

Dear Delegate,

First, I would like to welcome you to WASMUN 2001! We look forward to working with you throughout the coming months. This is a wonderful opportunity not only to meet other students with similar interests and create new friendships, but also to develop skills such as public speaking, debate, writing, and research. You will take many lessons away from this conference in April, but most importantly, you will have stepped into another's place, viewed the world from their eyes, represented that point of view, and understood what it means to be an ambassador, a global citizen, and most of all, human.

Now, I would like to introduce your Moderator, Secretary, and Chair.

*Moderator- Wendi Cram, wlc7@u.washington.edu*

Wendi is completing her first full and last year, at the University of Washington where her major is European Studies. Her language focus is German. She earned her Associates Degree from Pierce College before attending the University of San Diego in California and then returning to the University of Washington. She is scheduled to graduate this summer.

*Secretary- Nicole Porter, portnick@yahoo.com*

Nicole is an Honors student in the Sociology Department. She is focusing on Globalization and Social Change. She is also an officer for Campus Crusade for Christ.

*Chair- Meghann Rother, mgrother@yahoo.com*

I am a senior at the University of Washington studying Political Science with a focus on International Relations and European Studies. My particular area of interest has to do with security and defense issues. I've just returned from four months abroad, three spent in London working for the British Mission to the United Nations and the fourth working as a volunteer in a Refugee Camp. I grew up all over the States, my Father is in the Navy, but Seattle is home for now. I hope to graduate in June.

Again, we look forward to meeting and working with you over the next few months. If you have any questions or concerns feel free to contact any of us via email. Information is also available at [www.wasmun.com](http://www.wasmun.com)

Sincerely,

Meghann Rother  
Chair

General Assembly- Nuclear Disarmament & Chemical and Biological Weapons  
WASMUN 2002

## **History & Overview of the Committee**

The United Nations, established in 1945, was and is committed to preserving peace through international cooperation and collective security. Initially, the United Nations had fifty-one members, but now boasts 189. Once a member of the United Nations a nation agrees to follow the United Nations Charter, which lays out certain standards and rules in international relations; among these the United Nations maintains four purposes: to maintain international peace and security, to promote friendly relations between nations, cooperation in solving international problems and promoting human rights, as well as acting as a center for harmonizing the actions of nations. The United Nations is not a world government, all member nations are sovereign, or independent self-governing nations. The laws and treaties set out by the United Nations are merely guidelines.

The United Nations contains six main organizations within itself: the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the Secretariat, the General Assembly- all of the above are based in New York, and the International Court of Justice- based in The Hague, Netherlands.

All member states of the United Nations are represented in the General Assembly, which acts as a sort of parliament. Each country has a vote. The General Assembly is considering over 170 topics for the 2001/2002 session and will meet from September to December, with the exception of emergency meetings. When not in session, work is carried out by the six committees mentioned above as well as by other bodies in the Secretariat.

The United Nations has long served as an international forum for disarmament and other weapons issues. This committee, designated by the General Assembly, serves as a forum for this special purpose. As a venue for negotiations, in particular those at the Conference on Disarmament, various agreements have been established such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968), the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (1996) which will be referred to as the CTBT hereon out, and those treaties establishing nuclear free zones. Treaties discussed here are not limited to nuclear arms. In 1992 the development, production and stockpiling of chemical weapons was prohibited. Bacteriological weapons were banned in 1972, nuclear weapons were banned from the seabed and ocean floor in 1971 and from outer-space in 1967. The Ottawa Convention of 1997 banned landmines and was ratified by more than 100 nations. The United Nations encourages all nations to adhere to these treaties and agreements and has also begun to extend its efforts to small arms and lightweight weapons in 2001.

## **Topic I: Nuclear Disarmament**

### ***Statement of the problem***

The progress of nuclear disarmament has been excruciatingly slow, but there is hope especially with the extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), entry into the START I Treaty, and the beginnings of START II and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). These agreements and the discussions that accompany them serve as evidence that constructive progress towards nuclear disarmament is being made.

