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Chair’s Letter

Dear Delegates,

Hello DISEC! My name is Diego Negron-Reichard and I will be your Chair for the upcoming PMUNC 2015. This year we have an amazing Secretariat, so I am confident that it will be the best one yet. So, let me tell you a little about myself: I come San Juan, Puerto Rico (where everything is sunnier) and I am a sophomore studying at the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Affairs. I am also currently pursuing a certificate in Latin American Studies and in French. I was fortunate enough to co-chair DISEC last year, so you can expect me to be a diligent and experienced chair, just like I expect you delegates to be engaging, and more importantly, be innovative. Do not be afraid to change history. I challenge you all to go above and beyond the politics and make this world (set in the year 1982) a better one.

If you see something that could be improved in the committee, please tell me! I want this to be the best DISEC Princeton has ever had. And, I can’t do that without your feedback. Finally, during un-moderated caucuses or whenever you see me outside of committee, I absolutely encourage you to approach me and ask me about Princeton, Model UN in the college circuit, or anything that really interests you – I would love to meet you all personally.

Sincerely,

Diego
**Topic A: The Falklands Conflict**

*Diplomatic failure* is epitomized by the Falkland Wars. Throughout this background guide, we will study and analyze several opportunities in which the two main sides of the conflict, Argentina and the United Kingdom, and other key players, were presented with numerous opportunities to reach a diplomatic solution. However, because of lack of communication, incomplete information, and nationalist pride, this war, often characterized as unnecessary, took place. Not only were individual countries unsuccessful in creating peace, but the United Nations itself failed at achieving a peaceful solution. The Falkland Islands’ case serves as a perfect case study and committee background to learn both about international diplomacy and about the geopolitics of an era that still have tangible effects to this day.

For the purposes of both Topic A and B, the committee starts in May 1982, and an important date that delegates should always keep in mind. 
Sovereignty, in this case, is the enemy of peace.

Setting the Stage

The dispute over the islands has a long and complicated origin. To this day, it is unclear who discovered and settled the islands first.\(^1\) The British favor the story that it was Captain John Davis who found the territories first. On the contrary, the Argentinians argue that the islands were in fact discovered by a Portuguese man named Alvaro de Mesquita.\(^2\) While knowing these stories is irrelevant for the purpose of debate, it is important to recognize from the onset that the question of sovereignty and ownership of the islands is unclear at best. This lack of clarity and certainty is a general theme that will extend into all the diplomatic missions that attempted to stop the war. Nevertheless, there are some clear historical occurrences that offer each side of the conflict, the United Kingdom and Argentina, some degree of credibility in each of their claims over the Falklands. It is important to know that while the “Falkland Islands” is the official name of the islands as recognized by the international community, Argentina refers to them as “Las Malvinas” instead.

Surprisingly, the first settlements on the islands were established in 1764 by the French. Soon after, the Spanish would also settle the islands, followed by the English. On July 9\(^{th}\), 1816 Argentina obtained its independence from Spain.\(^3\) For Argentina, it was assumed that the Falkland Islands themselves would also now belong to


\(^{2}\) Id.

them, as these islands were fairly close to Argentina and had a link to the Spanish Crown. However, even by then, the population of the Falklands was mostly composed of English subjects. In 1828 the Argentinian government attempted to establish a penal colony on the islands, but the English quickly established their control over the area. In 1829 Argentina would try again at imposing its dominance over the islands, but just like the first time, they were expelled by the British. It was not until 1833 that the United Kingdom finally established a permanent colony. Given the context of the era, a time in which strength was measured by overseas possessions, it made perfect sense for the United Kingdom to assert its imperialist ventures.

We now see the first, and original basis, for both sides to make a claim at the sovereignty of the islands. In short: “The Argentines have always claimed that the islands were inherited from Spain after the Independence of 1816 but were taken from them by the British who, on the other hand, felt obliged to defend their colonial subjects from any outside aggression”⁵

From 1833 onward, the Argentine government would try numerous times to regain its “lost” islands.⁶ All of these attempts were nonetheless unsuccessful. In the second half of the twentieth century, Argentina would formally present a report to the United Nations in which it laid its claim to the islands. This move led to Resolution 2065 (XX) on December 16, 1965 titled “Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)”. The resolution

---


⁶ Id.
“Invite[d] the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom to proceed without delay with the negotiations [...] bearing in mind [...] the interests of the population of the Falkland Islands”.  

