

U.S. Delegation

Tufts Inquiry

12 March 2018

United States of America Briefing Paper

President Donald Trump's controversial approach to sovereignty has altered the status quo for American presidents' approach to international affairs. Past American presidents have generally been involved in the fight for international human rights and have used America's power and influence for the greater good, void of the United States receiving any tangible reward. Former president Obama was well-known for his stance on the United States standing up for universal rights. Although Obama's predecessor George W. Bush was more concerned than Obama with the idea of international sovereignty, he still fought for the maintenance of international peace and stability. For example, in 2008, George W. Bush signed the Strategic Framework Agreement with Iraq, which aimed to develop Iraqi sovereignty. However, this agreement had the goal of increasing international stability, rather than heightening the power of the United States.

In contrast, Trump's promotion of the idea of "America first" has created a large rift between nationalists and globalists in today's government. Trump's general policy of prioritizing America has led the president to take steps away from international cooperation that he thinks could be "one-sided" or financially burdensome. For example, Trump pulled the U.S. out of the Paris Climate Accord, he is openly against the World Trade Organization, and is generally opposed to alliances and trade that is not beneficial for the nation. He believes that instead of the United States supporting other countries, all nations should work towards establishing self-sufficient, sovereign nations. Although Trump has made decisive steps towards a more isolated America, he has stressed that "America first does not mean America alone," and would be willing to negotiate with other sovereign nations to establish successful alliances and trade deals.

In establishing sovereign nations, security becomes an increasing issue. With nuclear weapons coming into play over the last century, the United States has attempted to control the production of these dangerous weapons in order to reduce the threat of nuclear warfare. In order to prevent nuclear weapons from becoming an international threat, the United States, as well as other main powers, signed the Non Proliferation Treaty in 1968, which allowed these nations to build controlled nuclear arsenals. Although this provided some degree of international order, there were many nations, such as India, Israel and Pakistan, that did not sign the treaty, as well as a few nations that created secret nuclear programs in violation of the treaty.

North Korea is currently the largest threat to the United States' security, as it withdrew from the treaty in 2003, and has threatened the United States with nuclear warfare multiple times. In addition, North Korea has proven to be a realistic threat, as it has demonstrated its capability to produce nuclear weapons. Although some of its claims cannot be confirmed, there has been evidence suggesting that North Korea has been testing ballistic missiles, including intercontinental ballistic missiles, as well as hydrogen bombs.

The Obama administration tried to employ "strategic patience" with North Korea by imposing sanctions on the nation and refusing to negotiate without steps towards denuclearization. The Trump administration has taken a stronger and more strategic approach to North Korea through enforcing stricter sanctions and economic pressures, and has recently expressed willingness to negotiate with North Korea without any preconditions.

The Trump administration has also changed the overall approach to nuclear weapons, as Trump has indicated that the threshold for utilizing nuclear weapons has been lowered, and that the United States is prepared to use "smaller weapons" in response to a variety of situations, including cyber attacks.

A critical part of security is negotiating with other countries. Benjamin Franklin is considered America's first diplomat, for he was sent to France during the Revolutionary War to rally France's support of the U.S. against Great Britain. The first major step in official diplomacy policy was the creation of the Department of Foreign Affairs, but it had limited power, and was later replaced with the Department of State. The Constitution split foreign affairs between the legislative and executive branches of government. As the country grew, the Department of State

organized the expansion of the U.S. and negotiations on land with other nations, most notably the Louisiana Purchase.

A major declaration in early U.S. history was the Monroe Doctrine, published by President Monroe. The Doctrine announced that Europe should not try to interfere with the United States' affairs in any way. The doctrine would serve as the basis of U.S. diplomacy until the U.S. entry into World War I, when European diplomacy was a forefront matter. As America entered the Civil War, the primary diplomatic goal with European nations was to prevent countries from joining the war on the Southern side.

Further developments in American diplomacy helped spread influence in many regions of the world. In 1903, America signed a treaty to help with the construction of the Panama Canal, which was a major step in diplomacy in Latin America. Another development in Latin American ties was the agreement on lower trade barriers in the 1930's and the Good Neighbor Policy, which unified the military actions of the Americas. After World War I, the League of Nations was created to foster organization and prevent another World War, which ultimately failed as the U.S. declined to join it.

In recent years, the U.S. has focused on bringing peace to Afghanistan and other Middle Eastern areas. Currently, the United States is working to improve international relations as evidenced by Trump's visiting over a dozen countries within his first year in office and also in his continual efforts to improve relations with Russia and China. At the start of his second term, President George W. Bush announced that it was "the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture, with the ultimate goal of ending tyranny in our world" (usdiplomacy.org). This is increasingly prevalent in North Korea, where President Trump is concentrating his time and effort to negotiating critical nuclear policy with Kim Jong-Un.

Another major area of diplomacy is in the realm of terrorism. Although terrorism in the U.S. seems like a very current issue, bombings and individual acts of violence were prevalent throughout America's history. The deadliest school massacre in U.S. history occurred in 1927, when a man planted dynamite under the Bath Consolidated School in Michigan. Perhaps the most historically notable act of terrorism was in the 16th Street Baptist church in 1963, a

primarily black church in Alabama. The bomb was set by a white supremacist, and sparked national attention. The act of violence helped to push civil rights activists and the desegregation movement in America forward.

Terrorists bombed the United States for a variety of reasons. Some terrorists, like those that committed the 9/11 attacks on the World Trade Center, were part of a larger terrorist organization. The 9/11 attacks were carried about by Al-Qaeda, and masterminded by the leader of the regime Osama bin Laden. Bin Laden was an extremist whose goal was to unify Islam in battle by bringing the United States into a war. To do this, he had 19 extremists hijack 4 commercial passenger planes and sent them into the World Trade Center in New York, and one into the Pentagon. One plane was re-hijacked by the passengers and crashed into a field. The 9/11 attacks marked the beginning of the Afghanistan War, which is an ongoing conflict.

Other terrorists in America acted independently, for a variety of reasons. A study by the Investigative Fund at the Nation Institute found that the most terrorism from 2008 to 2016 was committed by right-wing extremists. For example, the right-wing extremist Robert Dear killed 3 people in a Planned Parenthood abortion facility in Colorado in 2015. Other independent terrorists have attacked the United States to protest labor movements and against black civil rights.

In addition to the threat of terrorism is the looming presence of climate change. Since the first political actions on climate change in the 1970s and 80s, the United States has varied immensely in its energy policy. President Nixon, before he resigned, signed the Clean Air Act. President George W. Bush declined joining the Kyoto Protocol, on the grounds that it placed carbon emission reductions too heavily on industrialized nations. Senator Al Gore, after losing the 2000 presidential election, went on to write and talk extensively about climate change and energy issues.