Certain audiences' disdain for nuclear weapons has been kept alive by prominent Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) campaigns over the years; these campaigns also reflect the policies of many non-nuclear states. Pressure from the public and these other states spurred nuclear states, especially the United States, to propose nuclear reductions incrementally. The United States is often held the most responsible for the nuclear arms race. As the Cold War faded, the reasons for nuclear weapons became less and less justified helping the cause of nuclear disarmament. The hope is that the incremental reduction of nuclear weapons, which will reduce the chance of accidental launch, surprise attack and theft, will open a discussion for the complete elimination of nuclear arsenals in their entirety. Certain developments, however, have further delayed this possibility.

The failure of nuclear states to eliminate their arsenals will most likely result in the passing of nuclear weapons to other nations. If these states maintain their position that nuclear weapons are necessary to preserve their security, it is logical that nations who are less powerful militarily will decide weapons of mass destruction are a mandatory necessity to their security also. With an increase in the number of nuclear arms, as well as the current level, there is always the threat of nuclear terrorism. Should the weapons themselves, or even the materials for the weapons, be obtained by criminals or terrorists the results would be horrendous. The culprits would be difficult to retaliate against as well as difficult to locate. Nuclear accidents also loom large. The accidental launch or miscalculation could have horrific results.

Nuclear weapons, some argue, are equivalent to mass murder. The use of these weapons is arguably highly immoral because the security of a nation in the event of use would come at the cost of hundreds of millions of lives. This policy is called *nuclear deterrence*. Nuclear weapons are also said to undermine democracy by placing the power individuals to destroy the world in the hands of a select few.

The elimination of weapons of mass destruction faces certain difficulties. American military dominance acts as an obstacle for nuclear disarmament as other great powers are unlikely to relinquish their arsenals because doing so, would only strengthen the United States' grasp. The American government also plays on its public's fear of attack justifying the maintenance of a nuclear force. Failure of the United States to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty has also hindered the process of nuclear disarmament.

### ***History of the problem***

As the Cold War faded into history, the nuclear arms race became unjustifiable. The movement for nuclear disarmament was first set into motion by the proposition of incremental reductions of nuclear arsenals along with the exchange of information between nuclear powers about the status arsenals. Several treaties have been created as a result, such as the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the START I and START II agreements.

The age of nuclear weapons first began on July 16, 1945 with the first nuclear explosion in New Mexico. This was called the Trinity Test. This was followed by the first detonation of a nuclear weapon on August 6, 1945 at Hiroshima, which killed 130,000 people followed by the Nagasaki bomb on August 9<sup>th</sup> killing 70,000 people. The first gesture towards common rules regarding nuclear weapons was made in 1963 when the United States, the Soviet Union, and Great Britain signed the Partial Test Ban Treaty

which ended above ground nuclear testing. In 1968 the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty was created. In 1991 START I reduced nuclear arsenals by 20 to 35%, and in 1995 President Clinton extended the moratorium implemented by the Hatfield-Kopetski Moratorium Act in 1992 indefinitely. Most recently, India and Pakistan have begun nuclear testing.

### ***Bloc Positions***

The Russian parliament, or Duma, has given few signs of final ratification of START II. Russian outrage over NATO bombing of Serbia, the United States' efforts for National Missile Defense (NMD), as well as the United States' and United Kingdom's bombing of Iraq, and continued NATO enlargement have all left a bitter taste in the mouth of Russia. As a result, Russian interest in nuclear disarmament has diminished. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the power vacuum left behind other issues have climbed the Russian agenda, such as survival, disappointment with reform and the western role in it, related anti-western and anti-American sentiments, and a rise in nationalist isolationism. In addition, there is also the perceived need for the reassurance of having nuclear weapons due to the decline of conventional military power. The possession of a nuclear arsenal has become the basis of its *Great Power* status, hence the wish to retain them.

