

CIF Project 2008-2009

“Solutions for a Nuclear Free World”

Benchmark III

Advanced Physics
Orinda Academy

Student Authors

Elizabeth Agramont
Van-Anh Su
Matt Hirsch
Grace Luo
Jack Wranovics
Ian Busher
Greg Rudy
Janelle Liu
Crystal Cardona

Editor

Ben Freitag

Faculty Facilitator

Bob Shayler

Table of Contents

Resolving Global Conflicts involving Nuclear Weapons

Russia vs. Georgia.....	3
India vs. Pakistan.....	5
Israel vs. Palestine.....	10
Iran.....	13

Maintaining and Improving Peaceful Relations

A New and Improved IAEA.....	14
Dealing with Hostile and Combative Nations.....	16
Enforcing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.....	18
Achieving a Peaceful World.....	19
Conclusion.....	20

Peace: Russia, Georgia, and NATO

The conflict between Russia and Georgia has stemmed from two separatist groups, the South Ossetians and the Abkhazians. These groups wish to be seen as independent states from Georgia, and Russia has no problem helping them with this tasks. Russia would gain the advantage of having a more secure and manageable border due to the assistance they would receive from the two separatist groups in return. This includes open access to the Black Sea and oil territory. Both locations would allow Russia to reap in lots of profit. Russia and Georgia were well known enemies during the Cold War and seem to still carry a mutual resentment to this day. Russia was appalled by the suggestion made by NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) of doing joint military exercises together because Russia still sees Georgia as “a reflection of the spirit of the Cold War.” [1]. Russia also does not want Georgia to be a part of NATO for this same reason and the fact that Georgia makes Russia’s pursuit to gain access to the South Ossetinians and the Abahazians very difficult. Throughout the first week in August of 2008, a war began between the South Ossetians and Georgia. The Abkhazians soon joined in the fighting as well. Soon after this series of drastic events, NATO broke its ties with Russia. However, once the war ended, NATO continued to maintain an open but weary communication with Russia. “Experts say Russia and NATO have many issues to discuss—from arms control, missile defense and European security to NATO expansion, Afghanistan and Iran’s nuclear weapons ambition.” [2].

The intricate and fragile history between Russia and Georgia and their separatist groups is a tremendous problem when trying to take action and develop solutions for the future. It seems very unlikely that Russia will continue with NATO if there are continued conflicts with Georgia. Still, it is extremely important for Russia to gain the support of Georgia since both were involved in the Cold War. The tension that exists between Russia and Georgia is not going to suddenly disappear. Therefore, NATO must acknowledge the severity of this problem and try not to take action towards Russia or Georgia that would provoke either in any way. For instance, it would probably be best for NATO not to participate with Georgia in a joint military exercise. Also, the issue of the separatist groups should be put aside for the time being until Russia and Georgia are more stable and are willing to work out their problems on a diplomatic level. Instead, NATO should focus on the similarities that all 26 member nations share, and try to work on a more global goal. Individual countries will reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the threat of terrorism by focusing on global issues instead of domestic concerns. The end of the five day war between Russia and Georgia was one step in ensuring peace; the next was for NATO to begin communication with Russia again. Now it is time for NATO to ask Georgia to join their organization and insist that Russia does not actively oppose this offer. It is important to have all parties on board, regardless of their initial points of view, because their opinions are subject to change once they see all sides of the matter. Russia and Georgia should be forced to sign an agreement in which

they state that they will put all their efforts into fulfilling the obligations and responsibilities of NATO. After this treaty is signed, the NATO Russia Council should have discussions about the Russia-Georgia predicament and the separatist groups. Then a consensus between the 26 member states should be reached and NATO should come forward with a recommendation for the type of action that should take place between Russia and Georgia. There should be no hurry to find permanent peace between Russia and Georgia as that would be almost impossible. Instead, it seems more realistic to try and prevent further outbreaks or attacks in these counties and territories. You cannot effectively tell a country to stop hating another; you must teach that country to be accepting of their foreign counterparts. NATO should help Russia and Georgia focus intently on the tasks that need all of the attention of the 26 member states, so that everyone will be preoccupied with the same goal.

