

# **AGENDA 1: Methods to curb the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons.**

## **Introduction:**

As we know, there have been numerous treaties and conventions that have been formulated, to regulate the use, use development and possession of various types of WMDs.

Notable among these are:

- THE NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY

This treaty commonly known as

the NPT, is an international treaty whose objective is to

prevent the proliferation of Nuclear weapons. This treaty was introduced in 1968 and has been extended indefinitely. While it has been widely accepted there are countries who have not yet signed the treaty.. There is also another significant Initiative known as New START ( Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) primarily between the United States and the Russian Federation.

- CONVENTION ON THE PHYSICAL PROTECTION OF NUCLEAR MATERIAL (CPPNM)

The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material sets safety standards as far as the international transport of nuclear material is concerned. It also has provisions including punishable offenses that the parties will commit in case they breach these standards.

- THE COMPREHENSIVE NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY (CTBT)

The Comprehensive Nuclear test Ban treaty which was signed in 1996 but has yet to enter into force. This multilateral treaty set to ban nuclear explosions, to safeguard

humans and the environment, and to take a step towards a systematic process to achieve nuclear disarmament. This treaty affirms the adherence of all states to contribute to the prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons.

- CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (CWC)

It prohibits the use and production of chemical weapons by a state. It has been signed by almost all countries except a few such as Angola, North Korea, and Somalia to name a few. This treaty urges member nations to gradually

destroy all chemical weapons and the infrastructure needed for their production. The implementing arm of this convention is the OPCW.

- BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION (BWC)

It has the same goals as the CWC, but pertains to the use and production of biological weapons. Countries like Israel, Pakistan etc., have not signed this treaty. However, unlike the CWC it does not have an organisation to monitor and verify biological weapon destruction. Therefore one can question the effectiveness of

this convention. Has this committee been forgotten?

### **Preventing Radical groups from Acquiring Arms and Related Material:**

Stripping terrorists from their arsenal of the WMDs would drastically reduce their grip on the whole world. It is true that terrorists use varied weapons like chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear. As one can imagine, it is critical to prevent terrorists from acquiring the materials used in the construction of weapons of these nature, as these cause

widespread damage than conventional firearms.

Categories :

## 1. Chemical weapons

Stopping terrorists from acquiring chemical weapons is simultaneously important yet challenging, as terrorists can use toxic industrial chemicals and other readily-obtainable chemical agents as low-cost alternatives to traditional chemical weapons.

Another challenge is halting the production and use of toxic industrial chemicals. In short, chemical terrorism can be very effective and it is very difficult to

stop terrorists from engaging with it as they easily have access to the related material. The only drawback is the storage of these weapons is extremely problematic and can also be detected.

## 2. Biological weapons

Biological weapons pose a deadly threat , as these are pathogens carried through food , air, water or even living organisms and if released they are capable of causing destruction at a massive scale ,even spreading to distant lands and people via the water bodies. Though extremely hazardous Bioterrorism may be



easier to prevent, as it requires more advanced technical skills to execute and as a result terrorists” of the street” cannot develop such weapons. The danger however is that laboratories where such substances are stored are not adequately protected and the evidence of such production programs can be hidden adequately. There are however, some dangerous pathogens, such as anthrax, are more widely available in nature and unfortunately can even be used by “amateur” terrorists.

### 3. Nuclear weapons

Nuclear weapons are the most dangerous weapons on earth and are widely recognised to pose the greatest threat to international security if they fall to terrorist hands. These weapons have the potential of destroying cities, killing millions of people, annihilating the environment and have long terms catastrophic impact on generation to come. They can provoke mass destruction not only of whole countries but also of continents. So it is imperative that all the nations cooperate with each other and focus on halting nuclear proliferation and promoting peace and security,

following the example of countries like South Africa.

The acquisition of the nuclear weapons or material (plutonium or enriched Uranium) is as difficult as it is expensive. In addition to that the infrastructure needed to produce them is not easily available. The case is different for radiological weapons where explosive mechanisms used to scatter radioactive material are accessible and can also cause serious damage.