The American government's efforts to make its public aware of the dangers of attack by *states of concern* (rogue nations) using *weapons of mass destruction* has hindered the movement for nuclear disarmament. Emphasis on this possible attack equates to the threat of an all out nuclear war during the Cold War. In all actuality, the possibility of such an attack within the next decade by a state other than Russia and perhaps China is inconceivable as it could not affect more than one or two sites within the United States; these sites would most likely not even have been the target of the attack. Along with this exaggeration, the administration's policy of ambiguity on retaliatory use of nuclear weapons including that in the event of a chemical or biological attack, detract from nuclear disarmament. The emphasis on the possible usefulness of nuclear weapons in the event of an attack with weapons of mass destruction advocates the research and development of new nuclear capabilities as well as retaining weapons already stockpiled.

The India-Pakistan nuclear tests and missile tests of the past years have also made a negative impact on nuclear disarmament and nonproliferation. However, the United States and Russia are larger obstacles in the reduction process. If this were remedied, it could discontinue the efforts of India, Pakistan, and Israel in the nuclear arena and immobilize their small arsenals.

### ***Past UN Action***

This particular branch of the United Nations provides support for the United Nations' activities concerning disarmament. Its main focus has been and continues to be on weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons). It monitors the trends and developments in the area of weapons of mass destruction in all aspects to keep the Secretary-General informed to the best of its ability as well as providing information to member states and the international community. Multilateral efforts to strengthen non-proliferation is supported and the branch also acts as a participant cooperating with intergovernmental organizations and specialized agencies within the

United Nations system in particular the IAEA, the OPCW, and the CTBTO Prepcom. The World Court has set up a series of conditions regarding weapons of mass destruction such as their use must not indiscriminately kill civilians and must not cause unnecessary suffering. As the use of any weapon of mass destruction cannot meet these criteria, the use of them is illegal under international law. The World Court has also unanimously ruled that an obligation exists for complete nuclear disarmament.

### ***Proposed Solutions***

The current economic troubles of Russia accompanied by the anti-American feeling are muddled with security interests. The United States has the ability to fund Russia's disarmament process; this is the greatest source of leverage. To increase Russian motivation and reduce the largest American defense emergency, the United States should be more than willing to fund and devise new programs to meet the reduction of nuclear arms in Russia as a result. Included should be an exchange of information regarding one another's nuclear stockpiles as well as the imposition of a ceiling on the production and deployment of missiles. In order to encourage nuclear disarmament within the United States, the public's view of the threat of an attack by *states of concern* via weapons of mass destruction should be put in perspective. The difference of the threat of attack during the Cold War and the threat of attack by a state of concern should be clearly differentiated. In the event of attack by a *state of concern*, it should be made clear to the American public that the United States would know where the attack came from and be fully capable of response with its conventional arsenal, thus removing the need for nuclear weapons.

Currently, there are 182 non-weapons building states who have signed onto the Non-Proliferation treaty. All these states have common interest in progress towards nuclear disarmament. If these states were to unite in a joint program towards nuclear disarmament to the governments of the nuclear weapon states, it would impose significant influence. Until now, this has not been possible. While the nonaligned countries campaign for elimination of all nuclear arms, the allied nations of the United States request only incremental reductions. Were these two groups to join forces the impact would be undeniable.

Recently, there have been an increasing number of small wars, especially inter-state. This remains an obstacle to nuclear disarmament because nuclear states will continue to refuse to give up their arsenals while there is a high level of violence in the international system. These small wars may not be a direct threat to weapon-state security, but they retain the possibility of developing into larger threats; this acts as justification for the continued stockpiling of nuclear weapons. Also, the military predominance of the United States remains an obstacle. It is highly unlikely that while this remains true that states such as Russia and China will agree to eliminate their nuclear arms as doing so would only increase American dominance. Some program for the conventional disarmament of the major powers is a pre-requisite for the elimination of nuclear weapons.

## Topic II: Chemical and Biological Weapons

***Statement of the problem***

A United Nations report from 1969 defines chemical warfare agents as *chemical substances, whether gaseous, liquid or solid, which might be employed because of their direct toxic effects on man, animals, and plants*. The Chemical Weapons Convention classifies chemical weapons as *any chemical which, through its chemical effect on living processes, may cause death, temporary loss of performance, or permanent injury to people and animals*. Plants are not mentioned in this Convention.