A major landmark in worldwide cooperation of climate change was the meeting in France to create the Paris Climate Accord, which is the major worldwide agreement currently setting the goals for carbon emissions before 2020. Almost every nation in the world signed the Agreement, including the United States. On June 1st, President Trump announced he would withdraw from the Paris Agreement, leading some to worry about the worldwide participation on

greenhouse reduction targets. Instead, the opposite happened and encouraged other countries to take the leadership role in renewable energy, and it seems that the U.S. will still meet target carbon reduction levels (fortune.com).

When the first settlers arrived in America, it was an agricultural society based on food production and distribution. After the ratification of the Constitution, the economy exploded and free trade with open ports allowed for prolific trade. Early politicians like Alexander Hamilton argued for a stronger central government to encourage commerce and manufacturing.

After the Civil War, the United States national debt skyrocketed and the South's economy was in ruin. To recover, enterprise grew and became the center of the American economy. As World War I passed, America entered the "Roaring 20's," and consumerism moved the economy forward at an incredible pace. The 20's ended with an astronomical crash of the stock market, throwing the country into economic depression that would last for years. The U.S. government stepped in during this period and gave support to workers to bring the economy back.

After World War II, the economy continued to grow, and continued to grow for most of the twentieth century. In the 1990's, the Internet became a large industry. America's dependence on Chinese goods became stronger and stronger, and inflation rates were kept low.

In 2007, the U.S. housing industry collapsed and forced many Americans to lose their homes. President Barack Obama worked to fix the housing crisis, and reestablish the economy.

Today's American economy is steadily growing at about 2.6% per year, and the Trump administration has pushed the economy upward, up from about 1.5% per year from Obama's term. Trump's \$1.5 trillion tax cuts also leave the future uncertain for the American markets.

In addition to the economy, disaster preparedness remains a pressing issue. With the increasing threat of North Korea's nuclear arsenal, the United States has recently taken increasing steps to prepare the nation for the possibility of a nuclear attack. The United States has also taken definitive steps towards developing technology that can prevent a successful nuclear attack, as well as preparing for the devastation that could result from the blast of an intercontinental missile.

The United States has developed a sophisticated global surveillance system with the capability of detecting missile launches. The system consists of sensors on land, at sea, and in space, so that missile launches can be detected almost immediately. In addition, ground-based interceptors have been created, which have demonstrated promise in being able to intercept intercontinental ballistic missiles. These GBIs can be launched from either Alaska or California, and if successful, could destroy the incoming missile with the force of its impact outside of the earth's atmosphere.

The United States has also been forced to entertain the possibility that the nation could be devastated by a nuclear blast if the interceptors were unsuccessful. Organizations like the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as well as public health officials in general, have been gathering and spreading information to doctors, government officials, emergency responders, and to the general public about the proper procedures to take following a nuclear blast in order to reduce its cataclysmic effects as much as possible.

Key Points

Sovereignty

- Cooperating with other countries and negotiating is an option; however, it must still be in the United States' best interests
- Countries must be strong and put themselves first, so that they are then able to help other countries

Security

- The balance of nuclear power and weapons is key for the ensuring the security, safety, and wellbeing of the United States and the rest of the world

Diplomacy

- Negotiating bilateral agreements that protect US citizens and allied countries particularly from rogue nations

Terrorism

- Non-State Actors are becoming a growing, concerning threat to a free world
- Nuclear Weapons threaten the fate of a peaceful world order

Climate and Energy

- Prevention of any sort of nuclear war as to not devastate the environment for decades
- Preventing civilian nuclear power from being easily converted to military nuclear power as to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons

Economics

- Effectiveness of nuclear energy and weapons to the U.S. economy
- Effect of United States-North Korea war on worldwide economy

Disaster Preparedness

- Negotiating international systems of aid that could be implemented following a nuclear attack

Issues and Committees

Security - Brooks Jordan

In the turn of the 21st Century, the United States has and will continue to provide International security to ensure human rights and democratic values. In a time of global instability, the United States has always prioritized the safety and well being of her citizens along with the other billions of people who populate the earth.

The fact that the United States is one of the only major powers involved in international security results in a global issue for all nations to actively participate in the preservation of mankind. Due to the unbalanced nature in the world, the idea of unstable nations obtaining and using nuclear weapons is a threat not only to its enemies, but to all human life. The United States has up to 10,000 strategic nuclear weapons placed across the mainland US, onboard naval vessels, and placed across mainland Europe to create a balance in who controls these weapons. The very existence of NATO was formed to protect the natural born liberties of people. Protecting 321 million people is an endless job of the US Government, and by having nuclear weapons, we are able to defend not only the US populous but of other allies and the innocent.

The long record of the US advocating for the rights and security of others will continue to pose a threat to those who wish to suppress the liberty and life of man. The current United States

administration finds that unstable and unpredictable nations such as Iran, Pakistan, India, North Korea, Russia, and China are moving forward to producing more weapons in contrast to the U.N.'s effort of disarmament. These unpredictable nations have been aggressively advancing their nuclear and missile programs to outer space and cyberspace which is alarming for all. The United States stands firm in its objective for a nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons free world. The US Government has declined its cold war stockpile voluntarily up to 80% in our own contribution to proliferation. The trouble with proliferation is that other countries or leaders can see such nukeless state as a state of vulnerability, especially if the international community is not equipped to respond to provoked attacks. The United States has a system of measures put in place with multiple checks and balances to ensure that no one person will have a final say in the order to deploy nuclear weapons.

What is concerning, is the fact that major nations are moving against the proliferations to increase their own advantage to use and deploy these weapons. With mutual assured destruction (MAD), the taunting thought of a nuclear war helps keep world balance to preserve democracy and mankind. Due to the lack of international cooperation in eliminating nuclear weapons, the United States needs to continue to have nuclear weapons as a leading force in international stability. The military doctrine of mutual shared destruction is one of the only reasons why we have not seen ourselves already in a nuclear war. The thought of both complete annihilation has no benefit to the attacker or defender. In this day in age, the same concept applies. In order to have a benefit, nations are planning strike force policies. This is why we see increased involvement in nuclear capabilities instead of disarmament. In a way to address both issues of disarmament and mutual assured destruction, countries have resulted in the production of "limited nuclear weapons". Despite being "limited", these nuclear weapons have proven to be even more dangerous. Using a smaller size and having a higher density, can still have devastating damage to highly concentrated areas. To see how deadly these "limited" nuclear weapons are, we can take look at photos of Hiroshima or Nagasaki. Similarly to the strikes on Japan, an equal and even more devastating loss of life and property would take place on the Korean peninsula. Despite any circumstances, the estimated casualties would be horrific.

The economic and environmental catastrophes would leave the peninsula unsafe for any human or environmental life, let alone any potential for economic growth in the region, for hundreds of years.

