

Boston Latin School
Tufts IGL Inquiry 2018
The Future Nuclear Imperative
Simulation #1

The Republic of India

Briefing Paper

Introduction

As one of the most culturally and socially diverse nations, we are not only familiar with the challenges derived from the governance of many peoples, but also fully committed to solving the challenges which confront the world. India aims to ensure the economic, political, and social integrity of our nation and our global neighbors. This conference extends a forum and platform on which the global community can come together to answer the complex domestic, cross-border, economic, and political questions which confront us today. As a rising global power we recognize the importance of the Future Nuclear Imperative and hope to expand upon our growing nuclear influence in the nuclear world order.

We accentuate our commitment to a strong international nuclear dialogue. In wake of increasing nuclear tensions across the world, all nations must focus on partnership and cooperation in order to foster international security and guarantee a protected future. This partnership may take many forms, and we bring flexibility in regard to nuclear non proliferation reform, provided that this reform does not discriminate against developing nations.

India enters the conference with an eager hand and open mind. We realize that all nations at this conference can come together to confront our issues, then they can be successfully resolved. Identifying, addressing, and resolving these issues are of the utmost importance to India, and we hope that we, as a collective of nations, can participate in a productive dialogue without obstruction and relegation which too often plagues international conferences.

A. Key Points

India would like to address the following issues:

- Establishing a prominent role in the nuclear world order
- Preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and ensuring eventual international nuclear disarmament
- Creating international precautionary preparedness and response plans addressing medical, security, and basic needs
- Curtailing terrorism through an international counterterrorism initiative
- Safeguarding human rights without undermining the sovereignty of another country
- Creating a way to safely dispose of nuclear waste and reduce radioactive fallout

B. Background

The Indian subcontinent is home to one of the world's oldest and most influential civilizations. India's history begins with its rich geography. India comprises the greater part of Southern Asia. The southern coast borders the open ocean while the north is protected by the massive ranges of the Himalayas. The Northeast and the Northwest are the only parts of India that are accessible by land. This is where the history of India and its people began. India is a constitutional Republic comprised of 29 states, each with a certain amount of sovereignty. With nearly 1.3 billion people, India holds about 1/6 of the world's population and is the second most populous country behind only China. This growing population has drawn India into the international spotlight with its promising economy and political influence.

India's history, however, extends all the way back to 2600 B.C. with the Indus Valley Civilization which dominated the valley until its demise in 2000 B.C. The people inhabiting the Indus River valley were thought to be Dravidians, whose descendants later migrated to the south of India. The Indus Civilization is believed to have created Hinduism, a popular religion in India that has survived to this day. Other religions, notably Hinduism and Jainism, also originated in India. Around 1700 B.C. the Indus Valley civilization came to an end. The second millennium

B.C was witness to the migration of Aryans into India. This sparked a new stage in India's history.

These Aryan tribes settled along the Ganga and Yamuna rivers, and by 500 the entire North portion of India was inhabited by ironworkers. Slowly a more ordered and settled society evolved. Tribes became kingdoms. The Aryans became the priests, rulers and warriors, free peasants and merchants. The subdued people became the slaves, laborers and artisans. These social distinctions marked the first signs of India's caste system. The Encyclopedia Britannica describes the Indian caste system as such: "Some *jatis* have occupational names, but the connection between caste and occupational specialization is limited. In general, a person is expected to marry someone within the same *jati*, follow a particular set of rules for proper behaviour (in such matters as kinship, occupation, and diet), and interact with other *jatis* according to the group's position in the social hierarchy." Among Hindus, castes are separated into 6 different classes, each with a different social function: Brahmins (priests), at the top of the social hierarchy, and, in descending prestige, Kshatriyas (warriors), Vaishyas (originally peasants but later merchants), and Shudras (artisans and labourers). The classes are based on the amount of contact one has with "pollutants." These pollutants include dung, blood, saliva, leather, dirt, and hair.

Next came the Vedic period lasting from around 1500 B.C-600 B.C. Many important milestones for Indian civilization were met during this period including the creation of the Vedas, sacred Hindu texts that are still important in Hinduism today. The Stone Age in India, lasting from around 1200 B.C. to 6 B.C., marks the rise of several kingdoms, republics, and realms known as Janapadas. During this period two famous Sanskrit epics, the Ramayana and Mahabharata are said to have been created. To this day the Mahabharata is said to be the longest epic poem in existence.

Soon three empires, Mauryan, Gupta, and Mughal, divided India into separate states. The Mauryan Empire was India's first empire. This period was marked by a wave of open mindedness as enforced by Mughal emperor Ashoka, who converted to Buddhism, attempted to unite his diverse peoples by enforcing tolerance. By 500 B.C. , the Gupta empire was comprised of 16 dynasties in the north plain. The Gupta empire is considered India's golden age. During this period Hinduism became a major part of Indian culture. The Mughal empire was marked by religious intolerance with the burning of Hindu temple. The Mughal empire decline in 1739 with the Persian invasion of Delhi.

The decline of the Mughal empire created a power vacuum which was filled by European colonialism. The Portuguese reached India by sea in 1498 and immediately began to import Indian spices. Soon the British caught on, and the East India company began to rule India directly as a colony. The East India company remained in control of India until 1858, when the Indian rebellion forced the East India company to transfer control to the British government. Soon after the Indian National Congress demanded the British to abandon rule in India. The British government responded by imprisoning leaders, including Mahatmas Gandhi, who was released in 1944. By the 1940s, however, there was a strong secular divide between Hindus and Muslims. The violence threatened to overwhelm New Delhi but Gandhi managed to prevent it by fasting and threatening to fast to death unless the violence stopped. It did but some extreme Hindus became angry with Gandhi. One of them murdered Gandhi on 30 January 1948. This eventually led to the independence of majority Hindu India and majority Muslim Pakistan in 1947.

In 1947 the Constitution of India was created which defined India as a “sovereign, socialist (democratic), secular, democratic republic.” India’s current government is most heavily influenced by the British model of parliament. In addition, India adopted several measures from the American constitution including the separation of powers, supreme court, and federal structure. We consider ourselves a democratic republic, and have a president as well as a prime minister who are elected by the people of India. The new constitution was put in place on January 26, 1950, proclaimed India “a sovereign socialist secular democratic republic.” The constitution includes a detailed list of “fundamental rights,” “directive principles of state policy”, and a much shorter list of “fundamental duties” of the citizen.

Then in the 1960’s and 1970s India fought three wars. The first was over a border dispute with China over Tibet. China declared a ceasefire. The second was over another border dispute with Pakistan. In 1965 Pakistani troops attempted to capture Kashmir, one of the few majority Muslims states in India. Both sides agreed to a ceasefire. Then in 1947 India fought another war with Pakistan. During that time Pakistan split into West and East Pakistan (now Bangladesh). Refugees flooded India from Pakistan looking for political stability. Pakistan agreed to a ceasefire in 1971 and Bangladesh gained its independence. In 1974 India exploded its first atomic bomb. This led to sanctions and criticism that prevented India from becoming a nuclear power for years to come.

In the 21st century India has come into the international spotlight. With its robust economy, nuclear arsenal, and growing population of 1.3 billion people, India has emerged as an important regional power. But it is also tackling huge, social, economic and environmental problems to face. Currently India’s government is controlled by two major political figures: the president and the prime minister. Ram Nath Kovind, a Dalit - one of India's lowest castes - was picked by an electoral college to become president in July 2017. India’s prime minister Narendra Modi stormed to power with the promise to strengthen the economy.

Sovereignty

As a former dominion of the British Raj, India values the importance of sovereignty. After 1950, King George IV abandoned the title of King- Emperor, making India a republic within the Commonwealth, and thus a sovereign nation. Our constitution is based on the Indian Preamble which defines India as a “sovereign democratic republic”. Today, India has a parliamentary sovereignty. India is both externally independent and internally supreme, meaning that India’s government hold supreme power, but does not control other foreign nations. We hold our national sovereignty to the highest level of importance and we believe that it is beneficial and necessary to us as part of a democratic world order.