There are thousands of poisonous substances known but only a few are considered suitable for chemical warfare. About seventy of these chemicals have been used or stockpiled as chemical warfare agents throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Only a few of these agents are suitable for chemical warfare today due to the high demands placed on the agent such as *suitably high toxicity for easy handling, long shelf life without corrosion or degradation of packaging, resistant to atmospheric water and oxygen as to not lose effect once dispersed, and it must withstand heat once dispersed*.

Chemical warfare agents can be classified in two different ways. First, there are volatile substances, which mainly contaminate the air, and secondly there are persistent substances, which are involatile and mainly cover surfaces. Chemical warfare agents used against people can be further divided into two categories: lethal and incapacitating. Incapacitating substances cause nausea or visual problems with less than 1/100 of the lethal dose. Chemical agents are normally classified according to their effect on the particular organism.

In the dispersal of chemical warfare agents a mix of liquid droplets and gas is created. The largest droplets fall and cause ground contamination while the smaller droplets are suspended like an aerosol. The aerosol and the gas form a *primary cloud*, which is moved by the wind. The evaporation of ground contamination causes a *secondary cloud*, which also drifts in the wind. An attack with chemical weapons causes injuries to unprotected people who are close to the target area. Strong weather conditions, such as wind, rain, or freezing temperatures can reduce the effectiveness of the agent. Wind velocity is an integral condition in deciding how long the *primary cloud* will take to pass. High wind velocity means that the cloud will remain in one place for a shorter period of time resulting in fewer injuries to unprotected people, whereas low winds mean a higher number of injuries. Wind direction is also important, which is why a circular area must be alerted in the event of an attack. The concentration of the gas/aerosol in the *primary cloud* is dependent on the air exchange or turbulence in the atmosphere. The less turbulence the higher the concentration; this is most likely to occur on a clear cool night, whereas there will be more turbulence on a warm sunny day and the effect of the *primary cloud* will be greatly reduced. Snow is a concern because it can become contaminated and cling to clothing and shoes and be transported into homes. Light rain will cause ground contamination to be more dangerous since the pores in the soil will become clogged and prevent the substance from penetrating down into the soil, whereas heavy rain will flush off ground contamination and heavy snow will cover it. Contact risk is decreased in both events. Woodland and mountainous terrain are subject to greater turbulence, thus less prone to chemical attacks. This terrain, however, can also work to the advantage of the attackers, as depressions in the landscape will hold the *primary cloud*.

### ***History of the problem***

Chemical agents are often referred to as *war gases* and a war where chemical agents are used is often referred to as a *gas war*. These misused terms are a direct result of history. During the First World War chlorine and phosgene, which are gaseous in form at room temperature and normal atmospheric pressure, were used. This caused the common misconception about these names. Today, chemical agents are rarely used in gaseous form, rather they are liquids or solids. Molecular biotechnology will transform agriculture, energy production, health care, and microelectronics, but it also poses immense military and strategic challenges.

The greatest biological threat comes from Iraq, whose research into anthrax, botulinum toxin, gas gangrene bacteria, and other chemical poisons is cause for concern. Mustard gas and nerve agents were used in combat against Iran from 1980-88 throughout the Gulf War, and nerve agents were deployed against a Kurdish village in 1988; casualties ran into the thousands. Russia's research in this field also gives rise to concern, especially with the collapse of the Soviet Union. With diminished security, there is the increased possibility that chemical and biological weapons or the information pertaining to them will be obtained by inappropriate persons. Even before the collapse of the Soviet Union there was cause for concern, as demonstrated by the accidental release of anthrax in 1979 resulting in 64 deaths on the eastern side of the Urals.

In 1986, before the relationship between Iraq and the United States crumbled, the United States supplied Iraq with seed cultures of anthrax. Spore samples were ordered over the telephone and were sent via regular mail. As a result, Iraq as well as other states that concerned the United States were able to begin or continue their work on biological weapons claiming the samples were needed for work on antibiotic regimens. The American Department of Defense has taken certain precautions to ensure that this will not occur again. Nations, however, are not the only parties with interest in chemical and biological weapons. The Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan was able to release substances on the subway harming thousands. A branch in the Republic of Congo is rumored to have arrived in the country just as the Ebola outbreak occurred.

