

Boston Latin School
Tufts IGL Inquiry 2018
The Future Nuclear Imperative
Simulation #1

The United Kingdom

Briefing Paper

A. Introduction

In our modern world, nuclear weaponry and its proliferation has become a major subject of discussion. From its introduction by the United States to end World War II, much debate and controversy has arisen about rights to developing weapons and restraining them.

We feel that to continue the stability of our nation, and others, that we should employ a multifaceted approach that works with the ideas of many other nations. As a nation, we are concerned with developing trends that lean towards nuclear growth and further encroachment. As we have recently faced many domestic issues, following our exit from the European Union, we would also like to focus on current political tensions. In short, we would like to see major improvements in our nation and abroad, while maintaining the currently established liberal world order.

B Key Points

We, the United Kingdom, would like to address the following issues:

- Establishing a productive balance regarding the growth of nuclear energy
- Determining alternatives to the less than lucrative nuclear weapons programs
 - Continuing guidelines set forth by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
- Regulating solutions for making the world safer, with or without nuclear weapons
- Developing agreements with countries threatening to use nuclear weaponry or start nuclear war
- Creating plans for what would happen in the event of a nuclear war and how to decrease the amount of impact on humans, the environment, and the economy that would result
- Protecting global human rights but not at the expense of other countries' sovereignty, including the UK's sovereignty.
- Finding a way to prevent future terrorist attacks through cooperation with other nations

C. Background

From its formal founding in 1801, the United Kingdom has shown its capacity to influence through its economy, industry, and culture. Under the Act of the Union, Great Britain (England, Scotland, and Wales) merged and Northern Ireland, creating what is known as the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom's founding began during the Georgian Era (1714-1837). Socially, the Georgian Era was a time of major change. At the height of the British Industrial and Agricultural Revolution urban cities featured major population growth. From 1810 to 1820, the average family size increased to five or six children. All this growth was in part due to smallpox inoculation and decreased mortality rates. Villages and rural towns began to decline as people surged to urban centers for jobs in factories and construction. All of this worked to grow the United Kingdom's (specifically Britain's) manufacturing, industrial, and energy scenes. Despite

all this growth, industry inevitably brought slow-growing class divisions, and later, under the New Poor Law of 1834, relief became more difficult to achieve.

During the early Georgian period, Britain became a major power at sea. Having possessed many colonies throughout North America, the Caribbean, and Southern/Eastern Asia, the United Kingdom dominated in shipping and trade under the English India Company. Despite losing America after its Revolutionary War, they were successful in many attacks against the French. Most notably, the victory under Wellington over Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815. Trade became carried out by private companies that were backed by naval power. Public borrowing and loans increased under the Bank of England.

Domestically, the United Kingdom began internal reforms to better the state of the nation. In 1807, the slave-trade in England was ended by the Abolition of Slave Trade Act, and in 1833 slavery was ended under the Slavery Abolition Act (excluding some East India Company territories). In 1829, the United Kingdom granted Catholic emancipation, allowing for political rights of protestant dissenters and Roman Catholics alike. The United Kingdom system of Parliament went through major reform under the Whig's Great Reform Act of 1832, seeking to ultimately to improve its current electoral system and House of Commons.

With Queen Victoria's entrance to the throne, a new era began, aptly named the Victorian Era, which lasted from 1837 to 1901. Largely left untouched by the Industrial Revolution, Ireland, between 1845 and 1847, experienced a potato famine, which decimated the population and hurt many peasants who dangerously relied on a single crop. With this came emigration of Irish Catholics to mainland Britain, Americas, and Australia. Many blamed the government, saying that the Act of Union (1801) was only created to continue the prosperity of Britain and hurt the Irish. This conflict worked its way into the political climate during Queen Victoria's lifetime. Along with this, voicings of universal suffrage began to rise during her reign. In 1884 about two-thirds of adult males could vote, which was up from the one-fifth of males allowed to vote in 1837. Later in 1918, the United Kingdom became a true democracy where universal adult male suffrage and women over 30 could vote. Women also began to play more influential roles in local governments and in local school and law boards. The era became marked with increasing representation of different types of people. Political debate in parliament and newspapers became more common and of a high order, especially seen through liberal William Gladstone and conservative Benjamin Disraeli's political duel for power.

More liberal ideas of civic engagement and pride also became a hallmark of her era. There was a lot of skepticism present, especially about the opinions of experts who wanted more involvement of the government in local issues. Many were concerned of higher taxes that would hurt small businesses and job security. In the 1860s, several organizations dedicated to charity and traditional qualities of giving formed to help some working classes. Medical advances, although relatively slow, did help. Chloroform, and anesthetic, was introduced by James Young Simpson in 1847. Antiseptics in 1869 by Joseph Lister improved hospital practices in cleanliness and sterility.

Internationally, early in Victoria's reign, the First Opium Wars, from 1839 to 1842, were fought. Britain wanted to continue the lucrative trade that was essentially destroying the Chinese political climate, people, and overall, the economy. The Chinese, denying the import of more opium, and banning the trade, were met with British military force. Using gunboat diplomacy, the Qing Dynasty signed the Treaty of Nanking, and the trade continued. Later the Second Opium War, from 1856 to 1860, continued with British dominance over opium in China. The Crimean War from 1853 to 1856 was a military conflict between the Russian Empire and the, later victorious, alliance between the British, Ottomans, French, and Sardinians. Except for this short war, there was a general peace abroad and at home. By the end of her reign, the British Empire expanded over about one-fifth of the Earth's surface. Many colonies were established with the ultimate religious goal to achieve good. Regarding Egypt, in 1875 Great Britain became the largest shareholder in the Suez Canal Company. In 1882, Britain invaded Egypt, which started the occupation of Egypt until the Suez Canal Crisis in 1956. Overall, though, the Pax Britannica (period of relative peace among the Great Powers), from 1815-1914, was a time of successful and stable foreign policy.