In creating a balanced world, one nation cannot simply take on the task of managing other world powers. This is even more true today. The United States has always been policing nations for a more democratic and free world. How is the United States suppose to help keep other nations in check if we are a single voice, that is becoming an even lesser nuclear equipped nation? It is simply taking one step forward, but two steps back if we do not have strong international backing. Taking the step towards proliferation is the first step forward, but having major nations getting away with continuously arming themselves without any repercussions, is the two steps back. It is a useless cause to be fighting for, unless the entirety of nations take ownership in the preservation of mankind and their own future. Furthermore, the United States urges for all nations to play a role to preserve the world in which they exist in, it is simply not a one man job. The lack of trust and participation of nations make themselves unpredictable and unstable, especially if armed with nuclear weapons. For instance, nations without multiple checks and balances can pose as a likely threat of deploying nuclear weapons easily and rapidly. Many nations without these type of checks and balances tend to have weak democratic systems such as North Korea, Iran, Pakistan, and Russia amongst other nuclear bound nations. With previous U.N. Charters and Agreements, countries who voluntarily give up their nuclear weapons are often relieved of any economic restrictions and offered military protection in certain scenarios. Adding an increased trust and cooperation between nations. Instances of this, would be when South Africa gave up their nuclear missiles in 1991, and when the USSR did not pose as a threat to Pretoria or with Ukraine when it gave up its nuclear weapons, in exchange of western sovereignty protection in 1994.

One of the final and most important questions to answer is, if nuclear weapons are the key to international stability? For the time being, yes they have been. In contrast, with efforts of proliferation, having nuclear weapons have kept the world vigilant in a time of uncertainty. With no proper international backing, the United States has to rely on a nuclear arsenal to ensure the life and liberties of man, in a worldwide competitive game of nuclear development.

Diplomacy - Levi Trestan

From the Cold War in the middle to late 20th century, until North Korean launch tests in the 2010s, The United States of America (US) has been at the forefront of major nuclear debates and conflicts. Historically, the US has been committed to creating fair deals where all parties are held accountable and follow through on their agreements. At this juncture, the US government believes that bilateral accords are the best way to achieve fairness and accountability. Past multilateral deals, per the current US administration, placed a larger, imbalanced burden of proactivity on America rather than evenly distributed responsibilities. The theory is that bilateralism allows for more specific agreements and will enable the US to better promote its own interests. When it comes to nuclear threats and expansion, the US, along with most other countries, prefers diplomacy. Evidenced by the lack of nuclear war and the extensive treaties of recent years, the diplomatic approach to threats of war and proliferation have been relatively successful thus far.

The US is committed to maintaining a strong store of weapons that includes a formidable nuclear arsenal. As explained in the 2018, congressionally mandated Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), America is looking to modernize its tactical and long range nuclear abilities to be able to compete and keep up with other nuclearized nations. As other countries improve their military capabilities, the US does not want to fall behind. Global competition is as high as ever and Congressional and Executive Branches of the US government, as well as both major political parties, believe that revitalizing the United States' old nuclear arsenal is a principal nuclear priority. As a leading world power, the US is at the forefront of the challenges that face nuclear powers. Not only a leading diplomatic nation, the US military is one of the strongest on the globe and controls one of the largest nuclear arsenals. One main US policy objective is to maintain dominance in the military arena, including sustaining modern nuclear weapons. The US is also a champion of promoting freedom and democracy. However, America has been alienated over the last couple of years from other nations and rebuilding those connections is key to restoring the global liberal order. Not reducing their nuclear weapon stocks as low as other United Nations (UN) allies have hoped and leaving the Paris Climate Accord have separated the US from other

countries. However, a more blatantly rogue state is North Korea. That nation has defied nuclear weapons agreements for more than a decade.

America continues to support the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and remains in compliance. The NPT has three main goals. First, Nations that do not have nuclear weapons should be stopped from acquiring them. Secondly, the NPT requires nations who have nuclear weapons to work towards disarmament wherever possible. Finally, the treaty ensures that, with adequate protections and limitations, any nation can have access to peacefully utilized nuclear technology. Another disarmament agreement, called New START, remains in effect between Russia and the US. The accord mandates both nations to have lowered their deployed nuclear warheads to less than 1,550. The treaty has extensive protections, including short notice check ups and constant data sharing between the two nations. The US has more information about Russian nuclear missiles than ever before. Despite the fact that this is a bilateral arrangement, the current Executive Branch considers this to be unfavorable to US interests and has not made a commitment to extend the Russian-American accord beyond 2021.

As a country rooted in values of democracy and basic freedoms, there is a constant public debate about the right direction for US government in terms of nuclear arms. The American population spans every part of the political spectrum and a healthy debate about this issue is ongoing. A study conducted in 2015 by Stanford and Dartmouth Professors, published by Stanford University News in 2017, found that 60% of Americans would be willing to kill up to 2 million civilians in a nuclear attack to save up to 20,000 US troops. The study framed a scenario similar to the Hiroshima nuclear bombing, but in the context of US involvement in Iran. Iran, along with North Korea, are two nations that represent significant concerns for nuclear proliferation. The Iran nuclear deal, signed in 2015, lifted trade and economic sanctions in exchange for tight regulation on Iran's nuclear development. The main goal of the agreement, signed between Iran, the US, the United Kingdom, Russia, France, and Germany, is to prevent Iran from creating nuclear weapons. North Korea, however, already has 15 nuclear warheads and has been increasing threats of attack and rhetoric in recent months. President Trump has responded with statements of his own. In March of 2018, South Korea brokered a verbal

agreement for a meeting between Trump and North Korean leader Kim Jong Un. It is unclear at this time whether that meeting will take place and what the stated objectives will be.

In this age of growing threats and competition, the US does not believe in getting rid of all nuclear weapons and returning to Global Zero. There are two main goals of the US nuclear weapons stocks. First and foremost, being able to defend the American homeland from a foreign attack. Secondly, America is adamant in being able to defend its allies in the event of an attack. These threats are not going away, and neither are nuclear weapons around the globe.

Terrorism- Emily Caffrey

Although the United States appears to be a stable, safe country, terrorism is an underlying threat. After the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001, President George W. Bush declared a War on Terror. As this war is still being fought, the threat of terrorism continues to threaten American Freedoms.

While the War on Terror has attempted to eliminate certain terrorist groups, new terrorist groups have formed as a result. The War on Terror has destabilized many Middle Eastern governments, which has allowed new terrorist organizations or Non-State Actors to emerge. The United States Commission on International Religious Freedom believes that Non-State Actors are one of the biggest threats to the current world order. The United States along with the majority of the world allows religious freedom; however, Non-State Actors want their sole religion to dominate. September 11th, the Boston Marathon Bombing, and the San Bernardino attack, are all attacks on American soil committed by Non-State Actors. The Trump Administration has taken a very aggressive stance to try and eliminate Non-State Actors, including ISIS, by isolating the United States. In Trump's first year of his Presidency, he has added supplementary background checks on countries with large populations of Non-State Actors. In addition, one of the Trump Administration slogans is to "build a wall", meaning that he wants to isolate the United States from exterior threats. While Non-State Actors do not appear to operate within the United States borders, they have had the ability to enter the country and attack the nation's freedom.

