

National High School Model United Nations 2012

Country: Jamaica

Committee: Disarmament and International Security Committee

Delegates: Giulia Pelos and Nicole Savio

Topic A: Security Implications of a Nuclear Weapons Program in the DPRK

Introduction

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has been proceeding with nuclear development since 1950, becoming the world's eighth atomic power. Although the country presently has no known working nuclear reactors, efforts at developing its nuclear power sector continue in fact the state is believed to have undertaken nuclear tests in 2006 and 2009. The current situation in DPRK is tragic because the state has not yet resumed its food self-sufficiency and relies on external food aid from China, South Korea and the United States. The population is impoverished and isolated, and the country faces an unstable political system and a struggling economy. In 2002, North Korea requested that food supplies no longer be delivered. The World Food Programme reports that in 2050 famine could return to North Korea. In fact, the reduction in food aid and the flooding in 2007 has aggravated the problem.

History of the Nuclear Weapons Program in DPRK

When the DPRK finally decided to sign the NPT (Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty) in 1985 it refused to agree to the safeguards, including clauses that would allow for IAEA (International Atomic Energy Agency) inspections. In 1992 the IAEA reached an agreement with North Korea, but the government prevented it from inspecting two nuclear sites. These signs of non-cooperation culminated in the first attempt at withdrawal from the NPT. The United States, to impede the withdrawal, came into bilateral negotiation with North Korea by the signing of the Agreed Framework. This measure temporarily stopped the DPRK's nuclear program, replacing the nuclear power plant program with more nuclear proliferation resistant light water reactor power plants, and improving economic and political relations between the U.S. and the DPRK. Despite the agreement, the North Korea has persisted in non-cooperation with IAEA inspectors. In 2002 the Agreed Framework effectively broke down because of remarks made by the then-president George Bush, that insulted the Asian State. In the same year the country revealed its full intention to pursue the production of weapons-grade plutonium, and expelled all IAEA inspectors from the country.

The crisis, exacerbated by the failure of the Agreed Framework, culminated in 2003 with the DPRK's full withdrawal from the NPT. The state declared that the decision was a legitimate defensive measure, citing Article X of the NPT. From their point of view, their actions were justifiable because the Agreed Framework represented an attack on their sovereignty and the dignity of the nation. Its noncompliance was justified due to their belief that the U.S. manipulated IAEA, using it to suppress the Nation.

Between 2003 and 2009, sporadic talks and negotiations took place between DPRK and five other nations, namely South Korea, U.S., China, Russia and Japan. However they yielded very little tangible results. In April 2009 the DPRK launched a three-stage rocket. In May, following the expulsion of IAEA inspectors, North Korea performed another stronger nuclear test. As a result, in June the Security Council tightened pre-existing sanctions on the country in an attempt to bring them back to line.

The possession of nuclear arsenal can be seen as a method of intimidating other states and organizations. To this end DPRK has used its nuclear weapons program as leverage to secure guarantees and humanitarian aid. This leverage has granted the state a certain status which distracts the international community from addressing the country's other problematic areas, including its economy and political system. When DPRK stipulates agreements with other States it demands food, fuel and money which it lacks, in return for its cooperation in negotiation, inspection or shutdown of nuclear facilities. The success of this strategy could potentially incentivize non nuclear weapons states to acquire nuclear weapons. It could also be seen by problematic States as a way of achieving international recognition. Furthermore, the sharing of nuclear weapons technology constitutes a problem that could hamper NPT's efforts to restrict any further countries from gaining nuclear capabilities.

Jamaica's position

"Jamaica is committed to international peace and security and the use of nuclear energy for safe and peaceful purposes. To that end, Jamaica has undertaken binding legal obligations under international law and is a party to the following conventions:

- The Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty
- The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
- Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and

the Caribbean"(1)." Therefore the country forms part of a nuclear-weapons-free zone and is also involved in OPANAL, an organization which promotes nuclear disarmament." The Government of Jamaica has not provided and does not intend to provide any support to non-State actors that attempt to develop, acquire, manufacture, possess, transport, transfer or use nuclear weapons and their means of delivery."(1)" Jamaica is a State Party to the IAEA and has signed the

Additional Protocol.”(1) As a consequence the state continues to support the aims and objectives of the International Atomic Energy Agency. “In conclusion, Jamaica reaffirms its support for the goal of general and complete disarmament and non-proliferation in order to strengthen international peace and security. Jamaica also supports international efforts to combat terrorism and is committed to fulfilling its obligations under relevant multilateral conventions.”(1)

- 1- Note verbale 2005. “Note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the Committee”. United Nations. Security Council.