**Direct Governmental Support to Armed Groups:**

There have been instances in the past where Governments have shown involvement and support for armed groups including those who have been known for their extreme terrorist"s activities. Generally governments align themselves with these armed groups to further their own cause which they deem fit for the progress of the nation. Most of the time the support goes out to causes where there is a similarity in the either the ideological, cultural, religious aspects. Moreover, supporting armed groups may grant them the right of controlling economy, e.g. fuel, mineral resources, trade routes.

What governments fail to anticipate is the growing power these armed groups acquire and in certain cases turn against the what they were initially fighting for.

### **Preventing Illicit Trade of WMDs:**

A possible method for terrorist acquisition of WMD is through illegal purchase from a state with access to WMD. States with WMD programs have been assigned the responsibility of non- proliferation through the treaties governing WMD. We find countries with no WMD history or advanced technology industry not concerning themselves with

the strategic and safety trade controls, however the absence of WMDs does not signify that the country is immune proliferation and trade of these weapons. The goal of implementing a Strategic trade control system is to substantially minimize the commerce of the Weapons and to create hurdles for the proliferators.

Additionally, states that sell WMD components (notably dual-use products) have, in many cases, chosen to prevent proliferation through the use of voluntary export controls, in addition to their treaty obligations. However,

there have been past instances of illicit trade.

## **Agenda 2:**

# **Demilitarisation of the Arctic**

### **Introduction:**

Until 1999, the North Pole and the major part of the Arctic Ocean had been generally considered to comprise international space, including both the waters and the sea bottom. However, both the adoption of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

as well as global climate change causing the polar ice seasonally to recede farther than expected due to global warming has prompted several countries to claim or to reinforce pre-existing claims to the waters or seabed of the polar region.

Under international law, no country currently owns the North Pole or the region of the Arctic Ocean surrounding it. The five surrounding Arctic countries, the Russian Federation, the United States (via Alaska), Canada, Norway and Denmark (via Greenland), are limited to an exclusive economic zone (EEZ) of



200 nautical miles (370 km; 230 mi) adjacent to their coasts. With the melting ice allowing for new economic and developmental opportunities, the Arctic Ocean and the surrounding region has become an increasingly sensitive zone, in terms of environmental, economic and military strategy.

The status of certain portions of the Arctic sea region is disputed for various reasons. All the Arctic States regard parts of the Arctic Ocean as their territorial waters or internal waters. There also are disputes regarding what passages constitute international seaways and rights of passage along them.

The current major challenge is to prevent an arms race in the Arctic. Despite the fact that the countries within the Arctic Circle espouse co-operative policies and practices, most of the countries have stated that they will protect their interests and are proceeding to build up their military capability.

There is a growing movement to establish the Arctic Circle as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Though both the U.S. and Russia have reduced their operations in the Arctic, they have not eliminated them. Concerns arise over the accidental deployment

of a nuclear weapon and the resultant damage.

Co-operative security measures are needed to augment the existing co-operative stewardship in the Arctic. The Arctic Council, an initiative of the Canadian Government, was established in 1996 to address issues in the region.

### **Disputes over territorial claims:**

There are ongoing disputes over the status of Hans Island, Beaufort Sea and the Northwest Passage. The United Nations Convention on the Laws of the

Sea (refer to annexure) provides an important mechanism for the resolution of disputes over maritime boundaries, including the current contentions over ownership of the continental shelf.

In 1973, Canada and Denmark negotiated the geographic coordinates of the continental shelf and settled on a delimitation treaty. It was ratified by the United Nations and has been in force since March 13, 1974. The treaty does not, however, draw a line for a distance of 875 m. Hans Island is situated in the centre of this area.

This leaves ownership of the island disputed, with claims over fishing grounds and future access to the Northwest Passage possibly at stake as well.

The dispute in the Beaufort Sea involves a wedge-shaped slice on the International Boundary, between the Canadian territory of Yukon and the American state of Alaska. The Canadian position is that the maritime boundary should follow the land boundary. The American position is that the maritime boundary should extend along a path equidistant from the coasts of the two nations. The disputed area may

hold significant hydrocarbon reserves.