The United States has the largest military arsenal in the world, as it contains 6,800 warheads. However, other nations continue to pose threats to the nation's security. Throughout the fall of 2017 and winter of 2018, President Donald Trump and Kim Jong-un have engaged in a twitter fight. Several tension causing tweets were exchanged, including President Trump's reference to Kim Jong-un as "Rocket Man," and Kim Jong-un threat that "[his] nuclear button is on his desk at all time". Despite these comments filling American citizens with anxiety, President Trump announced in the beginning of March that he plans to meet with King Jong- un. This event gives hopes that the two nations will reach a deal, and North Korea will begin to denuclearize. However, the nuclear black markets are an additional threat to the United States. A French reporter was able to purchase a functional nuclear weapon from the Bulgarian Black Market, which highlights the abundance of these weapons for Terrorist groups. Furthermore, evidence proves that Middle Eastern Terrorist groups have tried to purchase radioactive material from criminals of the former Soviet Union. After the Soviet Union split up, the United States initiated a plan to help Russia destroy the nuclear weapons and materials. However, this agreement ended in 2014, under the Obama Administration and has not been renewed since. The accessibility of nuclear weapons in the former Soviet Union and Middle East, along with the weapons capability for massive destruction, pose a threat to the United States. Not only could a nuclear weapon murder thousands of people, but the radioactive waste would injure hundreds of thousands more. Furthermore, a third world war composed of nuclear warfare has the possibility to permanently damage the world order.

Climate and Energy Committee - Olivia Goganian

While the United States does see impending climate change as an issue, it is focusing on what will benefit the U.S. the greatest. In 2017, President Trump withdrew the U.S from the Paris Climate Accord. He claimed it was unfair to the U.S. because of the terms of the agreement and the burdensome energy restrictions on the United States could cost America as much as \$2.7 million lost jobs by 2025. President Trump stated we are willing to re-enter if the U.S. could enter on more favorable terms that don't impose such restrictions and consequences. While under the terms of the agreement to reduce greenhouse gases emissions, the earliest a nation can formally withdraw is November 2020 but because greenhouse gas reduction targets are largely

voluntary, President Trump said he would immediately cease implementation of the Paris Accord.

The United States is currently most dependent on fossil fuels (petroleum, coal and natural gas). As of 2016, 34% of electricity generation came from gas, 30% from coal, 19.7% nuclear, and the remainder comes from renewable energy sources. The U.S. is the world's largest producer of nuclear power, accounting for more than 30% of worldwide nuclear generation of energy. There are 99 nuclear power reactors in 30 states, operated by 30 different power companies and in 2016 they produced 805 TWh (terawatt hour). The average capacity factor of nuclear energy has risen from 50% in the early 1970s, to 70% in 1991, and it passed 90% in 2002, demonstrating how fast the efficiency and practicality of nuclear energy is rising. The U.S. has 6,550 nuclear weapons and is the only country to have used nuclear weapons in combat when it detonated two atomic bombs over the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II. The US has not yet had an accident like Fukushima or Chernobyl, but the risks of nuclear energy are high. The waste from nuclear energy is extremely dangerous and has to be looked after carefully for several thousands of years and it is impossible to build a plant with 100% security. Potentially, the aftermath of a nuclear disaster would be far greater than the issue of impending climate change, as new studies have shown that even a small scale nuclear war would quickly devastate the world's climate and ecosystems, causing damage that would last for decades.

The balance between civilian and military uses of nuclear energy has to be closely monitored because the line between civilian and military nuclear programs is extremely thin. Civilian nuclear power inevitably leads to a nation's ability and capacity to build nuclear weapons because it is relatively easy to use the fuel and byproducts of light-water nuclear power reactors to produce nuclear bombs. In many countries, nuclear aspirants can hide their military programs behind the mask of peaceful nuclear power which makes it extremely difficult to put international safeguards on nuclear energy. Even in countries that have a long history of nuclear energy, development that has been consistently regulated, there is no guarantee that it won't be exploited. Most countries participate in international initiatives that aim to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons and the IAEA undertakes regular inspections of nuclear facilities. The

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been greatly effective in limiting the amount of nuclear weapons states but with countries possibly developing nuclear weapons behind the front of nuclear energy sources, it is very hard to regulate nuclear weapon production.

Although nuclear weapons emit a relatively low amount of greenhouse gases into the environment, there are climate related consequences including dumping waste into the ocean, warming it up to temperatures that are 20 degrees fahrenheit warmer than the natural environment and emitting carbon 14 from nuclear reactors.

The current world order effects who has nuclear energy because the reactants needed aren't inexpensive and the more power and resources a country has, the more likely it will have access to nuclear energy. This is demonstrated in countries such as the US, being the international leader in nuclear energy and having 6,550 nuclear weapons, but also having influence in other international matters such as economics, and military (especially relating to issues surrounding North Korea).

The U.S. is more heavily involved in the production of civilian nuclear power than any other nation and the government is heavily involved in enacting safety and environmental regulations. Although the U.S. is very involved in all nuclear production, it cannot limit the nuclear power other countries are developing, especially since many countries may be using nuclear energy as a mask for nuclear weapon development. The NPT and the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) seek to prevent nuclear weapon ranks from expanding further, but not all countries that are threats are apart of these agreements.

Finally, the Trump Administration has been reducing commitments abroad and withdrawing from treaties while countries like China have been doing the opposite. Many countries that range anywhere from developing nations to nations with more cultivated economies are emerging with nuclear energy such as UAE, Turkey, Belarus, and Poland. The less that the United States is involved in international matters outside of nuclear power, the less of a say the nation will be granted involving nuclear power.

Disaster Preparedness - Katie Hennessey

With the increase of technology over the past century, the capacity for destruction during war has become unimaginable. With North Korea's increasing nuclear capability, and the possibility of nuclear warfare looming on the horizon, the United States has taken definitive steps to prepare for this advanced type of attack. To evaluate how cataclysmic nuclear warfare could be, the Federal Emergency Management Agency created a worst-case scenario to predict what could happen to the United States in the event of a nuclear attack. The conclusion was that there would only be about ninety million survivors, and about one-third of those survivors would be injured. In order to prevent these apocalyptic results, the United States has been forced to prepare for the possibility of a nuclear attack.

