



Nuclear Security Dilemma in Nuclear Multipolar World vs Zero Hunger

Nükleer Çok Kutuplu Dünyadaki Nükleer Güvenlik İkilemi Sıfır Açlığa Karşı

Mehmet ALKANALKA*

Abstract

The Russia-Ukraine war has increased the risk not only of nuclear weapons use but also of the food crisis. A world free of nuclear weapons has once again emerged among the strategic priorities of international relations and states. We live in an age where the sources of threats are not limited to war and the threat of using nuclear weapons but also include the global climate crisis, starvation, and migration, which affect a significant part of humanity and also challenge security. Currently, a significant proportion of the global population suffers from hunger, intensified further by the coronavirus disease and economic crisis. In this article, I intend to dispense with nuclear weapons – one of the biggest threats to world stability, costing billions of dollars that fall within the scope of sunk costs – to contribute to ending hunger – one of the biggest threats to humanity – in the light of “Let humanity live so that the state can live” philosophy, and to fight the global climate crisis. This study suggests a creative perspective and addresses the problems holistically by providing a peace research analysis on the nexus of peace, security, and solidarity.

Keywords: Denuclearization, Zero Hunger, Peace Research, Nuclear Security Dilemma

Özet

Rusya-Ukrayna savaşı, yalnızca nükleer silah kullanma riskini değil, aynı zamanda gıda krizi riskini de artırdı. Nükleer silahlardan arındırılmış bir dünya, uluslararası ilişkilerin ve devletlerin stratejik öncelikleri arasında bir kez daha öne çıktı. Tehdit kaynaklarının sadece savaş ve nükleer silah kullanma tehdidiyle sınırlı kalmayıp, insanlığın önemli bir bölümünü etkileyen ve güvenliği de tehdit eden küresel iklim krizi, açlık ve göç gibi konuların da yer aldığı bir çağda yaşıyoruz. Şu anda, küresel nüfusun önemli bir bölümü, koronavirüs pandemisi ve ekonomik kriz tarafından daha da yoğunlaşan açlıktan muzdariptir. Bu makalede, dünya istikrarına yönelik en büyük tehditlerden biri olan ve batık maliyetler kapsamına giren milyarlarca dolara mal olan nükleer silahlardan vazgeçilmesini, insanlık için en büyük tehditlerden biri olan açlığın sona erdirilmesine ve küresel iklim krizi katkıda bulunmayı amaçlıyorum. Bu çalışma yaratıcı bir bakış açısı önermekte ve barış, güvenlik ve dayanışma ekseninde bir analiz sunarak sorunların bütüncül olarak ele alınması ve “insanı yaşat ki devlet yaşasın” felsefesini somut bir uygulama alanı olarak tavsiye etmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Nükleersizleştirme, Sıfır Açlık, Barış Çalışmaları, Nükleer Güvenlik İkilemi

* Dr., MEF University, mehmetalkanalka@yahoo.com, ORCID: 0000-0002-2311-935X

Introduction

“The one who sleeps while her neighbor is hungry is not one of us”

Prophet Muhammad

As the commander-in-chief during a war in the desert, to enhance solidarity and involve everyone, Alexander the Great refused to drink water until every member of his army had access to water. The army is composed of people and for the army or the state to win or survive in wars when people are hungry and thirsty is irrational.

Figure 1. Tom Lovell (1909–1997) Alexander The Great Refusing Water In The Desert



Source: Americangallery, 2012.

Currently, a considerable proportion of the world population suffers from hunger, intensified further by an economic crisis, which has exacerbated inequality. Humanity also faces existential threats such as global climate change and nuclear weapons. To prevent the nuclear arms race, the best way in an anarchic nuclear multipolar structure would be to use the resources saved in line with a common vision by radically reducing the nuclear weapons of the great states by setting an example like Alexander the Great. All great powers and nuclear weapon-capable countries and United Nations members should collaborate to eliminate these threats. This study aims to offer a holistic approach and contribute by proposing a creative solution for humanity and the world to be free from fear and hunger.

