

Boston Latin School
Tufts IGL Inquiry 2018
The Future Nuclear Imperative
Simulation #2

The United Kingdom

Briefing Paper

A. Introduction

In our modern world, nuclear weaponry and its proliferation has become a major subject of discussion. From its introduction by the United States to end World War II, much debate and controversy has arisen about rights to developing weapons and restraining them.

We feel that to continue the stability of our nation, and others, that we should employ a multifaceted approach that works with the ideas of many other nations. As a nation, we are concerned with developing trends that lean towards nuclear growth and further encroachment. As we have recently faced many domestic issues, following our exit from the European Union, we would also like to focus on current political tensions. In short, we would like to see major improvements in our nation and abroad, while maintaining the currently established liberal world order.

B. Key Points

We, the United Kingdom, would like to address the following issues:

- Establishing a productive balance regarding the growth of nuclear energy
- Determining alternatives to the less than lucrative nuclear weapons programs
 - Continuing guidelines set forth by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
- Regulating solutions for making the world safer, with or without nuclear weapons
- Developing agreements with countries threatening to use nuclear weaponry or start nuclear war
- Determining a set procedure to disarm countries with nuclear power
- Creating plans for what would happen in the event of a nuclear war and how to decrease the amount of impact on humans, the environment, and the economy that would result
- Protecting global human rights but not at the expense of other countries' sovereignty, including the UK's sovereignty.
- Finding a way to prevent future terrorist attacks by cooperating with other nations

C. Background

From its formal founding in 1801, the United Kingdom has shown its capacity to influence through its economy, industry, and culture. Under the Act of the Union, Great Britain (England, Scotland, and Wales) merged and Northern Ireland, creating what is known as the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom's founding began during the Georgian Era (1714-1837). Socially, the Georgian Era was a time of major change. At the height of the British Industrial and Agricultural Revolution urban cities featured major population growth. From 1810 to 1820, the average family size increased to five or six children. All this growth was in part due to smallpox inoculation and decreased mortality rates. Villages and rural towns began to decline as

people surged to urban centers for jobs in factories and construction. All of this worked to grow United Kingdom's (specifically Britain's) manufacturing, industrial, and energy scenes. Despite all this growth, industry inevitably brought slow-growing class divisions, and later, under the New Poor Law of 1834, relief became more difficult to achieve.

During the early Georgian period, Britain became a major power at sea. Having possessed many colonies throughout North America, the Caribbean, and Southern/Eastern Asia, the United Kingdom dominated in shipping and trade under the English India Company. Despite losing America after its Revolutionary War, they were successful in many attacks against the French. Most notably, the victory under Wellington over Napoleon at Waterloo in 1815. Trade became carried out by private companies that were backed by naval power. Public borrowing and loans increased under the Bank of England.

Domestically, the United Kingdom began internal reforms to better the state of the nation. In 1807, the slave-trade in England was ended by the Abolition of Slave Trade Act, and in 1833 slavery was ended under the Slavery Abolition Act (excluding some East India Company territories). In 1829, the United Kingdom granted Catholic emancipation, allowing for political rights of protestant dissenters and Roman Catholics alike. The United Kingdom system of Parliament went through major reform under the Whig's Great Reform Act of 1832, seeking to ultimately to improve its current electoral system and House of Commons.

With Queen Victoria's entrance to the throne, a new era began, aptly named the Victorian Era, which lasted from 1837 to 1901. Largely left untouched by the Industrial Revolution, Ireland, between 1845 and 1847, experienced a potato famine, which decimated the population and hurt many peasants who dangerously relied on a single crop. With this came emigration of Irish Catholics to mainland Britain, Americas, and Australia. Many blamed the government, saying that the Act of Union (1801) was only created to continue the prosperity of Britain and hurt the Irish. This conflict worked its way into the political climate during Queen Victoria's lifetime. Along with this, voicings of universal suffrage began to rise during her reign. In 1884 about two-thirds of adult males could vote, which was up from the one-fifth of males allowed to vote in 1837. Later in 1918, the United Kingdom became a true democracy where universal adult male suffrage and women over 30 could vote. Women also began to play more influential roles in local governments and in local school and law boards. The era became marked with increasing representation of different types of people. Political debate in parliament and newspapers became more common and of a high order, especially seen through liberal William Gladstone and conservative Benjamin Disraeli's political duel for power.

More liberal ideas of civic engagement and pride also became a hallmark of her era. There was a lot of skepticism present, especially about the opinions of experts who wanted more involvement of the government in local issues. Many were concerned of higher taxes that would hurt small businesses and job security. In the 1860s, several organizations dedicated to charity and traditional qualities of giving formed to help some working classes. Medical advances, although relatively slow, did help. Chloroform, and anesthetic, was introduced by James Young

Simpson in 1847. Antiseptics in 1869 by Joseph Lister improved hospital practices in cleanliness and sterility.

Internationally, early in Victoria's reign, the First Opium Wars, from 1839 to 1842, were fought. Britain wanted to continue the lucrative trade that was essentially destroying the Chinese political climate, people, and overall, the economy. The Chinese, denying the import of more opium, and banning the trade, were met with British military force. Using gunboat diplomacy, the Qing Dynasty signed the Treaty of Nanking, and the trade continued. Later the Second Opium War, from 1856 to 1860, continued with British dominance over opium in China. The Crimean War from 1853 to 1856 was a military conflict between the Russian Empire and the, later victorious, allegiance between the British, Ottomans, French, and Sardinians. Except for this short war, there was a general peace abroad and at home. By the end of her reign, the British Empire expanded over about one-fifth of the Earth's surface. Many colonies were established with the ultimate religious goal to achieve good. Regarding Egypt, in 1875 Great Britain became the largest shareholder in the Suez Canal Company. In 1882, Britain invaded Egypt, which started the occupation of Egypt until the Suez Canal Crisis in 1956. Overall, though, the Pax Britannica (period of relative peace among the Great Powers), from 1815-1914, was a time of successful and stable foreign policy.

The end of Pax Britannica was marked with the beginning of World War I, which lasted from July 1914 to November 1918. The United Kingdom was part of the Allied Power fighting against the Central Powers of the German, Austro-Hungarian, and Ottoman empires. To gather the troop necessary, the Royal Air Force was founded, and via conscription and volunteers, armies were raised. Although social stresses were present, much of the United Kingdom became unified for the common cause. Newspapers and other forms of media, including propaganda, served to rally the people and ensure morale. Under the Defense of the Realm Act, passed in August 1914, the government began to involve itself more in public affairs to avoid major food shortages and the lack of job security. Although the Germans did elicit air raids and attacks on the United Kingdom, the center of focus was on naval power. The British navy allowed for the maintenance of trade. The defeat of the German navy in 1916 prevented the Germans from advancing out of the North Sea. After Germany failed offensive at the Second Battle of the Marne, the Allies victory was decisive, and they could help gain back the previously invaded France and Belgium. In 1918, Germany sought for an Armistice, and in 1919 the Treaty of Versailles was signed. Although seemingly a treaty to end all wars, the resurgence of Germany before and during World War II proved otherwise.