Presenting Solutions to Conflicts between Nuclear-Capable India and Pakistan to Facilitate a Nuclear-Free World

India and Pakistan are neighboring South Asian countries exhibiting increasing hostile diplomatic relations since the Partition of British India in August 1947^[1]. Their conflict has resulted in the development of nuclear weapons on both sides as means of deterring each other. Both have a long and complicated history with each country grounded in territorial disputes that have led to numerous military conflicts, most notably the ongoing tug-a-war for the Kashmir territory. As a result of wars and armed skirmishes, India and Pakistan have built up their nuclear weapons programs, established in mid-1950s^[2] and 1972^[3], respectively, in order to hinder the other from initiating further assaults. However, such nuclear-proliferation measures have only stagnated peace building measures to address the true issues underlying Indo-Pakistani relations since their simultaneous independence from Britain. India and Pakistan, with the help of the international community, must engage in peaceful negotiations over their disputed territories and of confidence-building measures to reduce their likelihood of entering a devastating nuclear conflict and to foster a lasting peace.

The origins of the conflict between India and Pakistan began during the Partition of India in August 1947 in which the Princely states^[4] were left open to decide whether to join the Hindu-dominated Republic of India or the Muslim-dominated Republic of Pakistan. The Partition of India came about during the aftermath of World War II, when both British India and the Dominion of India experienced tremendous economic strain caused by the war and its demobilization from a war basis to a peace status^[5]. The Partition of India was supposed to be divided into two countries, in which areas consisting of 75%^[6] or more Muslims were to become Pakistan and the rest of the territory was to become India. However, the partition did not divide the nations cleanly along religious lines. Nearly 50% of the Muslim population of British India remained in India. Inter-communal riots between Hindus, Sikhs, and Muslims resulted in between 500,000 to 1 million casualties^[7].

The Partition of India also did not include the Princely-ruled territories, such as the Muslim-majority Kashmir. These territories were at liberty to determine their own future: to join Pakistan, join India, or remain as a sovereign state. The Maharaja of Kashmir, Hari Singh Dogra, was equally hesitant to join either India, because he knew his Muslim subjects would object, or Pakistan, because as a Hindu he was personally disinclined to. Consequently, the Maharaja decided to preserve Kashmir as an autonomous state. When Pakistan sent tribal lashkars to invade Kashmir in September 1947, the Maharaja appealed to India for help. However, India's Constitution barred the nation's forces to intervene in Kashmir because it did not come under its jurisdiction. Desperate for assistance, the Maharaja acceded Kashmir to India in the Instrument of Accession^[8], but against the will of the majority of Kashmiris. Although India claimed that Kashmir was now an integral part of India, Pakistan asserted that it was a decision that went against the Muslim-majority Kashmiri population. The dispute became subject of the Indo-Pakistani War of 1947, Indo-Pakistani war of 1965, and 1999 Kargil

Conflict^[9]. During these conflicts, which continue until today, both India and Pakistan continue to develop their nuclear arsenals to prepare for a looming widespread conflict^[10]. Kashmir remains divided between the two countries by the Line of Control (LoC), which distinguishes the ceasefire lines agreed upon in the 1947 conflict^[11]. Although a ceasefire has been maintained today, tensions along the Line of Control (Pakistan-backed Kashmiri terrorist attacks, human rights violations, pressing presence of the Indian army)^[12] continue to fuel movements toward a possible nuclear war.

For peace dialogues between India and Pakistan to impact measures towards ensuring lasting peace, both countries must engage in sustained peaceful negotiations and confidence-building measures in order to alleviate territorial and cross-border tensions. Although important steps have been made since the November 2004 ceasefire, including re-establishing communication and shipping routes^[13], such measures were more symbolic than substantive. The lack of any true progress on more contentious issues, such as delineating the land and boundaries and continuation of fragile relations, has not allowed the peace process to move forward. Nuclear capabilities have furthered transformed the conflict into an international matter with dangerous consequences. For India and Pakistan to approach diplomacy, both must focus on confidence building measures (CBMs), especially communication ranging from sustained meetings between local commanders to dialogue between civilians outside times of crises. In addition, Kashmir must be included in the planning, implementation, and problem-solving of CBMs. Kashmiri participation will make the peace process more meaningful. The international community, such as the United States (U.S.), must continue encouraging constant engagement.

Pressure must be applied on Pakistan to end support for militant organizations in Kashmir for regional peace to be assured. India must recognize that the security it provides in Kashmir has increased violence and human rights violations and caused resentment among the Kashmiris. In addition, India and Pakistan can implement a variety of political and economic changes that will build trust between the two and reveal the benefits of Indo-Pakistani peace. Politically, both nations can increase transparency, particularly with regards to information on military doctrines and force levels, encourage genuine debate rather than negative propaganda, halt production of nuclear weapons, support a no-first-use of nuclear weapons, and conduct joint policing operations against organized crime. Both can also implement economic policies like facilitating trade across the LoC with Kashmiri involvement, sharing electrical power, increase trade flow, improving and extending bus services across the border, promoting railway freight traffic across the border, improving telecommunication links, and making newspapers from both sides available across the border. By following such measures, India and Pakistan can develop a sense of mutual trust that will prevent the need for a nuclear conflict. In addition, these CBMs will show India and Pakistan, slowly and organically, that nuclear weapons are unnecessary in sustaining lasting peace and prosperity between the two countries. Consequently, the U.S. and the European Union can then successfully encourage the reduction of Indian and Pakistani nuclear arsenals. Therefore, by reducing violence in Kashmir, implementing sustained diplomatic talks among all levels of Indian, Kashmiri, and Pakistani governments, and practicing political and economic CBMs, India and Pakistan can avert a catastrophic nuclear disaster.

The conflicts between India and Pakistan have been long rooted in their territorial disputes. Ever since their independence from British India, wars, armed skirmishes, and tense relations have prevented a lasting peace. Current peace measures are stagnant as long as both nations continue to develop nuclear weapons in preparation for war. By fostering mutually beneficial political and economic policies with the assistance from countries like the U.S., India and Pakistan can understand the value of achieving harmony. Movements towards stabilizing the Kashmir region and LoC will further ensure the goodwill of the Kashmiris towards India and Pakistan. Efforts to develop mutually beneficial trade for India, Kashmir, and Pakistan in the region will help end the land dispute. Ultimately, sustained and effective confidence building measures will engender concord and understanding, thereby eliminating a regional nuclear threat and moving towards a nuclear-free world.

Internal Citations

- [1] Khan, Yasmin. The great Partition: the making of India and Pakistan. 2007, Yale University Press. Page. 12
- [2] “India Nuclear Weapons.” Federation of American Scientists, 08 November 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/india/nuke/index.html>.
- [3] “Pakistan Nuclear Weapons.” Federation of American Scientists, 11 December 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/pakistan/nuke>.
- [4] “Background to India and Pakistan conflict.” Mount Holyoke College, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~nmonasch/pakistan-india%20conflict.html>.
- [5] Khan, Yasmin. The great Partition: the making of India and Pakistan. 2007, Yale University Press. Page. 12
- [6] “Background to India and Pakistan conflict.” Mount Holyoke College, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~nmonasch/pakistan-india%20conflict.html>.
- [7] Khan, Yasmin. The great Partition: the making of India and Pakistan. 2007, Yale University Press. Page. 12
- [8] “Instrument of Accession.” Embassy of India, 26 October 1947, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/kashmir/kashmiraccession.htm>.
- [9] “The four Indo-Pak Wars.” KashmirLive, 14 September 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.kashmirlive.com/latest/The-four-IndoPak-wars/73887.html>.

- [10] Mian, Zia and M V Ramana. "Going MAD: Ten Years of the Bomb in South Asia." South Asians Against Nukes, 5 July 2008, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://pagesperso-orange.fr/sacw/saan/2008/ziaramanajune08.html>.
- [11] "The four Indo-Pak Wars." KashmirLive, 14 September 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.kashmirlive.com/latest/The-four-IndoPak-wars/73887.html>.
- [12] "India, Pakistan and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace." International Crisis Group, 15 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=4173&I=1>.
- [13] Grare, Frederic and Samina Ahmed. "India, Pakistan, and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace". Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 19 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=eventDetail&id=901&prog=zgp&proj=znpp>.

Bibliography

- "Background to India and Pakistan conflict." Mount Holyoke College, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~nmonasch/pakistan-india%20conflict.html>.
- "India Nuclear Weapons." Federation of American Scientists, 08 November 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/india/nuke/index.html>.
- "India, Pakistan and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace." International Crisis Group, 15 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=4173&I=1>.
- "Instrument of Accession." Embassy of India, 26 October 1947, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/kashmir/kashmiraccession.htm>.
- "Pakistan Nuclear Weapons." Federation of American Scientists, 11 December 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/pakistan/nuke>.
- "The four Indo-Pak Wars." KashmirLive, 14 September 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.kashmirlive.com/latest/The-four-IndoPak-wars/73887.html>.
- Grare, Frederic and Samina Ahmed. "India, Pakistan, and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace". Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 19 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=eventDetail&id=901&prog=zgp&proj=znpp>.

Khan, Yasmin. The great Partition: the making of India and Pakistan. 2007, Yale University Press. Page. 12

Mian, Zia and M V Ramana. "Going MAD: Ten Years of the Bomb in South Asia." South Asians Against Nukes, 5 July 2008, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://pagesperso-orange.fr/sacw/saan/2008/ziaramanajune08.html>.

Israel vs. Palestine

The area between Egypt and Jordan is one of the most disputed and war torn regions in the history of mankind. A dozen nations, several empires, and the three monotheistic religions of the world have poured their military might into an area slightly smaller than the state of New Jersey. Their collective fighting has raged for the past thousand years, and the twenty-first century has dawned with no apparent change in this pattern. Now in modern times with Israel's Defense Forces (IDF) on one side and radical Islamic elements such as Hamas and Hezbollah on the other, the fighting is not expected to end soon, if at all. This situation is made even more fragile by the increasing availability of nuclear weapons, which, if used by either side, could have consequences that reach far beyond Israel's immediate borders, or even those of the entire Middle East.

It is impossible to examine the current conflict properly without some understanding of its history, since the origins of this conflict are in fact many thousands of years old. Ownership of the land of Israel has been disputed since its discovery as a strategic position between Africa, Asia and Europe. Israel's location makes it a prime candidate for all overland trade routes between the continents. Furthermore, and perhaps even more relevant to today's conflict, is the fact that the area houses religious sites holy to Christianity, Judaism and Islam. These groups' presence instantly charges any discussion of the land with religious zeal. Though many powers claimed to have dominance in the region over the years, the seeds for the current struggle were laid in 64 BCE when the Roman general Pompey conquered the region. Unwilling to accept Roman rule, the Jewish population rose in revolt two years later by renaming the land "Israel," although the province was recaptured by the Romans shortly thereafter. The effect of this revolt was mainly to invite harsher measures from the conquering Romans who, under the leadership of the Emperor Titus, burned the temple of Jerusalem and expelled a large portion of the Jewish population from the province. Those Jews expelled from the region came to live in what they called the "Diaspora" meaning "exile" in Hebrew. Returning to their homeland became a dream of these Jews and their descendants and would grow into the Zionist movement in the 1900s. In the meantime, however, other forces were at work in the region. In the seventh century the Prophet Muhammad introduced a new religion to the Middle Eastern world in response to a vision he believed had been given to him by God. Attracting followers through his religious teachings and charisma, Muhammad carved a vast Islamic empire out of the desert tribes of what is today Saudi Arabia. □ When Muhammad died, his newly united people were ready to expand its influence across the earth. Naturally, one its first targets was Israel, which was strategic in that it would open the way to further conquests in Africa and Europe. Israel also was religious as the Prophet Muhammad was said to have ascended to Heaven from atop a rock in Jerusalem on the site where the mosque of the dome of the Rock stands today. As the Muslims conquered the land of Israel the final monotheistic religion of the earth was brought into the conflict, Christianity. The land is sacred to Christians as the home and original preaching ground of Jesus Christ, who was crucified in its holiest city, Jerusalem. It is understandable therefore that when Alexis the First, the

Byzantine Emperor at that time, appealed to Pope Urban the Second to send an army of Christian knights from Western Europe to assist their Eastern brethren, the Pope instantly acknowledged his request and called upon Knights from all Christian lands to reclaim the Holy land from the Muslim infidels. The result was a series of Christian Campaigns in Israel known as the crusades, the main result of which forever distanced the Muslim world from the Christian one and provoked the Muslims to defend the territory well into the modern era. Any action taken by a western power even today is viewed at some level as an attempt to claim dominion over this sacred realm.

As the twenty first century dawned the area now called Israel was yet again a scene of violence. Many of the worlds Jews living in the Diaspora had long hoped to return to the land, which they viewed both as the land promised to them by God and as the only safe place to practice Judaism. This desire for a permanent Jewish homeland increased many times over in the 1940's with the advent of the Holocaust, Hitler's "Final Solution" to the Jewish problem. Now what was previously an abstract religious dream turned into a desperate and immediate need in the minds of many of the surviving Jews, who concluded that there was no way for them to exist individually or as a people without a homeland to call their own. Sympathetic to the situation of the Jews after viewing the evidence of the holocaust, the Christian world supported the Jews' claim and on May 14, 1948 the modern state of Israel was born. The next day armies from Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Lebanon and Iraq crossed the border and invaded the country, with each respective country having declared war on the new state. The Arabs who lived in the region believed the creation of Israel was another attempt by the western and Christian world to claim as much as they could of what the Arabs believed was sacred and rightfully theirs. Though they had no historical blood-feud with the Jewish population, the idea that a culturally western people should suddenly govern an area containing the third holiest site in Islam was unbearable to many devout Muslims. Muslim disapproval of the west's actions was exacerbated as western allies had repeatedly disregarded Arab sovereignty and religion during World Wars One and Two. Muslims could not tolerate that the western world was supporting a nation that had been dominantly Arab and Muslim ever since the time of the crusades. The Jewish population proved their devotion to their cause, however, and the state of Israel has survived until the present day despite numerous wars and conflicts. While strife continues in Israel, some progress towards peace has been made.

In 1978 Israel signed the Camp David Accords with Egypt, officially ending hostility between the two countries. The remainder of Israel's neighbors followed suit, and today the fighting is mostly done by fanatical political or religious organizations rather than actual countries. Occasional terrorist actions on both sides continue to hamper the peace process but the sort of military invasions seen in 1948 no longer exist. While Israel has made peace with most of its neighbors, one country poses a threat to Israel which threatens to destabilize the entire region and once again plunge all immediate countries into war.

Iran has made known its goal to acquire nuclear material, ostensibly for the purpose of building weapons. While the nuclear program has failed to yet produce a nuclear weapon, Israel continues to be uneasy about the possibility that the most radical country in the Middle East might gain the most formidable weapon. Israel has made clear meanwhile that should Iran obtain a nuclear weapon, the Israeli military will

instantly attack and destroy it. This sets the scene for a possible disaster of truly biblical proportions, with several possible outcomes. Should Iran successfully build a nuclear weapon, and Israel subsequently attack it, it will naturally be viewed as a hostile Israeli action that could lead Iran to wage war against its attacker. This would lead to yet another full scale war in the region that could cost millions of lives and extensive damage to some of the holiest sites on earth, which could lead to further violence and the utter desecration of the entire region. Israel may feel that its existence is threatened to the extent that its conventional military is unable to protect it; in this case, the government may authorize the use of its own nuclear arsenal against its enemies, making it the only country ever to use nuclear weapons in war since the dropping of the atomic bombs on Japan during World War Two. This would increase the level of destruction and death in the region and also quite possibly make it uninhabitable for decades to come. A nuclear war will destroy not only numerous individual lives, but might also demolish entire cultures, histories, and nations.

This scenario begs the question for a possible solution to this conflict before it consumes its combatants and many bystanders. While there is no way to see into the future, or to know the answer definitively, one and perhaps the only solution is a gradual process of education and integration between Jews and Palestinians in the country. Each side ought to learn about the other and understand why those people who they see as their enemies are fighting with such vigor, even if it is for self-serving militaristic purposes.. While this would hardly seem the type of idealistic peace and love that would be most desirable for the region, such idyllic peace is at this stage unfeasible. Furthermore, since those who have the ability to affect the fighting at the moment have no intention of making peace, learning about their enemy in the context of war is the only conceivable way they could work towards peace. On another note, absolutely no effort should be spared in ensuring that nuclear weapons are not used by either combatants. This can either be accomplished by keeping these weapons out of Jewish and Palestinian hands or through attaching too much political, economic and military penalties on a combatant who uses them. Moral, economic, military and social results are of no concern in this matter since the failure of this process will render all other discussion on the topic of peace obsolete. The only matter left to discuss is how those countries left in isolation could survive the long term effects of a nuclear holocaust. On a slightly more positive level, many children have been left homeless and parentless by the fighting and require state or international assistance to survive. This provides an excellent possibility for the peace process because these children might be raised together instead of apart. This would lead them to understand each other in a way that is no longer possible for the remaining members of their parents' generation, and so perhaps the greatest possibility for peace will in this case come from a sad result of war, many thousands of orphans.

Resolving the Nuclear Crisis in Iran

In regards to the nuclear weapons problem in Iran, it's apparent that current negotiations are useless. Enforcement is the only solution to the conflict in Iran. While some may think the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and IAEA may curb this conflict, worldwide treaties and organizations have failed to resolve the issue so far.

