, but they change the calculations of leaders.

The Pessimist Hypothesis

The pessimist hypothesis argues that the observed relationship between NPT membership and non-proliferation may be misleading. States that want nuclear weapons are less likely to join, while states that do not want them are more likely to ratify. Under this interpretation, the treaty records national intentions but does not cause them. Security threats, rivalry, alliance protection, regime type, military leadership, technological capability, and economic resources may explain both joining and nuclear behavior.

Critics also point to cases in which treaty members developed prohibited capabilities or withdrew. A determined government may conceal activities, restrict inspections, or accept international costs when it believes nuclear weapons are essential to survival. The NPT’s unequal recognition of nuclear powers may weaken legitimacy, particularly when disarmament commitments appear slow or selective. The pessimistic view therefore does not necessarily claim that treaties are meaningless; it claims that strong national interests may dominate them.

The Causal Inference Problem

The original review correctly emphasizes that the NPT was not designed as an experiment. Researchers cannot randomly assign some states to ratify and others to remain outside. Every decision occurs within history. A country facing a powerful rival, protected by a nuclear ally, governed by a military regime, or possessing advanced scientific infrastructure has a different probability of joining and proliferating. These differences create selection bias.

Suppose researchers observe that NPT members pursue nuclear weapons less often. The result may mean that the treaty reduced proliferation, or it may mean that low-risk states selected into membership. To estimate a causal effect, the authors attempt to compare states with similar underlying preferences and conditions but different treaty commitments. Their method does not reproduce a randomized experiment perfectly, but it is designed to weaken alternative explanations.

Data From 1970 to 2000

The study examines the period from the NPT's entry into force through 2000. This period includes Cold War rivalry, decolonization, regional conflicts, the end of the Soviet Union, and changing nuclear markets. The data allow the authors to observe yearly state decisions concerning treaty membership and nuclear pursuit. The outcome is not limited to successful weapon acquisition. Pursuit of nuclear weapons and technology is important because many programs never produce a tested device but still represent proliferation behavior.

The period also creates limitations. Nuclear politics after 2000 includes the continuing North Korean program, disputes over Iran, nuclear cooperation agreements, new verification technologies, and changing relations among major powers. The study's results remain important for evaluating the treaty's historical effect, but they should not be treated as the final answer for every later development.

Stage One: Estimating Treaty Commitment Preferences

The first stage estimates each state's probability of joining the NPT in each year. The original review refers to this process as W-NOMINATE. The authors use patterns of state participation across multiple universal treaties to infer underlying preferences toward international legal commitments. A government that consistently joins certain kinds of treaties may differ systematically from one that avoids them. By examining a wider set of treaty choices, the study attempts to measure an otherwise difficult concept: willingness to accept international commitments.

This stage is important because direct statements by governments may be unreliable or incomplete. Leaders can publicly support non-proliferation while privately seeking options. Treaty behavior across issue areas provides an observable pattern. However, inferred preferences remain estimates rather than facts. States may join different treaties for different reasons, and a general tendency toward commitment may not capture every security concern affecting the NPT.

Stage Two: Matching Similar States

In the second stage, the estimated treaty-commitment preferences are used to identify matched pairs or groups of states with similar probabilities of joining the NPT. The purpose is to compare cases that resemble one another on relevant characteristics. If two states appear similarly likely to ratify but only one does, later differences in nuclear pursuit may provide stronger evidence of a treaty effect than a comparison between completely different countries.

Matching helps reduce model dependence by creating a more balanced sample before the final statistical analysis. It does not guarantee that every relevant difference is controlled. Secret intentions, leadership psychology, classified intelligence, or sudden security shocks may remain unobserved. Nevertheless, matching is an improvement over comparing all members with all nonmembers without considering why they chose their positions.

Stage Three: Logit Models and Hypothesis Testing

The third stage applies logit models to the matched data. Logistic regression is appropriate when the outcome is expressed as the probability of an event, such as whether a state begins or continues nuclear pursuit. The authors include variables intended to account for factors that may influence proliferation. The model then estimates whether NPT ratification is associated with a lower probability of pursuit after those factors and the matching process are considered.

The original review notes that each variable is coded and included in the final analysis. Careful coding is essential because concepts such as rivalry, regime type, alliance protection, and nuclear capability can be measured in different ways. Results may change if definitions or time periods change. The article’s contribution lies partly in making its assumptions explicit enough for other researchers to examine and challenge.

Table 4 and the Main Findings

The original essay identifies Table 4 as presenting the main results. The reported relationship between NPT ratification and nuclear-weapons pursuit is negative, meaning that ratified states are less likely to pursue nuclear weapons after the study’s adjustments. This evidence supports the optimist hypothesis. The result suggests that the treaty is not only a club joined by states that were

already peaceful; membership appears to influence behavior.

The finding should be interpreted as a reduction in probability rather than an absolute guarantee. A treaty can be effective on average while failing in particular cases. States may comply for many years and later change direction. The NPT may work more strongly where inspections, alliances, domestic institutions, and diplomatic incentives reinforce it. Effectiveness is therefore conditional, but conditional effectiveness is still meaningful.

