



EdiMUN

Where the smart come to sharpen their ideas



Edify Model United Nations-2023



Background Guide

**United Nations General Assembly-Disarmament and International Security
Committee**

UN-GA DISEC

Agenda: Non state actor's access to weapons of mass destruction

Letter from the Executive Board

Dear Delegates!

We are very pleased to welcome you to the simulation of the UNGA: DISEC at EDI MUN 2023. It will be an honour to serve you as your Executive Board for the duration of the conference. This Background Guide is designed to give you an insight into the case at hand. Please refer to it carefully. Remember, thoroughly understanding the problem is the first step to solving it.

However, bear in mind that this Background Guide is in no way exhaustive and is only meant to provide you with enough background information to establish a platform for beginning the research. Delegates are highly recommended to do a good amount of research beyond what is covered in the Background Guide. The guide cannot be used as proof during the committee proceedings under any circumstances.

Finally, we would like to wish you luck in your preparation. In case you have any questions, procedural or otherwise, please feel free to direct them to any member of the Executive Board and we will get back to you as soon as possible. Please do not hesitate to contact us with any queries or concerns. We expect all delegates to be well-versed with the various nuances of the agenda and geared up for an intense debate, deliberations, and great fun.

We are looking forward to meeting you at the conference!

Regards,

Kyathi Malyala
Chairperson

Ayush Mantri
Vice Chairperson

Important Points to Remember

A few aspects that delegates should keep in mind while preparing:

1. **Procedure:** The purpose of putting procedural rules in any committee is to ensure a more organized and efficient debate. The committee will follow the UNA-USA Rules of Procedure. Although the Executive Board shall be fairly strict with the Rules of Procedure, the agenda discussion will be the main priority. So, delegates are advised not to restrict their statements due to hesitation regarding the procedure.
2. **Foreign Policy:** Following the foreign policy of one's country is the most important aspect of a Model UN Conference. This is what essentially differentiates a Model UN from other debating formats. To violate one's foreign policy without adequate reason is one of the worst mistakes a delegate can make.
3. **Role of the Executive Board:** The Executive Board is appointed to facilitate debate. The committee shall decide the direction and flow of the debate. The delegates are the ones who constitute the committee and hence must be uninhibited while presenting their opinions/stances on any issue. However, the Executive Board may put forward questions and/or ask for clarifications at all points in time to further debate and test participants.
4. **Nature of Source/Evidence:** This Background Guide is meant solely for research purposes and must not be cited as evidence to substantiate statements made during the conference. Evidence or proof for substantiating statements made during formal debate is acceptable from the following sources:
 - a. **United Nations:** Documents and findings by the United Nations or any related UN body are held as credible proof to support a claim or argument. **Multilateral Organizations:** Documents from international organizations like OIC, NAFTA, SAARC, BRICS, EU, ASEAN, the International Criminal Court, etc. may also be presented as credible sources of information.

- b. Government Reports: These reports can be used in a similar way as the State Operated News Agencies reports and can, in all circumstances, be denied by another country.
- c. News Sources:
 - 1. Reuters: Any Reuters article that makes mention of the fact or is in contradiction of the fact being stated by a delegate in the council.
 - 2. State-operated News Agencies: These reports can be used in support of or against the State that owns the News Agency. These reports, if credible or substantial enough, can be used to support or against any country as such but in that situation, may be denied by any other country in the council. Some examples are – RIA Novosti (Russian Federation), Xinhua News Agency (People’s Republic of China), etc.

****Please Note: Reports from NGOs working with UNESCO, UNICEF, and other UN bodies will be accepted. Under no circumstances will sources like Wikipedia, or newspapers like the Guardian, Times of India, etc. be accepted. However, notwithstanding the criteria for acceptance of sources and evidence, delegates are still free to quote/cite from any source as they deem fit as a part of their statements.*

Introduction to the Committee

The United Nations General Assembly is one of the six important organs of the United Nations (UN), and the primary deliberative, strategy-making, and representative organ of the UN. The first committee of the General Assembly is the Disarmament and International Security Committee. It deals with disarmament, global challenges, and threats to peace that affect the international community and seeks out solutions to the challenges in the international security regime.