Shortly after the war, in 1920 the League of Nations was formed. In 1921, Ireland (excluding Northern Ireland, who opted out the treaty) was granted independence under the Anglo-Irish Treaty. Despite the victory, various political, economic, and social problems arose with the United Kingdom. The Liberal Party, a formerly prominent and relevant party, gave way to internal division and ultimately declined. The Conservative Party, instead, played a successful role in established a sense of stability in the inter-war years. The United Kingdom economy was also facing major problems of debt, as the United States began to rise in wealth. Strikes and cuts

in public spending, around 1922, increased, all to try to stop inflation. In 1929 when the New York Stock Exchange crashed, the United Kingdom experience the depression as well.

Britain's colonies had contributed a lot to the war effort, India, Africa, the Middle East, and the Caribbean supplied a lot of men and money. In India, British power began to slowly erode as anti-British sentiment arose. These same feelings were common in all the colonies, but not much changed in their ruling bodies until after World War II.

With Germany's invasion of Poland, Britain and France declared war, thus beginning World War II, which lasted from 1939 to 1945. The British Commonwealth mobilized quickly to establish a force of about 15 million men and women dedicated in defeating the German, Italian, Japanese, the major Axis powers. From 1940 to 1945 Winston Churchill, the Conservative Prime Minister, worked to The Axis air forces began attacking many British holdings. The Commonwealth forces, in the meantime invaded parts of Africa and the Middle East. It relied on other countries, like the United States and Canada, for money and supplies. The Commonwealth's forces worked to hold back the Axis powers from total control over Europe, and even beyond. With the United States entrance to the war in the December of 1941, many of the pressures previously on the Commonwealth lessened. In 1942, the major British stronghold in Singapore was taken by the Japanese, a defeat Churchill saw as one of the worst disasters in British history. Withstanding these troubles, with the help of the United States, the Nazis surrendered in May 1945, and the Japanese in August 1945, officially ending the war.

The home front of Britain during World War II experienced differed from the people fighting. The war was deemed a "people's war" which worked in arousing support in its democratic aspirations. Many women were mobilized and effectively worked to ration goods, and obtaining materials, like munition and food, necessary to support the war effort. Youth also became involved through organizations, or even enlisting if above the age of 16. When faced with German bombing from 1940 to 1941, also known as the Blitz, many evacuated majors from major cities. Belfast, in Northern Ireland, became an essential city in producing ships, tanks, aircraft, etc., to help the war. Unemployment decreased a lot as people got jobs in factories. Belfast also was affected by the Blitz. The welfare state increased to reward those who were making sacrifices for their country.

After the war, the Labour Party gained massive support. The overall economic recovery was slow, but it gave way to more growth in the 1950s. Britain played a role against the Soviet Union in the Cold War, and helped to found NATO in 1949. The United Kingdom declined in its role as a superpower, as it gave independence to India (1947), Ghana, Malaya, Nigeria, and Kenya. From 1979 to 1990 Margaret Thatcher, a Conservative Prime Minister, became the first women to be appointed. Called the "Iron Lady" she was known for her uncompromising politics. In 1993, the European Union was founded, of which the United Kingdom played a major role in. More recently, after a recession from 2008 to 2010, the Labour Party was defeated to usher in David Cameron. Cameron advocated for public spending cuts to reduce the budget deficit and wanted the United Kingdom to remain in the European Union. In 2016, the United Kingdom, in a narrow vote (52% wanted to leave, 48% wanted to stay), decided to leave the European Union,

and Cameron resigned. In 2016, Theresa May automatically became Prime Minister by the Conservative Party. She is still currently Prime Minister and is working to negotiate terms regarding specific details of the United Kingdom's exit from the European Union.

D. Current Issues

Sovereignty:

We feel that we must govern ourselves with our constitutional monarchy and parliamentary system. This was one of the reasons for our leaving of the European Union. Many people believed that the European Union was inhibiting UK sovereignty. We believe that the UK being able to make their own laws contributes to our national sovereignty and being in the EU made it difficult to pass individual laws without EU approval. The EU imposing laws on the UK suppressed our national sovereignty. In leaving the EU through Brexit we are enabling our country to have complete sovereignty, free from the European Union.

We consider breaching the sovereignty of other countries to protect human rights a justified act. Many times, we have considered it necessary to use military intervention in other countries to protect the human rights for global security. Military intervention and breaching sovereignty is necessary with matters of global security and human rights violations. As a Western country, we value human rights above almost all else and if a country is impinging on the rights of their own citizens, we will stop that.

As one of the founding members of the United Nations, we believe that every country's sovereignty is protected under the UN Charter. As the central document of the UN, the Charter states "The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its Members." The Charter when laying out the founding principles of the UN, states that every country's sovereignty is protected. We affirm the UN's statement and beliefs about sovereignty.

The Principle of Non-Intervention states that no state can intervene in the affairs of another state. According to the UN, a state is prohibited from intervention in matters of another state unless the question of protecting human rights is present. In that case intervention is allowed based on preserving and protecting the global human rights. We, as the UK, agree with the UN's definition that intervention is prohibited when it is taken through unnecessary force and is infringing on the sovereignty of another state. We believe that protecting states' sovereignty under the Principle of Non-Intervention allows for the preservation of individual state sovereignty.

We believe that the international community should be more invested in global unity but not at the expense of individual state sovereignty. Protecting human rights around the world is one of our top priorities through the United Nations. The United Nations is a globally unifying organization. Although global unity should be prioritized, individual state sovereignty is of the utmost importance. Sovereignty of a county should not be violated because of the international community investing in global unity.

As one of the founding members of the United Nations, we, as the United Kingdom, believe that international institutions are critical in providing global security. The UN along with

other institutions provide a unifying organization that is necessary in protecting human rights. International institutions should be focused on the protection of human rights. Providing global security through intervention to protect human rights is a main role international institutions should play.