### ***Bloc Positions***

The international community voices strong concern over the use of chemical and biological weapons, however, a few states still engage in their research and development. Iraq poses the largest threat, and Russia is known to have chemical and biological weapons research left from the Soviet days. The United States is said to have work in development regarding this type of weaponry, but refutes this. The United States has concern that other countries, such as North Korea (*nations of concern/rogue states*) also dabble in the development of chemical and biological weapons. The west monitors events in relation to chemical and biological weapons closely to ensure adequate defense mechanisms. Of greater concern, however, are the groups such as the Aum Shinrikyo cult in the Republic of Congo and Japan that are more difficult to locate for retaliation and more difficult to locate for preventative measures and arrest.

### ***Past UN Action***

Concerning biological weapons, the United Nations has set up a monitoring team under the United Nations Special Commission (UNSCOM) which searches for weapons.

Such a team is resident in Iraq on an on again off again basis. The trouble, however, remains finding them.

In 1992, the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) was born at the General Assembly's forty-seventh session. This resolution provided for the prohibition of the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical and biological weapons. This is the first disarmament agreement that negotiates the complete elimination of an entire category of weapons. The Convention prohibits all development, production, acquisition, and stock of chemical and biological weapons. It requires that each nation destroy all chemical and biological weapons as well as their production facilities. Verification that these duties have been carried out will be made through routine on-site inspections of declared sites and short-notice inspections. The Convention was signed by 130 nations and entered into full force on the 29<sup>th</sup> of April, 1997. The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) is responsible for the implementation of the Convention and also provides a forum for discussion and cooperation amongst states.

### ***Proposed Solutions***

With steps, such as the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC), efforts are being made to reduce the likelihood of chemical or biological attack by banning the production, acquisition, development, and stockpiling of these weapons. The halting of the development of chemical and biological weapons further aids the elimination of this threat by removing the possibility of biological weapons resistant to antibiotics and chemical weapons without an anecdote. The continued verification that nations are following through with the CWC agreement's guidelines through UNSCOM's routine and short notice inspections provides reassurance of the progress towards and the eventual elimination of chemical and biological threats.

## **Conclusion**

With the end of the Cold War, nuclear weapons became less of a necessity and more of an accessory to ego. Nations pitted against the United States in a power struggle saw relinquishing of their nuclear arsenals as relinquishing military dominance to the already strong United States, while the United States saw its nuclear arsenal as necessity to security. This, in turn, only causes smaller nations, non-super powers, to see nuclear weapons as a necessity to their security. If, after all, the United States needed these weapons, they were in dire need of them. While non-nuclear states campaigned for the elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, America's allies were content to suggest incremental reductions of American nuclear stockpiles. In order to eliminate the nuclear capabilities of the world, nuclear and non-nuclear states must join against superpowers to exert undeniably strong pressure or if the superpowers consent, work with them or the goal of a nuclear free world cannot be reached.

Chemical and Biological weapons have achieved great progress since World War I, however, the danger of chemical or biological attack does not come from one nation to another, although it is a risk, but from groups such as cults or terrorist organizations. With the establishment of the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and other agreements like it, the acquisition of chemical and biological weapons has become more and more difficult. Hopefully, once all nations, especially those currently engaged in



Washington State Model United Nations Topic Synopsis:  
General Assembly: Disarmament and International Security

research and development, it will become impossible to obtain chemical or biological weapons for use. This, however, can only come with international cooperation, just as with nuclear disarmament, nations must join forces to exert pressure to achieve their goals.

## Bibliography

[www.ucsusa.org](http://www.ucsusa.org)

[www.un.org](http://www.un.org)

<http://monticello.avenue.gen.va.us/Community/Agencies/CCPJ>

[www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org)

<http://cns.miis.edu>

[www.enduk.org](http://www.enduk.org)

[www.cdc.gov](http://www.cdc.gov)

[www.opcw.nl/chemhaz](http://www.opcw.nl/chemhaz)

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline>