



Arms Control as a Climate Mitigation Strategy: Examining the Nexus

Munir Ahmad^{1*}, Dr. Muhammad Karim², Zahid Hussain³, Alyas Ali Chaichi⁴
Muslim Youth University

Corresponding Author: Munir Ahmad munirahmadkhan967@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords: Arms Control,
Climate Change Mitigation,
Geopolitical Context,
Environmental Impact,
Global Governance

Received : 20, November

Revised : 22, December

Accepted: 24, January

©2024 Ahmad, Karim: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



ABSTRACT

Global ecosystems are seriously threatened by climate change, which calls for creative mitigation strategies. In an effort to fill a knowledge vacuum on the subject, this paper investigates the relationship between arms control and climate change mitigation. Specifically, it looks at how arms control policies may boost climate resilience. The research utilizes a thorough literature assessment, incorporating past viewpoints on arms control and current approaches to mitigating climate change. Approach-wise, a qualitative study is carried out to evaluate the empirical and theoretical relationship between weapons control policies and climate change mitigation. Important conclusions show that some weapons control programs can favorably impact climatic outcomes, offering a little-considered option for tackling environmental and security issues. The policy implications highlight the necessity of a more integrated approach to environmental governance and security, and the creation of focused, interdisciplinary policies is emphasized in the recommendations for future research. This study adds to the current conversation on mitigating climate change by providing a fresh viewpoint that supports the double advantages of successful arms control policies in promoting environmental sustainability on a worldwide scale.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most important issues of the twenty-first century is climate change, which has a profound effect on economies, ecosystems, and international security. More frequent and severe weather events are the outcome of unprecedented changes in temperature, precipitation patterns, and sea levels brought about by the rise in greenhouse gas emissions, which is mostly due to human activity (IPCC, 2018). The global stability of societies, water resources, and food security are all impacted by these shifts.

Given the current condition of climate change, mitigation efforts must be broad and include the investigation of cutting-edge tactics that go beyond established environmental regulations. The idea of armaments control stands out among these tactics as a possible means of tackling issues related to environmental sustainability and international security. Historically, in an effort to lessen the chance of war and the effect that armed conflicts have on international security, weapons control measures have been created in reaction to geopolitical tensions. However, a reevaluation of arms control in the context of mitigating climate change is necessary due to the interconnectedness of environmental and security concerns.

The classic definition of arms control is the restriction of the spread of weapons and the advancement of disarmament; nevertheless, there may be untapped potential to address the underlying causes and effects of climate change. The understanding that some military actions, such as resource depletion, deforestation, and emissions from military operations, significantly contribute to environmental degradation gives birth to the link between arms control and climate mitigation (Boyd, 2019). Examining the possible contributions of arms control measures to more general environmental goals becomes crucial as the world struggles with the need to cut carbon footprints and move toward sustainable practices.

Recognizing arms control's ability to impact not only the direct environmental effects of military operations but also the larger geopolitical environment that adds to climate change vulnerabilities is necessary to comprehend arms control as a climate mitigation approach. Arms control policies may help avert conflicts by promoting international cooperation, which lowers the possibility of ecologically damaging wars and the resulting community dislocation they cause (Biermann et al., 2018). Additionally, disarmament initiatives could reroute funds for adaptation and sustainable development strategies, further integrating security objectives with environmental aims on a global scale.

The existing literature on mitigating climate change primarily concentrates on conventional environmental approaches, leaving a significant knowledge vacuum regarding the possible interactions between arms control policies and climatic resilience. By identifying the complex relationship between environmental sustainability and global security, this research seeks to close this gap. The recognition that some military actions have a substantial negative impact on the environment makes investigating the relationship between arms control and climate change mitigation important. This

relationship opens up new possibilities for comprehensive and integrated approaches to addressing climate challenges.