The end of Pax Britannica was marked with the beginning of World War I, which lasted from July 1914 to November 1918. The United Kingdom was part of the Allied Power fighting against the Central Powers of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires. To gather the troop necessary, the Royal Air Force was founded, and via conscription and volunteers, armies were raised. Although social stresses were present, much of the United Kingdom became unified for the common cause. Newspapers and other forms of media, including propaganda, served to rally the people and ensure morale. Under the Defense of the Realm Act, passed in August 1914, the government began to involve itself more in public affairs to avoid major food shortages and the lack of job security. Although the Germans did elicit air raids and attacks on the United Kingdom, the center of focus was on naval power. The British navy allowed for the maintenance of trade. The defeat of the German navy in 1916 prevented the Germans from advancing out of the North Sea. After Germany failed offensive at the Second Battle of the Marne, the Allies victory was decisive, and they could help gain back the previously invaded France and Belgium. In 1918, Germany sought for an Armistice, and in 1919 the Treaty of Versailles was signed. Although seemingly a treaty to end all wars, the resurgence of Germany before and during World War II proved otherwise.

Shortly after the war, in 1920 the League of Nations was formed. In 1921, Ireland (excluding Northern Ireland, who opted out the treaty) was granted independence under the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Despite the victory, various political, economic, and social problems arose with the United Kingdom. The Liberal Party, a formerly prominent and relevant party, gave way to internal division and ultimately declined. The Conservative Party, instead, played a successful role in established a sense of stability in the inter-war years. The United Kingdom economy was also facing major problems of debt, as the United States began to rise in wealth. Strikes and cuts in public spending, around 1922, increased, all to try to stop inflation. In 1929 when the New York Stock Exchange crashed, the United Kingdom experience the depression as well.

Britain's colonies had contributed a lot to the war effort, India, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean supplied a lot of men and money. In India, British power began to slowly erode as anti-British sentiment arose. These same feelings were common in all the colonies, but not much changed in their ruling bodies until after World War II.

With Germany's invasion of Poland, Britain and France declared war, thus beginning World War II, which lasted from 1939 to 1945. The British Commonwealth mobilized quickly to establish a force of about 15 million men and women dedicated in defeating the German, Italian, Japanese, the major Axis powers. From 1940 to 1945 Winston Churchill, the Conservative Prime Minister, worked to The Axis air forces began attacking many British holdings. The Commonwealth forces, in the meantime invaded parts of Africa and the Middle East. It relied on other countries, like the United States and Canada, for money and supplies. The Commonwealth's forces worked to hold back the Axis powers from total control over Europe, and even beyond. With the United States entrance to the war in the December of 1941, many of the pressures previously on the Commonwealth lessened. In 1942, the major British stronghold in Singapore was taken by the Japanese, a defeat Churchill saw as one of the worst disasters in British history. Withstanding these troubles, with the help of the United States, the Nazis surrendered in May 1945, and the Japanese in August 1945, officially ending the war.

The home front of Britain during World War II experienced differed from the people fighting. The war was deemed a "people's war" which worked in arousing support in its democratic aspirations. Many women were mobilized and effectively worked to ration goods, and obtaining materials, like munition and food, necessary to support the war effort. Youth also became involved through organizations, or even enlisting if above the age of 16. When faced with German bombing from 1940 to 1941, also known as the Blitz, many evacuated from major cities. Belfast, in Northern Ireland, became an essential city in producing ships, tanks, aircraft, etc., to help the war. Unemployment decreased a lot as people got jobs in factories. Belfast also was affected by the Blitz. The welfare state increased to reward those who were making sacrifices for their country.

After the war, the Labour Party gained massive support. The overall economic recovery was slow, but it gave way to more growth in the 1950s. Britain played a role against the Soviet Union in the Cold War, and helped to found NATO in 1949. The United Kingdom declined in its role as a superpower, as it gave independence to India (1947), Ghana, Malaya, Nigeria, and Kenya. From 1979 to 1990 Margaret Thatcher, a Conservative Prime Minister, became the first woman to be appointed. Called the "Iron Lady" she was known for her uncompromising politics. In 1993, the European Union was founded, of which the United Kingdom played a major role in. More recently, after a recession from 2008 to 2010, the Labour Party was defeated to usher in David Cameron. Cameron advocated for public spending cuts to reduce the budget deficit and wanted the United Kingdom to remain in the European Union. In 2016, the United Kingdom, in a narrow vote (52% wanted to leave, 48% wanted to stay), decided to leave the European Union, and Cameron resigned. In 2016, Theresa May automatically became Prime Minister by the

Conservative Party. She is still currently Prime Minister and is working to negotiate terms regarding specific details of the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union.

D. Current Issues

Sovereignty:

We feel that we must govern ourselves with our constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system. We are a country of rich history and culture and this is shown in many ways. We have ruled over many parts of the globe, but those countries have now gained independence, yet British traditions still exist. We still maintain ties with some countries we previously ruled over, which are in the commonwealth of nations. We still have a queen, however her power is limited, and now the people are at the center of our government.

While we do believe that countries have the freedom to rule independently, and according to its people and its government, there are times that we decided it was best to invade other countries. In 2003, we, along with many other countries, invaded Iraq, and this continued war in Iraq was supported by our citizens (48% of our citizens supported troops staying in Iraq). We contributed troops to this effort.

We believe that each country's sovereignty is important and is protected by the United Nations Charter. Article 2 of the Charter specifically states that "The Organization [The United Nations] is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all of its members." We believe that this specifically states that each country is sovereign and equal. These countries have important and individual rights.

The principle of Non-Intervention is that a country cannot use threats or force against another country quest for independence or territorial integrity. This principle also suggests that countries should not invade other countries in a dictatorial way. While countries can help each other, this principle states that countries can't simply take over other countries without permission. This establishes how every state has a right to sovereignty and internal ruling. We support the principle of non-intervention because it is important that each country can rule itself without fear of other countries interfering. Every country has important sovereignty that must be protected.

We believe that we need to focus on the United Kingdom's important needs and continue to work on this while still helping the international community from time to time. This is one of the many reasons that we chose to leave the European Union. The United Kingdom has the rights of an individual state and we must focus on this. Putting too much effort and money into the international community could leave independent countries financially drained and with pressing internal issues, that would have otherwise been solved.

The United Kingdom believes in international institutions providing structural support to the international community and independent states governing themselves. We, the United Kingdom, strongly support the structure that the United Nations. We have an important leadership role inside of the United Nations, as one of the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, with our current representative is Matthew Rycroft. We believe that

the Security Council, and similar groups, need to investigate situations that could potentially harm international peace. We also believe that it is important that the Security Council is empowered to suggest a solution for this potential threat and problem. We also feel it is very important that the Security Council can use military force and other means to maintain international peace and unity. We think that the Security Council is an important part of international peace and its strengths outperform what some may call its failures. While the security council is just one example of a group inside of an international organization, we find that it is important that groups like these have the power to investigate and solve threats that are potentially harmful for international peace. However, we strongly believe that countries have the right to leave such institutions at their discretion. The UK left the European Union because we felt that our economy would do well without the EU's trade policies. Security-wise, we believe international institutions are important, yet when it comes to trade countries often must carve their own path.

We, the United Kingdom, like any other reasonable state, would like to see a world with fewer nuclear weapons and a peaceful world where nuclear weapons do not threaten us all. We believe that the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty is a cornerstone for international peace and provides a good way to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons while still supporting nuclear energy and countries already having nuclear weapons. The United Kingdom is part of a group of many countries who continue to support the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty. We feel that the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty continues to strengthen international peace while supporting states' rights. We feel that if the international community wants to achieve a nuclear weapon free world we must work within the existing framework, laws, and treaties, including the Nuclear Non- Proliferation Treaty.

We believe that while countries do have the right to govern themselves, and states sovereignty is an important issue, at some point international security is more important than a singular state's needs. Countries need to take part in an international effort to protect each other and at sometimes a state's individual sovereignty will be violated in order to benefit the greater good and international order which helps all. That said, we believe trade sovereignty must take some priority in a country, and our exit from the European Union is evidence of this. We believe that the UK will succeed without the burdensome weight of many European countries, which continue to drag down the EU with their absurd debt and extremely liberal welfare policies.

We, the United Kingdom, feel that sovereignty is a complicated and nuanced issue that is not simple or easy to understand. At times, certain groups want to have more power and independence and power inside their country and at other countries want to be absorbed by other more powerful, wealthy countries. Because of this view, we feel that if a country gives up sovereignty, how much they get back is a complicated issue. Sometimes, they have completely forfeited this right, and should not be allowed to regain this. However, at other times, countries need a second chance for ruling themselves, and to deny them sovereignty is an infringement on their rights backed by multiple international institutions.

We, the United Kingdom, think that nuclear weapons play an important role in international sovereignty. As history has shown, international weapons can stop and start wars, and do play an important role in international negotiations and sovereignty, and to ignore this would be ignorant and would fail to take this important and life changing factor into account.

We, are a country that contains a powerful nuclear arsenal. However, while we do feel that this impacts how we view nuclear weapons, this does not shift us in an unfair way. We still view nuclear issues with a view that will positively impact the entire international community. We feel that the liberal world order plays a large part in the international community and sovereignty of countries. While the liberal word order is not always perfect, it continues to impact our lives and the laws of our countries.

Security:

The global security environment is not safe, because there are a lot of Nuclear weapons that pose a threat to security of every country. Recently North Korea has been testing their nuclear weapons, which mainly poses a threat to the U.S., which North Korea has threatened to bomb on many occasions. Since the U.S. is in the UN this would lead to many of its allies aiding it if it went to nuclear war against North Korea. This threatens many countries' security because nuclear war is catastrophic to civilians, the environment, and the economy. There are also many terrorists groups in countries like Syria, which poses a threat to the civilians, and has lead to many refugees, many of which have fled to countries that are not able to take in such a sudden heavy flow of people. Countries that have these terrorist groups in peril.

Our security prism is based on national security because if other parts of the world are in trouble, it doesn't mean that we are in trouble. Our security is mostly determined on what happens inside our country. The only case in which our security prism would be based on global security is if our allies had threats against them and it affected us. More nuclear weapons means there will be a bigger threat to global security, and a greater chance of a country starting nuclear war. The most significant nuclear threat is the fact that nuclear wars could totally obliterate countries. The UK is a nuclear state, we have about 215 thermonuclear warheads, of which about 120 are operational. The Trident nuclear programme is the only operational nuclear weapons system in British service. Having Nuclear weapons has allowed the discussion of classified scientific data between us and the U.S., as well as cooperation regarding nuclear security matters. We view the current nuclear dilemma of North Korea as dangerous to global security. North Korea's recent nuclear missile tests threaten the security of the U.S. and its allies like us. The nuclear dilemma of Iran will make global security more secure. Iran reducing its nuclear weapons will decrease the number of nuclear weapons in the world therefore making it safer. The nuclear dilemma of India-Pakistan will be very dangerous toward global security, because if they start nuclear war it would be disastrous for both countries, and due to the amount of previous wars and skirmishes this is incredibly likely. The environmental, economic, and human damages would be very severe between both countries, and any other country that could potentially become involved in the war. This would threaten global security as many countries

would be unsafe. Mutually assured destruction and brinkmanship are at play. When both countries at war are nuclear countries then there is a strong chance that they will each use nuclear weapons against each other causing their mutual destruction. This is very dangerous because it will be disastrous for both countries and heavily impact our global population. Brinkmanship is also at play because many countries have been testing the limits in nuclear weapons without assuring total destruction of a country.