Although some nations argue that sovereignty means allowing other countries to deal with their own problems, but India believes that in order to continue sovereignty, if asked, India will intervene to restore political stability in compromised regions. As famous Indian strategist Subrahmanyam once said, “There is no need for India to feel guilty of having interfered in the affairs of another nation,” especially if the intervention is in the face of crimes against humanity. For example, although not approved by the UN Security Council, humanitarian intervention was taken in East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) to aid refugees in the face of mass atrocities, and was successful in doing so. The same can be said for intervention in Sudan and Myanmar. As the United Nations Security Council once stated, “Armed intervention must always remain the option of last resort, but in the face of mass murder it is an option that cannot be relinquished.” India stands by the principles of intervention when faced with mass humanitarian crisis. India

will abide by the UN Security Council against unilateral intervention, but justifies the right to intervention in the face of mass atrocities.

When India entered the United Nations, it was still a non-sovereign state. Today, we are proud to call ourselves a sovereign democratic republic state and believe that all member nations of the United Nations Charter, regardless of whether that country has sovereignty or not, should be granted a universal acceptance of sovereignty.

In 1954, India adopted the Panchsheel Treaty which established non interference in others internal affairs and respect for each other's territorial unity integrity and sovereignty. The Principle of Non-Intervention is the prohibition of the use of force against any state's territorial integrity or political independence. We believe in this principle wholeheartedly. Any nation's political power should belong to that nation and that nation alone, with no worry of threat. We believe that every state has their right to their own form of government, the Principle of Non-Intervention advocates for the individuality of every nation, without the enforcement of other ideals. We believe that keeping the integrity of a country's identity is very important. With that being said, there are certain circumstances in which intervention is beneficial such as the violation of human rights.

We believe the international community should invest more in countries' rights because global unity comes after internal peace of individual countries. A country has to grant its own human rights before worrying about that of others. We believe that granting human rights would be very beneficial to our country's overall desire for peace, while still being able to enforce our advocacy for sovereignty. We trust that civil equality would further strengthen our country as a whole as well as keep our civilians safe.

International institutions should enforce and stress human rights, which in turn will lead to global security. As India, we have a formal diplomatic relations with most nations. Although we are not part of any major military alliances, we have many close relationships with a number of major powers, including the Russian Federation, Israel, Afghanistan, France, Bhutan, Bangladesh, and the United States of America. While we have many strategic partners and alliances, we are still pushing for more to further our message of peace with more countries. Currently, we are pushing for alliances with Canada and Argentina.

As a nation that recognizes the importance of maintaining a peaceful world order, India supports the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Similar to the NPT, India has demonstrated an interest in the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, the end goal of complete disarmament, and the overall promotion of the peaceful and non destructive uses of the nuclear energy. The NPT, however, has many flaws that need to be fixed. The main issue India has with the NPT is that supports discriminatory treatment. Under the NPT, India is not allowed to have nuclear weapons simply because it did not conduct nuclear tests before 1970. This policy is discriminatory, purposefully holds back India's non- weapon nuclear potential, and has deterred us from signing the Treaty.

India believes that global security is only more important than state sovereignty in the event of mass humanitarian crises. If global security is cared more about than state sovereignty than the human individual state rights we exercise will be hindered and endangered. Only when states rights are denied will global security be threatened. Therefore, to ensure global security each state's sovereign rights must be put first. Only when internal problems lead to global endangerment, will the global security be considered a priority.

We believe that if a country gives up their sovereignty to the point where that country is almost totally under the power of another, it cannot reclaim their original authority and stance on

themselves. We hold political sovereignty to a very high level of importance, and any country giving up their power to an extremity is very dangerous to that country's identity.

We believe that nuclear weaponry only poses a threat when in action. The possession of nuclear weaponry does not directly have an effect on sovereignty and global security. Taking into consideration the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which we have not signed for this reason, we disagree on the monitorization of nuclear weapons if they are not actively posing a threat to global security. We have a No-First-Use policy, meaning that we will not put our nuclear weapons to use unless first threatened.

As India, we are in fact a nuclear state. Our nuclear power has been increasing significantly since the beginning of 2009, through power plants and mining resources. We have sources of nuclear power through our 20 power plants across the nation. Having gained significantly large amounts of Nuclear energy we plan to use in many ways, we are looking specifically at using the energy we create to bring electricity to our citizens. Due to our lack of mineral resources we are incapable of creating many impactful nuclear destructive weapons. With our 20 nuclear power plants around the nation we plan to be running off 25% of energy through nuclear suppliers by 2050. Although we are not included in the NPT as a nuclear state we have been growing exponentially as a nuclear power. Our parliament has openly been trading with large countries such as the US, France, Russia, and Canada. Since the rise in nuclear power we have conflicted with no other countries in particular, the international trade of Uranium has given us great prosperity to our nation. Having nuclear weaponry in our possession does not affect our views on sovereignty. We strongly believe in not provoking others unless provoked first. We have the notion that nuclear weapons should only be used in the case of a serious threat to our country or global peace as a whole. We do not believe that other countries should decide whether we have the right to nuclear weapons, we believe we hold the right to possess and, in extreme cases, put into action our nuclear weapons as we see fit. We trust the fact that we possess nuclear weaponry is entirely up to us.

While the liberal world order is crucial to global safety and in cases humanitarian crises, we believe that the liberal world order should not interfere in negotiations about sovereignty and nuclear weaponry. The overall message of the liberal world order is ever changing, and we believe that a notion that is not entirely concrete should not be wholly included, while of course not completely ignored, in discussions regarding the matter of sovereignty and nuclear weapons.

Security

We, India, see the global security environment today as vulnerable and dangerous, as there are many nuclear powers and unstable nations with potential to harm others. We believe that nations across the globe must collaborate.

India's current security prism is based on national security. With our location and previous political conflicts with China and Pakistan, India must put a lot of energy toward preventing armed conflicts on those fronts. While we continue our internal security measures, it is becoming increasingly obvious that we, as a strong global player, must cooperate with other nations to attack security threats on a global level.

From India's perspective, the biggest challenge we face from the proliferation of nuclear weapons is the participation of de facto nuclear nations in an illicit arms race. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty bars every country, except for members of the Security Council, from producing nuclear weapons. Despite this, de facto nations have develop nuclear weapons programs. As more and more de facto nations, such as Pakistan, acquire nuclear weapons,

nations such as India have been forced to acquire more nuclear weapons as military deterrence and defense. This constant increase in weapon stockpiles by de jure and de facto nuclear nations, the increasing technical sophistication of these weapons, the development of new weapons (such as “mini-nukes” or battlefield nuclear weapons), and the acquisition of nuclear weapons by terrorists are also smaller problems with nuclear proliferation. We see our conflicts with Pakistan as the most significant nuclear threat because they could escalate into a nuclear conflict, given that we are both nuclear powers. We have shown considerable restraint until now and have been a responsible nuclear state which has abstained from issuing nuclear threats. Our actions vis-à-vis Pakistan in the last few months have been in response to Islamabad’s constant support to terrorist organizations operating against us and its resistance to alter its strategic options. The threat of nuclear weapons has been created and hyped by the Pakistani leadership in order to restrict us from retaliating against Pakistan’s acts of terror. Both Pakistan and we became overtly nuclear in 1998 and the two states differed in their objectives of going nuclear. For us, nuclear weapons were important in order to combat the threat of nuclear weapons emanating from its neighbourhood where it has a border dispute. Indian nuclear weapons are aimed at defending yourself against nuclear weapon use and thereby, New Delhi adopted a “no first use” doctrine implying that we would use nuclear weapons only in retaliation of a nuclear attack.