The USA and Japan reaffirmed their commitment to the Korean Peninsula’s complete denuclearization under United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions (The White House, 2023). Humanity is at a loss in the 21st century. The Russia-Ukraine war has increased the risk not only of nuclear weapon use but also of the food crisis. A world free of nuclear weapons has once again emerged among the strategic priorities of international relations and states. Thus, it is very meaningful that Hiroshima hosts the G7 Summit in 2023. We live in an age where the sources of threats are not limited to war and the threat of using nuclear weapons but also include the global climate crisis, starvation, and migration, which affect a significant part of humanity and also challenge security. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) report published on 08 September 2022, states that although uncertainty is not a new situation, its dimensions lead to worrying new situations, and the new “uncertainty complex” is emerging in a way never seen before in human history (UNDP, 2022). The Bosphorus has two opposing currents in its waters—the

direction of the current in the upper layer is toward the Sea of Marmara (south), whereas the direction of the current in the lower layer is toward the Black Sea (north). Similarly, opposite currents exist under the same ozone layer globally. The first of these is the nuclear security dilemma in a nuclear multipolar international structure, and the other is the struggle for existence because of both hunger and global climate change. Although states are accepted as the main actors in the theories of international relations, various courses of action, especially balancing strategies, have been proposed for the survival of the states. As Edebali, a Turkish philosopher, said centuries ago, "Let humanity live so that the state can live." An extension of this thought to the present could be that let us keep our planet also alive so that humanity and living creatures can live. This article intends to increase situational awareness and simultaneously draw attention to the possibility of solutions to problems through solidarity. On the one hand, We aim to contribute to solving the nuclear security problem in the nuclear multipolar world; on the other hand, We seek to contribute by proposing a creative solution for humanity and the world to be free from fear, hunger, and climate change. To this end, We recommend dispensing with nuclear weapons – one of the biggest threats to the world, costing billions of dollars and never used, thereby falling within the scope of sunk costs – providing common solutions to end hunger – one of the biggest challenges of humanity – and fight the global climate crisis.

The year 2022 has witnessed many security concerns, the foremost being the Russia-Ukraine war. Strategy documents and important joint explanations have also been released in 2022. Five nuclear-powered states made a joint statement on 03 January 2022 for the first time in history under the title of "Preventing Nuclear War and Avoiding Arms Races" (The White House, 2022). The five states affirmed that nuclear war should never happen as it will have no winner (The White House, 2022). The statement also reiterated that nuclear weapons are not targeted both any other state and each other. With the Russia-Ukraine war, which broke out after the release of this statement, the possibility of irreparable harm by nuclear weapon use has compelled Europe and the entire humanity to act without delay. This problem has become serious enough for Russia to threaten Europe's destruction if the Western bloc provides nuclear weapons to Ukraine (Carbonaro, 2022). A world free of nuclear weapons has once again emerged among the strategic priorities of international relations and states.

The France National Strategic Review 2022 states that a nuclear multipolar international structure has become even more difficult considering China's increasing nuclear capacity, Russia's unpredictability, North Korea's continued nuclear armament, and Iran's nuclear (France Secrétariat général de la Défense, 2022). In the same document, French Minister of Defense, Parly, expressed that France cannot determine its national interests based only on its frontier's geographical proximity because, as a nuclear weapon state, France has global interests. During President Biden's term, the Nuclear Proliferation Review (NPR) 2022 Report, which was delayed because of the Russia-Ukraine war, mentions North Korea, Iran, and nuclear terrorism along with China and Russia, and emphasizes that the priority of the United States (US) and NATO is to deter Russia's limited nuclear use in a regional conflict (US Department of Defense, 2022). The most remarkable prediction of the report is the statement that by 2030, the US will face, for the first time in its history, two major nuclear powers as strategic rivals and potential enemies. It states that China has a target of 1,000 nuclear warheads by 2030. It also asserts that Russia plans to use the nuclear weapons doctrine more effectively and strategic and non-strategic weapons together, highlighting that Russia has 2,000 non-strategic nuclear weapons. One of the most striking points in the report is the effort of the US to balance China and Russia at the regional

level. Within the scope of balancing Russia in Europe, it states that the NATO allies, the joint action, and the nuclear power, France, and England, would combine forces. With these statements, the US motivates the nuclear powers of the other two European allies positively. Russian strategists have retained the option of nuclear weapons on the table, in case of a possible regional or major conflict with a major adversary such as NATO, as Russia's conventional power is relatively weak (Bruusgaard, 2021). Russia can negotiate the reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons on the condition that the West reduces its conventional weapons (McDermott, 2022).

The explanations and efforts at the different levels above can be considered signs that both states and military alliances are obliged to act jointly on global security issues. These examples also indicate the importance of handling the data holistically, rationally, and operatively. As people, we can pick up all these pieces together peacefully. The Covid-19 pandemic and the problem of vaccine access, the inability of states in addressing the global climate change problem, the Russia-Ukraine war in 2022 and its fallout such as the energy and the food crisis, and the Syrian civil war and the associated refugee problem illustrate that the world has not done enough. This necessitates creative perspectives and addressing the problems holistically. This study aims to contribute to world peace and humanity by proposing creative solutions.