The Mandate of DISEC

The committee considers all disarmament and international security matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any other organ of the United Nations; the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, as well as principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments; promotion of cooperative arrangements and measures aimed at strengthening stability through lower levels of armaments. The Committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament. It is the only Main Committee of the General Assembly entitled to verbatim records coverage.

Agenda: Non-state actor's access to weapons of mass destruction

Who are the Non-State Actors?

Non-state actors, in the context of international relations and security, refer to entities or groups that are not directly associated with a recognized nation-state but still exert influence or engage in activities on a global or regional scale. These actors can include:

1. Terrorist Organizations:

Groups like Al-Qaeda, ISIS, or Boko Haram are non-state actors that use violence and intimidation to pursue their political or ideological goals.

2. Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs):

While most NGOs are focused on humanitarian or advocacy efforts, some may become involved in political or security issues, acting as non-state actors in certain situations.

3. Private Military Companies (PMCs):

These are private organizations that provide military or security services, often in conflict zones. Examples include Blackwater (now known as Academi) and G4S.

4. Cybercriminal Groups:

Hactivist groups and cybercriminal organizations, such as Anonymous or state-sponsored hackers, are non-state actors that operate in the digital domain.

5. Criminal Organizations:

Organized crime syndicates involved in activities like drug trafficking, arms smuggling, or human trafficking can also be considered non-state actors.

6. Rebel Groups:

Armed rebel groups that challenge the authority of a government, like the FARC in Colombia or the Taliban in Afghanistan, are non-state actors.

7. Militias:

Local militias or paramilitary groups, often formed for self-defense or to pursue particular interests, can also be non-state actors.

8. Special Interest Groups:

Groups advocating for specific causes, such as environmental protection or indigenous rights, may engage in political or disruptive activities, making them non-state actors in certain contexts.

How do NSAs affect peace?

Non-state actors can have significant and varied impacts on peace, and these impacts can either contribute to peacebuilding or undermine it, depending on the nature and goals of the actors involved. Here are some ways in which non-state actors can affect peace:

1. Conflict Escalation:

Some non-state actors, particularly armed rebel groups and terrorist organizations, engage in violent activities that can escalate conflicts. They may seek to challenge the authority of a government or promote their political agenda through force, leading to increased instability and violence.

2. Mediation and Peace Negotiations:

Non-state actors, including NGOs and advocacy groups, can play a positive role in peace efforts by mediating conflicts, facilitating dialogue between conflicting parties, and advocating for peaceful resolutions. They often bridge gaps between governments and marginalized or disaffected groups.

3. Humanitarian Assistance:

NGOs and humanitarian organizations provide critical aid and relief in conflict zones, helping to alleviate suffering and stabilize affected populations. Their presence can be instrumental in post-conflict recovery and peacebuilding.

4. Cyber Attacks and Disinformation:

Non-state actors engaged in cybercrime or hacktivism can disrupt communication networks, spread disinformation, and compromise the cybersecurity of governments and organizations, potentially leading to instability and mistrust.

5. Resource Exploitation:

Non-state actors involved in illegal resource extraction, such as armed militias profiting from conflict minerals, can perpetuate conflicts by funding armed groups and undermining governance structures.

6. Peacebuilding and Community Engagement:

Community-based organizations and grassroots movements often work toward peacebuilding and conflict resolution at the local level. They address the root causes of conflicts and promote reconciliation and cooperation among affected communities.

7. Human Rights Advocacy:

Non-state actors engaged in human rights advocacy can expose abuses and violations, bringing international attention and pressure on governments to address issues and uphold peace.

8. Transnational Crime:

Criminal organizations involved in activities like drug trafficking, arms smuggling, and human trafficking can undermine governance, create violence, and contribute to instability, especially in regions with weak institutions.