We are an NPT-authorized nuclear weapons carrier with 120 operational nuclear weapons and 215 total weapons with some being under maintenance. Our priority is to protect our country and its citizens. We remain strongly committed to the Treaty and believe that it is central to the effort to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. In 2015, our government met to strengthen the Treaty and continue its efforts to disarm nuclear weapons. We have assured that we will not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against any countries party to the NPT but this does not apply to countries not party to the NPT and we reserve the right to review this assurance if threatened. It would be irresponsible to believe there won't be a future crisis in which a nuclear deterrent will be necessary, therefore we will be maintaining a small deterrent.

We will do whatever it takes to defend our own citizens and country. If we are threatened by another state, we will defend ourselves in order to maintain global security. If the safety of the world is at stake, we will do whatever it takes to protect civilians, even if it means forsaking state sovereignty. We are a strong supporter of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), a political commitment of the UN to prevent genocide and persecution and maintain human rights throughout the world. By being a member of this, the UK agrees to intervene in other countries when necessary to prevent the violation of human rights. The threshold of the necessity of global security overwhelming that of sovereignty can be defined as any point where human rights are being violated or there is imminent danger to civilian lives. As the R2P is a principle adopted by the United Nations, it is this body's responsibility to cooperatively define the threshold at which a country should relinquish their right to sovereignty.

If a country is fit to take power back into their own hands, and the reason they lost sovereignty in the first place has been resolved, then a country can reclaim said sovereignty. For example, after we, the UK, began formal procedures to leave the EU, we converted EU law back into British law, therefore establishing sovereignty over the UK. In this example, we willingly gave up our sovereignty and did not have to meet any requirements to regain it. In the case that sovereignty is forcibly taken from a country, whether for human rights violations or otherwise, a country must prove that they have corrected any violation that may have occurred and sovereignty will not be returned until that has happened.

Nuclear weapons and nuclear proliferation pose grave risks for both sovereignty and for global security. Nuclear weapons, if in the wrong hands, could do incredible damage to countries across the globe that the UK has an obligation to support. In the same way, nuclear proliferation adds an unknown factor to the question of global security. If one country is in possession of nuclear weapons without signing the NPT, then it makes it impossible to maintain global security while still holding up our end of the NPT. Currently, the UK is in the process of disarming our nuclear weapons but we still have nuclear deterrent options in place in case of any attack. On the other hand, for some countries, possession of nuclear weapons provides security benefits

assuring their sovereignty when surrounded by hostile neighbors. To protect their sovereignty in the past it has been a priority of these nations to maintain their nuclear capabilities, and they use them as “bargaining chips” of a sort, rather than offensive weapons.

We, the UK, are a nuclear state under the NPT. We are comfortable in our sovereignty to the point that we have nuclear deterrents in place as a precaution but have plans in place to disarm all our nuclear weapons in the coming years. We never worry about the state of our sovereignty due to our possession of nuclear weapons. We know that we are safe from attack due to our nuclear deterrence program. Another state should not be able to determine whether we should have nuclear weapons. We are happy to discuss the thoughts of other states regarding this fact, similarly to how the NPT came about, but when it comes down to the matter, the UK and the UK alone will determine when our nuclear weapons will be disarmed.

The “liberal world order” does matter in negotiations over sovereignty and nuclear weapons as part of the new “liberal world order” includes ideologies behind R2P - that countries have the right to invade other countries if they believe human rights are being violated. Nuclear weapons are a huge cause behind violations of human rights so when there are debates regarding the approval of nuclear weapons, it is inevitable that they are accompanied by human rights discussions. Along the same lines, if human rights are violated then countries such as us will invade to stop these violations, thereby violating a nation’s sovereignty. Therefore the “liberal world order” goes hand in hand with sovereignty and nuclear weapons.

Security:

The global security environment is not safe, because there are a lot of Nuclear weapons that pose a threat to security of every country. Recently North Korea has been testing their nuclear weapons, which mainly poses a threat to the U.S., which North Korea has threatened to bomb on many occasions. Since the U.S. is in the UN this would lead to many of its allies aiding it if it went to nuclear war against North Korea. This threatens many countries’ security because nuclear war is catastrophic to civilians, the environment, and the economy. There are also many terrorist groups in countries like Syria, which poses a threat to the civilians, and has led to many refugees, many of which have fled to countries that are not able to take in such a sudden heavy flow of people. Countries that have these terrorist groups in peril.

Our security prism is based on national security because if other parts of the world are in trouble, it doesn’t mean that we are in trouble. Our security is mostly determined on what happens inside our country. The only case in which our security prism would be based on global security is if our allies had threats against them and it affected us. More nuclear weapons means there will be a bigger threat to global security, and a greater chance of a country starting nuclear war. The most significant nuclear threat is the fact that nuclear wars could totally obliterate countries. The UK is a nuclear state, we have about 215 thermonuclear warheads, of which about 120 are operational. The Trident nuclear programme is the only operational nuclear weapons system in British service. Having Nuclear weapons has allowed the discussion of classified scientific data between us and the U.S., as well as cooperation regarding nuclear security matters.

We view the current nuclear dilemma of North Korea as dangerous to global security. North Korea's recent nuclear missile tests threaten the security of the U.S. and its allies like us. The nuclear dilemma of Iran will make global security more secure. Iran reducing its nuclear weapons will decrease the number of nuclear weapons in the world therefore making it safer. The nuclear dilemma of India-Pakistan will be very dangerous toward global security, because if they start nuclear war it would be disastrous for both countries, and due to the amount of previous wars and skirmishes this is incredibly likely. The environmental, economic, and human damages would be very severe between both countries, and any other country that could potentially become involved in the war. This would threaten global security as many countries would be unsafe. Mutually assured destruction and brinkmanship are at play. When both countries at war are nuclear countries then there is a strong chance that they will each use nuclear weapons against each other causing their mutual destruction. This is very dangerous because it will be disastrous for both countries and heavily impact our global population. Brinkmanship is also at play because many countries have been testing the limits in nuclear weapons without assuring destruction of a country.