Following a "successful" nuclear attack, the United States would face millions of fatalities and injuries, as well as the risk of radiation exposure for survivors, and food contamination. Exposure to the ionizing radiation would leave the survivors at a high risk for developing cancer. The radiation left behind by a nuclear attack could also affect the food supply, as the radioactive debris could contaminate the soil, leading to widespread harmful effects on humans and animals that consume the food. In January of 2018, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention held a workshop to raise awareness for what could be done to decrease the numbers of deaths and illnesses following a nuclear attack. The workshop was called the "Public Health Response to a Nuclear Detonation," and it was attended by doctors, government officials, and emergency responders, who would be crucial in helping the general public after a blast. It was also a platform that was used to disseminate knowledge to American citizens, as the event was recorded for public viewing. Organizations like the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have acknowledged that the consequences of nuclear warfare would be devastating and unpredictable, as there is still an aura of uncertainty surrounding the direct effects. So, public health officials have been trying to spread basic awareness for procedures to follow in the unlikely event of an attack. For example, public health officials have been spreading the word that if an attack were to occur, the safest thing to do is to remain where they are in order to reduce their exposure to the harmful ionizing radiation.

In the event of full-capacity nuclear warfare, the global public health consequences would be unfathomable. Scientists have theorized about the possibility of a nuclear winter following an all-out nuclear exchange. The theory of so-called “nuclear winter” is that, if multiple cities were burning, and copious amounts of smoke was being delivered into the atmosphere, then too much sunlight would be reflected. Therefore, not enough sun would reach the earth, resulting in a huge drop in temperatures, and widespread crop failure.

In order to avoid disastrous consequences such as nuclear winter, the United States has prepared a sophisticated missile defense system to try to prevent a successful nuclear attack on the nation. The missile defense system is a global network with 24-hour surveillance, consisting of sensors on land, at sea, and in space. A missile launch in North Korea would be immediately detected by infrared signals in surveillance satellites, and the Schriever Air Force base in Colorado would immediately be alerted. This air force base would be in contact with other command centers, and within eight to ten minutes after the detection of a missile launch, a ground-based interceptor would be launched from either Alaska or California in an effort to intercept the approaching intercontinental ballistic missile. These highly-advanced ground-based interceptors have only been tested eighteen times, with ten successes. However, with the one time that they were tested in a scenario that would involve an intercontinental missile, the interceptors were successful. The idea behind a ground-based interceptor is that once it is launched into space, it releases a “kill vehicle” that attempts to destroy the incoming weapon with the force of impact outside of the earth’s atmosphere. Although the tests of these interceptors have been unrealistic, as they have been during the day and with advanced warning, the technology is promising, and a new and improved model is expected by 2020.

The United States is mostly focusing domestically on the issue of nuclear warfare, as America faces the biggest threat of being attacked by North Korea. North Korean leader, Kim Jong-un, said himself that, “It’s the Korean people’s resolute decision that North Korea should face off with the US only with nuclear weapons to achieve the balance of power.” The Trump administration has not issued any direct statements regarding their actions if another nation faced a nuclear attack, but the United States would face a huge humanitarian and refugee crisis if that situation were to occur.

President Trump's stance on immigration is strict, particularly because he has the overall goal of putting America first. However, Trump has contradicted his "America first" policies before, such as when he ordered a missile strike on Syria following the deadly chemical weapons attack on its citizens. If this action is any indication, a nuclear attack on another nation would be a humanitarian issue worth considering for the Trump administration despite his overall strict immigration policies.

Economics - Isaac Hargrave

America is a massive global economic force, and its economy has grown with relative stability since its founding. Since the establishment of the Constitution, the U.S. has shifted from a primarily agricultural economy to a manufacturing and product-based market. Today, agriculture remains a major staple of the U.S. economy, but it has changed substantially. Instead of being run by small, independent farms, big companies with huge areas of land are more prevalent in today's American agricultural economy. These large farms also use less people and more machinery - over the last 50 years, production doubled, but the amount of farmers fell 2/3 (usa.usembassy.de).

The U.S. has a consumer economy, where almost 2/3 of all goods produced are sold to consumers (usa.usembassy.de). Consumer spending comprises 70% of the U.S. GDP, and whenever retail sales drop, the country's economy sinks into depression (forbes.com). Consequently, America has developed a "consumer" mindset that is a part of our culture, and enterprise is integrated in our daily lives and society.

Over the last several years, the economy has steadily grown two to three percent every year, and has shown remarkable stability; however, the U.S. has not always been so stable. In the 1920s, the United States entered a postwar consumerism frenzy that drove the economy very high, but the stock market crashed and created the worst depression in U.S. history, bringing the unemployment rate to 25%. In 2007, the housing market collapsed when low-income families were unable to pay rising mortgage rates, forcing them to lose their homes.

Nuclear energy in the U.S. is a major part of its electricity consumption, producing about 20% of energy, and every dollar spent in a nuclear reactor produces \$1.87 in the U.S. economy

(thebalance.com). Nuclear energy produces a very large amount of jobs for the U.S. every year, as nuclear processing facilities require more labor than simpler coal or natural gas facilities.

In contrast, nuclear energy at its start was extremely expensive. So expensive, in fact, that Forbes called nuclear energy “the largest managerial disaster in business history” (ucsusa.org). New power plants cost almost \$9 billion to create, and while they are funded by the utilities, that price burden is reflected in energy rates of the consumers. In addition, nuclear energy leaves behind radioactive waste, which is expensive to store for thousands of years and provides incentive to switch to more renewable energy sources, such as solar and wind.

From 1940-1996, the U.S. spent at least \$5.5 trillion on nuclear weapons, having a large impact on the U.S. national budget and representing 29% of the military budget (nti.org). The price of nuclear weapons only substantially costs the government, but of course the government is funded by taxpayers. In the event of an average-size nuclear weapon detonation, the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory estimates it would cost at least \$10 trillion to pay for the damage (nuclearfiles.org). In this event, a government would have enormous strain on their budgets; even America, whose national budget is just over \$3 trillion.

Nuclear weapons are also extremely expensive. Even though the U.S. has not built a new nuclear weapon since 1990, the Department of Defense has refurbished weapons since then, and has found that it is cheaper to renovate them than develop new nuclear weapons. In the case of a nuclear war between North Korea and America, the economic impacts (beside catastrophic loss of life) would rock the world’s supply chains. The world economy would have to radically adjust to make up for America’s inability to contribute to the markets. Oxford economists predicted that after a nuclear war, “The market impact is significant. Equities fall sharply in the region, accompanied by abrupt exchange rate and bond market adjustments” (businessinsider.com).

Even while nuclear warheads are extremely costly, they also boast immense military value. Nuclear programs are appealing to developing countries because they provide weapons on the scale of industrialized nations capable of destroying cities for comparatively little. For taxpayers, a nuclear state is more cost-effective than raising a huge conventional army, and a small nuclear arsenal can be just as powerful. In fact, some argue that small, nuclear powers would improve stability in regions such as the middle east (mises.org).