9. Environmental and Resource Management:

Non-state actors focused on environmental protection and sustainable resource management can contribute to peace by addressing disputes over natural resources and helping to prevent conflicts related to resource scarcity.

The concept of non-state actors using weapons of mass destruction (WMDs) is a significant concern in the realm of international security. This scenario involves entities or groups that are not affiliated with any recognized nation-state acquiring, possessing, or potentially using WMDs, which include nuclear, chemical, biological, and radiological weapons. Here's an explanation of the key aspects of non-state actors and their potential use of WMDs:

Non-state actors use weapons for mass destruction.

1. Definition of Non-State Actors:

Non-state actors are entities or groups that operate outside the control and authority of a government or sovereign state. They can include terrorist organizations, insurgent groups, criminal syndicates, and even individuals who are not acting on behalf of any nation-state.

2. Types of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs):

WMDs are characterized by their ability to cause widespread and indiscriminate harm. They include:

- Nuclear Weapons: These involve the use of nuclear fission or fusion to release a tremendous amount of energy, causing massive destruction and radiation.
- Chemical Weapons: These use toxic chemicals to harm or kill people, often through inhalation, skin contact, or ingestion.
- Biological Weapons: These involve the use of biological agents like bacteria, viruses, or toxins to cause diseases and casualties.
- Radiological Weapons: Also known as "dirty bombs," these weapons combine conventional explosives with radioactive materials, spreading radiation over a wide area.

3. Concerns and Risks:

- Terrorism: Non-state actors, particularly terrorist groups, may seek to acquire or use WMDs as a means to create fear, disrupt society, or advance their political or ideological goals.
- Lack of Deterrence: Unlike nation-states, non-state actors may not be deterred by the fear of retaliation, making them potentially more willing to use WMDs.
- Global Impact: The use of WMDs by non-state actors could have catastrophic consequences, causing loss of life, environmental damage, and long-lasting socio-political impacts.

4. Countermeasures:

- **Non-Proliferation Efforts:** International agreements and organizations, such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), aim to prevent the spread of WMDs.
- **Counterterrorism:** Intelligence, law enforcement, and military efforts focus on identifying and disrupting the activities of non-state actors seeking WMDs.
- **Border Security:** Measures to control the movement of materials that could be used in WMD production are critical in preventing their acquisition.

5. Challenges:

- **Detection:** Identifying and monitoring the activities of non-state actors aiming to acquire or develop WMDs can be extremely challenging due to their clandestine nature.
- **Cooperation:** International cooperation is essential to address the transnational nature of non-state actor threats.

What is a Weapon-Free Zone?

Weapon-free zones, also known as gun-free zones, are specific areas or locations where the possession, carrying, or use of firearms and other weapons is prohibited or restricted by law or policy. These zones are established with the aim of promoting public safety, reducing the risk of violence, and creating secure environments in places where people gather, such as schools, government buildings, public transportation, and private properties like malls or businesses.

The rules regarding weapon-free zones can vary widely by jurisdiction, and they may include:

1. Schools and Educational Institutions:

Many countries have laws or regulations that prohibit the possession of firearms and weapons on school campuses. This is intended to protect students and staff from potential acts of violence.

2. Government Buildings:

Government offices and courthouses often prohibit weapons on their premises to ensure the safety of employees and visitors.

3. Airports and Transportation Hubs:

Airports, train stations, and bus terminals typically have strict restrictions on firearms and other weapons to prevent potential acts of terrorism or violence.

4. Private Properties:

Private businesses, such as shopping malls, restaurants, and entertainment venues, can establish weapon-free policies to create a safe and welcoming atmosphere for customers.

5. Public Events:

Organizers of public events, such as concerts, sporting events, or festivals, may implement weapon-free policies to protect attendees.

The effectiveness and controversy surrounding weapon-free zones can vary. Supporters argue that such zones enhance public safety by reducing the risk of mass shootings and violence in sensitive areas. Critics, on the other hand, argue that these zones may inadvertently make people vulnerable to attacks, as law-abiding citizens are unable to defend themselves. The debate over gun control and weapon-free zones is a complex and contentious issue, and it varies significantly from one region to another based on local laws and cultural attitudes toward firearms.