Although we have conducted nuclear tests, India is not considered a nuclear state under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. In this way we are a de-facto nuclear state. Our possession of nuclear weapons affects both national and global security. On a national level, having nuclear weapons protects us from conflicts from other de facto nations like Pakistan. In this way, nuclear weapons protects our people from a nuclear attack. On a global level, however, mutual deterrence is not enough. If there was a nuclear attack on India by Pakistan, under our no first use policy, we would have the right to start a nuclear conflict with Pakistan. Therefore, our possession of nuclear weapons threatens global security because it may cause other governments to intervene in nuclear conflict or participate in it.

We view nuclear dilemma from Pakistan as possible and a threat to regional security, but we do not plan on attacking them unless they attack first. Although India has received criticism for our nuclear weapons program and refusal to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), having nuclear weapons allows us higher security on a national level because it allows for nuclear deterrence. India does not have hostile nuclear intentions towards Pakistan, and is open to abandoning nuclear weapons with the promise that Pakistan will abandon their weapons too. In regard to North Korea, we stand with our western counterparts in agreement that their nuclear program is a threat to regional security. We have repeatedly condemned their nuclear tests, nuclear proliferation record, and militaristic relationship with Pakistan. We hope to come to an agreement for the eventual eradication of North Korea’s unstable and potentially destructive nuclear potential. India and Iran differ significantly on key foreign policy issues. Although India and Iran share some strategic interests, we have expressed strong opposition against Iran's nuclear program and will continue to demand it discontinue its controversial nuclear program.

Currently, India uses many security strategies to avoid a nuclear conflict. We have adopted a no first use policy. NFU is a promise by a nuclear state to use nuclear weapons as a means of warfare unless first attacked by an adversary using nuclear weapons. This is different from Mutually Assured Destruction in that India will only retaliate with enough force to deter, rather than completely destroy, an enemy. Although India has received criticism for testing the limits of brinkmanship, we stand to believe that these measures are merely defensive and necessary to ensure the safety of our people. Pakistan has used brinkmanship to provoke our

nuclear power, but we have never used nuclear power against them. After countless attempts at brinkmanship, however, India is considering shifting your nuclear policy to preemptive military uses for nuclear weapons, such as destroying an adversary's wmd sites (silos or weapons facilities) that are buried deep underground.

Mutually assured destruction (MAD) is a doctrine of military strategy and national security policy in which a full-scale use of nuclear weapons by two or more opposing sides would cause the complete annihilation of both the attacker and the defender. It is based on the theory of deterrence, which holds that the threat of using strong weapons against the enemy prevents the enemy's use of those same weapons. The strategy is a form of Nash equilibrium in which, once armed, neither side has any incentive to initiate a conflict or to disarm. Since the Cold War, MAD has taken on a meaning directed toward nuclear capabilities. MAD no longer is a viable option for deterrence because it not only refers to countries' abilities to use nuclear weapons to destroy each other, but also encompasses a variety of other nuclear weapons such as ballistic missiles or hydrogen bombs.

First strike capability is defined as a the ability to use nuclear missiles in an opening attack calculated to destroy the enemy's nuclear weapons. The preferred methodology is to attack the opponent's strategic nuclear weapon facilities (missile silos, submarine bases, bomber airfields), command and control sites, and storage depots first. By destroying the enemy's nuclear weapons, the enemy can no longer retaliate, and the offensive nation is victorious.

Limited nuclear deterrence is a nuclear strategy that claims if low-impact nuclear weapons are used against another country, the country will not see the attack as expansive enough to justify using nuclear weapons in response. This strategy decreases the likelihood of a nuclear conflict. We spend billions of dollars building and maintaining nuclear weapons in the hope that we never have to use them. Designing new low-yield nuclear weapons for limited strikes assures deterrence, not war.

The human, environmental, and economic effects from a nuclear attack on North Korea are difficult to predict, but based on what is known from atmospheric nuclear testing from 1945 to 1980, there would be significant radioactive contamination due to dispersal of radioactive debris high into the atmosphere. As for human impact, this radioactive contamination could cause heightened levels of cancer in the long term. In the immediate strike zone, all living things, including humans, would suffer severe burns, genetic mutations, radiation sickness, or, in most cases, death. The environmental damage would be the loss or contamination of all surrounding ecosystems as well as depletion of the ozone layer, and a shortened the growing season. But nuclear explosions are also extremely likely to ignite fires over a large area, which release large volumes of soot and smoke into the stratosphere which would block the sun and cause a significant drop in average surface temperature and precipitation across the globe. A nuclear strike on the Korean peninsula would also cause a regional economic depression. According to Business Insider, one study found that a nuclear conflict in the Korean peninsula could result in "Weaker aggregate demand" in South Korea, "shocks to domestic demand and external demand" in Japan, "weaker domestic demand" in China, and overall a "weaker global demand" in the entire region.

India believes that is impossible for any individual country to contend with nuclear security challenges unilaterally. We regard nuclear security threats as threats to global security and hope that the international community can come together to discuss a global security plan in the event of a nuclear conflict.

India believes that the nuclear threat posed by a country depends largely on its willingness to be a part of the international community and the type of government it has. For example, North Korea, under the oppressive dictatorship of Kim Jong Un, threatens the security of East Asia with its aggressive nuclear program by conducting unapproved nuclear tests. Authoritarian governments pose an increased threat to international security because they act unilaterally—meaning that they are not a part of the international community security guidelines. India hopes to create an inclusive international nuclear committee which will communicate with countries such as North Korea about the importance of international security.

There have been some nations that have willingly chosen to give up nuclear weapons. The most famous example is South Africa. The government of South Africa began a nuclear-weapons program in the 1970s, and later became the first country to voluntarily give up its nuclear program—a decision that was easier because the major security threat at the time was internal tension. Although nuclear disarmament, as seen in South Africa, can be a way to curtail internal conflict, nuclear weapons can also help ensure international stability. For example, India has nuclear weapons because they deter other bordering nations from attacking us. Nuclear deterrence has been successful in curtailing nuclear conflict between our nation and Pakistan and China for years. So although we do not believe that nuclear weapons are the key to international stability, they certainly help deter external conflicts in the short term. India, however, sees the value in nuclear disarmament and hopes to negotiate international nuclear disarmament in the future to ensure long term international security.

Diplomacy

India is a coastal nation located in an area of conflict and shares borders with seven nations. With that being said, India is very exposed making it vulnerable to external threats. Likewise, India has a very diverse population with various internal conflicts. Although we understand that diplomacy can only be effective when backed by military deterrence, India leans more towards looking more to diplomatic solutions to security challenges. As the largest democracy, we believe that building internal strengths, overcoming issues with the international community, and believing in security with each other, not “security against each other.” It is a primary component that we look towards peace instead of war. Take our current skirmish with Doklam for example. As we currently argue with China concerning our borders it's important that we remain peaceful. To us, war is against our Indian values, as one of our most notable countrymen Mahatma Gandhi once said, “Peace is its own reward.”

The role of unilateralism, bilateralism and multilateralism all play an important role in reducing today's tense international climate. Multilateralism will ensure that nations can come to peaceful agreements on policy like nuclear proliferation. This is why we work with other countries in the West and East through international organizations like the UN Security Council. The one issue with multilateralism approaches to nuclear policy is that agreements often prioritize western nations and ideals. In regard to bilateralism, we believe it is always necessary for two countries to fix nuclear policy issues between themselves. For example, India and the United States Signed a bilateral 123 nuclear cooperation agreement to allow the trade of nuclear materials. We also signed Nuclear cooperation agreements with other countries such as Canada, Russia, France, Kazakhstan, and Namibia. Other evidence of our bilateral efforts is apparent in our Nuclear cooperation agreement with Australia in September 2014, where we signed a nuclear cooperation agreement allowing them to export Uranium to India for the purpose of nuclear power. We feel as though unilateralism isn't a good option. Although we have taken certain

unilateral measures to modernize our nuclear capacities, we understand that nuclear weapons are very powerful and destructive devices which need to be regulated internationally.