Mutually assured destruction in the Cold War was used to convince the United States and the Soviet Union not to attack each other, because it would result in their total destruction. Both had to hold back for fear of retaliation by the other, and avoided pushing each other to the limit. Today since we have developed better military technology a country may be able to destroy its enemy and render them unable to strike back, which eliminates the power of MAD. This is very dangerous because it would allow a country to strike another without immediate consequences. If a country can obliterate another in one hit, there is no need for concern that they will do the same to you. The rapid speed that our military technology is developing at poses a huge threat to global security. First-strike capability is a country with nuclear power's ability to defeat another country with nuclear power by destroying its arsenal, leaving the country unable to continue war, and allowing the attacking country to survive the weak retaliation. A limited nuclear war is a war with small-scale use of nuclear weaponry, by two or more nations involved in said war. If there was a nuclear strike on the Korean peninsula many people would die. The nuclear strike would also deplete many of their resources which would hurt the economy and put the Korean Peninsula into a depression. Their environment would be destroyed, there would be a lot of nuclear waste, and radiation exposure would cause a rise in cancer rates among survivors and their children. It is not possible for an individual country to contend with these security challenges on its own because is a global effort. To deal with these security threats, we need to eliminate nuclear weapons, and one country can't do that on its own, a mutual trust and agreement to eliminate all nuclear weapons everywhere internationally is the best way to eliminate this threat. Even without entirely removing nuclear weapons the matter of nuclear security is an international issue, as the range and capability of these weapons can have massive effect spanning the borders of just one country.

The government and its willingness to be a part of the international community affects the threat a nuclear state poses. Countries that are a part of the international community would

face a greater loss, as they would lose allies and likely damage their economy. If the government is isolated from the international community they likely do not value cooperation and do not depend on others to boost their economy. It is more dangerous for them to have nuclear weapons because they could easily use them against us, with the only consequence being the possibility of starting wars.

South Africa built six nuclear weapons and then dismantled them to show that they have the power to have these powerful weapons, but that they are unnecessary. Doing so showed their desire for peace. Other countries can do this too. The U.S. has asked North Korea to dismantle their nuclear weapons, but they refuse. It seems very unlikely that other countries would dismantle their nuclear weapons, but it is possible, and there haven't been any negative effects. Nuclear weapons are not the key to international stability. Nuclear weapons have the power to destroy entire countries. There is no reason to have to destroy an entire country to ensure your safety. Nuclear weapons are only seen as the key to stability because if you have them no one will mess with you out of fear, but at this point everyone has them. Nuclear war could lead to the destruction of entire countries, ecosystems, and international economy. You can have a reasonable military with reasonable weaponry to ensure your international stability without nuclear weapons. The only reason for having nuclear weapons is to defend oneself against other countries that have them as well, so once we can achieve some level of cooperation from potential threats they will no longer be needed.

Diplomacy:

We lean more toward solutions of diplomacy, and do not believe that states should have to be approached by war. However, if the only solution that appears is a solution which requires an approach, we believe that this approach will be the one which we will be forced to use. We believe in the use of deterrence theory so that we can prevent a conflict before it happens, and that a majority of conflict can be figured out on a psychological diplomatic basis.

On such grounds, we are deeply committed to the ideas of multilateralism, and believe that the entire world should give up all nuclear weapons at the same time. We do not believe that one country, especially large, empirical nations that have been recognized by agreements as proper to nuclear possessions, should be forced to forfeit their power in relation to necessary belligerent affairs. We are, as always, proud to remind that we have personally reduced our nuclear possessions by 50% in the last 50 years, a slow but effective process. Therefore, we do not believe that modern problems can have a quick fix, and must rely on effective multilateralism.

We believe that the countries which have already been recognized as powers are the only ones which are entitled to have power. By these conditions, it is unreasonable for dictatorial regimes to assume a power to which they have no right. For example, countries such as North Korea are proving to be a danger to our global community assuming a nuclear power, which is both irresponsible and illegitimate. In the Middle East, countries like Iran have been problems in the past, and have intentionally threatened the stability of nuclear powers. We see that those who

believe themselves to be a threat to the well-being of nuclear powers can hold little power, but must not be taken lightly.

We believe that there is no reason to find the possession of nuclear weapons by certain countries illegitimate, as they have been pre-determined to preserve the safety and longevity of a global community. Current nuclear powers have been determined by the United Nations to guarantee the safety of fellow countries in a shared world. We believe that if the legitimacy of nuclear powers were to be challenged, it would create a struggle for power, and motivate a usage of nuclear weapons among nations which are known to be in possession of dangerous destructive devices. For this set of reasons, we firmly believe in the committees which have been created for the designation and preservation of nuclear power.

We do not believe in the proliferation of nuclear weapons and remain deeply committed to solutions of multilateralism. We remain a devoted supporter of the concepts described by NPT, and motivated to make sure that the number of nuclear weapons in existence throughout the world should remain from increasing. Over the last 50 years, we have decreased our nuclear arsenal by approximately 75%, and are committed to a decrease in necessity of such devices in all parts of the world. An increase in presence of nuclear weapons actively encourages a nuclear war.

We hope that as a country we will be able to set up way to disarm the dangerous countries of the world and remove all nuclear weaponry from the world stage. We believe that this will be most attainable through a concrete set of steps which countries can take, and therefore believe that we, with the support of other countries, should set up an international procedure for disarmament.

We do not believe that this process will be easy nor will it be fast, but we do believe that in time the world can reach an international state of nuclear disarmament. We believe that a quick solution would be ineffective, and actively disagree with those countries that support one, since we find that with a sudden dissipation of nuclear weaponry, the world will be thrown into chaos, as the general population becomes paranoid for their safety within the newly created power vacuum.

Studies done within our country have shown that a minute majority of the population would be willing to launch a nuclear attack upon another state if they feel so provoked. By these statistics, we find it reasonable to assume that most of our population supports the nuclear industry. Though there are movements against nuclear weapons, this does not reflect the majority of the population. Ultimately, though the split is rather tight, we exercise diplomatic freedom and are inclined to make policies which favor our people, as in the spirit of a constitutional monarchy.

We believe there are some nations, historically including Iran, who threaten the security of other nations, and therefore can be defined as a rogue state. These states have strayed from the peaceful path provided by our world's natural orders. If there is any state which actively seeks to threaten the health and security of another nation, it must be treated as a rogue state. We believe that only certain countries can truly hold the power within the world stably. On the other hand,

certain countries can prove that they have become unfit to rule and hold power on the global stage. Once they have proven such, they have officially gone rogue as a state. These states cannot and will not be tolerated. Though they will be treated with a diplomatic respect to a point, there must be consequences for a state that threatens the safety of the worldwide community.

Having been created in an image of the desire for safety of all states, we believe that the current world order is more than fair to all states. There should be no reason to find such a order, as it has been justified and acknowledged by the world as proper and fitting for the progression of worldwide affairs. Without our current world order, the nature of life would be constantly threatened by dictators looking to disrupt the peace that binds the heart of the earth together. However, if various states do not believe such a system to be justified, we do not believe that, though their voices are important, their opinions are irrelevant. If these states wish to challenge a system which causes safety for all international citizens, they must realize that they are standing in the way of a world of international peace. If they wish to challenge the system saying that it is “unfair,” they must realize that peace can only come in the presence of power, whether justified or not. Debates on the justification of the liberal world order are irrelevant and distract from the goal of unity, peace, and order by attempting to promote an international system of anarchy.