Mutually assured destruction in the Cold War was used to convince the United States and the Soviet Union not to attack each other, because it would result in their total destruction. Both had to hold back for fear of retaliation by the other, and avoided pushing each other to the limit. Today since we have developed better military technology a country may be able to completely destroy its enemy and render them unable to strike back, which eliminates the power of MAD. This is very dangerous because it would allow a country to strike another without immediate consequences. If a country can obliterate another in one hit, there is no need for concern that they will do the same to you. The rapid speed that our military technology is developing at poses a huge threat to global security. First-strike capability is a country with nuclear power's ability to defeat another country with nuclear power by destroying its arsenal, leaving the country unable to continue war, and allowing the attacking country to survive the weak retaliation. A limited nuclear war is a war with small-scale use of nuclear weaponry, by two or more nations involved in said war. If there was a nuclear strike on the Korean peninsula many people would die. The nuclear strike would also deplete many of their resources which would hurt the economy and put the Korean peninsula into a depression. Their environment would be totally destroyed, there would be a lot of nuclear waste, and radiation exposure would cause a rise in cancer rates among survivors and their children. It is not possible for an individual country to contend with these security challenges on its own because it is a global effort. In order to deal with these security threats, we need to eliminate nuclear weapons, and one country can't do that on its own, a mutual trust and agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons everywhere internationally is the best way to eliminate this threat. Even without entirely removing nuclear weapons the matter of nuclear security is an international issue, as the range and capability of these weapons can have massive effect spanning the borders of just one country.

The government and its willingness to be a part of the international community affects the threat a nuclear state poses. Countries that are a part of the international community would face a greater loss, as they would lose allies and likely damage their economy. If the government is isolated from the international community they likely do not value cooperation and do not depend on others to boost their economy. It is more dangerous for them to have nuclear weapons because they could easily use them against us, with the only consequence being the possibility of starting wars.

South Africa built six nuclear weapons and then dismantled them to show that they have the power to have these powerful weapons, but that they are unnecessary. Doing so showed their desire for peace. Other countries can do this too. The U.S. has asked North Korea to dismantle their nuclear weapons, but they refuse. It seems very unlikely that other countries would

dismantle their nuclear weapons, but it is possible, and there haven't been any negative effects. Nuclear weapons are not the key to international stability. Nuclear weapons have the power to destroy entire countries. There is no reason to have to destroy an entire country to ensure your safety. Nuclear weapons are only seen as the key to stability because if you have them no one will mess with you out of fear, but at this point everyone has them. Nuclear war could lead to the destruction of entire countries, ecosystems, and international economy. You can have a reasonable military with reasonable weaponry to ensure your international stability without nuclear weapons. The only reason for having nuclear weapons is to defend oneself against other countries that have them as well, so once we can achieve some level of cooperation from potential threats they will no longer be needed.

Diplomacy:

We strongly believe that there is no reason that any country other than those pre-determined to have nuclear weapons, should have access to any. This being to preserve existing world order and the strength of countries who rely on their nuclear weapons for safety. Nuclear weapons should be legal and decided among a country themselves and surrounding countries. If there was a country who help power wrongfully, it would create a surge for power that is unnecessary and damaging to the existing nuclear world order. Nuclear weapons should only belong to countries that have a serious need and those who can use them under only completely necessary situations. If this weaponry was to fall into the wrong hands, the world wouldn't be the same.

We have Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service that employs English residents and deals with foreign affairs, rather than Home Civil Service which deals with domestic affairs. We strongly believe that we should look at all situations from all perspectives to let us see all sides. We the UK would much rather lean toward diplomatic solutions to security problems rather than by force, to a certain extent. We would, however, if we feel the need, pursue with force if it comes down to it. If the we, the United Kingdom, were ever attacked or threatened we would take any precautions to ensure the safety of all our people. Although, we wouldn't believe this would ever happen, it is necessary to know this.

We are one of the five countries under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as well as being permanent members on the United Nations Security Council. We strongly believe that countries not recognized as "Nuclear Weapon States" should not have access to Nuclear Weapons. We partner with the United States to "exchange [of] classified scientific data and materials such as plutonium", and work hard to make sure the power of nuclear weapons don't get into the wrong hands. We have also partnered with the United States by helping them carry out the Manhattan Project and have held conferences together concerning nuclear weapons and their creation.

We have a public view against our possession of nuclear weapons, that include the anti-nuclear movement. This movement was the public protest and demonstrations against the country have position of nuclear weapons. The public was especially alarmed when the government wanted

to replace the Trident system with a “newer model”. The Trident system was a series of submarines equipped with missiles that were “nuclear-tipped” and were designed for the Cold War. We also have a Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament (CND) where tens of thousands of people took part in multiple day protests and marches across the U.K.

We believe that nuclear power shouldn't be handled and decided by one country or even five countries, we believe that there should be a unanimous decision as how to handle the problem at hand and how to find a viable solution that pleases all parties involved.

Currently the UK has a mass of “215 thermonuclear warheads, of which 120 were operational [...] and the Trident nuclear programme has been the only operational nuclear weapons system in British service”.

A rogue state is defined “a nation or state regarded as breaking international law and posing a threat to the security of other nations” therefore causing other countries to worry and struggle. We believe by the Non-Proliferation act that any rogue country with the possession of any nuclear weapons should be punished by the United Nations. We firmly believe that these weapons of mass destruction shouldn't fall into the wrong hands.

We support the idea of Global Zero and think that the idea of a world without nuclear weapons is a great one. If the world had no nuclear weapons there wouldn't be a struggle to balance power and fighting with explosives about potentially blowing up a country. Although we do believe the idea of a world with no weapons of mass destruction is the eventual goal, at the moment, if one country has nuclear weapons, those with legitimacy for nuclear weapons should have them, for protection in any scenario or situation that might force the country to use them. The sad reality is, if there are no weapons, there should be none, but if there is one country with these weapons, then others should be armed.