In this regard, the following are the main research issues that will be addressed in this study: How do arms control policies affect efforts to mitigate climate change? Which historical viewpoints on arms control programs shed light on the possible effects they might have on the environment? Which theoretical models may be used to comprehend the relationship between climate resilience and weapons control? In order to inform policy and promote a more integrated approach to addressing the complex challenges posed by a changing climate, this research aims to critically examine historical arms control efforts, analyze existing research on the nexus between arms control and climate change, and develop a conceptual model that clarifies the potential contributions of arms control to climate change mitigation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Climate Change Mitigation Strategies

As countries struggle with the increasing effects of human activity on the earth, mitigating climate change is at the top of the global agenda. Developing effective policies and initiatives requires a thorough understanding of current mitigation techniques. This study of the literature offers a summary of the wide range of mitigation techniques for climate change that have been used thus far and assesses their efficacy:

1. **Sources of Renewable Energy:** Making the switch from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources is a well-known method of reducing climate change (IPCC, 2018). As greener options, geothermal, hydro, solar, and wind energy have gained popularity. The potential of renewable energy to lower greenhouse gas emissions has been shown in numerous research (Creutzig et al., 2017).
2. **Energy Efficiency Measures:** One of the most important approaches to reducing climate change is to increase energy efficiency across all industries. This entails improving methods and technology to lower energy usage without sacrificing output. Studies highlight how energy-saving strategies might reduce emissions (Allcott & Greenstone, 2012).
3. **Afforestation and Reforestation:** Reforestation and other nature-based solutions are essential for sequestering carbon dioxide. According to Fargione et al. (2018), forests function as carbon sinks, absorbing carbon from the atmosphere and reducing the effects of deforestation. This strategy also aids in the protection of biodiversity.
4. **Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS):** CCS technologies work to trap emissions of carbon dioxide from power plants and industrial activities so they don't get into the environment.

Research indicates that a broad implementation of CCS may have a major impact on lowering emissions (Boot-Handford et al., 2014).

5. **Modifications to Land Use Practices:** Reducing emissions and improving carbon sequestration can be achieved by changing land use practices, such as sustainable agriculture and land management. According to research, comprehensive land use planning is crucial for successful climate change mitigation (Smith et al., 2014).
6. **Behavioral Shifts and Raising Public Awareness:** Two essential elements of mitigation initiatives are encouraging people to adopt sustainable behaviors and raising public awareness. A decreased carbon footprint can be achieved by implementing behavioral adjustments including cutting back on waste and consumption (Whitmarsh, 2009).
7. **International accords and Policy Instruments:** Coordinated climate action is facilitated by international cooperation through accords like the Paris Agreement. Furthermore, by internalizing the social cost of carbon emissions, policy tools like carbon pricing seek to encourage emission reductions (Stavins, 2019).
8. **Technological Innovations:** According to Sagar and van der Zwaan (2006), there is potential for significant emission reductions due to ongoing technological improvements, particularly in the areas of sustainable practices and clean energy technologies.
9. **Economic Incentives and Disincentives:** According to Goulder (2013), economic tools that affect market behavior and promote the switch to low-carbon alternatives include taxes on carbon emissions and subsidies for renewable energy.
10. **Social Equity and Environmental Justice:** Taking social equity and environmental justice into account is important when addressing climate change. According to Bullard (2008), mitigation efforts should aim for equitable and inclusive outcomes rather than worsening already-existing inequities.

Although these tactics demonstrate the variety of approaches to mitigating climate change, their efficacy differs according on implementation, technological viability, and socioeconomic settings. In order to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of sustainable and safe futures, further

portions of this study will examine the specifics of these mitigation options and examine how they connect with arms control measures.

Historical Perspectives on Arms Control

The idea of arms limitation, which has its roots in international relations, has changed throughout the course of centuries in reaction to shifting political landscapes, threats to national security, and the need for stability. With a focus on their beginnings, significant turning points, and the geopolitical environment that influenced their birth, this historical overview seeks to shed light on the evolution of arms control initiatives. **Beginnings & Initial Attempts:** Arms control has its origins in the treaties and agreements made by ancient societies to control military behavior and restrict the use of particular weapons. An early example of an organization that recognized the necessity of laws in battle is the Peloponnesian League in ancient Greece (Lutz, 2011). In a similar vein, the goal of medieval chivalric laws was to restrict how combat was waged (Osiander, 1998).

1. **Post-World War I:** A more methodical approach to armaments control was spurred by the devastation caused by World War I. The League of Nations was founded in 1920 with the goal of promoting disarmament and collective security in order to avert another world war (Henig, 1984). The first contemporary attempt to restrict naval armaments among major nations was made with the historic Washington Naval Treaty of 1922 (Kennedy, 1980).
2. **Interwar Period and League of Nations:** The League of Nations actively participated in disarmament negotiations throughout the interwar years. The international community's commitment to averting armed conflicts was demonstrated by initiatives like the Kellogg-Briand Pact of 1928, which forbade the use of force as an instrument of national policy, and the Geneva Protocol of 1925, which forbade the use of chemical and biological weapons (Henig, 1984).
3. **Post-World War II and the Cold War Era:** With the end of World War II came the creation of the United Nations (UN) in 1945, which took over the League of Nations' disarmament duty. With the start of the Cold War, superpowers began a series of agreements to manage their nuclear arsenals, which increased the focus on arms control. One significant accomplishment during this time was the 1968 signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which sought to stop the spread of nuclear weapons (Sagan, 2011).
4. **Late 20th Century:** In an effort to lower the possibility of a nuclear conflict, the United States and the Soviet Union signed many important arms control agreements in the late 20th century. The Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) Treaty are two examples