NATO, the most powerful military alliance in the world, recognized climate change as a major challenge over the next 10 years for the first time in its new strategic concept (NATO, 2022a). NATO's Madrid Summit of 2022 concluded that climate change is a threat multiplier and the defined problem of today and has profound effects on NATO's security (NATO, 2022b). The seventh proposal in NATO 2030 Vision Document is to combat and adapt to climate change. The document stated that NATO leaders signed a new NATO Action Plan to understand climate change's impact on security and NATO's adaptation to it (NATO, 2021).

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. After the literature review on the subject, the data from the 1950s to the present on the states that have nuclear weapons are examined in light of the concept of the nuclear security dilemma. Next, We investigate whether the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) is binding and effective on countries. Finally, the nuclear dimension effects of the Russia-Ukraine war on the security of Europe are discussed.

1. Theory and Methodology

Kenneth Waltz, one of the important scholars of structural realism, argues that to understand international politics, the structure of the international system in which states interact must be examined first (Waltz, 1959). Cimbala contends that the international system does not rule the leading state actors, in reverse the leading states design the parameters of the system (Cimbala, 2017). The soul and heart of the international structure are defined as anarchy (Donnelly, 2012: 609). The arms race and anarchy are two essentials of international relations and changes in these two elements might enable a realist idealism synthesis (Buzan, 1984: 109). Herz defined realist liberalism as the "theory and practice of the realizable ideal" (Herz, 1950: 179). In international relations, "what is" can be represented with realism, and "what should be" can be with idealism, in this vein nuclear disarmament needs a transformation similar to the "waiting for Godot" metaphor (Payne, 2019: 7). It means that two different variables on the one hand realist nuclear security dilemma, and on the other hand idealist social cohesion and solidarity should be handled

together. Social cohesion has its origin in the solidarity model meaning mutual responsibility and obligations to each other (Spicker, 2014: 95-6). Social vulnerabilities might overlap with personal ones including thirst and hunger (Scholz, 2014: 54).

In this article, We prefix the word nuclear to the concepts in realist terminology. This study makes a novel contribution to the literature by adding nuclear attributes to neorealist theory. Thus, We define the concept of anarchy as nuclear anarchy, the security dilemma as the nuclear security dilemma, and the multipolar international structure as a nuclear multipolar structure. The NPT (UN Office for Disarmament Affairs Treaty) is an important document to analyze and mitigate nuclear war threats and risks (UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, 2022). Article 1 of the Treaty categorizes states into nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states. According to the NPT, the US, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (now Russian Federation), China, France, and the United Kingdom (UK) were recognized as nuclear weapon states. Currently, India, Pakistan, Israel, and North Korea also have nuclear weapons. In the anarchic structure in which no supreme authority exists above the states to solve the problems in the international system, the states behave according to the relative power distribution (Waltz, 1979). In anarchic environments with no controlling supreme authority, the priority of states is to survive. As the NPT did not work for the four states in practice, no state or international organization could prevent the four new states from developing nuclear weapons.

When a state increases its security, it also reduces other states' security (Taliaferro, 2001). The security dilemma means that when a state increases its security, it also causes to decrease in other states' security (Jerwis, 1978: 169). When a state increases its military capability, the net outcome could diminish its security (Glaser, 1997: 177). There is also a subjective part of threat as a perception of it. In this context, for example, while the US, which is a nuclear power, does not perceive the other nuclear powers, England and France, as a threat, yet does not share the same friendly sentiments toward China, Russia, and North Korea. Thus, we need a supranational benefit that no state feels to be exploited. The nuclear security dilemma, together with the pessimistic scenario, reveals the strategy of the cold war period. However, the collapse of the former Soviet Union, which had the most nuclear weapons during the cold war, demonstrated that this strategy was costly, aggressive, difficult to control, and not feasible. The security dilemma is mostly driven by the fear of being exploited (Jerwis, 1978: 172).

Montgomery claims that "a relative decrease in a state's relative capabilities can increase its security by revealing its benign motives." (Montgomery, 2006: 160). Tribes may overcome the power game to solve others' problems (Herz, 1950: 158). To prevent that fear, we can both overcome the nuclear security dilemma within the scope of the realization of the UN Sustainable Development Goals agreed on by the whole world, and we can benefit humanity and the planet within the scope of strategic goodness with a simple and creative transformation for all humanity within the scope of solidarity and social cohesion. We live in an age where the sources of threats are not limited to war and the use of nuclear power but also include the global climate crisis, starvation, and migration, which affect a significant part of humanity and also challenge security. Currently, a significant proportion of the global population suffers from hunger, intensified further by the coronavirus disease and economic crisis. European politics also faces nuclear weapons security dilemma, stemming mainly from the Russia-Ukraine war. This study offers creative perspectives and addresses the problems holistically.