Unilateral disarmament is overall a good idea, but as previously stated, the UK firmly believes that if there is even one country with any kind of nuclear weapon, we would want to have the power as well, to protect ourselves and to be ready for any position we are put in. Therefore it's all (with exceptions deemed by countries) or nothing.

We, the United Kingdom, believe that the current liberal world order is fair to all countries. We believe that all countries have a say in how the liberal world order affects them and how suppressed countries or even world super powers should be treated. We believe that the liberal world order was created to maintain lasting peace between nations and parts of the globe to ensure the stability and the goodwill of all people.

Our country's diplomatic position on the proliferation of nuclear weapons is that any war state should not have access to weapons. If any country gives their nuclear powers to states that don't need or shouldn't have the weapons, there would be a big disruption in the current liberal world order. The world order that is preexisting has created some long term peace and consistently maintained the well-being of some countries. We are part of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons as well as part of all of the major WMD nonproliferation treaties and international export control regimes.

Today's balance of power is difficult to explain. For one, there are nations with the capacity to destroy countries, and nations that possess weapons to protect them from those countries. Looking at the Middle East, Korean Peninsula, and South Asia, the countries with nuclear powers such as North Korea, China, Russia, Pakistan, Israel, we see that if any country that was an enemy to the states countries gained nuclear weapons, there would be a race for the nuclear power. For example, if Iran accessed nuclear weapons, there would be a nuclear arms race, starting with Saudi Arabia, Iran's chief regional rival. All in all, we believe that the nuclear world power could never really be perfect and that there will always be a power struggle form countries not possessing the powers or even countries who do have them and are potentially planning on using them and how these situations could play out.

Unilateralism is the best approach as to how to handle the current world nuclear topic. We believe that if all countries, those who do and don't have nuclear weapons, should come to a unanimous decision, if any, concerning how to handle the weapons of mass destruction in the world. We would even be able to agree on multilateralism as a way to handle the nuclear world powers.

Terrorism:

We face threats of internal and foreign terrorism. Internally, we are most affected by the Continuity Irish Republican Army (CIRA) and the Real Irish Republican Army (RIRA). Both terrorist groups aim to unify Ireland and to disrupt our governance of Northern Ireland. The Real Irish Republican Army frequently employs violence in their attempts to delegitimize and remove our rule over Northern Ireland. Both extremist groups carry out small-scale bombings, shootings, and robberies amongst other forms of political violence against our state. From foreign organizations, we are most threatened by the Islamic State of Iraq and Levant (ISIL). ISIL's main goals regarding our country are to gain more support from our citizens and to destabilize our economy.

Within our borders we face threats that pertain to our own security and borders rather than those of countries around the world. Both the CIRA and RIRA threaten our national sovereignty over Northern Ireland. The CIRA and RIRA threaten the security of our people as they have resorted to the use of violence with bombings, shootings, and other forms of violence that directly affect the lives of our citizens. To ensure the safety and prosperity of our people, we would like to see these threats diminished if not removed entirely.

Nuclear terrorism is a concern for our country, as the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) has been actively seeking to acquire nuclear weapons to use against us to incite terror and unrest. Nuclear weapons would release vast amounts of explosive energy, resulting in radiation and long-term environmental damage.

We would define the current world order as successful on basic indicators such as architecture, law, and values. Despite the successes we've had, we are still concerned about resurgent nationalism, the US retreating from the liberal world order, and the migration crisis. We would say that the current world order as not equipped to deal with the problems of the

modern age unless we have a shared commitment to reward cooperation and negotiation and to punish aggression and hostility.

The current world order is adaptable to contending with non-state actors, which are new and emerging threats to it. Non-state actors like ISIL serve as a challenge, and require cooperation from multiple states and negotiation on how to contend with them.

Terrorism is a great threat to the current world order, but the world order is adaptable to contending with it because the world order is not broken, and states will be able to combat terrorism if we all remain cooperative and work towards a collective goal, which is ending terrorism.

The nuclear black markets are forums where nuclear weapons or materials are exchanged illegally, which can be accessed by anyone who has an Internet connection. Our country has been implicated in the black market, which is proven by recent terrorist attacks, but we are working on investigating it and combating those who participate in the nuclear black market with the intent to cause terror.

The incentives behind those who sell nuclear materials and technology are to profit off of them and to cause terror in different states. We will remain committed to the long term goal of a world without nuclear weapons, as nuclear weapons are used to cause violence and intimidation.

A flaw is that there are no active deterrents for countries to abide by the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), which was evident when North Korea withdrew from the NPT. The non-proliferation regime also doesn't define a set timeline for states holding nuclear weapons to get rid of them, and doesn't have penalties for missing deadlines.

The enforcement mechanisms for the NPT are not sufficient, which is highlighted by the current defiance of states like North Korea and Iran. The NPT has been ineffective in establishing a consistent and forceful system for preventing nuclear proliferation. Future efforts should promote stronger consensus among participating states and uniform mechanisms for addressing those who do not abide by the NPT.

In open societies, we believe that there should be little to no risk of terrorism. Open societies have a flexible structure and a wide dissemination of information that would be greatly affected if there was a high risk of terrorism.

The threat of terrorism affects more democratic societies than authoritarian societies. Democracies are vulnerable because they allow room for free speech and greater protection of human rights, which terrorists choose to target because they know that they can cause terror and protest more easily in these societies. Terrorist groups wish to gain support from citizens, which is more easily done in democratic societies.

The threat of nuclear terrorism is a transnational and domestic issue that affects everyone in the world. Nuclear weapons have the power to destroy the world in a span of minutes. We therefore believe that it is vital that both the military and intelligence agencies work to fight issues of terrorism, particularly those concerning potential nuclear power. It is our belief that if intelligence agencies are constantly researching possible terrorist threats they may be able to prevent an attack from happening.