These suggestions were unfortunately ignored by both nations.

There are other examples of legislation from the United Nations that have failed to gain any traction on the Falklands issue. For example, both Resolution 3160 (XXVIII) and 31/49 suggested that Argentina and the United Kingdom resume their peace talks.  

However, these talks never resurfaced.

However, it is important to point out that these resolutions placed special emphasis and attention to the interests of the inhabitants of the islands. For the United Nations, the Falkland Islands issue has always been a colonial one, and thus the participation of the local population in finding a solution would be necessary for a truly just solution.

This is an interesting and consequential point, for if the United Nations recognizes the importance of the locals’ participation in this case, then it must do so in all other colonial cases. And thus, other powerful nations with colonial territories, such as the United States with Guam, American Samoa, and Puerto Rico, must also abide by this general principle. Two things should be highlighted at this moment: 1) the

---
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Falklands case is not an isolated case, as the outcome we partake in as a united body will have international repercussions (i.e. other colonial cases) and 2) the United Nations has until this point been unsuccessful at establishing peace, so what about this time will ensure that a diplomatic solution is achieved?

Finally, further discussions carried out by diplomatic teams of each country took place in the 1960’s and 70’s, but no concrete solution was found. It is soon becoming clear that a diplomatic solution might not be possible.

Now, let’s talk war. Was the Falkland War inevitable? No. In order to get to this answer, a proper analysis of the contemporary geopolitics of the era and the reasons each country had for engaging in this conflict is necessary. For simplicity, here are each countries motives arranged in bullet points.

Reasons for Argentina to go to war:

• Argentina claims the Malvinas belong to them, seeing as they legally inherited them from Spain once they gained its independence in 1816.

• In 1980, Chile won an important victory in the Beagle Dispute, which in turn increased both Chile’s reputation and power in the Southern continent. This occurrence forced Argentina to rethink its position in Latin America, and thus has motivated it to expand its territorial dominion.

• It is believed that these islands possess vast oil reserves under


10 Id.

them. Also, Krill fishing seems like a legitimate economic endeavor to pursue.

• Under the current dictator, General Leopold Galtieri, the Argentine economy is experiencing a deep recession. Winning back the Malvinas would be a good way for the General to regain popularity. For context, here are some figures:

“By 1981 the inflation rate rose to 100 per cent, foreign debt climbed to its highest records, deindustrialization rate reached 22.9 per cent, net salaries decreased by 19.2 per cent, GDP (Gross Domestic Product) fell by 11.4 per cent and the national currency collapsed at rates of 600

per cent.”

Evidently, the people are unhappy.

Reasons for England to go to war:

• Arguing that they had a legitimate claim to the islands since 1833, the United Kingdom feels obliged to protect its subjects from any foreign aggression.

---

The world is right in the middle of a Cold War (foreshadowing Topic B?) and Margaret Thatcher, the leader of the United Kingdom, is not prepared to allow a dictatorship to get away with even a small victory. She was the “Iron Lady”, and Argentina’s behavior would not be tolerated. The UK risked too much by losing the Falklands.

For England, although not as intensely as for Argentina, the prospect of natural resources is also an appealing factor.

Just like Argentina, England is in deep economic trouble. In fact, it is facing its strongest recession since 1931. Thatchers popularity is at an all time low, so winning this war would ameliorate the situation. In fact, after the United Kingdom’s victory (this has not happened in our committee’s timeline), Thatcher’s approval soared.

On March 19th, 1982 a group of Argentinian workers raised the Argentina flag at South Georgia (A Falklands dependency). The British interpreted this as a hostile move, but no measures were taken to increase security. On April 2nd, the Junta, or the government of Argentina, ordered the invasion of the islands.


\[13\] Id.

\[14\] Id.
The Junta believed that the United Kingdom had no interest in protecting its overseas territories. It though the former for two reasons: 1) in 1981, the British Nationality Act was passed, which severely limited the natives’ access to British citizenship, and 2) the removal of the HMS Endurance a few months before the conflict erupted, a ship that carried supplies to the islands, convinced the Junta that the United Kingdom had no political interest in the Falklands.¹⁵

On April 2nd, the same day as the invasion, the British garrison surrendered. Quickly the United Kingdom sent a Task Force to take engage in combat and also deployed a submarine to the area. Argentina’s forces then reached their peak of around 10,000 troops on the islands. The British counterattack started by recapturing South Georgia (April 21-26) and gained good traction with the crucial, and controversial, sinking of the ARA General Belgrano (May 2).¹⁶ After several advances, and finally the loss of the capital city to the British, the Argentine

---


commanders agreed to surrender on
the evening of June 15TH.