The U.S. has never been sanctioned for nuclear weapons, but it imposes sanctions on other countries, namely North Korea. The U.S. North Korean sanctions have traditionally been enforced by presidents, but Congress recently passed a round of sanctions. While the U.S. has successfully enforced these, some countries, like China, have continued to trade. In September President Trump “authorized the Treasury Department to block from the U.S. financial system any foreign business or individual that facilitates trade with North Korea” (cfr.org). These sanctions directly influence residents of North Korea in daily lives, pressing some into malnourishment (cfr.org). To date, the sanctions have made some progress in stopping their nuclear program, but China remains to trade and is keeping the regime’s program alive (vox.com).

The U.S. ratified the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and the country has not been tolerant of countries who didn’t sign, most notably North Korea. The Trump Administration has made it a priority to resolve the increasing tension, and has not been supportive of other countries who did not ratify the NPT. The U.S. is upgrading their nuclear arsenal, and the world is entering into an increasingly worrying nuclear and economic era. Trump’s agreement to meet with Kim Jong-un may be the turning point for worldwide nuclear tensions, and economic sanctions on North Korea may help decrease the speed of their nuclear program. The economic and nuclear future of the two countries rides on their meeting, which is expected in the coming months.

Sovereignty - George Beninati

In the past the United States presidents have been huge supporters of global unity and helping wherever possible. Woodrow Wilson supported intervention to make the world safe for democracy after WWI. Roosevelt did the same thing during WWII, invading sovereign countries to stop their aggression and building international institutions in the aftermath of war. During the Cold War, presidents routinely intervened in other countries’ sovereignty to stop the spread of communism - a policy called ‘containment’. Bush intervened in Iraq with the hope of creating a democratic regime that would help bring security to the Middle East. President Donald J. Trump, however, has taken a complete turn into a different direction. President Trump is a huge advocate for sovereignty across the globe and believes strongly that each country should look out for

himself first. The idea itself is simple, America is an independent nation run by its people. America created its own government, elects its own officials, and creates its own laws, completely self-sufficient in that regard. President Trump wants America to put America first; however, that does not mean he will completely excommunicate other countries. America is trying to perfect itself before it goes along and helps other countries out but they are still completely “open for business” if it is considered profitable enough for the States (DAVOS).

Although America values sovereignty, they still believe in some instances it is their place to intervene when they see fit. For instance, they strongly adhere to the R2P (Responsibility to Protect) commitment adopted by the UN in 2005, which sets up conditions under which sovereignty can be violated, including ethnic cleansing, genocide, and war crimes. This notion has been a major driver in US liberal humanitarian interventions in countries like Somalia and Iraq. These are essentially interventions to stop state violations of people’s innate human rights.

The United Nations Charter does protect sovereign countries because it provides mutual protection for all countries. The UNC protects the sovereign countries from being overrun by any rogue countries, and if a country is deemed unfit to self rule by the UNC, it won’t take away their sovereignty but rather help replace the unstable government with one that is capable of being sovereign.

The principle of non-intervention is a rule that disallows countries from intervening in others internal affairs. America is a adamant supporter and advocate of this policy, believing that its military forces are stretched too thin and its money could be better spent on other things. The international community should be geared towards countries rights. International institutions should do a better job of providing security and should rely less on the United States military to do so for them.

The US is a key supporter of the The Treaty for the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Started at the height of the Cold War, it was and is still seen as the surest way to prevent accidental nuclear conflict that could kill millions of people. In the time since its inception, the US has reduced its nuclear weapons stockpile by more than 80% and has not added any new nukes, only modernizing its old ones, showing its full commitment to the treaty.

Global security outweighs state sovereignty when a rogue state poses a common security threat to the most powerful nations on earth - i.e. the ones that sit on the UN Security Council: Russia, China, the US, France, and Britain. When these nations all agree that a country - e.g. North Korea - is behaving dangerously on the world stage, they can jointly approve a resolution allowing for violations of sovereignty. Hence, the threshold would be defined by the P5's (Security Council's permanent five members) subjective perception of a nation's threat to them.

Sovereignty is very difficult to reclaim once it is given up. The US often points to the example of the EU, whose nations gave up some of their sovereignty to an EU leadership in Brussels that sets economic, trade, and immigration policy for the entire bloc. As time went on, these member states began to feel as if their sovereign elected representatives no longer had a say in policy, leading to an anti-EU reaction that culminated in Brexit. Many right-wing US politicians are fearful of going down the path of EU member states and resist further global integration.

Global unity is a more important priority for the international community than state sovereignty. In recent years, the US has routinely worked through international institutions and organizations, such as the UN and NATO, to solve global problems rather than relying on unilateral action. For instance, the US worked with its partners in the UN security council to place sanctions on North Korea rather than placing sanctions unilaterally. This is an example of the US rallying the global community behind an action, rather than going it alone. Furthermore, the US has not been a fan of state sovereignty in the case of its interventions. When the US led an international NATO coalition to bomb Libya, it justified sovereignty violation with its goal of helping pro-democracy groups from being repressed. Therefore, an emphasis on global unity and limits on state sovereignty/country rights can be used to help promote democracy and topple tyrannical regimes that violate their citizens' rights. In addition, global unity can spread the cost of military/diplomatic action around to partners so as to not overburden the US with the costs, as was the case in the Iraq war.

According to neoliberal institutionalism, international institutions can build bonds of trust by promoting interdependence and cooperation among nations. By making nations more economically/politically dependent on one another, institutions make them less likely to go to

war, which promotes global security. Institutions like NATO can also have collective security benefits - if one nation is attacked, all of its allies are obligated to defend it against the aggression. This makes powerful nations less likely to go to war against weaker ones, who are often in collective security agreements.

By having a nuclear arsenal it allows the US to be self-reliant and they can rely on themselves to face war threats or even nuclear threats sent. It is much easier to advocate self-interest when you have a vast arsenal of the most advanced super weapon of all time. If a country is unstable and would be a threat to the peace, then it is the duty of the other nations to provoke their rights to obtain a nuclear arsenal.

There is a clear tension between nuclear weapons proliferation and state sovereignty. On the one hand, the very core of sovereignty is the right and ability to use force to achieve your national interest - which includes, for example, a nuclear first strike in a worse case scenario. Therefore, limiting nuclear weapons use would be an infringement on the state's monopoly over the use of force. On the other hand, sovereignty limits might be justified because of the destructive threat of nuclear weapons, which can incinerate earth/mankind and therefore violate the "common heritage of mankind" that is protected under international law. In terms of global security, nuclear weapons exacerbate the "security dilemma" and can lead to a deadly nuclear arms race that started with only defensive goals.

As a powerful nuclear state, the US does not believe in the right of other countries to dictate how many nuclear weapons it has. However, it does believe that nuclear disarmament is the best way forward, rather than unilateral disarmament that puts the US at a security disadvantage.