Climate/Energy:

We, the United Kingdom, believe that climate change is an issue that countries all over the world are affected by and should be working to prevent. We are worried about what this problem could mean for this planet and the people who live on it. Evidence of climate change and its impact can be seen in air pollution, flooding, droughts, and extreme weather. There are consequences caused by the change in climate that can't be reversed like extinction, but we should continue to prevent climate change to keep it from happening more. This is a real problem caused by the actions of humans and can't just be ignored. In the United Kingdom, we've seen a pattern of severely destructive floods, and we will continue to see the risk worsen if this issue isn't fixed. Marine life could also be put at risk because of a recent wind boom on the offshores. Fishermen have seen increases in the temperature of the water and the hard winds they saw before aren't there anymore. We also noticed that some bird species' migration and egg laying pattern are different. The temperature in the UK has increased and birds have responded by leaving earlier or later. If we don't start reversing this, many lives will be impacted negatively.

The United Kingdom has taken steps to help reverse the harm that climate change has caused. The United Kingdom is part of the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and Paris agreement. In 2016, our carbon emissions have dropped by 42% less than they were in 1990. Our target for 2050 is to reduce carbon emissions by at least 80% of the amount in 1990. We want to make sure this happens by setting 5-yearly carbon budgets that restrict the amount of greenhouse gas that can be emitted. The first two goals have been accomplished and we will strive to outperform on the next three. This has helped reduce our energy by 17% between 1998 and 2015. We have seen the effects of climate change and would like to try and reverse some of the damage that has already been made by reducing our carbon emissions and using more energy from renewable sources.

We are dependent on imported energy from other countries. Crude oil, natural gas, and petroleum are our main sources of energy. More than 20% of the United Kingdom's electricity is produced by renewable technologies and this amount has been increasing. Most of our energy is imported from the European Union. The main types of fuel we use are gas, petroleum, and electricity. Our reliance on foreign sources of energy has increased and peaked in 2013, but has been slowly falling. We are the 12th most dependent on imported energy out of the 28 European Union. Crude oil and natural gas are imported mainly from Norway because of the underwater pipeline network connecting us. We've had to import most of our petroleum from Russia after the miners' strike.

Nuclear energy plays an important role in our country, with almost a quarter of the United Kingdom's energy comes from nuclear energy produced by 15 operational generators at nine plants. This nuclear energy currently generates 21% of our electricity and is projected to increase. Most of our older nuclear plants will be decommissioned by 2030, adding to the 11

already retired because of their 30-year lifespan, but we have agreed to replace them by building a new generation of nuclear reactors. Energy Companies plan to invest £70 billion in new nuclear power plants, creating 19GW of nuclear power capacity.

We independently create and test nuclear weapons. Our nuclear program began in April of 1940 and we tested our first nuclear weapon during October of 1952 in Australia. A lot of nuclear waste is produced by these 2 industries and much of it will stay hazardous for hundreds of thousands of years. We are working on a long-term solution that is better than burying it deep underground. Although nuclear reactors don't directly produce carbon dioxide emissions, high amounts of energy are needed for building and operating them. The United Kingdom is not the only country impacted by this. Many countries with nuclear energy plants have also suffered from the environmental consequences. One concern is the dangers of radioactive waste. Nuclear power plant accidents are rare, but they do happen, especially in the U.S and Japan.

We feel that nuclear energy plays an essential role in powering our country, and others. Currently, twenty-one percent of our electricity is generated by fifteen reactors. This having been said, we do have concerns about how nuclear energy may be used for violent reasons. We suggest more international organizations focus on the specific development of nuclear technologies worldwide, as to ensure no essential information is being spread to potential terrorist civilian or military organizations. Countries seeking to mine plutonium or uranium for "peaceful" purposes should ensure the international community that they will securely keep any sensitive material away from black-market vendors, weapon programs, or terrorist organizations. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of which, we have signed, we feel is a step in the proper direction. Its main objective of preventing "the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, [promoting] cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and [furthering] the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament" is in line with our beliefs as an already developed nation. The ideologies of non-signatories is concerning, and we definitely feel that more oversight is necessary to prevent future nuclear conflicts. The NPT, currently, does provide moderate safeguard against such conflicts, but we suggest further guidelines be implemented. This is because we fear the increased presence of weapons that could easily destroy large areas of countries, or even possibly the planet. Proliferation of such technology should not be necessary by other countries.

Human caused global climate change remains at the forefront of our policy and ideologies. We recognize the likely and damaging repercussions of climate change, and have worked to create policy to reduce and mitigate some of our current issues. This includes the Climate Change and Sustainability Act of 2006, Climate Change Act of 2008, and the London Green500, all to reduce harmful emissions. Specifically, regarding nuclear energy, we feel that it is nuclear energy is extremely useful to our energy security and plays a large part in reducing emissions. Through our New-Build Plan, we have discussed increasing our nuclear energy sources, mainly to make a switch to greener sources of energy.

We feel that the current world order allows a variety of countries, developed and developing, to have access to nuclear energy. Definitely, we notice some correlation between

countries having nuclear energy and having nuclear weaponry, ourselves included. Many who have the necessary resources and infrastructure to build and finance nuclear power plants have already begun to take active steps in planning nuclear energy. Those who do not currently have nuclear energy are still able to produce energy, mainly by bypassing systems of non-renewable energy. These countries should continue their development, trying to avoid unstable sources of energy.

If the United States of America provides critical training in nuclear security, trade, and standards, it should not give it extra privileges to say what other countries should and should not do. We, the United Kingdom, believe that there should instead be a coalition of countries that work on helping many nations looking to develop nuclear energy. We encourage the investment of any other countries into alternative sources of energy, including, but not limited to, solar (and its encompassing forms), geothermal, wind, tidal, hydropower. With the current lack of beneficial understanding about energy, in the United States, we believe it is best to not have a single country dictating contrasting ideologies. The United States also needs to work on their own development of nuclear energy standards.