In the global nuclear arena, The United States of America, The United Kingdom, France, China and Russia hold the most power because, under the Nuclear Proliferation Act, they are the only nations allowed to hold nuclear weapons. Naturally, countries like India have less power in the nuclear area because we are not permanent members of the Security Council. India is most concerned with imbalance of nuclear power in Southeast Asia in relation to India. Although India recognizes itself as a growing international power, we are aware of China's immense military power and our tense relationship with Pakistan and wish to sustain balance in Southeast Asia by modernizing our own military with nuclear power. India agrees with its western counterparts that North Korea is a unstable threat to the balance of nuclear power in the Korean peninsula and we wish for them to negotiate peace-talks.

There is definitely a monopoly on nuclear weapons by certain nuclear powers. This monopoly is enforced by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which states "Except five states, no other state should produce nuclear weapons". As it happens, the five states are the permanent members of the Security Council: The United States of America, The United Kingdom, France, China and Russia. Why should these countries, three of which are democracies, pretend to support nuclear proliferation when they themselves restrict all countries from nuclear weapons except themselves? They are using nuclear proliferation to mask their monopoly on nuclear weapons.

India is not a signatory of the NPT because believe that the Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty is discriminatory against rising world powers. Although we do desire a world free of nuclear weapons, India has developed weapons to be on equal standing with other world powers. For this reason, we are also not members of the Comprehensive Nuclear Ban Test Treaty. India believes in global non-proliferation of non nuclear weapons and we wish for the globe to join us in a new global, verifiable, and non-discriminatory nuclear disarmament as a security objective.

India wishes to be seen as a dominant role on the international stage in relation to nuclear challenges. Our biggest goal is similar to many of our allies. We want to play a part in making sure countries with questionable policies abide by the rules and not threaten the liberal world order. Finally we want the world to recognize us as a power nation and respecting our concerns.

We are currently world's largest democracy and as a result we care deeply about public opinion. The people elect us to serve them and as a result, their opinions shape our policies. The people of our country support global disarmament in the long-run. However, for our own safety, not to threaten the safety of others, it is a shared belief among many of our people that we should maintain our arsenal until other countries are ready to do so. This is reflected in our "no first use" initiative (it can only be used in retaliation).

There is most certainly a such thing as a "rogue state". Our neighbor, Pakistan, for example, is a "rogue state". They have repeatedly broken international laws and have made their nuclear weapons with the intention to harm not defend. It threatens our security every day. North Korea is also an example. They constantly test nuclear missiles, defying international law, and often threaten to attack other nations. Unlike many of these rogue states, India is a democracy. Although we have gotten criticism for our nuclear weapons arsenal, our actions should not be considered "rogue." We are subject to discriminatory policies, and, unlike other nations, we are willing to negotiate a non-discriminatory and global disarmament of nuclear arms.

While we do not have a big issue with the current liberal world order, we do think that it is too Western-oriented and that we, as an Eastern nation, do not get as much of a say or a voice as we should. We recognize that organizations, like the UN, still have to recognize the voices of growing Eastern and Southern Asian countries. The liberal world order should be fair to all states whose actions indicate that they want progress and to change for the better. India, for example, has always been a responsible de facto nuclear weapons state, and we deserve to be trusted on a global level, with or without nuclear weapons, just as the Western world. Only then can we progress as a world.

Historically, we have always been a proponent of global disarmament. Ever since 1940, we have made it clear that the elimination of nuclear weapons is necessary for the future of the world. In 1954, we advocated for a ban on nuclear testing. Later, in 1988, our prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi proposed a plan to rid the world of nuclear weapons by 2010. We also pledged a commitment to global disarmament in 2003 and ever since, we have continued to back and promote it.

We support a move to global zero. Our history with nuclear non proliferation extends as early as 1940 when our former Prime Minister, said “We believe that complete disarmament of all nation-states should be aimed at, as an urgent necessity, if the world is not to be reduced to barbarism”. Since then India has been a vocal advocate for global disarmament. Although India’s relationship with the NPT itself is fraught with controversy, India’s relationship with nuclear non proliferation and the call for universal disarmament goes back a long way. More recently, our former prime minister, Rajiv Gandhi proposed a plan to rid the world of nuclear weapons by 2010. This plan outlined how to go about doing it and what was necessary. This is essentially what global zero plans to do. Global zero is the push for the elimination of all nuclear weapons in the world. Global Zero aligns with India’s history of nuclear non proliferation advocacy. We believe in Global Zero because it would alleviate the increasingly tense relationships within our region and throughout the world. Without nuclear weapons, there would be a safer world, and no one would have to live in fear that their entire town or city might be destroyed at the push of a button.

As we have said and reiterated many times, we strongly believe that unilateral disarmament is ineffective and unsafe. Possessing weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear weapons should not be the choice of any individual or sovereign nation. These weapons are far too dangerous to sidestep international regulation. In order to achieve a nuclear-free world, multilateral disarmament is the only strategy that will work. In the society and world we live in, it is sad to say that unilateral disarmament, or giving up nuclear weapons without the assurance that others will do so as well, will simply not work. The conflicting countries bordering India, including Pakistan and China, have a nuclear arsenals that threaten billions of Indian lives. India’s unilateral disarmament would endanger the lives of over one billion citizens of this great country. For India, our conventional forces are enough to defend ourselves. Since India has no hostile intentions against China or Pakistan, India will not need nuclear weapons if all armed countries, Pakistan and China included, do not have them. We urge others to follow our example, and advocate for nondiscriminatory multilateral non proliferation.

Terrorism

Terrorism, according to the department of Home Ministry, poses a huge threat to the people of India. India subdivides terrorism into five major groups. These groups include, but are not limited to, Ethno nationalist terrorism, Religious terrorism, Left-wing terrorism, and Narco Terrorism. Due to the over looming threat of terrorism, India has experienced a decline in

tourism and foreign investments. Religious sites are especially dangerous. Our government is incredibly likely to be attacked by groups such as Isil. We are the third largest target for terrorism after Iraq and Afghanistan. In 2016 there were 927 attacks against India Naxal is one of our largest threats and is ranked right after the taliban in there deadliness. Because India has a high population density, terrorist attacks can harm lots of people in a small amount of space. There have been attacks on election sites and other government activities as well as attacks based on racial bias. As India we do not fear terrorism via nuclear weapons inside our borders. This is due to the past not involving and “wmds.” Current terrorist groups working within India mainly use assault weapons and take hostages. As a collective the terrorist groups within India pose a threat to the government, target ethnic and religious groups, and the general population.

Our country is home to non-state terrorist groups within our borders. India has withstood the brunt force of Pakistani terror for decades. Groups such as the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), the Haqqani Network and the Taliban have repeatedly been used by Pakistan as instruments to help it achieve its foreign policy objectives in New Delhi and Kabul. Recently Islamabad has turned a blind eye to Pakistani terrorism in India by claiming that these terrorist groups are “non state actors.” This distinction has led to smaller fractions and splinter groups of the Tehrik-i-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and Al-Qaeda spreading their influence and threat in India. All of these terrorist groups aim to undermine the Indian government, and therefore are a threat to global and national security.