The basic reason why Iran wanted to have nuclear weapons was that Iranian people worried about their social position in the world and the threat of the United States and other powerful nations. Citizens worry that a country like the U.S. will try to occupy or control Iran. If the aim of Iran is to protect and defend itself from foreign invaders, other countries should help Iran to set up certain economic policies. One such policy should include closer foreign trade, which will help Iran grow economically as a nation. Once these individuals have good and stable lives, they will be less inclined to forge wars with other countries. Ultimately, Iranian citizens will gain a stronger voice as a result of these provisions, and can overthrow the current government in power. Once this is accomplished, it will be possible to abandon the nuclear weapons program in Iran.

A primary reason why people are so panicked and worried about the nuclear crisis in Iran is because they believe the protection of nuclear weapons is an excuse for their production. Believers of this notion hold that the primary goal of the Iranian government is to control the whole world by using nuclear weapons. If this were true, the easiest way to solve the problem is to declare war against Iran. However, that's not what the vast majority of U.S. citizens want. Each country committed to a nuclear-free world must work to develop programs to curb nuclear production while pressuring nuclear holders, including Iran, to abandon their programs. Hopefully, the pressure applied to these nuclear threats like Iran will prevent further production of dangerous weapons while maintaining a level of civility in U.S. relations with these nations. Finally, the economic agreements between different countries can guarantee that each one follows this agreement.

Revamping the IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Organization (IAEA) has not been able to end the threat of nuclear weapons, but the organization's purpose – to limit the threat of nuclear war while encouraging safe uses for nuclear technology – is extremely admirable and necessary. The IAEA should encourage a revamped global nuclear policy based on the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons. Because the IAEA already exists in an organized form, it is likely that it would be too costly and repercussive to end the program and replace it entirely. The IAEA will continue to exist in the immediate future, but will follow the Logic-of-Zero principle, and new initiatives must be created and enforced to counter the IAEA's deficiencies.

The second incarnation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will properly define the jurisdictions of the eight boards of directors. The 1999 Amendment to Article VI, which would require greater proportional representation for developing countries, would be accomplished by allowing the board of directors to discuss with the representative countries which region they belong to.¹ The New IAEA will meet four times a year in regular conferences held in Geneva, but if circumstances require a special meeting, it will take only a 51% vote from the representatives to call the meeting. In terms of enforcement, the New IAEA will be more forthright and demanding in terms of its right to inspect nuclear arsenals, but will respect the goals of nations that maintain nuclear power and weapons. The New IAEA will encourage the support of other nations' militaries, as well as the UN Peacekeeping Organizations.

One of the first roles of the New IAEA will be to create regional chapters that will set up regulatory agencies to inspect the weapons held by each region roughly once every three months, although the agency reserves the right to randomly inspect the weapons without warning. Since the Logic of Zero is agreed upon at this point in future history, no member nation will be able to sufficiently balk at the prospect. Video cameras will be set up to record the exterior of every nuclear storage facility (making sure the pad with the code numbers on it is safely out of view), and the feed will be sent to a virtually permanent webcam, paid for by international money on a series of regional organization websites. Should IAEA researchers detect evidence of a secret nuclear explosion, the nation will be required to explain itself immediately. The IAEA will undergo a comprehensive investigation (backed up by international police, if necessary) in order to determine the state of the nuclear program, and a new board of directors will be instigated in the country. Violation of the terms of the CTBT will be considered a heinous criminal act, and the members of the state's nuclear program will be tried in a criminal court.

Since the nations of the world will have agreed by this point that a world without nuclear weapons is the ideal one, plans will need to be mapped out to ensure of this. Sessions must involve all member nations while nuclear weapons still exist. The nuclear threat might never completely dissolve, but the IAEA will maintain the right to examine nuclear materials, and exact reports about the amount of material used (for peaceful purposes). These reports will be delivered every month to the board of IAEA scientists. If, at any point, animosity exists between a country and the organization, and (as has happened in North Korea) the government refuses to allow examinations (a scenario very

plausible due to the unlikelihood of a world in which tensions have eased), the UN will be mobilized to actually enter the country by force and demand a nuclear examination. This method should only be used a year after economic sanctions have failed in order to deter the defiant country.