There is, however, one major
factor that ensured that this war
would take place: diplomatic failure.

We have already seen how the
United Nations was unable to
mitigate the conflict, but there are
other instances, in between the first
invasion in April 1982 and the
British counterattack, that could have
ended the conflict in a diplomatic
manor.

The failure of diplomatic
negotiations can be largely attributed
to miscommunication, animosity,
and lack of information. Two things
must be kept in mind: the
Argentinians believed that the United
Kingdom was not serious over its
territorial claim over the Malvinas
(as previously explained), and that
the United Kingdom believed that
Argentina wanted no peaceful
solution – when in reality, some
historians believed that Argentina
never intended to go to war, it simply
wanted to elevate the topic to an
international forum. As we can see,
right from the onset, both parties
have a clear misunderstanding of its
enemy’s position. This, coupled with
other significant incidents, ensured
that war would be the only solution.

Here outlined are the failed
diplomatic missions:

1. The first initiative was taken by
   United States President Ronald
   Reagan and Secretary of State
   General Alexander Haig.
   Although originally very much
   welcomed by both countries, in
   the end Argentina refused to
   accept the United States’
   proposal. The reason being that
   while Argentina wanted eventual
sovereignty of the islands to be a talking point in the discussions, the US offered no such thing. The United States argued that its proposal was fair, and that Argentina’s refusal was in itself an aggression. This led the United States to pursue both economic and military sanctions against Argentina.\textsuperscript{17}

2. The second attempt was by the President of Peru, Fernando Belaunde Terry. He proposed a seven-point plan, the first two points being an immediate cease fire. Although originally both parties were going to accept the deal, the controversial sinking of the Belgrano (May 2\textsuperscript{nd}) by the United Kingdom caused talks to cease. The sinking of the ship was contentious for it supposedly happened out of the designated war zone. By May 8\textsuperscript{th}, the possibility of peace dwindled, as internal support for the war increased with the election of the Conservative Party in the Falklands Town Council, and as the United Kingdom gained NATO’s official support.\textsuperscript{18}

3. Finally, the United Nations made one more attempt. The Secretary General, the Peruvian Javier Perez de Cuéllar, collected the points of discussion that both countries were willing to negotiate an agreement on. The United Kingdom wanted the creation of a local council on the islands, in other words demanding the residents of the Falklands exercise their right to


\textsuperscript{18} Id.
self-determination. Argentina, conscious of the evident British majority in the islands population, demanded that the council be composed of members of the international community. The United Kingdom ignored Argentina’s demands, cut discussions, and proceeded with what would be the final invasion on May 21st, 1982.19

**Important:** For purposes of the committee, this last third diplomatic failure, will not have happened. The committee would start after the second diplomatic mission failed. However, I presented this scenario so that delegates would be aware of the difficulty of achieving a diplomatic solution, even with the involvement of the United Nations. Nevertheless, I encourage you all to be creative and to go beyond what is normally expected. Diplomacy is much preferred over war.

**Potential Solutions**

At this point, it is important to recognize the most contentious points of debate, or the subtopics of the committee if you will, in order to be able to solve the issue at hand.

The most evident problem is the question of sovereignty. Who has the legitimacy to make a claim of sovereignty and how long is this claim valid? Determining the extent of a country’s sovereignty is not an exact science, but more a question of diplomatic dispute. Given the level of ambiguity that already permeates in these discussions, a possible solution could be providing an official definition for the concept. Of course, this only sets the framework for further debate, but

19 Id.
will help the committee in reaching a long-term solution. While the United Nations has already expressed its concern for the participation of the local populations involved, the repercussions of such a move have not been fully internalized yet. For other colonies in the world, this represents an opportunity for full integration or independence from its metropolis. While some countries may argue that fighting against powerful nations such as the United States is pointless, putting pressure on such a country to abide by the “self-determination” policy could create a situation that brings the United States back to the diplomatic table. After all, no powerful country wants to lose any territory in this Cold War context.