With nuclear security as a major domestic security concern, India has implemented several strategies to prevent nuclear terrorism including “ permanent team of technical and security experts from multiple ministries and agencies that conducts tabletop exercises simulating nuclear smuggling, phased out the use of highly enriched uranium (HEU) and built a database of all radioactive sources in the country. It has also started real-time tracking of radioactive sources when they are transported and set up a network of 23 emergency response centres across the country for detecting and responding to any nuclear or radiological emergency.” According to the IAEA’s Illicit Trafficking Database, as of 31st December 2015, a total of 2889 confirmed illicit trafficking incidents were reported between 1993 and 2015 by the 131 participating states in India. An example of this happened in 2001 when 1 when smuggled uranium was confiscated from suspected terrorists in Balurghat, West Bengal. There have also been actual nuclear terrorist attacks such as members of the Jaish-e-Mohammed terrorist group attacking the Pathankot Air Force base in northern India, killing seven security guards. Overall India is concern with nuclear terrorist attacks from Pakistan and smuggled nuclear resources that could fuel the nuclear arsenals other terrorist groups.

India has found an emerging role in the current world order. We consider the world order to be run by the western powers, including the NPT nuclear member states: the United States, Russia (the successor state to the Soviet Union), the United Kingdom, France, and China. India considers itself a responsible nuclear power.

We believe that the international community is adaptable to contending with non-state actors and terrorism. India believes that, especially with rising nuclear tensions, there should be rising international cooperation to stop the spread of terrorism and non-state actors. If the international community comes together to create a multilateral counter terrorism organization, then the collective power could curtail these threats.

Unfortunately we have been implicated in the Black Market. But not just in one section of the black market. Not only are there people selling organs and weapons but it has gotten to the point where people are adopting and giving up children over the black market. The Black-Market

Baby grade flourished when a new adoption law was reformed. Young unmarried women and childless couples were targeted in the selling and stealing of newborn children. The struggle to adopt above the table left a childless woman often traumatized and scared that what the leaders of these adoption organizations were doing the wrong things to get her a child. And although the child trafficking is horrific there was also the illegal exchange of weapons and organs. But all of the different sections of the black market have only shown up due to new reforms and laws. Recently, however, Narendra Modi has cracked down on the black market with rupee reform.

India believes that there are many incentives to selling nuclear materials. First, there are few countries who are allowed to trade nuclear materials. Therefore they enjoy a monopoly on the nuclear industry which provides them with massive profits and power as a global nuclear supplier. Additionally, India manufacturing nuclear materials domestically can stimulate the economy, reduce reliance on other countries for goods, save money on nuclear materials, and create domestic jobs. As a whole we are working to use nuclear energy as a positive part of society (not so much as a weapon). We believe that a nuclear push can help us achieve long term energy security. Allowing us to also lead on innovation getting an extra point in the economic sense section. Our government is hoping this push to fast-track a domestic nuclear industry will help us have long-term energy and self-sufficiency. It will also boost our goals to work with clean energy. Right now we have built 16 nuclear power units using purely indigenous tech, materials and equipment. We are “on the verge of passing a nuclear milestone by commissioning an ultra-modern, indigenously-designed fast-breeder reactor(FBR) capable of converting atomic waste into usable fuel. The reactor thus generates more atomic fuel than it consumes, ensuring renewable and unlimited supply of clean electricity.”(Sengupta 1). So not only are our nuclear experiments clean they are also safe. Safety precautions are taken such as: “double containment to minimize radioactive release; extra space for holding radioactive waste; adequate natural cooling features; capability to withstand absence of off-site power; and special features to guard against natural calamities.”(Sengupta 2)

The current flaws in the non-proliferation regime include discriminatory and hypocritical policies. Although many leaders of the non-proliferation regime block other countries from obtaining nuclear weapons, they themselves are in possession of nuclear weapons. India supports full nuclear disarmament if we wish to see true non proliferation of nuclear weapons. The current non-proliferation regime also prevents de facto countries from obtaining nuclear resources with ease. This creates a monopoly on nuclear weapons that benefits existing world powers and poses a threat to nations that use nuclear weapons as a form of nuclear deterrence.

The enforcement mechanisms for the NPT are not sufficient. Despite the establishment of the NPT, many countries, including India, Pakistan, and North Korea have obtained nuclear arsenals. Given the difficulty of instituting the ideals of non-proliferation, the failures of the NPT in addressing non-compliance and withdrawal make it apparent that the treaty needs revision. We look forward to negotiating a clear definition of the safe uses of nuclear energy as well as a clear plan of action for countries that violate or reject the NPT provisions.

Although establishing “acceptable levels of risk” to terrorism is a ethically difficult question, India believes that as long as we strengthen our internal counter terrorism initiatives in government then small terrorist groups can be controlled. Otherwise we do not like to define any level of risk to terrorism as acceptable, especially in India, where terrorism is a serious national issue.

Democracies are more prone to terrorist attacks for a couple of reasons. Because democracies tend to have freedom of speech , there is a more likelihood of an open extremism,

and eventual rise of terrorist regimes. Democracies also provide more human rights protections which are often conflict with the ideals of terrorist regimes. We also have history to prove it. India has long been a target for terrorism ever since it became a democracy. Although authoritarian governments can fuel terrorism, there is less likelihood for non-state extremist groups because these governments strictly regulate their people.

Using the intelligence community and the military to address nuclear terrorism is both a transnational and domestic issue. While we believe that all countries should be willing to cooperate with an international counter terrorism dialogue and humanitarian assistance, sometimes it is best for countries to first deal with national problems before addressing them on a international level. India is interested in international counterterrorism funding and humanitarian aid, but not necessarily in fighting another countries' terrorism through intelligence and military intervention except for in mass atrocities.

Climate and Energy

Climate is a global issue that requires vision, leadership, compassion and wisdom to be grappled with. Despite that India has not contributed immensely to the problem of climate change, we actively seek solutions. Other countries that are considered developed and wealthy with resources should hold more responsibility for climate change by increasing their efforts, since developing countries have the additional struggle of finding resources to meet their development needs. We sincerely believe that, as best stated by our Prime Minister in 2015, “international partnership must be at the centre of our efforts, whether it is development or combating climate change. And, the principle of common, but differentiated responsibilities, is the bedrock of our collective enterprise. When we speak only of climate change, there is a perception of our desire to secure the comforts of our lifestyle. When we speak of climate justice, we demonstrate our sensitivity and resolve to secure the future of the poor from the perils of natural disasters.”

As a country we have approached the threat of global warming by establishing goals that limit fossil fuels emissions and setting up determined results for the protection of our home and people. We have already adopted a National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC), and our Solar mission is the most ambitious of any country yet. Besides our NAPCC, 32 of our states and Union territories have created a State Action Plan on Climate Change (SAPCC). Other actions India has done to approach the threat of global warming include the following: the Energy Conservation Act which serves to encourage their our people to efficiently use and conserve energy when possible. India contains a large farming population which is to be affected by climate change so we have a National Policy for Farmers which centers on the sustainable development for agriculture. Our The National Electricity Policy (NEP) and Integrated Energy Policy (IEP) target on providing many more civilians with access to electricity and promote renewable energy. We have also put in place many policies which encourage people to live more sustainably including the Clean Energy Cess, cuts in subsidies, market mechanisms, and an increase in taxes on petrol and diesel. Low-carbon emissions are important to us, and city offices from all over India have questioned the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) on how to develop heat-action plans for their areas after the NRDC created an action plan for the city of Ahmedabad. State leaders have also set up building codes which create standards of energy efficiency in cities. McKinsey, a global management company, has estimated that 70% of buildings that will exist in India are not yet constructed, so opportunity for sustainable infrastructure exists.

Currently our country is mainly dependent on thermal power (coal, gas, diesel), which at 210 GW as of May 2016, totals 70% of our energy supply. Hydroelectric power adds just over 40 GW to our energy system, and our grid-interactive renewable power (wind, solar, biomass and small hydro) contributes 43 GW of energy to our economy. Despite the fact that as of now nuclear energy makes up 2.2% of our energy supply as of 2015, we look to expand our nuclear energy usage to 25% by 2050 in an effort to decrease the amount of carbon released into our atmosphere. Our Solar Mission also looks to expand the use of solar energy.