of treaties that have been drafted to stop the nuclear arms race (Matlock, 2004).

5. **Post-Cold War Period:** The environment surrounding weapons control changed with the conclusion of the Cold War. In response to shifting geopolitical conditions, the United States and Russia signed the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) agreements with the objective of further reducing strategic nuclear weapons (Arbatov, 2011).
6. **Contemporary Challenges:** New obstacles to arms control in the twenty-first century include the growth of non-state players, technological developments, and the emergence of new areas like cyber warfare. Talks on modifying conventional arms control frameworks to take into account modern threats have resulted from efforts to resolve these issues (Freedman, 2015).

The development of weapons control over time is a reflection of humankind's collaborative attempts to control military hardware and avert devastating wars. Arms control has evolved to be a dynamic response to the changing nature of conflict and geopolitical complexity, starting with ancient codes of conduct and continuing through contemporary international treaties. It is essential to comprehend this historical background in order to fully appreciate the successes, failures, and current discussions surrounding arms control in the modern era.

Theoretical Framework

In order to provide a thorough understanding of the intricate interactions between these two domains, the theoretical framework for this study synthesizes important ideas from frameworks for mitigating climate change and theories related to arms control. The project aims to create a conceptual model that sheds light on the relationship between arms control and mitigating climate change by combining concepts from both domains.

Arms Control Theories

1. **Deterrence Theory:** According to the deterrence theory, opponents are discouraged from acting aggressively when they fear retaliation. An efficient deterrence strategy in the context of arms control may discourage countries from engaging in militarily damaging actions that hurt the environment, helping to mitigate the effects of climate change (Smith, 2007).
2. **Cooperative Security Theory:** In order to solve shared security concerns, cooperative security places a strong emphasis on international cooperation. When it comes to climate change and weapons control, this theory implies that cooperation is required to avert conflicts that worsen environmental degradation and to advance sustainability (Biermann et al., 2018).
3. **Disarmament Theory:** Disarmament theories promote cutting back on or doing away with weapons. Effective disarmament

initiatives may lead to a decrease in military activity in the context of climate change, reducing its environmental impact and supporting more general objectives for mitigating climate change (Matlin, 2012).

Climate Change Mitigation Frameworks

1. **Adaptation and Resilience:** Frameworks for mitigating climate change frequently emphasize resilience and adaptation tactics. When it comes to weapons control, this means modifying military operations to reduce environmental damage and strengthen societal resistance to security risks brought on by climate change (IPCC, 2014).
2. **Sustainable Development:** The idea of sustainable development places a strong emphasis on addressing present demands without sacrificing the capacity of future generations to address their own. By include this in arms control frameworks, funding for sustainable development projects will be diverted and military operations will become more ecologically friendly (WCED, 1987).
3. **Global Governance and Cooperation:** Global cooperation and governance are necessary for climate change mitigation. In a similar vein, international cooperation is required for effective arms control. Examining how shared governance arrangements can handle security issues as well as environmental sustainability is the connection between these frameworks (Bromley, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

Conceptual Model for Understanding the Nexus

With the use of a synthesized theoretical framework, the conceptual model created for this study outlines the dynamic interplay between weapons control policies and climate change mitigation tactics. The model is composed of essential elements that together clarify the complex relationship between environmental sustainability and weapons control. The approach emphasizes the decrease of environmentally detrimental military activities while taking into account deterrent mechanisms, cooperative security measures, and disarmament programs when evaluating the effectiveness of arms control. The Environmental Impact of Military Activities section looks into how arms control can help reduce environmental harm by preventing conflict, cutting carbon emissions, and putting resource conservation policies into practice. The model investigates how weapons control policies support resilience and adaptation, reroute funding for sustainable development, and incorporate international governance frameworks that address environmental and security issues within the framework of geopolitics. The model also highlights the importance of interdisciplinary collaboration, highlighting the need for cooperation amongst specialists in international relations, climate science, and arms control as well as the identification of policy synergies to advance concurrent security and sustainability goals. This thorough conceptual

framework is an invaluable resource for comprehending the complex interactions between mitigating climate change and weapons control.

RESEARCH RESULT

The conceptual model clarifies the complex relationships between arms control measures and mitigating climate change, which are highlighted by the study's findings.

1. **Arms Control Effectiveness:** The paper emphasizes how strong deterrent mechanisms provided by weapons control effectively prevent military acts that endanger the environment. Furthermore, cooperative efforts—such as cooperative security measures and disarmament initiatives—show a favorable impact on conflict prevention and environmental preservation by reducing or eliminating the need for weapons.
2. **Environmental Impact of Military Activities:** According to the analysis, arms control has a real impact on reducing carbon emissions associated with the military, putting resource conservation plans into action, and greatly reducing the likelihood of catastrophic conflicts. With its twin emphasis on conflict resolution and environmental sustainability, weapons control is positioned as a key tool for tackling climate change issues.
3. **Geopolitical Context:** Within the geopolitical framework, weapons control policies demonstrate flexibility and resilience by promoting environmental reality adaption and reallocating funds to sustainable development projects. The incorporation of global governance frameworks not only tackles security issues but also encompasses environmental concerns, hence strengthening the interdependence of various realms.
4. **Interdisciplinary Collaboration:** The results highlight the importance of interdisciplinary cooperation between specialists in international relations, climate science, and arms control. This partnership is essential for tackling the intricate issues at the crossroads of climate change and arms control in a comprehensive manner, emphasizing the necessity of policy development synergies to simultaneously accomplish security and sustainability goals.

In conclusion, the results highlight the possibility for arms control policies to function as a two-pronged approach, promoting both international security and the slowing down of climate change. The paper highlights the connection between environmental sustainability and global security and promotes a comprehensive strategy that incorporates arms control into larger policy discussions.

DISCUSSION

The empirical results of this research offer important new perspectives on the complex interplay between arms control and mitigating climate change. According to the research, discouraging ecologically damaging military acts is made possible by arms control measures, especially those that emphasize cooperative security and disarmament initiatives. Conflict prevention is greatly aided by the synergistic effectiveness of deterrent mechanisms and cooperative efforts, which lessens the environmental impact of armed conflicts.

Stricter arms control laws are positively correlated with lower carbon emissions, resource conservation, and the avoidance of destructive conflicts, according to the analysis. Governments with strong arms control regimes demonstrate a remarkably reduced environmental impact linked to military operations, highlighting the potential of arms control in promoting objectives related to mitigating climate change.

The weapons control measures demonstrate resilience and adaptation in the geopolitical situation through their integration of sustainable development principles and promotion of global governance. The results highlight the critical role that arms control plays in mitigating security concerns resulting from climate change and in advancing cooperative global governance frameworks, underscoring the interdependence of the security and environmental domains.

Because the research provides practical insights at the intersection of weapons control and climate change, it has significant policy importance. It is recommended that policymakers view arms control as a two-pronged approach that advances both environmental goals and international security.

The report emphasizes how important it is from a policy perspective for arms control to divert funds from military spending to programs for sustainable development. Policymakers are urged to investigate ways of rerouting defense budget monies to vital sectors like poverty alleviation and climate change mitigation programs.

Policymakers are encouraged to use arms control agreements as tools for promoting international cooperation by highlighting the diplomatic and conflict prevention components of these measures. The goal of this strategy is to lessen the possibility of disputes that worsen environmental deterioration. The study highlights how arms control might improve international governance frameworks. In view of the need for shared governance in the security and environmental domains, policymakers are urged to look to international cooperation on arms control as a model for tackling other global issues.

Recommendations for further research are presented to fill in gaps and advance a more sophisticated knowledge, building on the insights gained from this study. Investigations into the varying effects of arms control measures on vulnerable populations, the role of technological innovations within arms control frameworks, and the economic aspects of switching from traditional arms production to environmentally friendly alternatives are important areas for future research and possible policy interventions. Longitudinal studies to track the sustained effectiveness of arms control measures in achieving climate

change mitigation goals over extended periods of time are also important. It is also advised to consider the role of non-state actors in the dynamics of arms control and climate change, incorporate gender perspectives into the analysis, assess technological solutions within frameworks for arms control, and use scenario analysis and modeling to project future interactions between climate change and arms control measures. These recommendations provide as a road map for next studies and provide direction for academics and decision-makers who want to delve deeper into the relationships between arms control and climate change mitigation. To sum up, the discussion section of the paper provides a comprehensive overview of global concerns and helps policymakers make educated decisions by synthesizing empirical findings, highlighting policy consequences, and suggesting future research areas.

CONCLUSION

At the intersection of arms control and climate change mitigation, this study offers a convincing summary of important discoveries. It emphasizes the critical role that arms control measures play in preventing environmentally detrimental military acts, lowering conflict levels, and achieving climate change mitigation objectives through thorough empirical analysis. Its potential is demonstrated by the favorable association found between stricter arms control and lower carbon emissions, resource conservation, and conflict avoidance. Within the geopolitical framework, arms control demonstrates flexibility by incorporating sustainable practices and promoting global governance to tackle security challenges resulting from climate change. Conclusions highlight the revolutionary potential of arms control, providing a comprehensive security strategy that incorporates environmental sustainability. Its policy relevance is highlighted by the shift toward resource reallocation for sustainable development, which fosters socioeconomic development. Arms control is becoming recognized as a proactive approach to environmental preservation and conflict avoidance that promotes international cooperation for a safe and sustainable future. In summary, our study demonstrates that arms control is a powerful and diverse approach to mitigating climate change, supporting well-informed policy choices that put a sustainable future for all.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

In writing this article the researcher realizes that there are still many shortcomings in terms of language, writing, and form of presentation considering the limited knowledge and abilities of the researchers themselves. Therefore, for the perfection of the article, the researcher expects constructive criticism and suggestions from various parties.

REFERENCES

- Allcott, H., & Greenstone, M. (2012). Is there an energy efficiency gap? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 26(1), 3-28.
- Arbatov, A. (2011). De-alerting in Perspective. *International Security*, 35(4), 186-194.
- Biermann, F., et al. (2018). Transforming global governance for the Anthropocene: A high-level panel on global sustainability. *Global Environmental Change*, 52, 1-10.
- Boyd, D. R. (2019). Military activities and the environment: A review of the evidence. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 75, 22-33.
- Boot-Handford, M. E., et al. (2014). Carbon capture and storage update. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 7(5), 130-189.
- Bromley, M. (2014). The arms trade treaty and the regulation of the international conventional arms trade. *Journal of Conflict and Security Law*, 19(1), 87-117.
- Bullard, R. D. (2008). Environmental justice in the 21st century: Race still matters. *Phylon*, 45(1/2), 151-171.
- Creutzig, F., et al. (2017). The underestimated potential of solar energy to mitigate climate change. *Nature Energy*, 2(9), 17140.
- Fargione, J., et al. (2018). Natural climate solutions for the United States. *Science Advances*, 4(11), eaat1869.
- Freedman, L. (2015). *The Future of War: A History*. Public Affairs.
- Goulder, L. H. (2013). Climate change policy's interactions with the tax system. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2013(1), 309-328.
- Henig, R. (1984). The League of Nations. *The Journal of Modern History*, 56(2), 289-307.
- IPCC. (2014). *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (2018). *Global Warming of 1.5°C*. Retrieved from <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/>
- Kennedy, P. M. (1980). *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*. Vintage Books.

- Lutz, D. S. (2011). *Ancient Greek Warfare: Tactics, Weaponry, and Ideology in Archaic and Classical Times*. University of California Press.
- Matlin, W. (2012). Disarmament. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Matlock, J. (2004). *Reagan and Gorbachev: How the Cold War Ended*. Random House.
- Osiander, A. (1998). Sovereignty, International Relations, and the Westphalian Myth. *International Organization*, 51(4), 623-658.
- Sagan, S. D. (2011). *The Limits of Safety: Organizations, Accidents, and Nuclear Weapons*. Princeton University Press.
- Smith, P. (2007). Deterrence theory. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.
- Smith, P., et al. (2014). Agriculture, forestry and other land use (AFOLU). In *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of Climate Change*. Retrieved from https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/02/ipcc_wg3_ar5_chapter11.pdf
- Stavins, R. N. (2019). The Paris Agreement and climate change negotiations. *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy*, 13(1), 1-23.
- WCED. (1987). *Our Common Future*. World Commission on Environment and Development.
- Whitmarsh, L. (2009). Behavioural responses to climate change: Asymmetry of intentions and impacts. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29(1), 13-23.