Another issue to consider is the changing economic and geopolitical landscape in Latin America. In the 1970’s, many countries in the region experienced a rapid economic growth (noticeably Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina), a factor which incentivized powerful nations to lend enormous sums of money to these countries. Ever increasingly after 1973, commercial banks had access to oil-rich countries and used this capital to heavily invest in Latin America. Soon, the region’s external debt would quadruple, representing around 50% of the region’s gross domestic product (GDP). In Argentina, these troubles were compounded by Chile’s mostly successful claim to the Beagle Channel over Argentina. While times seem bleak, a unique opportunity emerges. We have a desperate region that is thirsty for economic stability. Thus, a possible solution is using financial aid as bargaining chip that forces Argentina to sit down and reach a diplomatic solution.
After all, it is a reasonable proposal, seeing as Argentina’s current dictatorial government is losing power as the economic crisis worsens. Remember that each country has a position (Argentina wants to keep the Falkland Islands), and that each country has a real interest (Argentina wants to maintain economic and political stability). When I encourage you to be creative, what I mean by that is to go deep into history and find the positions and interests of each bloc, and manipulate them to fit in with your preferred outcome. Finding ways to appease a country’s real interests is the best way to achieve diplomatic success.

Finally, always keep in mind that we are in the middle of a war. While possibly limited, there will be casualties and suffering. Thus, another point of discussion is what role should the United Nations play in ensuring the well-being or treatment of the local population in the Falklands (that is, if it should even intervene in the first place).

**Country Blocs**

It is important to remember that the world is in the middle of a Cold War, which in turn entails that many, but not all, of the divisions that would emerge among countries will follow a similar pattern to that of the alliances that were already formed during this period.

**NATO and other allies:**
As previously mentioned, NATO pledged its support for the British cause, a factor that greatly allowed the United Kingdom to carry out its final and determinative counterattack. France’s support was integral for England. Also, New Zealand, South Africa and Chile openly expressed their support for the British cause. (Remember how Chile had just won a major victory?). When voting on Resolution 502, Spain and Poland both abstained from the voting procedure. Finally, the European Economic Community or EEC, a precursor to the European Union, expressed its support of England.

Latin America and other allies:
Argentina received much, if not most, of its support from Latin American countries. Specifically, it was Panama that offered the most help openly. However, there were other countries, such as Brazil and Peru that aided the Argentine cause. The initial intervention of the United States is largely attributed to the fear that Argentina would have received help from the Soviet Union. Although it never surfaced openly, several clandestine operations were orchestrated by the Soviet Union (for example Libya’s sale of arms to Argentina).

Rest of World
It is worth mentioning that China also abstained from the Resolution 502 vote. However, for the most part, support for
each side of the Falklands conflict was dictated by Cold War alliances.
or if the United Kingdom succeeds? How is the Falkland case internationally relevant?

Questions to Consider:

1. When identifying your country’s bloc, ask yourself: how is my delegation currently involved in the contemporary geopolitics of the era? Has it traditionally favored the United States, or the Soviet Union? Countries that do not have a clear policy have an advantage in committee, for they can use this ambivalence to gain leverage. Just because your country’s position is not on Wikipedia, does not mean that you cannot play an important role during committee.

2. What constitutes a legitimate claim of sovereignty? Does the right to self-determination mean anything? Is it not simply one country was abler to establish a predominantly favorable population?

3. What are the consequences if the war continues? What are the consequences if Argentina wins,
Nuclear Disarmament and Nonproliferation

Before engaging in a thorough, historical analysis of the Cold War era, it is imperative to clearly define several concepts that will be used throughout this background guide. When talking about nuclear disarmament, we are referring to the process of reducing or completely eliminating a country’s nuclear weapons stock. When making reference to nuclear proliferation, we are referring to the spread of nuclear weapons or nuclear information and technology to nations not recognized as “Nuclear Weapon States” (NWP) by the Treaty of Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1968, or the NTP.