As the world moves toward a more violent position, we believe that tides of violence must be reversed, and nations should proceed to disarm together. We do not believe that all nations should immediately disarm, as this would create a definite power vacuum. Rather, we do support a gradual process towards disarmament. We are calling on other nations to join in the creation of such a procedure which can be used as a strict outline for global disarmament.

We are currently in a domestic attempt toward complete disarmament and a Global Zero. We have recently between the years of 2015 and 2016 decreased our operational nuclear arsenal by 33% and are seeking to continue the trend of decreasing the presence of such destroyers. We are imploring the rest of the world to follow in our footsteps and reduce the potential risk of harm inflicted by the mere presence of the threat of damage to the lives of innocent citizens and nations caught in political crossfire.

We do not believe in unilateral disarmament as neither does it improve national security nor does it increase trust or transparency. We further that usage of unilateral disarmament beckons to opposition states to launch an attack, as it shows an inability to defend oneself. We do not believe that sudden, complete unilateral disarmament has the power to increase global peace, but rather can increase violence, and work against its intended goal. However, we will forever remain committed to a world without nuclear weapons achieved through multilateral disarmament.

Terrorism:

Terrorism poses a real threat to the safety of the citizens of our nation. We have experienced 5 major terrorist incidents, including the Manchester Arena and London bridge attacks, in the past year, and it is clear that the threat of terrorism has a potential to be relatively large here. On May 22, 2017 in the Manchester Arena during an Ariana Grande concert, a

homemade shrapnel-laden bomb was detonated, killing 23 victims and injuring 512 others. Our citizens are apprehensive due to recent acts of terrorism and want to “regain control of [their] borders”. Our vote on Brexit is a step the government has taken to try to reassure citizens. In addition, last March (2017), we banned passengers on direct flights from a few Middle Eastern countries (Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, Tunisia and Saudi Arabia) from bringing laptops and any other electronics larger than a standard smartphone on board with them while flying into the United Kingdom. Although the ban has been lifted, precautions such as the laptop ban have been made in airports to help prevent nuclear and non-nuclear acts of terrorism from occurring in the United Kingdom.

The non-state actors within our nation do not pose a threat to our country’s security, or to global security. The only non-state actors, here, are independent groups trying to push their goals, none of which harm the ourselves, or the world.

We have been concerned about nuclear terrorism. Although our country does not face consistent terror attacks, there have been five major ones in the past year that keep our government on alert, and of course attempt to preemptively stop any terror attacks that could occur. The government is able to recognize the threat of terrorism to the country and its citizens, and is discussing solutions to the our current. terrorist conflict. Brexit is one example in which we worked with the citizens to take steps to attempt to stop more terror, by limiting immigration and showing a concern to being within the European Union, and the possible dangers associated with it.

The current world order is liberal, and should remain that way. In the United Kingdom, we are still a democratic country, giving adequate power for citizens to vote and have a say in politics. Free speech is still heavily value, and people are given immense freedom inside our country.

We can and will take actions to stop any violent non-state actors found within the country and its borders. Although it values free speech as a liberal right, we are wary of the harms of letting terrorists grow on our own soil, and will therefore not be afraid of taking careful measures to shut down violent non-state actors. In the recent years, no violent non-state actors have been found here.

We are also wary of the threat that terrorism poses to its country, and the damage that has already been inflicted on its citizens, so it can take out any threats that are posed towards it. So far, we have taken steps to reduce terrorism, and adapt our own immigration and security policies, most clearly seen in Brexit, to make sure its country and citizens are safe. These examples show how much we are openly willing to counteract terrorism.

The nuclear black market does not operate in our country, but it could implicate our country if a terrorists group was to buy a nuclear weapon and set it off in our country. We have decided, with certainty, that we will not be selling any of our old nuclear weapons. We are giving incentives to the underground nuclear waste factories.

Our country has been reducing its number of nuclear weapons, we are committed to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Some of the flaws are the constant

debated about whether we should be getting rid of nuclear weapons or not. So far, the side agreeing with the NPT is winning, and they have control in the United Kingdom's Labour Party. But other than that, our country is successfully lowering our number of nuclear weapons.

Under Article 4, we are legally required to enforce NPT. The enforcement mechanisms for NPT are sufficient, so far reducing our operational warheads to 120 from 540 in less than 50 years. We have removed fissile factories, removing the way of making some nuclear weapons. We are reducing our arsenal size, but continuing to advance out warhead technology, and we will maintain the ballistic missiles on our submarines for the time being. Along with this, we are trying to change our nuclear strategy by using cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. We have signed the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), the Partial Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), and haven't tested nuclear weapons since 1991. Communities in the UK are being offered one million euros to host underground nuclear waste disposal factories, allowing us to get rid of our nuclear waste.

We., ideally, would not risk any terrorism happening within our borders. Although we know it is almost impossible to stop all terrorism, we are fully committed to giving its citizens as much protection as possible, and any level of terrorism is already considered a heavy risk. However, we are also not willing to completely give up their citizens' freedom to defend them, as liberty and freedom are two highly valued tenants of our society, and terrorism should be stopped, while also giving our citizens freedom.

The threat of terrorism affects more democratic societies more than authoritarian societies. According to a study from Belfer Center, "democracies provide the permissive environment, or opportunity structure, wherein terrorist groups flourish. Second, the motivation for terrorist groups to escalate in democracies can be explained by intergroup dynamics, with terrorist groups of various ideologies competing with one another for limited agenda space." These two reasons reveal how democratic societies, due to being freer, tend to provide a "permissive environment" for terrorist groups and sentiment to flourish. Terrorists also target democracies more due to the competition between different terrorist groups.

The intelligence community should address nuclear terrorism by finding out as much information about future dangers to the country as possible. The issue is both transnational and domestic, as the U.K. has faced homegrown threats in the past, including attacks such as the murder of Jo Cox, which was committed by a British far-right terrorist, Thomas Mair. However, the issue is also transnational, as attackers from different countries around the world have committed atrocities in the U.K., including attackers from the Middle East who were radicalized by Islamic terrorists. Both of these issues are very important to be stopped, and the intelligence community should be exposing violent threats from radical attackers who are domestic, as well as threats from immigrants or radicals abroad.

Climate/Energy:

We, the United Kingdom believe that climate change is an issue that countries all over

the world are affected by and should be working to prevent. We are worried about what this problem could mean for this planet and the people who live on it. Evidence of climate change and its impact can be seen in air pollution, flooding, droughts, and extreme weather. There are consequences caused by the change in climate that can't be reversed like extinction, but we should continue to prevent climate change to keep it from happening more. This is a real problem caused by the actions of humans and can't just be ignored. In the United Kingdom, we've seen a pattern of severely destructive floods, and we will continue to see the risk worsen if this issue isn't fixed. Marine life could also be put at risk because of a recent wind boom on the offshores. Fisherman have seen increases in the temperature of the water and the hard winds they saw before aren't there anymore. We also noticed that some bird species' migration and egg laying pattern are different. The temperature in the UK has increased and birds have responded by leaving earlier or later. If we don't start reversing this, many lives will be impacted negatively.

The United Kingdom has taken steps to help reverse the harm that climate change has caused. The United Kingdom is part of the UNFCCC, Kyoto Protocol, and Paris agreement. In 2016, our carbon emissions have dropped by 42% less that they were in 1990. Our target for 2050 is to reduce carbon emissions by at least 80% of the amount in 1990. We want to make sure this happens by setting 5-yearly carbon budgets that restrict the amount of greenhouse gas that can be emitted. The first two goals have been accomplished and we will strive to outperform on the next three. This has helped reduce our energy by 17% between 1998 and 2015. We have seen the effects of climate change and would like to try and reverse some of the damage that has already been made by reducing our carbon emissions and using more energy from renewable sources.

We are dependent on imported energy from other countries. Crude oil, natural gas, and petroleum are our main sources of energy. More than 20% of the United Kingdom's electricity is produced by renewable technologies and this amount has been increasing. Most of our energy is imported from the European Union. The main types of fuel we use are gas, petroleum, and electricity. Our reliance on foreign sources of energy has increased and peaked in 2013, but has been slowly falling. We are the 12th most dependent on imported energy out of the 28 European Union. Crude oil and natural gas are imported mainly from Norway because of the underwater pipeline network connecting us. We've had to import most of our petroleum from Russia after the miners' strike.

Nuclear energy plays an important role in our country, with almost a quarter of the United Kingdom's energy comes from nuclear energy produced by 15 operational generators at nine plants. This nuclear energy currently generates 21% of our electricity and is projected to increase. Most of our older nuclear plants will be decommissioned by 2030, adding to the 11 already retired because of their 30-year lifespan, but we have agreed to replace them by building a new generation of nuclear reactors. Energy Companies plan to invest £70 billion in new nuclear power plants, creating 19GW of nuclear power capacity.

We independently create and test nuclear weapons. Our nuclear program began in April of 1940 and we tested our first nuclear weapon during October of 1952 in Australia. A lot of nuclear waste is produced by these 2 industries and much of it will stay hazardous for hundreds of thousands of years. We are working on a long-term solution that is better than burying it deep underground. Although nuclear reactors don't directly produce carbon dioxide emissions, high amounts of energy are needed for building and operating them. The United Kingdom is not the only country impacted by this. Many countries with nuclear energy plants have also suffered from the environmental consequences. One concern is the dangers of radioactive waste. Nuclear power plant accidents are rare, but they do happen, especially in the U.S and Japan.

We feel that nuclear energy plays an essential role in powering our country, and others. Currently, twenty-one percent of our electricity is generated by fifteen reactors. This having been said, we do have concerns about how nuclear energy may be used for violent reasons. We suggest more international organizations focus on the specific development of nuclear technologies worldwide, as to ensure no essential information is being spread to potential terrorist civilian or military organizations. Countries seeking to mine plutonium or uranium for "peaceful" purposes should ensure the international community that they will securely keep any sensitive material away from black-market vendors, weapon programs, or terrorist organizations. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), of which, we have signed, we feel is a step in the proper direction. Its main objective of preventing "the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, [promoting] cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and [furthering] the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament" is in line with our beliefs as an already developed nation. The ideologies of non-signatories are concerning, and we definitely feel that more oversight is necessary to prevent future nuclear conflicts. The NPT, currently, does provide moderate safeguard against such conflicts, but we suggest further guidelines be implemented. This is because we fear the increased presence of weapons that could easily destroy large areas of countries, or even possibly the planet. Proliferation of such technology should not be necessary by other countries.

Human caused global climate change remains at the forefront of our policy and ideologies. We recognize the likely and damaging repercussions of climate change, and have worked to create policy to reduce and mitigate some of our current issues. This includes the Climate Change and Sustainability Act of 2006, Climate Change Act of 2008, and the London Green500, all to reduce harmful emissions. Specifically, regarding nuclear energy, we feel that it is nuclear energy is extremely useful to our energy security and plays a large part in reducing emissions. Through our New-Build Plan, we have discussed increasing our nuclear energy sources, mainly to make a switch to greener sources of energy.

We feel that the current world order allows a variety of countries, developed and developing, to have access to nuclear energy. We notice some correlation between countries having nuclear energy and having nuclear weaponry, ourselves included. Many who have the necessary resources and infrastructure to build and finance nuclear power plants have already begun to take active steps in planning nuclear energy. Those who do not currently have nuclear

energy are still able to produce energy, mainly by bypassing systems of non-renewable energy. These countries should continue their development, trying to avoid unstable sources of energy.

If the United States of America provides critical training in nuclear security, trade, and standards, it should not give it extra privileges to say what other countries should and should not do. We, the United Kingdom, believe that there should instead be a coalition of countries that work on helping many nations looking to develop nuclear energy. We encourage the investment of any other countries into alternative sources of energy, including, but not limited to, solar (and its encompassing forms), geothermal, wind, tidal, hydropower. With the current lack of beneficial understanding about energy, in the United States, we believe it is best to not have a single country dictating contrasting ideologies. The United States also needs to work on their own development of nuclear energy standards.

If the United States decided to step back from its work in security, trade, and standards, we feel that we could work with the United Nations to fulfill the role. Specifically, we advocate for a plan combining the backgrounds of several countries with and without nuclear energy. We feel that, overall, to improve we need to understand several different points of view. Without learning from the mistakes and successes of others, we are not functioning in the most efficient ways. There is no growth without the presence of positive change.

Economy:

The main sectors of our nation, the United Kingdom, are services, manufacturing, and construction. Services alone in 2015, according to the House of Commons Library, contributed approximately 1.3 trillion pounds of economic output, 80% of our economic output. Manufacturing contributed 10%, and construction 6%. The remaining four percent is made up of mining/extractives and agriculture. The employment of the workforce reflects this distribution, with 85% of the workforce employed in the service industry. The largest sub-sectors of the service industry in the UK are government, health, education, and defense. The entire industry's output has grown by 88% since 1990. Manufacturing, on the other hand, has fallen since 1990 by 2%. The global fall in the price of oil, and the declining oil production in the North Sea, the mining and extractive industry has fallen by 33%.