Our country views the expansion of nuclear energy from our current 1.8%, as an effort to help undertake the fight against climate change by limiting our total carbon emissions. We look to increase our 1.8% of nuclear energy (5.78 GW) as of 2016 to 25% of 2050. Our Prime Minister Narendra Modi made an agreement with United States President Barack Obama in 2015 for nuclear company Westinghouse to build nuclear reactors in India. Westinghouse has since hit bankruptcy and then been bought by a United States investor. Westinghouse has made clear that they will focus on nuclear reactors and not the construction required. Larsen & Toubro was approached by Westinghouse on being the general contractor. As of January 2018, Westinghouse is now scheduled to build six AP1000 nuclear reactors in India.

India has nuclear weapons, but our nuclear weapons are for the purpose of retaliation, not attack. We have suffered some minor nuclear power accidents. In order to prevent frequent nuclear power accidents we have installed, as noted by Deolalikar R. who studies environmental medicine, "proper radiological protection of workers and the public, regular surveillance, dosimetry, approved standard operating and maintenance procedures, a well-defined waste management methodology, proper well documented and periodically rehearsed emergency preparedness and disaster management plans. The NPPs have occupational health policies covering periodic medical examinations, dosimetry and bioassay and are backed-up by fully equipped Personnel Decontamination Centers manned by doctors qualified in Occupational and Industrial Health. All the operating plants are ISO 14001 and IS 18001 certified plants." The evident efforts taken to safeguard our environment and population's safety have prevailed and we continue to use nuclear energy and maintain our nuclear weapon supply. Nevertheless, India has had several nuclear energy accidents in the past which have contributed to higher levels of radiation found in the atmosphere, in the water supply, and in the workers of nuclear power plants themselves.

In India, we believe the only military "use" of nuclear energy is as a deterrent. The international community must work to ensure that the military applications of nuclear energy are never exercised. As for civilian uses, India believes the international community can regulate civilian use of nuclear energy by, just as India has, allowing facility-specific IAEA safeguards at a handful of foreign-supplied reactors and nuclear facilities and nuclear materials. While India rejects the notion of "balancing" uses, we do believe the civilian and military nuclear industries should work toward shared goals of securing nuclear facilities, managing waste, and eliminating the risk of clandestine proliferation. As noted in "Nuclear Security Governance in India: Institutions, Instruments, and Culture," by Sitakanta Mishra and Happymon Jacob, an international community that welcomes India to "to observe nuclear security training, practices, simulation exercises, etc. in other nuclear states and vice versa" can help progress toward the goals of maintaining nuclear security, no matter that energy's ultimate use.

Additional international oversight is necessary to increase nuclear security for all. Nevertheless, we do believe that India and other developing nations should not be deterred from nuclear development from overarching international oversight. Instead, India is especially

interested in nondiscriminatory international oversight that will give us a voice in the affairs of other nuclear powers that we would not have as an individual country.

India is a responsible stakeholder in the global forum of nuclear powers. India participates in all high-level nuclear summits, and supports and upholds the valuable safeguards, managed by IAEA. However, India must always be conscious of our geographic vulnerability: located between two nuclear powers (China and Pakistan). With the ever-changing political landscape, and emerging challenges (whether from cyber threats or partisan fighters), India believes that our current safeguards can only benefit from a revised, and updated set of safeguards. We believe that new standards need to be put in place that will ensure safety while allowing countries to develop safety and defense measures.

Our country is vast with many people living in poverty and therefore in inadequate infrastructure. We are threatened quite severely with the prospect of irregular monsoons, flooding, rising sea levels, and higher temperatures. The monsoon season is very important to our economy because many of our citizens are farmers. Our extensive shorelines spanning 7517 km, Himalayan region, and islands designate us a vulnerable victim for climate change. The threat of global warming on our country urges us against global warming and for us to seek nuclear energy as an emission free alternative to many fossil fuels we currently use. We do, however, recognize that the nuclear energy sector has its downsides. For example, the international community has yet to figure out how to properly dispose of nuclear waste which, if improperly disposed of, can emit radioactive waves into the surrounding area. India looks forward to discussing an international resolution to this nuclear waste issue.

Currently, 31 countries have access to nuclear energy. Some countries choose not to have nuclear energy because they do not consider nuclear a legitimate clean energy source due to its waste. For example, Scotland has opted out of nuclear energy in its plans to run off of 100% clean energy by 2020. On the other hand, some countries do not have access to nuclear energy simply because it is expensive to maintain and build nuclear infrastructure. Aside from the pricetag, is the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) is another factor that factors into which countries have access to nuclear energy. The NSG is a collection of nuclear supplier countries that seek to prevent nuclear growth by controlling the export of materials, equipment, and technology used to manufacture nuclear weapons through two sets of guidelines. If the NSG does not trust a country will use its nuclear energy responsibly. Only recently has India the NSG agreed to grant India a "clean waiver" from its existing rules, which forbid nuclear trade with a country which has not signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). The approval was signed after India agreed to not share sensitive nuclear technology or material with others and promised she would uphold its voluntary moratorium on testing nuclear weapons. India is a rare case. Many other countries who are interested in nuclear energy still do not have access to it simply because they are not part of the wealthy and powerful current world order.

It is possible that the U.S. could require a "this-for-that" agreement around providing critical training: if that is the case, each nation will have to determine whether the U.S.'s requests align with our own national interests when deciding whether to comply. It is more likely that while the U.S. might not be so aggressive in its terms, the nature of being the provider allows for an outside say in what gets discussed as well as what gets considered or dismissed for regulation. Being the acknowledged expert in training amplifies the voice of the U.S. That voice is not one that would necessarily control what sovereign nations can do, but its influence would be felt.

Since we look to extend our nuclear energy production and many businesses in India have partnered with United States businesses before in matter of nuclear energy, we see

ourselves as qualified to replace the United States should they step back from their current position on nuclear energy. There are also many other emerging and existing nuclear energy powers that could help fill the void. For example, France derives about 75% of its energy in nuclear power, and could certainly lead, along with other countries, the nuclear energy world order.

Economics

India's economy is based on three major sectors: services, agriculture, and industry. The services sector is the largest contributor to India's GDP (53.8% of the GDP) with significant foreign investments (from companies like McDonalds, PE investments, Airbnb, THSC, and MoU) and employment of 28.6% of the total population. The government has also encouraged incentives for the service sector through a variety of policies including the DARPAN, Digi Yatra, Ministry of Electronics and Information Technology service portal, SEIS funding, and software service exports. Narendra Modi has recognized the importance of this sector and has prioritized trade facilitation agreements. Although 58% of rural households identify agriculture as their livelihood, the agriculture sector (including livestock, forestry, and fisheries) contribution to GDP has steadily declined over the past decade. This decrease is linked to a diversification of India's economy. Industry, India's third largest sector, has a campaign called Make in India "with the objective of job creation and skill enhancement in 25 sectors of the economy, by improving the quality standards and minimising the impact on the environment, to attract capital and technological investment in India." The "Make in India" initiative has attracted foreign investments and factories from the leaders in hi-tech manufacturing including GE, Siemens, HTC, Toshiba, and Boeing.

According to the central power report 2017, India's smallest energy sector is in nuclear power. India, however, hopes to lead the nuclear movement in upcoming years through the "Make In India" campaign. India currently has over 22 nuclear reactors that boost local manufacturing. Although Direct Foreign Investment is not allowed in the nuclear sector, several foreign companies and countries have invested in supply chains for nuclear power plants as well as nuclear power projects in India. For example, in 2016 the United states signed a contract between the Nuclear Power Corporation of India and the Westington Electric Co. to begin engineering and site designing work for 6 new nuclear reactors in India. The nuclear energy industry is small, but with new investments it has a promising future for India's economy.