Canada, the Kingdom of Denmark (via Greenland), and the Russian Federation each assert that the Lomonosov Ridge is an extension of their own continental shelf. Proof of its continuation would give the state access to the sea bed and natural resources beyond the current limits.

Canada considers the Northwest Passage to be part of its internal waters according to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The United States and most maritime nations consider it to be an international strait,

which means that foreign vessels have the right of "transit passage". In such a situation, although Canada would have the right to enact fishing and environmental regulation, and fiscal and smuggling laws, as well as laws intended for the safety of shipping, it would not have the right to close the passage.

### **Timeline:**

- (1907, 20 February): Canadian Senator Pascal Poirier proposed a resolution before the Canadian Senate to declare possession of the lands and

islands between Canada and the North Pole. He deemed the resolution necessary to protect Canada's right to the Arctic.

- (1926, 15 April): USSR Central Executive Committee issued its Arctic Decree.

In it, the USSR declared that all lands and islands, between the USSR and North Pole, were territory of the USSR. The Decree was seen as a response to previous Canadian claim to the territory between its mainland and the North Pole the previous year.

- (1969, 24 August - 14 September): US oil tanker, the



SS Manhattan, becomes the first commercial vessel to cross the Northwest Passage.

- (1973, 17 December): Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark sign and submit agreement on the delimitation of the continental shelf between Greenland and Canada to the United Nations.
- (1982, 10 December): The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) is signed and opened to ratification by States.

- (1984, 28 July): Denmark raises its national flag on the disputed Hans Island.
- (1988, 11 January): Agreement on Arctic Cooperation between Canada and the United States.
- (1994, 16 November): The UN Convention of the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) enters into force one year after its sixtieth signature.
- (1996, 19 September): The Arctic Council emerges from the Ottawa Declaration of 1996.
- (2001, 20 December): The Russian Federation delivered a

submission to the CLCS claiming that the Lomonosov Ridge was an extension of its continental shelf. Russia stood to potentially acquire nearly one-half of the Arctic Ocean, including the North Pole.

- (2007, 2 August): Russian explorers symbolically claim the North Pole by planting a titanium deep-sea flag on the seabed (14,000 feet) below the North Pole during the Arctic sea expedition.
- (2008, 28 May): The Ilulissat Declaration following a political level meeting between the five coastal States bordering the

Arctic Ocean - Canada,  
Denmark, Norway, the Russian  
Federation, and the United  
States - in Ilulissat, Greenland.

### **The Arctic Council:**

In September 1989, on the initiative of the government of Finland, officials from the eight Arctic countries met in Rovaniemi, Finland, to discuss cooperative measures to protect the Arctic environment. The initiative resulted in numerous technical and scientific reports being prepared, culminating in the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (June 1991) - a declaration on the protection of

Arctic environment. Through this cooperation the Arctic Council formed with the signing of the Ottawa Declaration on 19 September 1996 in Ottawa, Canada.

The Arctic Council member states are Canada, Denmark (Greenland and the Faroe Islands), Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, the Russian Federation, and the United States of America.

The Council does not allow nations which do not have territory in the Arctic to become members. China, India, South Korea, Japan, Singapore, and Italy have obtained observer status,

while the EU awaits the result of its application.

The Arctic Council is the only circumpolar forum for political discussions on Arctic issues involving all the Arctic states. It also functions with the active participation of its Indigenous Peoples. Arctic Council working groups document Arctic problems and challenges such as sea ice loss, glacier melting, tundra thawing, increase of mercury in food chains, and ocean acidification – processes that have a profound and direct impact on the security of the region.

Despite its potential role in regional security cooperation, the Arctic Council has limited its mandate to technical areas centered on environmental issues. At the time of the Council's creation, peace and security were deliberately omitted from its mandate in order to secure American support for the project. Today, the receding sea ice is opening up the Arctic to new security challenges, making an expansion of the Arctic's Council's mandate to include peace and security issues increasingly necessary.