It is inherently difficult to prognosticate on the events of the world that the IAEA's second edition will monitor, as the shape of this world depends so much on the altered, superior relationship that opposing nations may share for one another even after their conflicts (not necessarily nuclear) have waned. The unpredictability of the world in stable periods is precisely why the IAEA must exist in an expanded form, and its increased role of enforcement in the world will be, so to speak, taking advantage of the stability caused by reduced tensions shortly beforehand.

¹“Amendment to Article VI of the Statute.” IAEA. 27 Aug 2003. International Atomic Energy Organization. 11 May 2009
<www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC47/Documents/gc47inf-5.pdf>.

Dealing with Resistant Nations

Scenario:

Our scenario addresses the possible complications associated with a drawdown of nuclear weapons. We run this as a thought experiment to examine whether our procedures and methods will be sufficient to stop a country from both developing nuclear weapons and continuing with their proliferation.

Having more access to facilities is crucial to the regulatory agency's success in accomplishing nonproliferation. When a nation starts dismantling nuclear weapons, inspectors need to be able to see where the nuclear material is going to in order to ensure that none of it is being diverted. Governments would be able to see the process in almost real time, which will allow nations to know how fast the countries are disarming.

Should a nation refuse to allow inspectors or attempt to deceive them, the international community must be able to pressure them to comply. The international community would largely be unwilling to force an economically and militarily powerful country to give up nuclear weapons. This program requires that nations be committed to the process of nuclear non-proliferation. Individual countries must be aggressive instead of passive in dealing with powerful and resistant nuclear nations.

Nuclear weapon states will have a variety of ways to respond to such a potential threat from another they deem to be violating the agreements. The following scenario is what we predict would happen if any one country refuses to dismantle the number of nuclear weapons according to their earlier agreements and what we recommend the other nations do. First an independent commission of members appointed by the countries would hold an emergency vote to declare a state noncompliant with treaties, which would trigger certain immediate sanctions. These sanctions would be designed primarily to retard development of weapons and send a message to the country that the economic costs alone of noncompliance are likely to be worse than the security benefits. The compliant weapon states are given an exemption from provisions and are allowed to cease disarmament of their remaining weapons. If any country hides nuclear weapons instead of dismantling them the other nuclear powers will stop dismantling theirs, which renders no nation any strategic advantage. In this situation deterrence is still in place and the process must start again to convince that country that a world free of nuclear weapons is still in their best interests. In a world that still has nuclear weapons the only way to eliminate them is by convincing nations of the world that they do not need them.

An alternative scenario would occur if all countries have already reduced the nuclear arsenals to zero and a country decides to develop them. Enforcement and inspections are even more necessary because if one nation creates nuclear weapons or other Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMDs) there will be no deterrent. Therefore in a situation where one country decides to be noncompliant, the board must be able to authorize military force to dissuade the country. This must be a potent and real threat. Any country which starts building up an infrastructure for militaristic purposes, diverts material to a weapons program, or otherwise interferes with inspectors must know that they are tempting an invasion. This is a serious cost of a non-nuclear world. Without a

viable military threat we cannot expect that nations will not try again to use nuclear weapons for their security needs. This requires that nations have cooperative armies that are ready to join together to stop another nation from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.

As the United States and Russia are the two most militarily developed nations in the world, they will either have to downsize their militaries or the other nations of the world must build up theirs. The power of the other countries combined must be able to overwhelm any individual nation.

Global issues and sources of conflict must be resolved so that nations may scale back their militaries to reflect concerns regarding nuclear weapons.

Implementing and Enforcing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

The purpose behind the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty created in 1970 was to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and insure that technology is used only to produce nuclear energy. The objective was to use nuclear technology for peaceful means rather than expand nuclear weapons.

We now face several problems that affect our level of safety and security in this world. When the Non-Proliferation treaty was originally signed, five countries had nuclear weapons; France, the United States, Russia, Britain and China possessed nuclear power. While these countries were supposed to reduce their number of nuclear weapons, there have been mixed results at reaching this goal. New nuclear nations, including India, Pakistan, and Israel, have failed to sign the treaty. These countries, along with North Korea, which pulled out of the treaty, have expanded their nuclear capabilities. Some nations, although they have not admitted to possessing nuclear weapons, may be hiding uranium in reserve to build nuclear weapons. Another problem is that the treaty allows countries to enhance their nuclear arsenal while continuing as treaty members.

The treaty is vague in terms of whether nuclear countries are complying with its conditions. It does not force treaty members that possess nuclear weapons to cut back on them. Nuclear weapons have been dismantled only through separate agreements. In addition, there are no penalties under the treaty for violating it or withdrawing as treaty members. In order for the treaty to fulfill its purpose, verbal threats must be abandoned in favor of stricter penalties.