Why Treaties May Change State Behavior

The results raise the question of how an international agreement changes decisions in a system without one global government. One mechanism is reputation. Governments value trade, alliances, technology, and diplomatic relationships. Violating a major treaty may damage credibility beyond the nuclear issue. Another mechanism is domestic politics. Ratification can empower agencies and political groups committed to compliance and require legal or administrative changes that make reversal difficult.

Verification and information also matter. Safeguards do not reveal every secret activity, but they make diversion more difficult and provide evidence that can support international response. The treaty creates common language and procedures through which suspicious behavior is assessed. Finally, assistance with peaceful nuclear technology can provide a benefit for remaining within the system.

Rebel Leaders and Nuclear Preferences

The original review mentions the study's suggestion that former rebel leaders may be more inclined to seek nuclear weapons and resist treaty constraints. Leadership background can influence threat perception and willingness to accept international rules. A leader shaped by armed struggle may value self-reliance, distrust external guarantees, or view powerful weapons as protection against intervention.

This factor should not be generalized to every former rebel leader. Political institutions, regional conditions, ideology, and economic capacity also matter. Its inclusion demonstrates the authors' effort to consider domestic characteristics rather than treating states as identical units. Nuclear decisions emerge from leaders and institutions operating within international pressures.

Strengths of the Research Design

The three-stage methodology is the study's greatest strength. Instead of assuming that treaty membership is independent of state preferences, the authors address selection directly. The use of

wider treaty data to estimate commitment preferences is innovative, and matching creates more comparable cases. The final statistical models then test the hypotheses on a sample designed to reduce bias.

The study also presents both optimist and pessimist expectations fairly. It does not begin by treating treaty effectiveness as obvious. This strengthens the credibility of the conclusion because the research is organized around a genuine debate. The original essay is correct that the method can provide a useful blueprint for evaluating other treaties where membership is voluntary and causal effects are difficult to isolate.

Limitations

No observational design can control every factor. The estimated preference measure may omit motivations specific to nuclear politics. Secret programs and classified intentions are difficult to code. The quality of historical evidence varies across countries, and some pursuit decisions may be disputed. Matching can balance observed characteristics but cannot remove unobserved differences completely.

The study also evaluates one part of the NPT's mission more directly than others. Reducing pursuit is central to non-proliferation, but the treaty also includes peaceful nuclear cooperation and disarmament commitments. A treaty may succeed in limiting new nuclear states while being criticized for slow disarmament by existing powers. Effectiveness and fairness are related but distinct questions (United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, n.d.).

Cases Outside the General Pattern

The global non-proliferation system includes difficult cases. India, Israel, and Pakistan remained outside the NPT and developed nuclear weapons. North Korea joined, announced withdrawal, and tested weapons. Iraq and Libya demonstrate different forms of prohibited or abandoned activity. South Africa developed weapons and later dismantled them before joining as a non-nuclear state. These cases show that security, leadership, verification, sanctions, and diplomacy interact with treaty membership.

Exceptional cases do not automatically disprove an average statistical effect. A medical treatment can reduce risk without helping every patient; similarly, a treaty can reduce proliferation without eliminating it. The important question is whether the world would likely contain more nuclear pursuits without the NPT. Fuhrmann and Lupu's findings suggest that it would.

Implications for Arms Control

The study supports the broader idea that arms-control treaties can influence state behavior. This does not mean that negotiators can create any desired outcome by writing legal rules. Treaties work when commitments are supported by verification, incentives, diplomatic pressure, domestic institutions, and continued legitimacy. Governments must also believe that compliance serves their security interests better than violation.

The findings encourage policymakers to strengthen rather than dismiss the NPT. This includes supporting safeguards, addressing withdrawal and noncompliance, maintaining credible peaceful-use cooperation, reducing regional security pressures, and demonstrating progress toward disarmament. If nuclear-weapon states neglect their own commitments, non-nuclear members may view the system as permanently unequal and become less willing to cooperate.

Conclusion

Fuhrmann and Lupu's article provides evidence that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty reduces the probability that states will pursue nuclear weapons. The authors address the major selection problem through a three-stage design: estimating treaty-commitment preferences, matching states with similar probabilities of joining, and applying logit models to test the optimist and pessimist hypotheses. The negative association between ratification and pursuit supports the optimist hypothesis.

The study does not prove that the NPT prevents every program or that treaties overcome all security interests. Its importance lies in showing that legal commitment appears to matter even after researchers account for some of the reasons states select into membership. The NPT's effectiveness is therefore real but conditional. It works as part of a larger system of verification, diplomacy, domestic politics, incentives, and legitimacy. The research strengthens the argument that treaties can help manage complex international problems while also demonstrating the need for careful causal analysis.

References

Fuhrmann, M., & Lupu, Y. (2016). Do arms control treaties work? Assessing the effectiveness of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. *International Studies Quarterly, 60*(3), 530–539.

International Atomic Energy Agency. (n.d.). *The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and IAEA safeguards*.

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs. (n.d.). *Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons*.