## **The Arctic Five:**

The five coastal states bordering the Arctic Ocean – Canada, Denmark, Russia, U.S. and Norway – have an increasingly important role to play in the region. Close cooperation among these nations is essential in ensuring stability, peace and security in the Arctic.

In May 2008, representatives of the Arctic Five met in Ilulissat, Greenland to recommit to a common approach for adjudicating their offshore claims in the Arctic Ocean. Through the Ilulissat Declaration they restated that United Nations' "Law of the



Sea” principles would function as the foundation for the resolution of all outstanding Arctic maritime issues. At the same time, they reaffirmed their sovereignty and jurisdiction over the region.

## 1. CANADA

Canada has more Arctic land mass than any other country. This land is included within the administrative regions of Northwest Territories, Nunavut, and Yukon. Approximately 120,000 Canadians live in the Arctic. In 1880 the British government transferred to Canada the rest of its possessions in the Arctic, including "all Islands

adjacent to any such Territories" whether discovered by British or foreigners, or not yet discovered.

Canadian claims of sovereignty in the Arctic have shifted from the mainland of the north, to the Arctic Archipelago, and most recently to the marine passageways within the Archipelago. Legislation governing Arctic policy is expanding due to the opportunities opened up by the melting of Arctic summer ice.

In 2009 the Government of Canada launched the Northern Strategy, followed by the Statement on Canada's Arctic

Foreign Policy in 2010 in order to respond to the opportunities and challenges for the Arctic region. The Arctic Council continues to be the leading multilateral forum through which Canada advances its Arctic foreign policy and promotes Canadian Arctic interests internationally. In 2013, Canada will again take over the Chair of the Arctic Council.

## 2. RUSSIA

In accordance with UNCLOS, Russia submitted a claim to an extended continental shelf beyond its 200-mile (320 km) exclusive economic zone on December 20, 2001, to the UN

Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf (CLCS), claiming more than half the Arctic seabed.

Russia has plans to exploit the large offshore resource deposits in the Arctic. The Northern Sea Route is of particular importance to Russia for transportation, and the Russian Security Council is considering projects for its development.

Part of Russia's Arctic policy includes maintaining a military presence in the region. Russia says that it has military units specifically trained for Arctic combat. These include nuclear-powered icebreakers. In June

2008 the Russian Military reportedly announced that it would increase the operational radius of its Northern Fleet submarines.

### 3. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Since March 30, 1867 (when the United States purchased Alaska from the Russian Empire), the United States of America has been one of the eight Arctic nations and one of the five Arctic Ocean littoral countries.

On May 10, 2013, the Obama White House released the National Strategy for the Arctic Region, emphasizing three areas:

advancing U.S. security interests, pursuing responsible Arctic region stewardship, and strengthening international cooperation.

The United States has been a member of the Arctic Council since its inception in 1996 and assumes the Chairmanship (from Canada) in May 2015. The United States is also an observer of the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region.

#### 4. DENMARK

Denmark is an Arctic nation only because of its special relationship with Greenland and the Faroe

Islands. The Danish Constitution stipulates that the foreign and security interests for all parts of the Kingdom of Denmark are the responsibility of the Danish government.

Denmark has declared that it is a keen supporter of economic development and foreign investments in the Arctic area, but it will demand conformity to the highest environmental standards. It is of paramount importance for the governments of Denmark and Greenland that the local communities will benefit from any future activities in the

region, according to their Arctic policy.

## 5. NORWAY

Norway's Arctic territory consists of the three counties Nordland, Troms and Finnmark on the mainland, and the Svalbard archipelago and the island of Jan Mayen. Together, these areas make up almost half the Norwegian land mass and they are home to around 470 000 people or a tenth of the Norwegian population. Norway's maritime areas in the Arctic come to approximately 1 500 000 km<sup>2</sup>, which corresponds to the



combined area of France,  
Germany and Spain.

On March 12, 2009 Norway released the report “New Building Blocks in the North” which identifies seven priority areas. In the 2011 central government budget, a total of NOK 1.2 billion was set aside for initiatives in the High North, a significant portion of which was earmarked for research.