If the United States decided to step back from its work in security, trade, and standards, we feel that we could work with the United Nations to fulfill the role. Specifically, we advocate for a plan combining the backgrounds of several countries with and without nuclear energy. We feel that, overall, to improve we need to understand several different points of view. Without learning from the mistakes and successes of others, we are not functioning in the most efficient ways. There is no growth without the presence of positive change.

Economy:

The majority of our economy rests on our service sector, providing 80% of our GDP. London stand, at the moment, most successful in terms of our final services industry. The final 20% of our economy is centered around oil and gas production, through varied sustainable and non-sustainable practices. We gain our oil through Natural Sea, boosting our economy enough to stand second in the world in gross domestic product. These industries have allowed the UK to expand into Aerospace technology, become a leader in pharmaceuticals, lead by Britain and London respectively. On account of our success in services and production we do not rely on agriculture, which can be unstable and unpredictable. The UK has created a successful and stable economy, leading us to becoming a world leader and a world power.

We stand as a leading producer in nuclear energy, being the first nation to boast a commercialized nuclear power reactor. We produce an average of 336 terawatt hours of energy each year, and 21% of that energy is produced nuclear in our 15 operable nuclear power plants. We aim to have, by 2030 31% of our energy produced from nuclear energy, cutting down significantly in our own carbon emissions. 2030 will also be marked by a total of 19 nuclear power plants, 16 of which will be able to run without foreign equity. Currently we also have energy connection with France, Belgium, and Scotland providing a total of 3400 MW of nuclear energy to joined peoples. Nuclear energy provides a significant contribution to our economy,

actively pulling away from oil and gas, and instead creating to a more sustainable, clean nation, proving ourselves as one of several world leaders of clean energy and stable economy.

As of 1958 we have taken part in the US-UK Mutual Defense Agreement with the United States, participating in the trade of data and materials concerning nuclear weaponry, and we also stand as a member of the United Nations Security Council along with the US, China, France, and Russia. Along with these two we also stand in the NPT to fairly trade and monitor the use of nuclear weaponry and energy. While we do possess nuclear weapons, we are making an active effort in continuing to cut down. By 2020 we plan to have brought our weapons from 215 warheads, of which only 120 are operational, to 180 total, honoring our own goal for global change. The UK stands as a leader in the control and regulation of nuclear weaponry, and we will continue to stand as models for the goal of a nuclear weapon free world. On account of this, nuclear weaponry has very little impact on our economy, other than trade with the US, our main trading partner.

We as a nation are seeking to increase our use of nuclear energy to fuel our energy needs and demands. Nuclear weaponry on the other hand is something we have made an active effort to cut down on. We take part in multiple treaties and agreements to enforce a limitation on nuclear weaponry in other countries, as well as regulating our own. Our aim is to stand as a world leader in clean energy, and global safety. In honouring our own goal we have, and will continue to make active efforts in ending reliance on coal, and eliminating nuclear weaponry.

With the production of nuclear weapons, an increase in the number of jobs would occur, which would obviously boost our economy. However, a nuclear weapons industry requires a very specialized workforce. Although this is hard to achieve, having a skilled workforce would benefit the economy even if the nuclear weapons industry fails. With this said, although there are many benefits of having a nuclear weapons industry, economic or otherwise, we don't condone their usage.

We ourselves are a Nuclear Weapon State (NWS) and are actively undergoing the process of disarming our nuclear arsenal. With that said, we would actively support international sanctions on any country who would violate the NPT. For example, in the case of North Korea, we've actively supported sanctions against them when they initiated their nuclear program. Currently we have an arms embargo against North Korea, and we would be willing to impose sanctions on other countries.

If we violate any of the agreements reached during the transition period of Brexit, which we haven't done, we would be sanctioned by the European Nation. Otherwise, we don't have any major recent economic sanctions imposed upon us. In the case of North Korea, international sanctions are definitely decreasing the funding spent towards the nuclear program. With that said, we are willing to impose additional sanctions on other countries because of their effectiveness on nuclear threats.

We do support the NPT. While still maintaining an arsenal of nuclear weapons, it is our belief that nuclear disarmament is the best solution for preventing a global nuclear war. We therefore support the NPT and its goals, while still keeping a small nuclear warhead stock for the

worst of possible emergencies (our nuclear arsenal includes 215 thermonuclear warheads, but only 120 of them (56%) are operational). Our economic sectors would be damaged severely by a terrorist or nuclear attack, particularly on our soil. However, our new exit from the European Union would prevent even further economic repercussions from an attack on Europe.

An attack within our borders would obviously devastate our country. However, it would have long-lasting repercussions on the global economy (with us being the world's 5th-largest economy). Our main exports include industrial chemicals and mechanical machinery, and, although defense spending accounts for only 1.8 percent of our GDP, we would probably focus more of our efforts on defense spending. We would also call on our allies, along with NATO, to help with the recovery effort depending on the scale of the attack.

One staple of our procedures includes a letter of last resort. Written by the Prime Minister, it is not to be revealed unless a nuclear Armageddon is imminent or undergoing. We additionally set up bunkers such as Pindar in London that are designed for the continuation of government in the event of an attack. If another country were to use nuclear weapons, we would join the rest of the world in condemnation, and a global conflict would probably be inevitable by that point. However, the Cold War is over, and, as of now, nuclear proliferation is not on our National Risk Register

We would most definitely institute sanctions on the country(s) who used nuclear weapons in such an event. We would try to consolidate our assets and prevent a global panic and collapse of global world trade. As much as we would try to do, we would need the help and cooperation of some of our largest trading partners such as the United States. Even so, it would be hard to prevent a devastating economic event, as developed countries with access to nuclear weapons will most likely be the victims and aggressors.