The next step for nuclear powers is to develop plans to guarantee the security of lesser nations through economic aid and other services. A better plan must then be put in place to inspect countries suspected of building nuclear weapons and stricter penalties must be imposed on such nations. These penalties may include withholding economic aid and imposing sanctions.

As a last resort, the original five nuclear nations should agree to coerce by force those countries which have violated the treaty or withdrawn from it.

The Non-Nuclear Proliferation Treaty must be enforced extensively, regardless of which country is involved in a nuclear weapons controversy. While our current situation is unfortunate, hopefully there will be a day when the world is rid of all nuclear weapons.

The ultimate and only viable solution for a peaceful world is through the elimination, or at least drastic reduction, of all nuclear weapons. Why must countries resort to violence? Does it bring satisfaction and a sense of pride, knowing weapons kill the opponent? Innocent people have been killed because of nuclear weapons. They cause nothing but “environmental devastation and genetic damage that affects future generations” (Green Peace). While the International Court of Justice states that nuclear weapons are known to be illegal, this does not prevent certain nations from developing and threatening to use them. As a means of prevention against global disaster, the enforcement of nuclear disarmament is a must. Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine are some states that have rejected weapons after the USSR broke, and chose to be non-nuclear weapon states. (How is this last sentence relevant? Maybe explain the advantages these states gain by being nuclear free or why other states must follow their lead)

A reasonable way to enforce peace in the world is to start slow, and work our way up. It all rests on trust. Each region should have a nuclear-free zone. As of now, greater than fifty percent of the world is already a nuclear-free zone. “Region by region these zones will rid entire parts of the world of nuclear weapons and shrink the geographical space [...] These zones of safety and security also build cooperation and trust amongst peoples and nations” (Green Peace). Hopefully over time, the world will find universal peace. At a slow and steady rate, anything is possible if a person’s desire for change is strong enough.

Source: <http://www.greenpeace.org/australia/solutions/peace>

In order to achieve a peaceful world, nuclear weapons must be reduced to the fullest extent possible. While the earth should ideally be a safe place for everyone, which requires the complete dismantling of all nuclear weapons, this is not always feasible. People do try with organizations like the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), and countries also have conferences to talk about the treaties. President Barack Obama addressed the possibility of a nuclear-free world during his speech in Prague on April 5, 2009. Obama said, “So today, I state clearly and with conviction America's commitment and desire to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons.” It is both possible and beneficial to have a nuclear-free world. Nations must do whatever they can to avoid another catastrophe like the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings, and ensure a safer world for all.

Bibliography:

“Background to India and Pakistan conflict.” Mount Holyoke College, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~nmonasch/pakistan-india%20conflict.html>.

“India Nuclear Weapons.” Federation of American Scientists, 08 November 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/india/nuke/index.html>.

“India, Pakistan and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace.” International Crisis Group, 15 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.crisisgroup.org/home/index.cfm?id=4173&I=1>.

“Instrument of Accession.” Embassy of India, 26 October 1947, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/kashmir/kashmiraccession.htm>.

“Pakistan Nuclear Weapons.” Federation of American Scientists, 11 December 2002, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/pakistan/nuke>.

“The four Indo-Pak Wars.” KashmirLive, 14 September 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.kashmirlive.com/latest/The-four-IndoPak-wars/73887.html>.

Grare, Frederic and Samina Ahmed. “India, Pakistan, and Kashmir: Stabilising a Cold Peace”. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 19 June 2006, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://www.carnegieendowment.org/events/?fa=eventDetail&id=901&prog=zgp&proj=znpp>.

Khan, Yasmin. The great Partition: the making of India and Pakistan. 2007, Yale University Press. Page. 12

Mian, Zia and M V Ramana. “Going MAD: Ten Years of the Bomb in South Asia.” South Asians Against Nukes, 5 July 2008, Accessed 23 April 2009, <http://pagesperso-orange.fr/sacw/saan/2008/ziamanajune08.html>.

“Amendment to Article VI of the Statute.” IAEA. 27 Aug 2003. International Atomic Energy Organization. 11 May 2009
<www.iaea.org/About/Policy/GC/GC47/Documents/gc47inf-5.pdf>.

<http://www.greenpeace.org/australia/solutions/peace>