Waltz argues that the more states possess nuclear weapons, the less the likelihood of war (Waltz, 2012). He emphasized that Indian and Pakistani leaders have learned from the folly of the nuclear arms race between the US and the former Soviet Union. Subrahmanyam contends that minimal deterrence is as effective as maximum deterrence and that India's 60 nuclear weapons are enough to deter Pakistan or China (Sagan-Waltz, 2022). Although nuclear weapons appear to be a negative feature of every country, they are a powerful tool for peace because their deterrent is very high (Mearsheimer, 2012). Mearsheimer predicted that after the cold war, the Eastern European countries that gained their independence could be exposed to nuclear blackmail by Russia. Despite the territorial integrity guarantee provided to Ukraine by Russia, the Russia-Ukraine war seems to have justified the pessimistic realists in international relations.

In this study, the number of nuclear weapons of the world's two largest nuclear powers, the USA and the former Soviet Union during the Cold War, was analyzed as a case study in the context of the nuclear security dilemma. After the Cold War, the number of nuclear weapons between India and Pakistan is examined as a second case study.

2. Nuclear Threat in the World

Currently, nine countries in the world have nuclear weapons. Five of these are Permanent Member States of the UN Security Council, which have been accepted as nuclear states according to the NPT. Even before the cold war, the world's largest nuclear powers, the US and Russia, significantly reduced their nuclear weapons. Table 1 shows that the US, Russia, and the UK plan to retire some of their nuclear weapons.

Table 1. World Nuclear States

State	Year of the first nuclear test	Total inventory(2022)	Warheads to be retired	Total stockpile
Russia	1949	5,977	1,500	4,477
The US	1945	5,428	1,720	3,708
China	1964	350		350
France	1960	290		290
The UK	1952	225	45	180
India	1974	160		160
Pakistan	1998	160		160
Israel	Unknown	90		90
North Korea	2006	20		20

Source: SIPRI 2022 Yearbook (Kristensen-Korda, 2022).

Article VI of NPT states that "Each of the Parties to the Treaty undertakes to pursue negotiations... and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control" (UN Office for Disarmament Affairs, 2022). Table 2 shows the trend of the nuclear arms race of two superpowers from the cold war to the present.

Table 2. Nuclear States' Nuclear Expenses (2021)

State	Expenses (in USD billion)
The US	44.2
China	11.7
Russian Federation	8.6
The UK	6.8
France	5.9
India	2.3
Israel	1.2
Pakistan	1.1
North Korea	0.642
2021 total	82.4

Source: International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) Report (ICAN, 2021).

The nuclear expenses of nuclear weapon states are presented in Table 2. Analyzing Tables 1 and 2 together reveals that the number of nuclear weapons owned by states and their expenditures is not proportional. Russia's total nuclear stockpile was 4,477, while its nuclear expenditure was USD 8.6 billion. However, a more appropriate analysis would entail examining expenditures over a larger time frame. Thus, for example, the US Congress Budget Office estimated that the nuclear expenditure of the US between 2021 and 2030 was USD 634 billion (US Congressional Budget Office, 2021). According to SIPRI, costs are predicted to increase further as nuclear states seek to modernize their nuclear arsenals (SIPRI, 2022).

Russia-Ukraine war has once again proved the importance of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. During the cold war, the contingency plans of NATO included the use of nuclear power against the former Soviet Union, which had conventionally superior military power. The Russia-Ukraine war has changed all paradigms. Considering the conventional weakness of Russia, the possibility that Russia may also use nuclear weapons, especially against its neighbors, has increased. Therefore, the issue of reducing nuclear weapons has ceased to be an agenda item alone and has moved to a ground including considering Russia's sensitivities along with many international issues would be beneficial. South Africa's deactivation and destruction of all its nuclear weapons, despite being the only nuclear power in the African continent, and France's neutralization of land-to-ground nuclear weapons after the cold war, are exemplary practices to reduce nuclear weapons.

The Russia-Ukraine war not only increased the risk of nuclear weapon use but also resulted in European politics facing the nuclear security dilemma. The return of war to Europe with a nuclear power Russia and the tragedy of Ukraine shocked the European policy agenda. In this context, both the increase in conventional defense expenditures and the need for protection under the nuclear umbrella gained importance. While Germany decided to increase its defense spending by € 100 billion in a revolutionary change, Estonia decided to increase its defense spending to 3% of its gross domestic product.