The year is 1982 and the world is in a precarious situation. Alliances are not as clear as they used to be during the 1960’s, developing countries now play a considerable stake in the outcome of diplomatic missions, and the possibility of war ever increases. As the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC), we are the proper and legitimate body to deal with these pressing issues. As DISEC, we should strive to promote the creation of multilateral disarmament agreements, the implementation of international standards and regulations regarding certain types of weapons, and the establishment of collective measures to reduce the amount of armaments across the world. In order to succeed in this committee, in other words, in order to stop a nuclear war, delegates must be both aware of the current geopolitics of the era and able to offer creative diplomatic solutions.
With an increased nuclear weapons arsenal, and an alarming rhetoric employed by both sides, this War might just blow up.

Setting the Stage
Before entering into a discussion of the “current” trends that characterize the year 1982, it is important to go over an overview of the reasons that motivated each Nuclear Weapon State (NWS) to obtain their nuclear stock in the first place. A country by country analysis of the big players is thus warranted:

The United States of America
Around October 1939, President Franklin D. Roosevelt received a message from Albert Einstein warning him of Germany’s intentions of building a nuclear weapon.21 Fueled by the fear of the Nazis gaining the upper hand in the Second World War, President Roosevelt, in conjunction with the United Kingdom, embarked on a venture known as the Manhattan Project.22 This project was responsible for capacitating the United States with the origins of its nuclear program. Although the war ended in 1945 and Germany had fallen, in August of the same year the destructive capabilities of the new weapon were tested in Japan when a powerful uranium


22 Id.
bomb called “Little Boy” severely damaged Hiroshima and a plutonium bomb destroyed Nagasaki.

War was over, but the race to become an international superpower was not. By this time, the Soviet Union had also begun to develop its nuclear weapons arsenal. Fueled by the fear of a Communist rise, US President Truman went on to develop a more advanced type of weapon, the hydrogen bomb. Again, the rationale of “someone else becoming more powerful” took control of US foreign policy. This theme of constant fear would continue to hinder later attempts at ending the Cold War, in part because it led to the adoption by several states of the doctrine of “mutually assured destruction” (MAD). The MAD policy basically meant a scenario in which two or more countries would employ enough weaponry to ensure the destruction of both the aggressor and the defender. When engaging in communication, there was always, unfortunately, a deep sense of mistrust. This is an important factor to remember when engaging in debate during committee: how can we, as an international body, ensure that promises and assurances are kept?

As other nations began to develop nuclear technology, and when taking into consideration the aftermath of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, a fusion of pragmatic political considerations and a fervent idealism moved the United States, causing the country to shift its outlook on proliferation. In 1953, President Dwight D. Eisenhower gave his renowned “Atoms for Peace” speech at the UN General Assembly. The result of this was the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a body that had the following

\[23\] Id.
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two goals: 1) helping countries that did not have a peaceful nuclear program develop the necessary technology to do so, and 2) ensure that no more nuclear weapons were developed. Although its original intent was to curtail widespread proliferation, this Agency actually further sped the process of proliferation, as both the United States and the Soviet Union “handed out” information to their allies, in the hope of building up their blocs. For example, the United States signed more than 40 nuclear cooperation agreements during this time. The conflict was again escalating.

The Soviet Union

Interestingly enough, the Soviet Union was originally a proponent of curtailing proliferation, to the extent that it even supported the Baruch Plan that was proposed at the first meeting of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission (UNAEC). The Baruch Plan proposed the creation of an international body to regulate the use of nuclear energy. Nevertheless, the awe and fear of Hiroshima propelled the Soviet government to being developing a nuclear weapons program. To Stalin, Hiroshima destroyed the world balance. In other words, the Soviet Union had no actual military need for a nuclear weapons program; building it was purely a political move. In 1953, the first thermonuclear weapon was successfully built, and that year marked the start of the American-Soviet arms race.