In 2005, the National Suppliers Group granted India a waiver to participate in international nuclear weapons trade and the U.S-India Nuclear Cooperation Agreement was signed. These agreements, however, do not tolerate the trade of nuclear weapons. Therefore nuclear weapons have a minimal impact on our economy.

As India faces and shortage of fossil fuels, we are looking to nuclear energy as the future of our industry. We are seeking to increase the amount of electricity from nuclear power by 25% by 2050. Following the NSG agreement in 2008, India opened up access to nuclear reactors and fuel trade with USA, Russia, France, UK, South Korea, Czech Republic and Canada, as well as Australia, Argentina, Kazakhstan, Mongolia and Namibia. This new trade contributes to India's increasing interest in nuclear energy as a clean alternative to traditional fuel sources like coal. As for nuclear weapons, India is not interested in nuclear weapons trade. Although we do possess nuclear weapons, these weapons are only for defense on a no first use policy. We do not want to promote nuclear weapons trade, but find possessing them necessary when bordered by two hostile nuclear powers like China and Pakistan.

Instead of buying nuclear weapons from foreign countries, having a domestic nuclear weapons industry can open up cheap and reliable defense. For India, nuclear weapons mean nuclear deterrence which could avoid costly wars with bordering nations. Nuclear deterrence also promotes economic independence. Without having to rely on other countries for weapons, nuclear countries can both save some money on lend lease policies while simultaneously stimulating a new domestic industry. Although having a nuclear weapons industry will not ensure a complete prevention of foreign invasion, they will likely reduce the amount of terrorist attacks that threaten the economy of a country. Finally, the jobs created in the manufacturing, engineering, maintenance, and deployment of nuclear weapons would stimulate the economy.

No, international placing sanctions on countries in violation of the NPT is both ineffective and discriminatory. First, international sanctions are not realistic. In an increasingly interconnected world, placing international sanctions against one country will surely hurt the target country, but will also hurt the country applying the sanctions in terms of existing investments or companies. Additionally, the target country may suffer economically, but this does not ensure a change in government. For example, after international sanctions on Russia in 2014 actually boosted nationalism, Vladimir Putin's popularity, and patriotism.

India conducted a peaceful nuclear explosion called Pokhran II in May of 1998. As a result, in 1978 and 1998 a sanction was placed on India by the United States and Japan, foreign aid embargoes from various countries, and international commendation from the United Nations.

International sanctions are ineffective in stopping the development of nuclear weapons because they are usually short lived, problematic, and weakly enforced. India believes that economic sanctions must be long term in order to be effective. During Indian sanctions of 1998 the flow of foreign aid was largely unimpacted. Although private investment dropped marginally, official foreign aid flow (often from the same countries issuing the sanctions) remained stable. Nevertheless, India continued its nuclear industry during the sanctions. Second, sanctions can actually provoke nuclear programs. Economic sanctions only work with friends and allies, but can actually cause conflicts when imposed against adversaries. For example, the sanctions imposed against Russia by the United States contributed not just to a surge in Vladimir Putin's popularity but, more importantly, to the growth of Russian patriotism and nationalism. The point is that sanctioned countries barely change their policies, and might actually enhance them- nuclear programs included. Lastly, international sanctions would be hard to enforce because there is no agreement all countries will stop trade with the sanctioned country. Despite sanctions on North Korea, Iran, Pakistan, and India, the development of nuclear weapons in all of these countries has continued. In an increasingly interconnected world, international sanctions are difficult to enforce. Often sanctioned countries find loopholes and ways to continue trade. During previous sanctions on North Korea, Chinese-North Korean trade increased by 2.8%. Even official NSG countries such as China, are suspected of violating the NPT by trading nuclear weapons with de facto countries such as Pakistan and North Korea.

No, India is opposed to the NPT as it now stands. The NPT is a discriminatory and hypocritical policy. Instead of favoring world powers already in possession of nuclear weapons before 1970, the ban on nuclear weapons should be a blanket policy. Selectively allowing certain nations to own nuclear weapons does not help the cause of nuclear disarmament. Although India is not a signatory of the NPT, India has no records of proliferation of nuclear weapons with other countries. India is not a member of the NPT, but is certainly does not violate its rules and therefore can be trusted as a nuclear weapons bearing state. With that being said, if a nuclear or terrorist attack happened in India, several economic sectors, most namely insurance, trade,

tourism, and FDI would be affected. First, affecting all sectors dependant on foreign investment would cause investment drainage and unemployment in all sectors. Second, the services sector, specifically in regards to hospitality and tourism, which makes up about 53.8% of our GDP and 60.7% of our foreign investments according to the IBEF, would plummet. For example, the 2008 Mumbai attacks slowed the nation GDP to 7.8% growth rate and resulted in the withdrawal of 13 billion dollars worth of foreign investment mostly in the services sector. In addition the insurance sector would plummet because insurance companies do not protect national disasters like war destruction. Last, India would not be able to freely trade due to a lack of resources and lost trust from skeptical foreign countries.

In August of 1999, India released a nuclear doctrine based on a no first use policy, nuclear triad, and credible minimum deterrence. This doctrine states that India “will not be the first to initiate a nuclear first strike, but will respond with punitive retaliation should deterrence fail.” This ensures that, if attacked first, India will use a three branched nuclear capacity to decrease the possibility of destroying all of India’s nuclear weapons in one attack. In addition, the nuclear weapons produced will only be enough to deter, not destroy, an adversary from attacking.

A terrorist attack in India would have several effects on the global economy. The first most concrete impact it would have is physical destruction of property. Terrorists often destroy transportation, machines, small businesses, and religious sites. All of these locations have foreign investors which would lose money immediately and cause a drop in the global economy. Second, all kinds of markets hate uncertainty, and terrorism creates a lot of it. Who wants to trade or invest in any global market when there is always the possibility of a terrorist attack sweeping your money away? If there was a terrorist attack in India, the global economy would become much more conservative with their spending which might slow the global markets. For example after the September 11th terrorist attacks the global economy did not recover for months. The final risk to the economy is political risk. When foreign countries begin to doubt the stability of a region they will often cut off all economic ties. For example Brexit anti-globalist and anti-trade sentiments helped pass Brexit. Similarly terrorist attacks in India may result in uncertain economic fallout on everything from currency to trade and diplomacy.

Domestically, India has several intelligence, military, and police organizations in place to help fight terrorism in India. These groups include “state-run police forces, special security forces to guard airports and other high-profile targets, and paramilitary forces that patrol the borders and assist the police when necessary.” The Intelligence Bureau is a domestic agency which collects information on terrorism which it reports to the Home Ministry, “which oversees all national police, para-militaries, and domestic intelligence gathering.” All of these services ensure a quicker economic rebound in the case of a terrorist attack. Internationally, India has many precautionary economic measures to prevent a terrorist attack. Recently India signed a pact with the United States against terrorism that has resulted in 15 billion dollars in defense trade and unique access to the Sea Guardian Unmanned Aerial System. According to the United States ambassador to India, the U.S. has created a “U.S.-India Counterterrorism Designations Dialogue. We need to continue to enhance the sharing of information, designations of terrorists, combating of financial crimes and networks, and disruption and dismantling of terrorist camps and operations – both regionally and globally.” Additionally, India has implemented The Act East Policy to open up India’s economy to the wealth of East Asian trade and ensure ASEAN allies to aid with counterterrorism. In the middle east, India has partnered with Gulf Cooperation council to create the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), an international body that works to

counter money laundering and terrorist financing among other things. In 2017, India signed an agreement with China and Russia to counter terrorism by agreeing to stop sources of terrorist funding. Although we recognize most of our measurements are bilateral and precautionary we want to negotiate new economic plans to counter terrorism internationally.