The nuclear energy industry has a great impact on the economy on our nation, the United Kingdom. We place great importance on our nuclear energy sector because of its smaller negative impact on the environment compared to other energy sources. Currently we have 15 nuclear energy reactors that generate a large portion of our country's electricity, and about 110 billion pounds will "be spent on new power generating capacity in the next decade." We, the United Kingdom, will continue to attempt to maintain these nuclear energy sources in order to reduce negative influences on our environment and keep creating sustainable energy.

The nuclear weapons industry has served as a source of employment, but has been costly to our nation. Under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, our spending on nuclear weapons has been reduced. In December 2015, our then defense secretary, Philip Hammond stated that the 350 million pounds awarded to defense firm Babcock International,

“As well as securing 2,000 U.K. jobs, this contract will ensure the nuclear deterrent submarine fleet can continue to operate safely and effectively to maintain a continuous at-sea deterrent.” This plan will ensure maintenance of our warhead-armed submarine defense, as well as employment. Similarly, trident, the long-term nuclear weapon program in effect since (assumable) 1969, provides that there will be, at any time, a warhead-armed submarine on duty in the defense of the United Kingdom. Costly to maintain, these submarines do, however, provide jobs.

We are seeking to uphold our nuclear energy industry, as it has a very important impact on our nation and its energy production. However, we want to continue to use our nuclear energy in a peaceful manner for the prosperity of our nation, and not to harm or help with the development of nuclear weapons. We are not seeking to continue our development of nuclear weapons, and since signing the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have been reducing the number of nuclear weapons available to our country.

The nuclear weapons industry, despite the violent reputations it has, is useful to the economy nonetheless. As any industry it provides one, undeniable asset: jobs. Unemployment is not particularly surging in our nation, but more people working is only a positive. However, programs like Trident consume far more money than they can ever put out. Our trust in these spendings comes entirely from the assurance of safety in a nuclear attack. Pursuing domestic nuclear weapon construction may be a massive gain for our economy, as it is in current nuclear-producers. As of now, trident missiles are imports from the United States.

We, the United Kingdom, are extremely committed to preserving and defending the values presented in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which is also known as the NPT. Our nation places great value and importance on this treaty because we seek prosperity and welfare for humanity, especially in the dangerous nuclear weapon era that we live in today. In accordance to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we have “reduced the number of warheads on each of our deployed ballistic missile submarines from 48 to 40, and the number of operational missiles on each of those submarines to no more than eight.” We, the United Kingdom, have played an unparalleled role in the keeping and strengthening of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to keep the world safe from the use of nuclear weapons, while being able to use nuclear energy peacefully.

While we have signed and committed ourselves to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we also realize that other nations have not, and that they are not willing to come to terms with this treaty. Along with having to uphold the guidelines set by the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we must also “enforce these rules, working through organizations such as the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, or as groups of concerned states.” We, the United Kingdom, support international sanctions against nations that defy this treaty, as they are putting everyone in the world in danger. By sanctioning countries that choose to go against the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, we hope to save lives and help them out of their reckless paths.

The United Kingdom is currently under the UN and EU sanctions. Although they apply to all members, the UN and EU sanctions that our country is under are in the best interest of the global wellbeing and economy. Within our country, sanctions in place are in the forms of arms embargo, bans on internal repression equipment, export controls, asset freezes and financial sanctions on designated individuals and corporate entities” (Eversheds). Further measures on certain individuals include restrictions on travel and trade license. Our Country, the United Kingdom, is more often sanctioning others in our efforts to create a stronger world economy.

Although some international sanctions are not effective in stopping the development of nuclear industries for the long term, most of these economic sanctions can have a great impact. For the growth of nuclear industries, often a country needs to trade a lot for various materials which also requires many funds. Through economic sanctions, the trade and funds for the development of nuclear industries in these countries can often be completely stopped and frozen, causing the nation to not be able to finish developing their nuclear industries and possibly hurting their economy as well. These sanctions can have an even greater affect if all of the important trade partners of the nation being sanctioned agree to cut off trade and support the sanction. If the sanction has enough of a negative effect on the nation, often the nation will give in and agree to partially or completely stop their development of nuclear industries.

A great example of an international sanction that was effective in the stopping of the development of nuclear industries was the economic sanctions placed against Iran in 2013. These sanctions, which were placed and enforced by the European Union and the United States of America, had a profound effect on the trade routes and economy of Iran, causing its development of nuclear industries to slow down exponentially.

However, while international sanctions are often effective in the stopping of the development of nuclear industries, they can still be improved upon. This is because although most trade routes are closed, not all-important trade partners always agree to the sanction, which can cause it to not work. In addition, black markets can always develop in which the government is still able to develop their nuclear industries illegally.

We are very much in support of the NPT. We feel that not only would peace be at risk in an unrestricted nuclear landscape, but economy as well. Given the rise of total wars in the past century, a nuclear war would presumably halt almost all other aspects of life. The United States, a nation that will find itself at the center of any war no matter its location, is the largest receiver of the United Kingdom’s service exports. In the scenario of war, whether we are in it or not, we will be tied in by this relationship. IF the US economy plunges, our services sector (our largest sector) will have difficulty. If the United States, however, has an increasing need of services exports in a time of war, as unlikely as it may be, our economy will experience a great increase.

Although an attack within our borders could have some impact on the global economy, it would not be extremely significant. Tourist rates across Europe could possibly go down for a bit of time, depending on the gravity of the attack, but often, in economically strong countries, there is only a very low impact on the global economy after an attack. In addition, travel from other

nations to ours would temporarily go down, which would negatively impact their economies as well as our own, yet it still would not tremendously hurt them nor the global economy.

Our nation's plans for nuclear attack, although not public, may be assumed from what has been revealed as the plans for the cold war. These, though, are not particularly comforting for the future. Plans in the case of a nuclear attack in the cold war consisted of sending elite members of government and society to few bunkers located across the nation. This leaves absolutely no room to maintain an economy in the time of war. With the current advancements at hand in the modern day, digital business may have a better chance of surviving in similar conditions. In the years following the war, we hope to rebuild adequately, and potentially greener and more effectively than before.