WHY ARE WFZ'S IMPORTANT?

Here are some of the reasons why weapon-free zones are considered important:

1. Public Safety:

The primary goal of weapon-free zones is to enhance public safety. By restricting the presence of weapons, especially firearms, in certain areas, the risk of gun-related violence and accidents is reduced. This can make these places safer for people, including children, students, employees, and visitors.

2. Reducing the Risk of Mass Shootings:

Weapon-free zones are often established in places like schools, universities, government buildings, and public events to reduce the risk of mass shootings. Proponents argue that these zones may act as a deterrent for individuals with harmful intent, making it more difficult for them to carry out attacks.

3. Preventing Accidents:

In areas with a high potential for accidents, such as schools, the prohibition of firearms can help prevent unintentional discharges or other firearm-related accidents that could harm innocent people, particularly children.

4. Promoting Conflict Resolution:

By discouraging the presence of weapons, weapon-free zones can encourage non-violent conflict resolution and de-escalation techniques. People in these zones may be more likely to resort to peaceful means to resolve disputes or disagreements.

5. Psychological Comfort:

Some individuals may feel more psychologically comfortable in settings where weapons are prohibited. Knowing that there is a lower likelihood of encountering firearms can reduce anxiety and create a sense of security for people in such areas.

6. Compliance with the Law:

Establishing weapon-free zones allows law enforcement to enforce specific regulations related to the possession of firearms in those areas. This makes it easier for authorities to take action against individuals who violate the rules.

7. Protecting Vulnerable Populations:

Places like hospitals, mental health facilities, and domestic violence shelters often establish weapon-free zones to protect vulnerable individuals who may be at a higher risk of harm if weapons are present.

It's important to note that there is ongoing debate and controversy surrounding weapon-free zones. Critics argue that these zones may not effectively prevent gun violence, as individuals with criminal intent may disregard such rules, and disarmed law-abiding citizens may be less able to defend themselves. Additionally, some argue that these zones may create a false sense of security, as those intent on violence may still choose to enter them.

Ultimately, the effectiveness of weapon-free zones depends on various factors, including the local legal framework, enforcement, and public attitudes toward gun control. The importance of such zones is a matter of balancing public safety with individual rights and responsibilities, and different jurisdictions may make different determinations on this issue.

Existing WFZ'S

Five such zones exist today, four spanning the entire Southern Hemisphere. The regions currently covered under NWFZ agreements include: Latin America (the 1967 Treaty of Tlatelolco), the South Pacific (the 1985 Treaty of Rarotonga), Southeast Asia (the 1995 Treaty of Bangkok) Africa (the 1996 Treaty of Pelindaba), and Central Asia (the 2006 Treaty of Semipalatinsk).

Nuclear-weapon-free zones are an important regional approach to strengthening global nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament norms and consolidating international efforts toward peace and security.

Within the respective territories of the zones, the Treaties establishing NWFZs prohibit the acquisition, possession, placement, testing, and use of such weapons.

In addition, States Parties to the Treaties establishing NWFZs are exerting efforts to formalize legally binding agreements that would prevent nuclear-weapon States from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against any countries that are part of the zones.

Legal Definition

According to the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) resolution 3472 B (1975), a NWFZ is “any zone, recognized as such by the General Assembly of the United Nations, which any group of States, in the free exercise of their sovereignty, has established by a treaty or a convention whereby the statute of total absence of nuclear weapons, to which the zone should be subjected, is defined and an international system of verification and control is established.”³ Thus, NWFZs involve groups of countries cooperating regionally through multilateral agreements to maintain the denuclearized status of the region.