Disaster Preparedness

India has several preparedness and response plans for a nuclear attack. In the medical realm, first responders have been diligently trained for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) attacks that may strike India. There are also an adequate number of ERCs set up across the country as well as buildings identified for use as emergency shelters. As for security, The Defence Research and Development Organization has come out with advanced radiological defence equipments which include detectors and reconnaissance vehicles and other equipment such as dosimeters which are able to measure an individual's or object's exposure to harmful substances in the environment. All Government Ministries, Agencies, and armed forces are required to plan and execute emergency drills in the event of a nuclear attack. There are also inflatable shelters that are able to ward off nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons for up to 48 hours. As for providing basic needs in event of a nuclear attack, India's framework for Nuclear emergency management includes prevention, compliance to regulation, mitigation, preparedness, capacity development, response relief and rehabilitation and recovery.

Our plans for preparedness and response plans following a nuclear attack were last revised in 2009. They appear on our website for National Disaster Management Authority. When creating the steps we will take following a Nuclear attack or any attack that may have harmful effects on our citizens we made sure the basic steps we will follow will always be applicable in any year and to every situation. These basic steps are prevention, mitigation, preparedness, response, reconstruction and rehabilitation.

Our steps for how we would deal with not only nuclear attacks, but any attack on our citizens in terms of preparation and response is available to all citizens. Our National Disaster Management Authority meets constantly to discuss the plans on any attacks. Through platforms such as social media we are able to effectively communicate with all our citizens with access to internet and as a public government agency, no one is denied information concerning our preparation plans. The National Disaster Management agency equips the community in mitigation during a crisis such as a nuclear attack. Along with the citizens the NDMA also equips and trains other Government officials and institutions that have a duty to the citizens of India to protect them in any case. This preparation makes it possible for hands on training for disaster management.

While the safety of our citizens is our main concern, global relations are crucial when dealing with an attack of such size. As our National Disaster Management Outline states, "Unlike a nuclear emergency, the impact of a nuclear disaster is beyond the coping capability of local authorities and such a scenario calls for handling at the national level, with assistance from international agencies, if required." Our community is our focal concern, but after we have done all we can do as a country we must turn to international actors for help and support. We recognize it is not only important, but crucial to develop relationships on all levels, domestic and international alike. Although we do not have strong military alliances, we have close strategic relationships with countries such as the Russian Federation, Israel, Afghanistan, France, Bhutan Bangladesh, and the United States. Following a major attack on our citizens, these countries should be able to foster a movement towards complete rehabilitation if need be.

As expected after any nuclear attack, the ability to assure health for all people will not be easy at the incipient stages of rehabilitation. As seen in occurrences where this has happened such as in Nagasaki or Hiroshima, there will be occurrences where a portion of the population may experience major health issues such as cancer, radiation poisoning, severe burns, and even death. Although we recognize that nuclear attacks will cause inevitable health consequences, we want to assure a portion of our population will suffer from the harmful effects of nuclear weapons.

We share borders with all other South Asian nations, therefore our location is full of contradictions, disparities and paradoxes making preparation for an attack crucial. We have different relationships with all of our neighbors and therefore it is difficult to generate a single foreign policy prescription for our entire region, but we adhere to our policy of non-interference into affairs of other countries in our region unless it affects our national interests. For a situation such as a border attack we need to reach a national consensus before taking action as we value the opinions of our citizens. If this attack is close enough to harm our citizens, we will take steps in making sure things are taken care of and our citizens are safe. If a neighboring country faces an attack we must reach a national consensus before taking action.

We, India, conduct registration from nuclear attack centuries in an efficient manner to protect the growing amount of people of concern. Through outreach services, we provide support including legal, social, and educational assistance to refugees suffering from nuclear attacks. UNHCR and local NGO networks focus on these people with these needs and community initiatives “are designed to help refugees become more self-reliant.” Mainly from nuclear threat contours such as Pakistan and Afghanistan, the UNHCR will find durable solutions for them. Part of their global mandate is to “facilitate long term solutions for refugees.” Our government provides a number of solutions to these nuclear refugees. One allows them to have voluntary repatriation to return to their country with “dignity and safety”. Some may stay in India and apply for permanent citizenship or others with compelling protection needs are able to submit a case for settlement in a third country. We are prepared to accept refugees from states suffering from nuclear attacks and can assist with long term accommodations for these select groups.

We, India have had a recent downfall on the source of our major mining resource, coal. In 2013, a recorded half of our 1.3 billion citizens depend on coal for electricity. On the other hand, however, over 300 million have no access to electricity, often using biomass as their alternative energy source. With the refugee increase year by year, we will not be able to support the additional electricity and coal usage for over 1 billion people. The same can be said for other resources such as clean drinking water, lumber, living space, and food. India is simply too big, and cannot sustain a larger population with our limited resources. Although we are willing to accept refugees, in order to sustain our current population and resources we hope that other countries will open their borders to nuclear refugees.

At the moment, we are accepting 40,000 Rohingyas fleeing persecution from Myanmar alone. Temporary migrants are being assisted however, many refugees can apply for long term visas in India now. For this process to go through, their UNHCR (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees) documentation needs to be approved by the Indian and originating country’s government. We grant asylum and assistance to 200,000 refugees coming from Somalia, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Myanmar and neighboring countries. Conducting the Refugee Status determination, we determine the status of the refugees. Our government, allows refugees to receive work permits, healthcare, education and basic law enforcement services. Through the RSD, we are currently assisting 5,074 asylum seekers and 25,865 refugees registered with UNHCR India. In the event on a nuclear attack, India is willing to accept around

200,000 more refugees. This number can be negotiated depending on how many refugees other countries are willing to accommodate. Although we recognize this number is small, we are already dealing with several other internal issues and hope other countries will be able to open their borders to the remaining refugees.

It is a well known fact that India has been a recipient of humanitarian aid from other countries. Therefore, we are willing to help other countries in return. That is why India is willing to offer personnel or other assistance to zones in the strike area.

Reviewing the challenges posed to governments worldwide following the Syrian refugee crisis, India is willing to accept a number of international policies. First, refugees must not only be relocated, but also given a chance at resettlement. India is interested in creating a coalition of refugee settlement countries similar to the EU Joint Resettlement Program. This coalition would target countries that have not traditionally taken in refugees. Second, India would like to join a donation support group similar to the Syrian Crisis Fund, to fund front-line states. Lastly, India would like to implement a plan similar to the EU Regional Protection Program, which makes resettlement easier for refugees by enhancing the capacity for refugees in non EU countries. This program funds “return, local integration and resettlement,” which involves practical actions supported through EU financing, delivering real benefits both in terms of protection offered to refugees and arrangements with non-EU countries in support of refugees.”

Another refugee crisis would pose several problems to India’s government. First, India’s government policies have been long associated with the Non-Aligned Movement which practices non-interventionism. More recently India has been willing to participate in international politics and its often binding policies. Accepting a full transition into international relations would pose change in the attitude of India’s governing body.

Our civilian population would also be posed with new challenges with another refugee crisis. First, India has the second largest population only second to China. Given that we have a dense population of about 1.3 billion people, it is hard to accommodate refugees with adequate resources and living space. Our civilian would have to sacrifice some resources that they already lack to accommodate incoming nuclear refugees. Opening our borders to refugees also increases the possibility of an internal threat. For example, India has accepted over 40,000 Rohingya Muslim Refugees fleeing ethnic cleansing in Myanmar, and although we wish to continue our aid, there have been rising concerns about refugees posing a threat to internal security. For example, the Modi government recently reported evidence of terror links between some India-based Rohingya and extremist groups such as Islamic State. India realizes that opening our borders to refugees may bring some unwanted threats to the security of our civilian population from refugees linked to terrorist groups.