Disaster Preparedness:

We, the United Kingdom, have historically been a global center of political discussion, empowerment under the law, and a driving force for change. As a collection of nations, we strive to react to any outside force, be it natural or of human doing, with the collective effort of both our governing bodies and our citizens. Through our bond, and our undying pacts with fellow global influencers, we work to reach the overarching goal of global peace and global prosperity. As of recent, our efforts have sparked some opposition, and have granted our presence in this conference.

Through our participation, we wish to elaborate on our goals, educate other nations on disaster precautionary measures, and re-establish connections with fellow nations. Following our wave of civil disputes, and political fragmentation, we now find ourselves able to rebrand ourselves, and reconsider our global standings. We wholeheartedly believe that this cause constitutes the combined efforts of many different nations, of many different backgrounds, and many different abilities, and therefore, we do not wish to tread on alone. In the following passages, we will outline our intentions, our actions, and plans in regard to disaster preparedness. We will assume the worst, and act accordingly, putting the wellbeing of our people as top

priority. If anything were to compromise this, they will face the combined force of the UK, and all that support us. This is your opportunity to reconsider your global standings. The UK has often been synonymous with other world leaders, such as the United States, and nations within the framework of the European Union (EU). However, as of recent, we have prioritized the well being of our people, and in turn, have ceased to unconditionally support mentioned nations.

This is not to say that we will not stand with these nations if the circumstances warranted our help, but rather, when deciding whether to become involved, we will consider the initiative, the willingness of our state to participate, and the actions leading up to the conflicts. Today, facing the overarching threat of a disastrous attack, we openly cooperate with mentioned nations in order to coherently guarantee optimal security. We have developed a holistic viewpoint of the global model, and will remain to it for decades to come.

Now as a more removed collective force, we do not have a direct voice in the endeavors of the setters of the framework by which the world's major influencers conduct, but as a present nation in general world affairs, we do have much influence in how security related matters are carried out, particularly with synthetic and natural disasters of mass destruction. We wish to set the bar for precautionary measures taken, and increased proactive political measures taken in order to prevent these disastrous activities.

In the face of a nuclear attack, we will allocate preferably the current prime minister, and if not, any political administrator, to one of the four designated nuclear submarines, and from there assess the situation. If London were to fall, along with the governing body, an issued final decree will be instituted, and the people will be expected to be fully cooperative with our aligned motives and actions. We will also expect respective communal leaders to assume temporary leadership positions, delegating as seems fit. Depending on the situation, our response agencies will be deployed, to maintain peace and sustenance within the populous. The government, if fully able to, will actively assist the populous with food and enemies. As stated as a classification of proactive activity in our government website, *direction* is of utmost significance, along with recurring themes such as *information*, *anticipation*, *cooperation*, and *continuity*. The demand for these guidelines emerged in 1980, in regards to the prevalent threat of a Soviet Union missile attack, and we answered to it, issuing booklets to be delivered to every citizen. However, a threat that is still present and unaddressed is the *potential danger of radiation* as a result of the nuclear attack. Ecologically speaking, this will have a profound effect on the quality of our water and crops. We have taken measures to stockpile non-perishable foods, and have allocated a federal funding of 308 million dollars to radiation research, and precautionary measures. We would like to draw inspiration from other nations who have successfully been able to address this underlying issue, as we recognize that this is the extent to which the health of the entire world may be put in critical danger. We will attempt to bring our ideas to the table, as we encourage other nations to take part in the discussion of global health, and the possible effects of nuclear warfare on the standard of global health.

In the face of such a catastrophe, complementing our physical booklet directions are procedures that can be accessed from our multi-national, government run website, or from any

media outlet, 4 minutes prior to any presumed attack. If all goes accordingly, all of our citizens will be accounted for, and in an optimal position to remain secure during such events. Following our wave of social opinion, we have opted to cater to our populous, and to focus primarily on the well being of our political estate before any other. If an allied nation calls for our aid, we will limit the use of our own resources to only the recovery and reconstruction of that targeted nation, and we will not engage in any retaliation. We will do everything and anything in our power to ensure that we will always be accounted for, and will take precautionary measures to ensure that we are never stretched too thin. Our domestic humanitarian efforts and investments are prioritized over international investments, including disaster preparedness.

The UK has a history of maximum accommodation of refugees with the compromise of our people's safety. Considering the most recent aerial attacks in Syria, we recognize that region as a possible future strike zone, and have already taken action, accepting 1,000 Syrian refugees, and promising to accommodate 19,000 more by 2020. Since 2012, we have invested 1.1 billion pounds (1.5 billion U.S.D) in international refugee wellness, and we encourage other nations with the necessary resources, to invest as well, without compromising the wellbeing of their state and their national security. Currently, we have approximately 118,000 refugees living productive lives in the UK, and a 45% accommodation rate.

As a founding member of the United Nations, we defaultly accede to the international laws mandated by HIAS and our Commissioner for Refugees, with the international laws being international resettlement quotas, protection for the most vulnerable, child protection, and international funding. Considering our harmony with our populace, and the common culture driven by our governing body to aid when it is possible, this would not pose a challenge to our government, and has yet to pose a challenge to our government. Because of the necessary costs, our citizens as a holistic model would do their part to fund these programs, contributing through taxes. If the populace were to revert to any social modes of defiance against our government, as a representative government, we would adhere to them, prioritizing the solidity of our nation over all else, and better putting us in a position to help others in the future.

All in all, the UK has taken proactive measures to limit damage caused by disasters (namely nuclear attacks), and will continue to do so. Our citizens play an active role in our governance, and we are opting to change with the tides as well. As we stand today, we are a main contributor to efforts established by the United Nations, and will continue to abide by international laws, as well as invest in these initiatives. We pride ourselves in being able to accommodate thousands of refugees, and we look forward to accommodating victims of nuclear warfare, should there be nuclear attacks soon. We are evolving, and we encourage those around us to evolve to. Through negotiation, we hope to achieve a shared vision of the global agenda for the next decade, in regard to disaster preparedness.