The negotiation process between the US and Russia concerning the issue of reducing medium-range nuclear weapons has remained incomplete because this nuclear threat primarily affects European countries. Therefore, European countries and Russia should initiate negotiations urgently to reduce medium-range nuclear missiles and ensure peace in Ukraine at the earliest. In this article, We recommend that Russia and Europe together should reduce their nuclear weapon stockpile by two-thirds, following a radical decision. As in the example of Alexander the Great refusing water offered to him, this exemplary behavior will not only overcome the nuclear security dilemma for European security but

also set an example for world peace within the scope of the vision of nuclear disarmament as well as in humanity’s fight against hunger and global climate crisis. Climate change and the Covid-19 pandemic crises have also motivated all nations to act together. While billions of dollars are wasted on unused nuclear weapons, millions have to struggle with hunger.

2.1. USA vs Soviets Nuclear Security Dilemma Case

When the course of nuclear weapons from World War II to 2022 is analyzed, it is seen from Table 3 that the two major nuclear powers, the USA and Russia, increased the proliferation of nuclear weapons within the scope of the increasing nuclear security dilemma during the cold war and that there is a competition.

Table 3. Nuclear Weapons of Russia and the US

State/Year	1954	1967	1978	1986	2002	2016	2022
Russia	150	8,400	26,169	40,159	11,152	4,490	4,477
The US	1,703	31,255	24,418	23,317	10,520	4,018	3,708

Source: fas.org (Federation of American Scientists, 2023)

At the start of the cold war, for example, in 1954, the US had 1,703 nuclear weapons, while the Soviet Union had 150. In other words, the difference between the two countries was 11-fold. The US reached its highest number of nuclear weapons in 1967, after which it reduced them, whereas the Soviet Union continued increasing them continuously until 1986, reaching its peak of 40,159 nuclear weapons, nearly twice as many weapons as those of the US. With the end of the cold war, both countries reduced their nuclear stockpiles to approximately 11,000 in 2002 and further to 4,000 in 2016. After the end of the cold war in 1990 the nuclear weapon stockpile of both the Russian Federation and the US declined sharply. A race to the opposite extreme began between the world’s two largest nuclear powers. With the end of the Cold War, both countries significantly reduced their weapons. However, most of the world’s nuclear weapons still belong to these two countries. We observe that the USA and Russia in the 21st century have reduced their nuclear weapons from 11 thousand to 4 thousand, which means a reduction of about two-thirds. The nuclear weapons of both countries were first equalized at around 10,000 in 2002 and then at around 5000 in 2010. The collapse of the former Soviet Union, which had the most nuclear weapons during the cold war, demonstrated that this strategy was costly, aggressive, difficult to control, and not feasible. Although nuclear weapons appear to be a negative feature of every country, States cannot give up their nuclear weapons in the international security environment where other nuclear states exist, and some of them increase them relatively due to security concerns. The nuclear security dilemma also has domino-effect risks. As nuclear weapon security is an asymmetrical issue, an increase in conventional weapons expenditures cannot be a solution to nuclear threats. We can conclude that an increase in nuclear weapons is not a good strategy in the context of the nuclear security dilemma. Therefore, either reducing or eliminating the nuclear threat would be the most rational solution.

2.2. India vs Pakistan Nuclear Security Dilemma Case

The nuclear armament of India and Pakistan can be cited as an obvious example of realism’s security dilemma and the balance of power. After India acquired nuclear weapons in 1974, Pakistan started its programs to acquire nuclear weapons. To the question of why Pakistan needs nuclear weapons, Benazir Bhutto stated that the answer to the question was found in the history of the country, that the population and military power of India was five

times greater than Pakistan, and that Pakistan was defeated in all three wars with India, thus it stemmed from an existential threat for Pakistan's survival (Dreifus, 1994).

Table 4. Nuclear Weapons of India and Pakistan

State/Year	2000	2005	2010	2019	2022
India	13	38	80	140	160
Pakistan	14	44	90	150	165

Source: fas.org

While Pakistan had 14 nuclear weapons in 2000, and India had 13 and, in 2022 these numbers rose to 165, and 160 respectively. The nuclear arms race between Pakistan and India continued with a sharp rise, while the USA saw terrorism as the main threat in 2002 and continued its nuclear disarmament with Russia. After India and Pakistan conducted mutual nuclear tests in 1998, the United States began to impose sanctions on both countries. US President Bush announced that sanctions were lifted on both countries after India and Pakistan agreed to act together in the fight against terrorism following the 9/11 terrorist attack (CNN, 2001).