25 Id.
26 Id.
The United Kingdom

Although the United Kingdom embarked on the secret Manhattan Project in conjunction with the United States, in 1946 the United States severed its ties with UK nuclear scientists due to fears of further proliferation.\(^2^9\) Motivated both by the Soviet Union’s and the United States’ successful detonation of thermonuclear bombs in the beginning of the 1950’s, the U.K. decided to being its own independent nuclear program. By 1957, the United Kingdom succeeded in its quest. The United States, seeing as the U.K. could no longer be ignored, re-established its partnership with the country.\(^3^0\)

France

Although France had been involved in nuclear research prior to WWII, its aim was purely peaceful, in the search of alternative energy sources. Nevertheless, when its three former allies began to develop its nuclear arsenal, the French created the secret Committee for the Military Applications of Atomic Energy.\(^3^1\) As France was losing the Indochina War, and as the United States refused to assist in the conflict, the government saw it fit and even necessary to develop such a program. Here we see how security plays crucial role in developing a nation’s foreign policy.

\(^{30}\) Id.  
China

As “nuclear anxiety” spread across Europe, China began to develop its own stock of weapons. In 1953, under the guise of a civilian tailored project, China began to experiment with nuclear energy/weapons. It first successfully tested an atomic bomb in 1964, and by 1968 the first plutonium explosion occurred.\(^\text{32}\)

Relevant Treaties and Discussions

This frenzy and determination to build up a nuclear weapons stock eventually led to the signing of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).\(^\text{33}\) Out of the 189 signatories, five of them, the already discussed United States, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, France, and China, had "manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device prior to 1 January 1967"\(^\text{34}\), and were hence known as Nuclear Weapons State (NWS). The aim of the treaty was to curtail the excessive creation of nuclear weaponry, and required that NWSs no longer transfer nuclear weapons or technology to nonnuclear states. It also ensured that a nonnuclear state would not start to create its own nuclear stock. Finally, it recognized the


\(^{33}\) Id.

\(^{34}\) Id.
right of every sovereign state to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, a very important factor to keep in mind during debate. However, even during the time the treaty was being written and was enacted, the United States still maintained secret nuclear weapons sharing agreements with other NATO members. The question rises again: how can such a treaty be enforced, especially when dealing with NWSs?

After the scare caused by the Cuban Missile Crisis, presidents Richard Nixon and Gerald Ford called for a détente, or a period of ceased hostilities between the Soviet Union and the United States that lasted from 1969 to 1979, the year that coincided with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. During this period, numerous summits and important treaties were discussed, the most important being SALT I, or the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks Agreement. SALT I, which started in 1969 and was signed in 1972, halted the number of strategic ballistic missile launchers at existing levels and provided the framework for future discussions between these two belligerent countries. SALT II was the product of the continuation of these conversations from 1972 to 1979 and it aimed to reduce the number of strategic nuclear weapons that were manufactured. Finally, on June 18th 1979, an agreement to limit strategic launchers was signed in Vienna by both President Carter and General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev.

However, six months after the treaty was signed.

---


signed, the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan. This, coupled with the discovery that a Soviet combat brigade was stationed in Cuba, severed the diplomatic ties between the two countries. Although the treaty was never ratified by the Unites States Senate, the stipulations of it were in fact honored by both sides until it expired.

**Recent Events**

President Ronald Reagan ran on an anti-détente platform and won with an overwhelming majority. When asked how he would define the détente in 1978, he responded: “Isn’t that what a turkey has with his farmer until Thanksgiving Day?” Upon entering office, Reagan rapidly increased United States military spending and employed inflammatory anti-Communist rhetoric when referring to the Soviet Union and its allies, calling her an “evil empire”.

From there on, several alarming events developed, and the prospects of war became ever more threatening. In 1980, the United States and its allies boycotted the Summer Olympics held in Moscow. During 1981, the US Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) begins to support the anti-Sandinista Contras in Nicaragua, as a measure to curtail the expansion of the Communist ideal. On February 24th 1982, President Reagan announced the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI), as a way to provide aid and certain trade benefits to Central American and Caribbean countries that were experiencing leftist surges.

---


40 Id.
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March 22nd, President Ronald Reagan signs P.L. 97-157, which demanded that the Soviet Union stop its human rights abuses. And on April 2nd, Argentina invaded the Falkland Islands (wow! Everything is connected huh?). Things are escalating, and DISEC has to find a consequential way of reducing the “nuclear anxiety” that now permeates in the geopolitics of the time.