NWFZs history

Initial efforts to create an area free of nuclear weapons began in the late 1950s with several proposals to establish such a zone in Central and Eastern Europe. Poland offered the first proposal-named the Rapacki Plan after the Polish foreign minister in 1958. The Rapacki Plan sought to initially keep nuclear weapons from being deployed in Poland, Czechoslovakia, West Germany, and East Germany while reserving the right for other European countries to follow suit. The Soviet Union, Sweden, Finland, Romania, and Bulgaria also floated similar proposals. All these early efforts, however, floundered amidst the U.S.-Soviet superpower conflict, although the Rapacki Plan would serve as a model for the nuclear-weapon-free zones that were eventually set up in other regions of the globe.

Article VII of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT), which entered into force in 1970, affirms the right of countries to establish specified zones free of nuclear weapons. The UN General Assembly reaffirmed that right in 1975 and outlined the criteria for such zones. Within these nuclear-weapon-free zones, countries may use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

Cooperation

The key challenge for strengthening cooperation among the NWFZs is the low level of institutionalization in the majority of them. The level of institutionalization

differs sharply from zone to zone: whereas Latin America has its specialized agency to maintain the regional nuclear non-proliferation regime and to promote international cooperation in this field, the South Pacific, Southeast Asian, and Central Asian NWFZs have focal points or chairs that rotate among the Member States. The African NWFZ also established a specialized implementing body, but the AFCONE secretariat has yet to become fully operational.

Where regional institutions exist, they do not express high and consistent interest in strengthening cooperation among NWFZs, except for OPANAL. Several statements by the PIF or individual countries, such as Indonesia, have made references to the need for greater cooperation but have rarely provided further specifics. In its 2014 Report, the PIF Secretariat stated that “the Member States should continue to liaise with secretariats of other nuclear-weapon-free zones in relation to relevant developments,” but it remains unclear what such cooperation should entail and by which means it should be maintained.

However, the record of cooperation among the existing Nuclear Weapons-free zones, obstacles to such cooperation, and potential for its improvement are a far less examined subject, although the issue of cooperation and its importance has been brought up on several occasions in the context of NWFZ meetings, the review process of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and United Nations fora. In practice, cooperation among the zones has remained limited. Collaboration among the NWFZs is both necessary and desirable as it serves the objectives and interests of both the zones and its Member States. However, many parties to the NWFZs, particularly small and less developed States, are preoccupied with other pressing issues, from socio-economic development to security and climate change – to all of which they have to devote precious resources. Therefore, it is essential to encourage cooperation among the NWFZs as a matter of importance by making shared goals clear and the vision convincing for the States concerned to devote the necessary time to its implementation.

While different NWFZs have their particular characteristics and unique regional circumstances that motivated their creation, all of the zones are broadly united in their commitment to the goals of nuclear non-proliferation and the complete

elimination of nuclear weapons. With more than 100 States Parties, NWFZs have the potential to speak in unity on pertinent disarmament and non-proliferation issues. A united, or coordinated, action by the NWFZs could be a force multiplier for small States Parties to the zones.

The purpose of NWFZs

Although each zone has particular and sometimes unique characteristics, their purposes are similar. NWFZs attempt to achieve several goals:

1. To prevent the development of new nuclear-armed states or capabilities in their region, achieved through bans on production, testing, use, or other acquisition of nuclear weapons.
2. To keep nuclear weapons out of the zone (or, in some cases, to allow sovereign decisions by governments about whether foreign countries can ship nuclear materials through their territory).
3. To prevent nuclear-weapon states from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against countries in the zone.

Governments in the region concerned can readily choose whether or not to join a NWFZ; thus, the obligations that are adopted by states within the zone go into effect when these states ratify the NWFZ treaty and it enters into force.

NWFZ contributions to non-proliferation and disarmament

Treaty of Tlatelolco

In Latin America, two of the largest countries in the region, Argentina and Brazil, have both large nuclear power industries and the potential capability to develop nuclear weapons.

The Treaty of Tlatelolco provides a confidence-building framework and regional non-proliferation norm which has helped defuse a potential nuclear arms race between these two

key regional states. Together with the Brazilian-Argentine Agency for Accounting and Control

of Nuclear Materials (ABACC) bilateral treaty between Argentina and Brazil, the Treaty of

Tlatelolco has created a regional non-proliferation regime that has highly effective verification and compliance provisions, which should greatly reduce the chance of nuclear proliferation in this region.