Waltz argued that the possibility of war would decrease if the state had nuclear weapons. Subrahmanyam contends that minimal deterrence is as effective as maximum deterrence and that India's 60 nuclear weapons are enough to deter Pakistan or China. However, the increase of approximately 140 nuclear weapons by both countries between 2002 and 2022 refutes the claims of Waltz and Subrahmanyam.

3. UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

In 2015, the UN General Assembly adopted the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which includes 17 SDGs to transform the world and is mainly built on the principle of "leaving no one behind" (UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2022). These goals include ending poverty, zero hunger, reducing inequality, clean water, clean energy, and climate action. Undoubtedly, the issue of zero hunger is a very important and existential goal of not leaving anyone behind. In 2021, the number of people affected by hunger worldwide increased to 828 million (FAO et al, 2022). In addition, around 2.3 billion people around the world face moderate or severe food insecurity, with 11.7% suffering from severe food insecurity (FAO et al, 2022).

According to a note, "developed countries decided to commit to a goal of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries" (UN Climate Change Secretariat). The same note also states that "In Paris, through decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 53, the COP extended the goal of mobilizing jointly USD 100 billion through 2025" (UN Climate Change Secretariat). The annual commitment of USD 100 billion signed by the developed countries could not be fulfilled in practice. This budget fell short by USD 20 billion against the commitment made in the agreement, as it amounted to approximately USD 80 billion annually, including USD 78.3 billion in 2018 and USD 79.6 billion in 2019 (OECD, 2021). However, additional resources are needed as the SDGs focus not only on climate change.

The simple and concrete proposal in this study is the UN Security Council recommending the immediate deactivation of nuclear weapons and the UN General Assembly deciding in 2023, utilizing the mechanisms implemented in the CFE Agreement for the implementation of this decision, and the budget to be obtained from 2023 until 2050 must be extended and used following the UN SDGs. The budget, which is the amount of

savings to be achieved by reducing two-thirds of nuclear weapons, will be utilized for fighting hunger and climate change under the supervision of the UN.

Conclusion

In this article, after the literature review on the subject, the data from the 1950s to the present on the states that have nuclear weapons are examined in light of the concept of the nuclear security dilemma. We live in an age where the sources of threats are not limited to war and the use of nuclear power but also include the global climate crisis, starvation, and migration, which affect a significant part of humanity and also challenge security. Currently, a significant proportion of the global population suffers from hunger, intensified further by the coronavirus disease and economic crisis.

This study is based on transferring the resources allocated for nuclear armament to the fight against hunger and poverty by breaking the mutual security dilemma. In this context, this article can be assumed as a descriptive study. The issues of breaking the security dilemma between realist states and allocating their resources to the UN are the next research topics. We can conclude that an increase in nuclear weapons is not a good strategy in light of the nuclear security dilemma. During the Cold War, the contingency plans of NATO included the use of nuclear power against the former Soviet Union, which had conventionally superior military power. The Russia-Ukraine war has changed all paradigms. Considering the conventional weakness of Russia, the possibility that Russia may also use nuclear weapons, especially against its neighbors, has increased. Therefore, the issue of reducing nuclear weapons has ceased to be an agenda item alone and has moved to a ground in addition to considering Russia's sensitivities along with many international issues would be beneficial. The nuclear security dilemma also has domino-effect risks. As nuclear weapon security is an asymmetrical issue, an increase in conventional weapons expenditures cannot be a solution to nuclear threats. Therefore, either reducing or eliminating the nuclear threat would be the most rational solution. European countries and Russia should initiate negotiations urgently to reduce medium-range nuclear missiles and ensure peace in Ukraine at the earliest. In the first phase, the security concerns of all countries and the asymmetric nuclear weapons capability they apply to address this can be reduced to two-thirds of the current rates. After maintaining this situation for a certain period, completely dispensing nuclear weapons should be undertaken.

This study suggests a creative perspective and addresses the problems holistically by providing a peace research analysis on the nexus of peace, security, and solidarity. In this article, We recommend dispensing with nuclear weapons—one of the biggest threats to world stability, costing billions of dollars that fall within the scope of sunk costs—to contribute to ending hunger—one of the biggest threats to humanity—and to fight the global climate crisis. Article VI of the NPT also includes a vision for all states party to the treaty to negotiate for complete nuclear disarmament. In this article, within the scope of acting in line with the vision of neutralizing nuclear weapons, We recommend diffusing the existential threat originating from nuclear weapons under the supervision of an international commission to be formed by the UN and using the resources saved to combat hunger and inequality. The implementation of this recommendation can lead to both a safer and peaceful world free from nuclear weapons and a concrete demonstration of the goodness of humanity, as well as providing the budget needed for the UN SDGs until at least 2030 and extending it until 2050, if possible. A large proportion of the USD100 billion annual budget needed to implement the SDGs can be derived from the savings generated

from dispensing nuclear weapons. This radical decision will lead to great prestige, hope, and peace, as well as motivate humanity and the planet.