The liberal world order should be taken into account during nuclear arms negotiations. In this order, there is a "natural harmony of interests", where each state ultimately benefits from international cooperation. Everyone wins when there is nuclear disarmament because everyone is safer and more peaceful, and states should see things this way instead of in a self-interested realist way when negotiating nuclear arms regulations. Furthermore, norms are important in this liberal world order, so states are interested in minimizing suffering and being moral actors on the world stage. So nuclear weapons disarmament allows this morality-driven view to flourish.

Bibliography

Sovereignty

Chhabra, Tarun. "Why Trump's 'Strong Sovereignty' Is More Familiar than You Think." *Brookings*, Brookings, 20 Sept. 2017

Landler, Mark. "Trump Offers a Selective View of Sovereignty in U.N. Speech." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 19 Sept. 2017

Patrick, Stewart M. "Trump at Davos: Nationalism, Globalism, and American Sovereignty." *Council on Foreign Relations*, Council on Foreign Relations, 26 Jan. 2018

Security

Merrill, Dave, et al. "To Launch a Nuclear Strike, President Trump Would Take These Steps." *Bloomberg.com*, Bloomberg, 20 Jan. 2017, www.bloomberg.com/politics/graphics/2016-nuclear-weapon-launch/.

Starr, Terrell Jermaine. "Only One Country Has Ever Voluntarily Given Up Its Nukes." *Foxtrot Alpha*, Foxtrotalpha.jalopnik.com, 10 May 2017, foxtrotalpha.jalopnik.com/only-one-country-has-ever-voluntarily-given-up-its-nuke-1795101440

Feinberg, Ashley. "Exclusive: Here Is A Draft Of Trump's Nuclear Posture Review. He Wants A Lot More Nukes." *The Huffington Post*, TheHuffingtonPost.com, 11 Jan. 2018, www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/trump-nuclear-posture-review-2018_us_5a4d4773e4b06d1621bce4c5.

O'Hanlon, Michael. "Trump's Plan for Nuclear Weapons Makes Sense." *USA Today*, Gannett Satellite Information Network, 6 Feb. 2018, www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/2018/02/06/trumps-plan-nuclear-weapons-makes-sense-ohanlon-column/305390002/.

“U.S. Opinion on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction.” *Council on Foreign Relations*, Council on Foreign Relations,
www.cfr.org/backgrounders/us-opinion-proliferation-weapons-mass-destruction.

“Resources.” *Missile Threat*, missilethreat.csis.org/resources/.

“Beyond Clinton or Trump: Nuclear Weapons and Democracy.” *Ploughshares Fund*, 3 Feb. 2017,
www.ploughshares.org/issues-analysis/article/beyond-clinton-or-trump-nuclear-weapons-and-democracy.

Davenport, Kelsey. “Fact Sheets & Briefs.” *Chronology of U.S.-North Korean Nuclear and Missile Diplomacy* | *Arms Control Association*, Mar. 2018

Davenport, Kelsey. “Fact Sheets & Briefs.” *Nuclear Weapons: Who Has What at a Glance* | *Arms Control Association*, Mar. 2018

Davenport, Kelsey. “Issue Briefs.” *Recalibrating U.S. Policy Toward North Korea* | *Arms Control Association*, Feb. 2017

“The Other NPR: Nuclear Posture Review.” *NPR*, NPR, 28 Jan. 2018

Diplomacy

“Arms Control and Proliferation Profile: The United States.” *Arms Control Association*, Arms Control Association, 15 Jan. 2018,
www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/unitedstatesprofile#Major.

Dodge, Michaela. “Trump's Plan to Protect America's Nuclear Capabilities.” *The National Interest*, The Center for the National Interest, 16 Feb. 2018,
nationalinterest.org/feature/trumps-plan-protect-americas-nuclear-capabilities-24529?page=1.

“Iran Nuclear Deal: Key Details.” *BBC News*, BBC, 13 Oct. 2017,
www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-33521655.

Kerry, John F. “America's Crucial Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty with Russia.” *BostonGlobe.com*, Boston Globe Media Partners, 5 Feb. 2018,
www.bostonglobe.com/opinion/2018/02/05/america-crucial-nuclear-nonproliferation-treaty-with-russia/kNsroMWwlfrsXGLMOJrizK/story.html.

Parker, Clifton B. "Americans Weigh in on Nuclear War." *Stanford News*, Stanford University, 7 Aug. 2017, news.stanford.edu/2017/08/08/americans-weigh-nuclear-war/.

"Strengthening the Liberal World Order." *Brookings*, Brookings, 25 Apr. 2016, www.brookings.edu/research/strengthening-the-liberal-world-order/.

Tharoor, Ishaan. "Trump's Nuclear Policy Is Taking Us Back to the Cold War." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 6 Feb. 2018, www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2018/02/06/trumps-nuclear-policy-is-taking-us-back-to-the-cold-war/?utm_term=.584b74f6ffb0.

"Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons." *Nuclear Threat Initiative*, Nuclear Threat Initiative, 25 July 2017, www.nti.org/learn/treaties-and-regimes/treaty-on-the-non-proliferation-of-nuclear-weapons/.

"An Online Exploration of Diplomatic History and Foreign Affairs." *A Brief History of U.S. Diplomacy*, www.usdiplomacy.org/exhibit/protecting.php.
<https://www.ourdocuments.gov/doc.php?flash=false&doc=23>

Terrorism

Baker, Peter, and Michael Tackett. "Trump Says His 'Nuclear Button' Is 'Much Bigger' Than North Korea's." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 2 Jan. 2018, www.nytimes.com/2018/01/02/us/politics/trump-tweet-north-korea.html.

"Did You Know...Non-State Actors." *United States Commission on International Religious Freedom*, 12 Feb. 2014, www.uscirf.gov/reports-briefs/spotlight/did-you-know-non-state-actors.

Gilsinan, Kathy. "Why Moldova May Be the Scariest Country on Earth." *The Atlantic*, 8 Oct. 2015, www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2015/10/moldova-nuclear-weapons-isis/409456/.

"Nuclear Arsenals." *ICAN*, www.icanw.org/the-facts/nuclear-arsenals/.

Szoldra, Paul. "You Can Buy a Nuclear Warhead on the Black Market." *Business Insider*, Business Insider, 28 Aug. 2015, www.businessinsider.com/you-can-buy-a-nuclear-warhead-on-the-black-market-2015-8.

History.com Staff. "9/11 Attacks." *History.com*, A&E Television Networks, 2010, www.history.com/topics/9-11-attacks.

"Osama Bin Laden Biography." *The Biography.com Website*, A&E Television Networks, 28 Apr. 2017, www.biography.com/people/osama-bin-laden-37172.

Sampathkumar, Mythili. "Majority of Terrorists Who Have Attacked America Are Not Muslim, New Study Finds." *The Independent*, Independent Digital News and Media, 23 June 2017, www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/terrorism-right-wing-america-muslims-islam-white-supremacists-study-a7805831.html.