With so many recent terrorist attacks having been carried out over the past couple of years, we, the United Kingdom, place immense value on the protection of our people and visitors in our country. Recently, we have been erecting barriers, and more specifically, anti-vehicle barriers, in order to ensure safety in extremely populated or visited areas. In addition, we have been carrying out messages and safety procedures to stadiums, bars, and tourist attractions on how to act during a terrorist attack, to minimize its effects. We, the United Kingdom, have been improving “protection in public spaces, including increased physical security measures at locations such as bridges and city centers.” We have also been fortifying our national security by securing borders and amplifying the security in airports and in passport checks. Our national intelligence agencies have also been working together with those of other nations such as France and Germany in cyber security to protect our nation from future terrorist attacks.

Disaster Preparedness:

We, the United Kingdom, have historically been a global center of political discussion, empowerment under the law, and a driving force for change. As a collection of nations, we strive to react to any outside force, be it natural or of human doing, with the collective effort of both our governing bodies and our citizens. Through our bond, and our undying pacts with fellow global influencers, we work to reach the overarching goal of global peace and global prosperity. As of recent, our efforts have sparked some opposition, and have granted our presence in this conference.

Through our participation, we wish to elaborate on our goals, educate other nations on disaster precautionary measures, and re-establish connections with fellow nations. Following our wave of civil disputes, and political fragmentation, we now find ourselves able to rebrand ourselves, and reconsider our global standings. We wholeheartedly believe that this cause constitutes the combined efforts of many different nations, of many different backgrounds, and many different abilities, and therefore, we do not wish to tread on alone. In the following passages, we will outline our intentions, our actions, and plans in regard to disaster preparedness. We will assume the worst, and act accordingly, putting the well-being of our people as top priority. If anything were to compromise this, they will face the combined force of the UK, and all that support us. This is your opportunity to reconsider your global standings. The UK has

often been synonymous with other world leaders, such as the United States, and nations within the framework of the European Union (EU). However, as of recent, we have prioritized the well being of our people, and in turn, have ceased to unconditionally support mentioned nations.

This is not to say that we will not stand with these nations if the circumstances warranted our help, but rather, when deciding whether to become involved, we will consider the initiative, the willingness of our state to participate, and the actions leading up to the conflicts. Today, facing the overarching threat of a disastrous attack, we openly cooperate with mentioned nations to coherently guarantee optimal security. We have developed a holistic viewpoint of the global model, and will remain to it for decades to come.

Now as a more removed collective force, we do not have a direct voice in the endeavors of the setters of the framework by which the world's major influencers conduct, but as a present nation in general world affairs, we do have much influence in how security related matters are carried out, particularly with synthetic and natural disasters of mass destruction. We wish to set the bar for precautionary measures taken, and increased proactive political measures taken in order to prevent these disastrous activities.

In the face of a nuclear attack, we will allocate preferably the current prime minister, and if not, any political administrator, to one of the four designated nuclear submarines, and from there assess the situation. If London were to fall, along with the governing body, an issued final decree will be instituted, and the people will be expected to be fully cooperative with our aligned motives and actions. We will also expect respective communal leaders to assume temporary leadership positions, delegating as seems fit. Depending on the situation, our response agencies will be deployed, to maintain peace and sustenance within the populous. The government, if fully able to, will actively assist the populous with food and enemies. As stated as a classification of proactive activity in our government website, *direction* is of utmost significance, along with recurring themes such as *information*, *anticipation*, *cooperation*, and *continuity*. The demand for these guidelines emerged in 1980, regarding the prevalent threat of a Soviet Union missile attack, and we answered to it, issuing booklets to be delivered to every citizen. However, a threat that is still present and unaddressed is the *potential danger of radiation* because of the nuclear attack. Ecologically speaking, this will have a profound effect on the quality of our water and crops. We have taken measures to stockpile non-perishable foods, and have allocated a federal funding of 308 million dollars to radiation research, and precautionary measures. We would like to draw inspiration from other nations who have successfully been able to address this underlying issue, as we recognize that this is the extent to which the health of the entire world may be put in critical danger. We will attempt to bring our ideas to the table, as we encourage other nations to take part in the discussion of global health, and the possible effects of nuclear warfare on the standard of global health.

In the face of such a catastrophe, complementing our physical booklet directions are procedures that can be accessed from our multi-national, government run website, or from any media outlet, 4 minutes prior to any presumed attack. If all goes accordingly, all of our citizens will be accounted for, and in an optimal position to remain secure during such events. Following

our wave of social opinion, we have opted to cater to our populous, and to focus primarily on the well being of our political estate before any other. If an allied nation calls for our aid, we will limit the use of our own resources to only the recovery and reconstruction of that targeted nation, and we will not engage in any retaliation. We will do everything and anything in our power to ensure that we will always be accounted for, and will take precautionary measures to ensure that we are never stretched too thin. Our domestic humanitarian efforts and investments are prioritized over international investments, including disaster preparedness.

The UK has a history of maximum accommodation of refugees with the compromise of our people's safety. Considering the most recent aerial attacks in Syria, we recognize that region as a possible future strike zone, and have already acted, accepting 1,000 Syrian refugees, and promising to accommodate 19,000 more by 2020. Since 2012, we have invested 1.1 billion pounds (1.5 billion U.S.D) in international refugee wellness, and we encourage other nations with the necessary resources, to invest as well, without compromising the wellbeing of their state and their national security. Currently, we have approximately 118,000 refugees living productive lives in the UK, and a 45% accommodation rate.

As a founding member of the United Nations, we accede to the international laws mandated by HIAS and our Commissioner for Refugees, with the international laws being international resettlement quotas, protection for the most vulnerable, child protection, and international funding. Considering our harmony with our populace, and the common culture driven by our governing body to aid when it is possible, this would not pose a challenge to our government, and has yet to pose a challenge to our government. Because of the necessary costs, our citizens as a holistic model would do their part to fund these programs, contributing through taxes. If the populace were to revert to any social modes of defiance against our government, as a representative government, we would adhere to them, prioritizing the solidity of our nation over all else, and better putting us able to help others in the future.

All in all, the UK has taken proactive measures to limit damage caused by disasters (namely nuclear attacks), and will continue to do so. Our citizens play an active role in our governance, and we are opting to change with the tides as well. As we stand today, we are a main contributor to efforts established by the United Nations, and will continue to abide by international laws, as well as invest in these initiatives. We pride ourselves in being able to accommodate thousands of refugees, and we look forward to accommodating victims of nuclear warfare, should there be nuclear attacks soon. We are evolving, and we encourage those around us to evolve to. Through negotiation, we hope to achieve a shared vision of the global agenda for the next decade, in regard to disaster preparedness.