**Important:** Just like in Topic A, we find ourselves in May of 1982. I choose this particular moment in history because it allows us to do two things: 1) it ensures we are in a critical moment in which action is required, and 2) some important developments (i.e. treaties, discussions, etc.) have not happened yet—which in turn gives the committee the leeway and freedom to reshape history. In other words, researching what happens after this particular date would be useful, this way delegates are aware of what worked and what did not work. Hopefully, we can ensure that a war does not escalate. And if it does, so be it – this is your committee. But again, diplomacy is a far more elegant and creative solution.

**Possible Solutions**

Identifying the points of greatest contention will allow us to construct long-lasting and effective solutions. Let’s start with what we already have: the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty of 1968, or the NPT. Although supported by a wide and diverse composition of nations, there are still some important key players that have not signed on to the treaty. For example, India is not a member of the treaty and successfully tested a nuclear weapon on May 18th, 1974. The problem at hand is then how to incentivize non-treaty members to step away from building a nuclear weapons stock. To find a solution to this
type of problem, we must first understand the interests and reasons for each country to engage in the nuclear weapons business. Do they feel threatened by neighboring countries that already possess nuclear weapons? Are they being influenced by a specific bloc? Once this is determined, diplomatic strategies begin to crystallize. Offering certain incentives, such as financial and military aid, or offering information and resources on how to build a peaceful nuclear energy program, could ensure that a non-NPT member changes its views.

In an imaginary scenario in which a country like India would promise to stop its nuclear weapons program, another issue arises: how to actually enforce the NPT. As has been the case with Iran, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) faces the difficult task of creating a set of criteria to guide the international community in its pursuit of halting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. Even more importantly, this body is also responsible for ensuring that these criteria are being followed by all participating members. Evidently, if countries do not allow the intervention of the IAEA within its national borders, then the extent of the IAEA’s effectiveness is severely limited. Solutions for this type of problem could very much be a combination of different strategies. For example, renegotiating the terms of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty with countries that are still pursuing a nuclear weapons program is a possibility. This new agreement should reflect both the political reality of the country and the country’s willingness to compromise. If such an agreement is not effective, well thought-out sanctions remains on the table.
Finally, let us consider the current geopolitical landscape. There are two powerful and belligerent nations lashing at each other, and stuck between these two, there are numerous countries. While it is true that within this group of countries there is an array of diverse opinions and stand points, there is one critical point of convergence. Most of these countries, if not all, do not favor the prospects of war. It would take a massive diplomatic effort (and I am confident my delegates will be more than competent to achieve it), but a possible solution is temporary, yet strong, alliance between these countries in order to condemn both the United States’ and the Soviet Union’s harmful rhetoric. With sufficient international pressure, these two nations could be pushed into a corner and forced to negotiate.

Just like in Topic A, I encourage and remind you all to identify both the explicit positions and implicit (read: real) interests of each country, seeing as this will facilitate the diplomatic process.

**Country Blocs**

Similar to the Falkland’s case, the divisions among the countries are pretty similar, albeit with some exceptions. In order to be successful at swaying countries towards you, knowing the current “trends” and positions is extremely helpful.

**Western Bloc**

Composed of the United States, NATO, and its other allies, the Western bloc’s purpose is to curtail and halt the spread of Communism across the world. They were known as the Capitalist Bloc during the Cold War, and wanted to ensure their absolute dominance over world politics.

**Non-Aligned Movement**
Formally formed by Egypt, India, Indonesia, Ghana, and Yugoslavia, and now composed of several other countries, this group of countries proved very potent and relevant during the Cold War. In some cases, Third World countries benefited from the politics of the era as they played a smart balancing game: getting aid from powerful nations, and not fully committing to any side. Yet, others were deeply affected on the long-term for creating a heavy culture of dependency. Delegates member of this group will have to have long-term strategies in mind when formulating their policies. And of course, short term ones in order to not be sucked into an all out war.

**Eastern Bloc**

Composed of the Soviet Union, members of the Warsaw pact, and its allies, the Eastern bloc advocated for the expansion of Communist ideals. Their main concern was their sovereignty, and any threat or infringement upon it would be considered a serious advance.

**Questions to Consider:**

1. Taking into consideration the current geopolitics, how can each country leverage its position to get a better outcome?
2. What would be the necessary conditions for war to break out? How can these conditions be avoided?
3. Why has past legislation failed, or not achieved its desired output? What are the talking points your country or bloc would be willing to talk on in order to compromise?