"A Timeline of Domestic Terrorism." *The American Prospect*, Prospect.org, prospect.org/a-timeline-of-domestic-terrorism#.WqMJK-jwbIU.

Witte, Griff. "Afghanistan War." *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 21 Feb. 2018, www.britannica.com/event/Afghanistan-War.

Climate and Energy

Carrington, Damian. "Unsure about Nuclear Power? Here's the Five Questions You Must Answer | Damian Carrington." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 21 Apr. 2011, www.theguardian.com/environment/damian-carrington-blog/2011/apr/21/chernobyl-nuclear-power-fukushima.

"Cooperating on Nuclear Power." *The Century Foundation*, 1 Mar. 2018, tcf.org/content/report/cooperating-nuclear-power/.

"Fact Sheets & Briefs." *Nuclear Weapons: Who Has What at a Glance | Arms Control Association*, www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/Nuclearweaponswhohaswhat.

"General Overview of the Effects of Nuclear Testing." *General Overview of the Effects of Nuclear Testing: CTBTO Preparatory Commission*,

www.ctbto.org/nuclear-testing/the-effects-of-nuclear-testing/general-overview-of-the-effects-of-nuclear-testing/.

Hughes, Trevor. "White House Says No Change in Position on Paris Climate Agreement." *USA Today*, Gannett Satellite Information Network, 18 Sept. 2017, www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2017/09/16/reports-trump-administration-may-not-pull-out-paris-climate-agreement/673988001/.

Jha, Alok. "Nuclear Bombs Pose Threat to Environment, Scientists Warn." *The Guardian*, Guardian News and Media, 12 Dec. 2006, www.theguardian.com/environment/2006/dec/12/nuclearindustry.climatechange.

"Journalist: As U.S. Retreats From World Stage, China Moves To Fill The Void." *NPR*, NPR, 3 Jan. 2018, www.npr.org/2018/01/03/575288560/journalist-as-u-s-retreats-from-world-stage-china-moves-to-fill-the-void.

"Nuclear Power in the USA" *Nuclear Power in the USA - World Nuclear Association*, www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power.aspx.

Paris Climate Agreement." *NPR*, NPR, 17 Sept. 2017, www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/09/16/551551083/u-s-still-out-of-paris-climate-agreement-after-conflicting-reports.

Romo, Vanessa, and Miles Parks. "Confusion Continues: The United States' Position On The Paris Climate Agreement." *NPR*, NPR, 16 Sept. 2017, www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/09/16/551551083/u-s-still-out-of-paris-climate-agreement-after-conflicting-reports.

"Safeguards to Prevent Nuclear Proliferation" *Nuclear Proliferation Safeguards - World Nuclear Association*, www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/non-proliferation/safeguards-to-prevent-nuclear-proliferation.aspx.

Time for Change, 18 July 2011, timeforchange.org/pros-and-cons-of-nuclear-power-and-sustainability.

Wasserman, Harvey. "How Nuclear Power Causes Global Warming." *Progressive.org*, 21 Sept. 2016, progressive.org/dispatches/nuclear-power-causes-global-warming/.

"Javascript Required!" *US Nuclear Power Policy | Nuclear Energy Policy USA - World Nuclear Association*,
www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/country-profiles/countries-t-z/usa-nuclear-power-policy.aspx.

"World Energy Needs and Nuclear Power" *World Energy Needs and Nuclear Power | Energy Needs | Nuclear Energy Meeting Energy Needs - World Nuclear Association*,
www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/current-and-future-generation/world-energy-needs-and-nuclear-power.aspx.

<https://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/timeline-the-politics-of-climate-change/>
<http://fortune.com/2017/09/25/trump-paris-agreement-climate-change/>

Disaster Preparedness

Abrams, Herbert L. "Medical Supply and Demand in a Post-Nuclear-War World." *The Medical Implications of Nuclear War.*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 1 Jan. 1986

Carey, Joseph. "North Korean Nuclear Threat 'Only Aimed at the US' and Other Countries 'SHOULD NOT FEAR'." *Express.co.uk*, Express.co.uk, 26 Nov. 2017

Dreazen, Yochi. "Here's What War with North Korea Would Look Like." *Vox*, Vox, 7 Feb. 2018

Franz, Julia. "Nuclear War: What Is 'Nuclear Winter,' and How Likely Is It?" *USA Today*, Gannett Satellite Information Network, 23 Oct. 2017

Kaplan, Sheila. "The C.D.C. Wants to Get People Prepared for Nuclear War." *The New York Times*, The New York Times, 5 Jan. 2018

"President-Elect Trump's Stance on Immigration." *FAIR*

Starr, Barbara, and Jeremy Diamond. "Trump Launches Military Strike against Syria." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 7 Apr. 2017

Whiteaker, Chloe, et al. "How Would the U.S. Defend Against a North Korean Nuclear Attack?" *Bloomberg.com*, Bloomberg, 8 Sept. 2017

Economics

- Albert, Eleanor. "What to Know About the Sanctions on North Korea." *Council on Foreign Relations*, Council on Foreign Relations, 3 Jan. 2018, www.cfr.org/backgrounder/what-know-about-sanctions-north-korea.
- Aleem, Zeeshan. "Here's Why North Korea's Economy Is Able to Survive Sanction after Sanction." *Vox*, Vox, 7 Dec. 2017, www.vox.com/world/2017/12/7/16745692/north-korea-sanctions-nuclear-economy.
- Amadeo, Kimberly. "Is U.S. Nuclear Power the Answer to Climate Change?" *The Balance*, 17 July 2017, www.thebalance.com/nuclear-power-how-it-works-pros-cons-impact-3306336.
- "The Cost of Nuclear Power." *Union of Concerned Scientists*, Union of Concerned Scientists, www.ucsusa.org/nuclear-power/cost-nuclear-power#.WqUbuOjwbIU.
- "Economic Effects." *Key Issues: Nuclear Weapons: Issues: Effects on Health & Environment: Economic Effects*, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation, www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/nuclear-weapons/issues/effects/economic.htm.
- "How Much Does It Cost to Create a Single Nuclear Weapon?" *Union of Concerned Scientists*, Union of Concerned Scientists, www.ucsusa.org/publications/ask/2013/nuclear-weapon-cost.html#.WqUeDOjwbIU.
- Martin, Will. "This Chart Shows What a War with North Korea Could Do to the Global Economy." *Business Insider*, Business Insider, 12 Sept. 2017, www.businessinsider.com/economic-impacts-of-war-between-usa-north-korea-2017-9.
- McMaken, Ryan. "The Economics of Nuclear Weapons." *Mises Institute*, Mises Institute, 15 July 2015, mises.org/wire/economics-nuclear-weapons.
- "U.S. Economy > Labor." *About the USA > Labor*, U.S. Department of State, usa.usembassy.de/economy-labor.htm.

<http://www.randomhistory.com/us-economy-history.html>