Treaty of Rarotonga

The South Pacific NWFZ has served to reduce the risk of future nuclear-weapon rivalry between state parties and neighboring regions. The Treaty of Rarotonga has not only served to reinforce Australia's commitment to non-proliferation—despite Australia having considered nuclear weapon development in the 1960s to early 1970s—but it also prohibits NWSs conducting nuclear tests in the region.

Treaty of Bangkok

For South-East Asia the Treaty of Bangkok similarly confirms and reinforces the nonproliferation commitments of the ASEAN group, and creates major legal and political barriers to any potential break-away state. It also prevents NWSs from again stationing nuclear-capable forces at military bases in the region, as was the case during the Vietnam War. While the Treaty of Rarotonga and the Treaty of Bangkok have yet to secure complete ratification of the relevant protocols by the NWSs, there were signs of renewed willingness at the 2010 NPT Review Conference either to undertake the necessary ratification or, in the case of the Treaty of Bangkok, enter into fresh negotiations on the protocols.

Treaty of Pelindaba

In Africa, the Treaty of Pelindaba has contributed to reversing and preventing proliferation, as had already started in South Africa in 1989. The zone also prevents a repeat of the use of African territory for nuclear weapons testing, stationing, and deployment.

Treaty of Semipalatinsk

In Central Asia, the Treaty of Semipalatinsk has played a critical role in averting further proliferation in a strategic region that has extensive access to fissile materials, plutonium stockpiles and nuclear-weapons-related facilities dating back to the Soviet administration, and nuclear expertise. In signing and ratifying the treaty, the Central Asian states have greatly reduced proliferation risks within the region and moved to prevent the NWSs from once again, using the region for nuclear weapons testing and stationing. As in the case of the Korean Peninsula, a continued failure of the Western NWSs to offer the Central Asian zone states negative security guarantees against use or threat of use of nuclear weapons could well be counterproductive in the longer term. It may prompt one of the Central Asian states to make the same decision that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea appears to be making that nuclear weapons need to be acquired to insure against nuclear attack.

Guidelines and Principles for the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

The UN Disarmament Commission in its report of April 30, 1999, recommended a set of principles and guidelines for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone, which included, *inter alia*:

- Nuclear-weapon-free zones should be established based on arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned.
- The initiative to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone should emanate exclusively from States within the region concerned and be pursued by all States of that region.

- The nuclear-weapon States should be consulted during the negotiations of each treaty and its relevant protocol(s) establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone to facilitate their signature to and ratification of the relevant protocol(s) to the treaty, through which they undertake legally binding commitments to the status of the zone and not to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against States parties to the treaty.
- A nuclear-weapon-free zone should not prevent the use of nuclear science and technology for peaceful purposes and could also promote, if provided for in the treaties establishing such zones, bilateral, regional, and international cooperation for the peaceful use of nuclear energy in the zone, in support of socio-economic, scientific and technological development of the States parties.

Treaties Involved in the Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones

The following treaties form the basis for the existing NWFZs:

- [Treaty of Tlatelolco](#) — Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean
- [Treaty of Rarotonga](#) — South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone Treaty
- [Treaty of Bangkok](#) — Treaty on the Southeast Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone
- [Treaty of Pelindaba](#) — African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty
- [Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia](#)

Resolution on the Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East (77th Session)

- [A/RES/77/38](#)

Reports of the Secretary-General on the Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East (77th Session)

- [A/77/153 \(PART I\)](#)
- [A/77/153 \(PART II\) The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East](#)

Letters addressed to the Secretary-General confirming support for declaring the Middle East a region free from weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons

- [Note by the Secretary-General](#)
- Letters received by the Secretary-General

Mongolia's self-declared nuclear-weapon-free status has been recognized internationally through the adoption of UN General Assembly [resolution 55/33S](#) on "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status."