Proposed actions and solutions

Jamaica, supporting the aims of IAEA, proposes to revise Article X of the NPT in order to define what extraordinary events justify withdrawal from the Treaty. In this way it would be able to take serious and strict measures through the creation of a body which would control the application of the punishment imposed by the UN. Pursuing these measures would also prevent the use of nuclear weapons as political leverage by ensuring that the receipt of humanitarian aid or other international aid is linked to the development of nuclear arms. For example in North Korea, its level of humanitarian aid should be determined by its nuclear activity or by its cooperation to IAEA’s inspections. The sharing of nuclear technology can cause damage to peace and international security as the sharing of this information can lead to the creation of new nuclear weapons states as pointed out earlier. The only way to prevent this, is to implement sanctions against states that need these technologies, and to reward the states who choose not to introduce nuclear weapons.

Bibliography and Sitography

- Background guide- Disarmament and International security Committee

<http://imuna.org/nhsmun/committee/disarmament-and-international-security-committee-2012>

- Note verbale 2005. “Note verbale from the Permanent Mission of Jamaica to the United Nations addressed to the Chairman of the Committee”. United Nations. Security Council, 2005. Web.

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N05/297/09/PDF/N0529709.pdf?OpenElement>.

- A/RES/66/46. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “66/46. Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons”. United Nations. Sixty-sixth session. 12 January 2012. Web

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/461/58/PDF/N1146158.pdf?OpenElement>

- “Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons”. General Assembly. United Nations. Sixty sixth session. 10 November 2011. Web

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N11/510/87/PDF/N1151087.pdf?OpenElement>

- A/RES/65/59. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “65/59. Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments”. United Nations. Sixty-fifth session. 13 January 2011. Web

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/516/08/PDF/N1051608.pdf?OpenElement>

- A/RES/65/80. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “65/80. Convention on the Prohibition of the Use of Nuclear Weapons”. United Nations. Sixty-fifth session. 11 January 2011. Web

<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/517/34/PDF/N1051734.pdf?OpenElement>

- A/RES/65/56. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “65/56. Nuclear disarmament”. United Nations. Sixty-fifth session. 13 January 2011. Web
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/515/90/PDF/N1051590.pdf?OpenElement>
- A/RES/65/49. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “65/49. Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia”. United Nations. Sixty-fifth session. 13 January 2011. Web
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/515/48/PDF/N1051548.pdf?OpenElement>
- A/RES/65/49. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. “65/88. The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East”. United Nations. Sixty-fifth session. 11 January 2011. Web
<http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N10/517/82/PDF/N1051782.pdf?OpenElement>
- Nuclear- Weapon-free zones http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear-weapon-free_zone
- Information about Nuclear Weapons http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuclear_weapon
- List of states with nuclear weapons
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_states_with_nuclear_weapons

TOPIC B: State-Sponsored Terrorism

“Terrorism is the use of violent action in order to achieve political aims or to force a government to act.” (OXFORD Advanced Learner’s Dictionary, New 8th Edition)

Jamaica’s policy defines acts of terror by many different activities of organized crime kidnapping, violence against women, drug trafficking, money laundering and corruption. It is important to underline that the Caribbean countries are the most involved in drug trafficking.

As a matter of fact, Jamaica is geographically situated in the middle of the drugs’ flow, between the Andean region of South America, which is the main point for cocaine trafficking, and its primary consumer markets, which are the United States and Europe.

Movement of drugs inevitably involves corruption of civil servants and local law enforcement officials.

We are involved in State-sponsored terrorism which “is a term used to describe terrorism sponsored by nation-states. In general, State-sponsored terrorism is associated with support of paramilitary organizations.” (State-sponsored terrorism, www.en.wikipedia.org)

Terrorism and State-sponsored Terrorism are serious obstacles to the economic and social development. These strong consequences are due to the devastating impacts of these acts on civilian targets.

“In 2005, it is estimated that about 10 tons of cocaine transited through Jamaica, and 20 tons went through Haiti or the Dominican Republic. However, the flow of drugs through the region has decreased with the shift of trafficking to the Central American corridor. Cannabis production for export from Jamaica, the largest producer in the region, also appears to be in a slump. But demand from Europe may be increasing, and much of this traffic transits the Caribbean.” (ORGANIZED CRIME, [siteresources worldbank, INT/HAITI/Resources/CaribbeanC&VChapter2.pdf](http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INT/HAITI/Resources/CaribbeanC&VChapter2.pdf))

In the late 1970s, Jamaica was directly affected by Cuban officials and young people received instruction in revolutionary tactics and use of weapons. Immediately after discovering that arms intended for Jamaica were illegally purchased by the Cuban government, the first one decided to break the cooperation with Cuba, maintaining diplomatic relations at the same time.