The world is at a crossroads; within the scope of the nuclear multipolar world nuclear security dilemma, either more countries will choose to obtain nuclear weapons and the nuclear weapon states will choose the path of nuclear proliferation, or they will reduce their nuclear weapons to radical levels, as suggested in this study, to fight hunger for humanity and global climate crisis for the planet. This can be achieved by the concrete implementation of a win-win strategy for all parties and states, the size of the global gain, and the issue of the survival of all humanity, especially that of the non-nuclear weapons states, from the nuclear threat through joint effort and close cooperation. The UN can implement this immediately by calling an urgent meeting agenda. The resolution of nuclear disarmament to be taken by the UN Security Council can also be accepted at the UN General Assembly with the participation of all members. An international audit commission, including representatives of countries with nuclear weapons, can actively initiate the process. All great powers and nuclear weapon-capable countries and United Nations members should collaborate to eliminate these threats. All international organizations, states, academics, peace volunteers and organizations, and local administrations, especially the UN, must urgently take action for peace, humanity, and goodness in line with a common vision. The most important difference that distinguishes the new century from the past should be the rational use of resources for the welfare, happiness, and benefit of everyone.

Although this article contains a valuable proposal in terms of combining topics in different fields, how this proposal can be transformed into concrete projects will be among the issues that might be among subjects of subsequent researches.

Bibliography

- Americangallery (2012). <https://americangallery.wordpress.com/2012/12/22/tom-lovell-1909-1997/alexander-the-great-refusing-water-in-the-desert/>, (Accessed: 30.09.2022)
- Bruusgaard, K.V. (2021). "Russian Nuclear Strategy and Conventional Inferiority", *Journal of Strategic Studies*, Vol: 44, Issue: 1, pp. 3-35.
- Buzan, B. (1984). "Peace, Power, and Security: Contending Concepts in the Study of International Relations", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol: 21, Issue: 2, pp. 109-25.
- Carbonaro, G. (2022). "Russia Warns Europe Would 'Disappear' if West Gives Nuclear Weapons to Ukraine", *Newsweek*, <https://www.newsweek.com/russia-threatens-nuclear-hit-poland-rest-europe-1715088>, (Accessed: 16.01.2023.)
- Cimbala, S. J. (2017). "Nuclear Proliferation in the Twenty-First Century: Realism, Rationality, or Uncertainty?", *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Vol: 11, Issue: 1, pp. 129-146.
- CNN (2001). "Bush Lifts India, Pakistan Sanctions", <https://edition.cnn.com/2001/WORLD/asiapcf/south/09/22/ret.sanctions.pakistan/>, (Accessed: 01.01.2023).
- Donnelly, J. (2012). "The Elements of the Structures of International Systems", *International Organization*, Vol: 66, Issue: 4, pp. 609-643.
- Dreifus, C. (1994). "Real-Life Dynasty; Benazir Bhutto", *The New York Times Magazine*, <https://www.nytimes.com/1994/05/15/magazine/real-life-dynasty-benazir-bhutto.html>, (Accessed: 01.01.2023).

- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP and WHO (2022). "The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2022 Repurposing Food and Agricultural Policies to Make Healthy Diets More Affordable", <https://www.fao.org/publications/sofi/2022/en/>, (Accessed: 01.01.2023).
- Federation of American Scientists (FAS) (2023). "Status of World Nuclear Forces", <https://fas.org/issues/nuclear-weapons/status-world-nuclear-forces/>, (Accessed: 01.01.2023).
- France Secrétariat général de la Défense et de la sécurité nationale (2022). "France National Strategic Review 2022", <http://www.sgdsn.gouv.fr/uploads/2022/12/rns-uk-20221202.pdf>, (Accessed: 20.12.2022).
- Glaser, C. L. (1997). "The Security Dilemma Revisited", *World Politics*, Vol: 50, Issue: 1, pp. 171–201.
- Herz, J. H. (1950). "Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma", *World Politics*, Vol: 2, Issue: 2, pp. 157–180.
- ICAN (2021). "Squandered: 2021 Global Nuclear Weapons Spending", https://www.icanw.org/squandered_2021_global_nuclear_weapons_spending_report, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- Jervis, R. (1978). "Cooperation Under the Security Dilemma", *World Politics*, Vol: 30, Issue: 2, pp. 167–214.
- Kristensen, HM and Korda, M. (2022). "World Nuclear Forces in SIPRI Yearbook 2022: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security", <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2022/10>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- McDermott, R. N. (2022). "Russia's Conventional Military Weakness and Substrategic Nuclear Policy", Report for Foreign Military Studies Office, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/pdfs/ADA549120.pdf>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2012). "Why We Will Soon Miss The Cold War", Richard K. Betts (Ed.), *Conflict After the Cold War*, New York: Routledge.
- Montgomery, E. B. (2006). "Breaking out of the Security Dilemma: Realism, Reassurance, and the Problem of Uncertainty", *International Security*, Vol: 31, Issue: 2, pp. 151–85.
- NATO (2021). "NATO 2030", https://www.nato.int/nato_static_fl2014/assets/pdf/2021/6/pdf/2106-factsheet-nato2030-en.pdf, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- NATO (2022a). "NATO releases its Climate Change and Security Impact Assessment", https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_197241.htm, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- NATO (2022b). "Madrid Summit Declaration", Press Release 095, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_196951.htm, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- Ndtv.com (2022). "Fear of Nuclear War Renewed As Russia Looks For Breakthrough In Ukraine", <https://www.ndtv.com/world-news/fear-of-nuclear-war-renewed-as-russia-looks-for-breakthrough-in-ukraine-3643800>, (Accessed: 01.01.2023).
- OECD (2021). "Statement from OECD Secretary-General Mathias Cormann on climate finance in 2019", <https://www.oecd.org/newsroom/statement-from-oecd->

- [secretary-general-mathias-cormann-on-climate-finance-in-2019.htm](#), (Accessed: 01.01.2023).
- Payne, K. B. (2019). "Realism, Idealism, Deterrence, and Disarmament", *Strategic Studies Quarterly*, Vol: 13, Issue: 3, pp. 7-37.
- Sagan, S. D. and Waltz, K. N. (2002). *The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: A Debate Renewed*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Scholz, S. J. (2014). "Solidarity as a Human Right", *Archiv Des Völkerrechts*, Vol: 52, Issue: 1, 49-67.
- SIPRI (2022). "Global Nuclear Arsenals are Expected to Grow as States Continue to Modernize-New SIPRI Yearbook Out Now", <https://www.sipri.org/media/press-release/2022/global-nuclear-arsenals-are-expected-grow-states-continue-modernize-new-sipri-yearbook-out-now#:~:text=SIPRI%20estimates%20that%20the%20total,stockpile%20from%202025%20to%2020260>, (Accessed: 10.11.2022).
- Spicker, P. (2014). "Cohesion, Exclusion and Social Quality", *The International Journal of Social Quality*, Vol: 4, Issue: 1, pp. 95-107.
- Taliaferro, J. (2001). "Security-Seeking under Anarchy: Defensive Realism Reconsidered", *International Security*, Vol: 25, Issue: 03, pp. 128-161.
- The White House (2022). "Joint Statement of the Leaders of the Five Nuclear-Weapon States on Preventing Nuclear War and Avoiding Arms Races", <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2022/01/03/p5-statement-on-preventing-nuclear-war-and-avoiding-arms-races/>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- The White House (2023). "Joint Statement of the United States and Japan", <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/statements-releases/2023/01/13/joint-statement-of-the-united-states-and-japan/>, (Accessed: 16.01.2023).
- UN Climate Change secretariat (UNFCCC Secretariat). https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/tierIII-indicators/files/13.a.1_Background.pdf, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2022). "#Envision2030:17 Goals to Transform The World For Persons With Disabilities", <https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/envision2030.html>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- UN Office for Disarmament Affairs (2022). "Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)", <https://www.un.org/disarmament/wmd/nuclear/npt/text>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- UNDP (2022). "Human Development Report 2021-2022", <https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).
- US Congressional Budget Office (2021). "Projected Costs of U.S. Nuclear Forces, 2021 to 2030", <https://www.cbo.gov/publication/57130>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).

US Department of Defense (2022). "Nuclear Posture Review Report Immediate Release", <https://www.defense.gov/News/Releases/Release/Article/3201683/department-of-defense-releases-its-2022-strategic-reviews-national-defense-strategy/#:~:text=The%202022%20NPR%20reaffirms%20that,our%20Allies%2C%20and%20our%20partners>, (Accessed: 20.10.2022).

Waltz, K. N. (1959). *Man, the State and War*, New York: Columbia University Press.

Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of International Politics*, New York: McGraw Hill.

Waltz, K. N. (2012). "The Spread of Nuclear Weapons: More May Be Better." Richard K. Betts (Ed.), *Conflict After the Cold War: Arguments on Causes of War and Peace*, 4th Ed., New York: Routledge.