Other treaties that also deal with the denuclearization of certain areas are:

- [Antarctic Treaty](#)
- [Outer Space Treaty](#) — Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies
- [Moon Agreement](#) — Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies
- [Seabed Treaty](#) — Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and Other Weapons of Mass Destruction on the Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the Subsoil Thereof

Non-Proliferation Treaty

The [NPT](#) is an international treaty which aims to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote peaceful uses of nuclear energy in the global community and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament. Opened for signature in 1968, the Treaty entered into force in 1970. On 11 May 1995, the Treaty was extended indefinitely. A total of 191 States have joined the Treaty, including the five nuclear-weapon States. More countries have ratified the NPT than

any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement, a testament to the Treaty's significance.

[The International Atomic Energy Agency \(IAEA\)](#) is tasked to oversee global nuclear cooperation and also to check for violations of the NPT. Safeguards are used to verify compliance with the Treaty through inspections conducted by the IAEA. The Treaty promotes cooperation in the field of peaceful nuclear technology and equal access to this technology for all States parties, while safeguards prevent the diversion of fissile material for weapons use.

The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

[The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty \(CTBT\)](#) bans all nuclear explosions, whether for military or peaceful purposes. It comprises a preamble, 17 articles, two annexes and a Protocol with two annexes.

Another important text is the [Resolution](#) adopted by the States Signatories on 19 November 1996 establishing the Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization (CTBTO).

It has not come into force yet as eight specific nations have not ratified the treaty.

Obligations under CTBT

-Each State Party undertakes not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, and to prohibit and prevent any such nuclear explosion at any place under its jurisdiction or control.

-Each State Party undertakes, furthermore, to refrain from causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion or any other nuclear explosion.

Plausible Measures:

The establishment of Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones (NWFZs) can indeed be an effective preventive measure against the potential threat of mass destruction by non-state actors. To combat this threat, here's how the creation and enforcement of NWFZs can be approached:

1. **International Agreements:** Encourage nations to enter into international agreements to establish NWFZs in regions where there is a risk of non-state actors gaining access to nuclear weapons or materials. These agreements can be legally binding and commit participating countries to the prohibition of nuclear weapons within the designated zone.
2. **Diplomatic Engagement:** Promote diplomatic efforts to negotiate and establish NWFZs. This includes engaging in dialogue with relevant countries and regions to garner support for the initiative. Diplomatic channels can be used to address security concerns and build consensus
3. **Disarmament Commitments:** Encourage nations within the NWFZs to commit to disarmament efforts, which involve reducing, eliminating, or relocating nuclear weapons and related infrastructure from the designated area. This demonstrates a commitment to non-proliferation and sets an example for other regions.
4. **Verification and Monitoring:** Implement rigorous verification and monitoring mechanisms within the NWFZs to ensure compliance with disarmament commitments. International organizations and agencies can play a role in overseeing and verifying the dismantling of nuclear weapons.

5. **Security Guarantees:** Provide security assurances to countries within the NWFZs to address their concerns about potential threats from non-state actors or external powers. These assurances may involve commitments by nuclear-armed states to refrain from using or threatening to use nuclear weapons against NWFZ countries.
6. **Education and Awareness:** Promote education and awareness campaigns within NWFZs to inform the public and policymakers about the benefits of the zone, the risks associated with non-state actors, and the importance of disarmament efforts.
7. **Capacity Building:** Assist countries within the NWFZs in developing their capacities for nuclear security, including measures to secure nuclear materials, facilities, and technologies. International cooperation and support can enhance their ability to prevent non-state actors from gaining access to nuclear weapons.
8. **Collaborative Intelligence Sharing:** Facilitate international intelligence sharing and collaboration to identify and address potential threats from non-state actors seeking nuclear weapons or materials. Timely information sharing is crucial for preventing illicit activities.
9. **Sanctions and Penalties:** Implement sanctions and penalties against any state or entity found in violation of NWFZ agreements. These measures can serve as a deterrent and reinforce the commitment to preventing non-state actors from acquiring nuclear weapons.
10. **Regular Review and Adaptation:** Continuously review and adapt NWFZ agreements to address emerging threats and challenges related to non-state actors. Flexibility in response to evolving security conditions is essential.