This measure has been made possible thanks to the acceptance of counterterrorism Conventions, made by Jamaica and United Nations.

Especially after the attack of the Twin Towers on 11th September 2001, the United Nations have implemented many initiatives in support of counterterrorism. On 10th November 2001, the Jamaican government signed the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism in order to remove the threat to international peace and security. This International Convention “is a multilateral treaty open to the ratification of all states designed to criminalize acts those who finance terrorist activities and to promote police and judicial cooperation to prevent, investigate and punish financing those acts”.

Article 2.1 defines the crime of terrorist financing as the offence committed by ‘any person’ who ‘by any means, directly or indirectly, unlawfully and wilfully, provides or collects funds with the intention that they should be used or in the knowledge that they are to be used, in full or in part, in order to carry out ‘an act’ intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian, or to any other person not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict, when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act.’

State parties to this treaty commit themselves also to freezing and seize of funds intended to be used for terrorist activities, to share the forfeited funds. Moreover, States commit themselves not to used Bank secrecy as a justification for refusing to cooperate.” (International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, www.en.wikipedia.org)

Jamaica is implementing and improving structures and treaties against this type of violence.

Another breakthrough made by the Parliament of Jamaica regarding this issue is the acceptance of the Terrorism Prevention Act on 8 April 2005 amid strong opposition from the minority Jamaica Labour Party and civil organizations. “The Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005 (c 2) was an Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom, intended to deal with the Law Lords' ruling of 16 December 2004 that the detention without trial of eight foreigners (known as the 'Belmarsh 8') at HM Prison Belmarsh under Part 4 of the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 was unlawful, being incompatible with European (and, thus, domestic) human rights laws.

The Act allowed the Home Secretary to impose ‘control orders’ on people who were suspected of involvement in terrorism, which in some cases may have derogated (opt out) from human rights laws. As of yet, no derogating control orders have been obtained under s.4 of the relevant Act.

Despite having passed permanent counter-terrorism legislation only a year earlier, in the shape of the Terrorism Act 2000, the British government's response to the September 11, 2001 attacks was to rush through emergency legislation to increase powers to deal with individuals suspected of planning or assisting terrorist attacks within the UK.

A key feature of the Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001 was that resident foreigners suspected of terrorism could be interned without trial, if they could not be deported to another country without breaching British human rights legislation (for example, if they might be subject to torture or the death penalty in their native country). Several individuals were interned, mainly in Belmarsh prison, under these powers; they were free to leave, but only if they left the country, which some did.

The Government claims that it has evidence against these individuals that is inadmissible in court — or unusable in open court due to security concerns — and is reluctant to allow this evidence to be used. However, the House of Lords ruled that the internment of these people, without trial, was contrary to the Human Rights Act 1998, mainly because the powers only extended to foreign nationals; the new act allows control orders to be issued against British citizens as well as foreign

nationals. This Act remedied the discriminatory nature of the previous provisions.” (Prevention of Terrorism Act 2005, www.en.wikipedia.org).

With all the episodes of Terrorism and State-Sponsored Terrorism the Jamaican government proposes to stipulate to the United Nations International agreements in order to contrast political violence.

Jamaica suggests adopting as Counter-terrorism Strategy a similar one used by the European Union “which covers four strands of work, fitting under its strategic commitment in order to combat terrorism globally while respecting human rights, allowing its citizens to live in an area of freedom, security and justice. Strategic Commitment includes: Prevent, Protect, Pursue, Respond.

Prevent: To prevent people turning to terrorism by tackling the factors or root causes which can lead to radicalisation and recruitment, in Europe and internationally.

Protect: To protect citizens and infrastructure and reduce our vulnerability to attack, including through improved security of borders, transport and critical infrastructure.

Pursue: To pursue and investigate terrorists across our borders and globally; to impede planning, travel, and communications; to disrupt support networks; to cut off funding and access to attack materials, and bring terrorists to justice.

Respond: To prepare ourselves, in the spirit of solidarity, to manage and minimise the consequences of a terrorist attack, by improving capabilities to deal with: the aftermath; the co-ordination of the response; and the needs of victims.” (THE EUROPEAN UNION COUNTER-TERRORISM STRATEGY, Council of the European Union, Brussels 30 November 2005, 14469/4/05 REV 4).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/State-sponsored_terrorism

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prevention_of_Terrorism_Act_2005

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/International_Convention_for_the_Suppression_of_the_Financing_of_Terrorism

<http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/guerrilla/report-90.htm>

<http://register.consilium.eu.int/pdf/en/05/st14/st14469-re04.en05.pdf>

<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTHAITI/Resources/CaribbeanC&VChapter2.pdf>

OXFORD Advanced Learner's Dictionary, New 8th Edition