The establishment of NWFZs requires international cooperation, diplomacy, and a commitment to nuclear disarmament. By taking these steps and building a strong framework for NWFZs, the international community can significantly reduce the risk of non-state actors gaining access to nuclear weapons, thus enhancing global security and preventing mass destruction.

Strengthen Existing NWFZs:

Focus on reinforcing the effectiveness of established NWFZs and encourage more regions to adopt such zones. Provide technical and financial assistance to countries interested in creating or expanding NWFZs.

Multilateral Diplomacy:

Promote diplomatic efforts to engage nations in discussions about the establishment of NWFZs. Encourage dialogue among states in regions where the proliferation of nuclear weapons poses a significant threat.

Verification Mechanisms:

Develop robust verification and monitoring mechanisms to ensure compliance with NWFZ agreements. This can involve international inspections and cooperation with relevant international organizations like the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

Education and Awareness:

Raise awareness about the benefits of NWFZs and the risks associated with non-state actors obtaining nuclear weapons. Develop educational programs to inform the public, policymakers, and relevant stakeholders.

Security Assurances:

Provide security assurances to countries within NWFZs to enhance their confidence in the effectiveness of these zones. Ensure that they will not be subjected to nuclear threats or attacks by nuclear-armed states.

Disarmament Initiatives:

Advocate for global disarmament efforts and the reduction of nuclear arsenals among nuclear-armed states. A reduction in the overall number of nuclear weapons worldwide contributes to a safer international environment.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the establishment of Nuclear Weapon-Free Zones (NWFZs) serves as a crucial preventive measure against the potential threat of mass destruction by non-state actors. By strengthening existing NWFZs, engaging in multilateral diplomacy, implementing effective verification mechanisms, raising awareness, providing security assurances, and promoting disarmament initiatives, we can collectively work towards a world where the risk of non-state actors obtaining and using nuclear weapons is significantly reduced.

NWFZs not only enhance regional security but also contribute to global efforts to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. In the spirit of cooperation and shared responsibility, nations must continue to collaborate and support the establishment and maintenance of NWFZs as an essential component of our collective commitment to peace, security, and a nuclear-weapon-free world.

Moreover, the establishment of NWFZs fosters confidence-building measures among states within the designated zones. It promotes dialogue, transparency, and collaboration on disarmament issues. These zones represent a tangible step towards the shared goal of a world free from the threat of nuclear weapons.

However, it's important to acknowledge that NWFZs alone cannot eliminate the risk posed by non-state actors. Comprehensive global efforts, including strict export controls, enhanced security measures for nuclear materials, and continued diplomatic initiatives, are essential in addressing this multifaceted challenge.

In a world facing evolving security threats, the commitment to NWFZs underscores the international community's dedication to peace, security, and the prevention of mass destruction. These zones represent a testament to the belief that cooperation and disarmament are key elements in building a safer and more secure future for all nations and generations to come.

Some questions to consider on the agenda.

1. What are some solutions the committee can come up, to stop the influx of NSA groups?
2. What are the objectives regarding NWFZs?
3. Are the measures proposed therein still feasible under the current circumstances? Why or why not?
4. What can be done regarding the control on NSAs to access weapons of mass destruction?
5. How could the UN have a stronger conciliation/ intervention?
6. How can the Human Rights violations arising out of interference of NSAs in the region be mitigated?

Links for research and reference purposes:

<https://www.amnesty.org/en/>

<https://www.cfr.org/global-conflict-tracker/>

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/>

<https://www.un.org/>

****Note for the delegates: Documents and findings by the United Nations or any related UN body is held as a credible proof to support a claim or argument.***

Multilateral Organizations: Documents from international organizations like OIC, NAFTA, SAARC, BRICS, EU, ASEAN, the International Court of Justice, etc. may also be presented as credible sources of information. *