Introduction

Upon the conclusion of the Second World War, the world was politically and physically in ruins. The ineffectiveness of the League of Nations as a forum for political dialogue between the major military and economic powers of the world led to crippling division and unreasoned violence. The conclusion of the war sparked the political and social forces to the populations of Africa, Asia, and South America to pursue self-determination. Determined to neutralize the potential of such devastation from occurring again, the international community set out to shape a stable international structure built on mutual respect and common aspiration for peace with the capacity and authority to resolve conflicts between nations with words before arms.

Bearing foundation from the Atlantic Charter by United States and United Kingdom of October 14, 1941, and the Tehran Conference of November 1943, as well the Dumbarton Oaks proposals and Yalta formula of February 1945, the Charter of the United Nations created the United Nations on October 24, 1945. Rather than “a world parliament,” the United Nations was established as the international forum for consultation and cooperation, with six principal organs distributing the extensive work of the organizations. Foremost among these organs is the General Assembly, the only broad-based organ recognizing the sovereign equality of all Member States, regardless of military strength, financial power, population, geographic size or any single characteristic of superiority or inferiority. Under Chapter Four—including Articles Ten through Seventeen of the Charter—the General Assembly is empowered to discuss any question pertaining to the duties of the United Nations as specified in Article One of the Charter. The General Assembly may further make recommendations to the Security Council—either under the rare circumstance of request or due to an arising conflict situation of concern to the General Assembly under General Assembly resolution 54/54 V, the United for Peace Resolution—as well as controlling the United Nations budget.

In order to confront the myriad of political, economic, and social issues in fulfillment of the purposes of the United Nations in its Charter and the closely linked Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the General Assembly is divided into six standing committees. The First Committee assesses threats to global security and weapons of mass destruction, as well as the elimination of conventional arms, while the Second Committee is concerned with economic development and international trade, including reducing barriers to trade for developing nations to exercise full potential. Working toward social wellbeing and absolute upholding of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, international covenants and Geneva Conventions, the Third Committee works closely with the Fourth Committee, which focuses on peacekeeping particularly oversight of high profile subsidiaries such as United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East. The Fifth and Sixth Committees deal with budgetary and legal matters respectively, determining if new initiatives by the General Assembly are fiscally and legally viable. Following discussion, each committee presents its recommendations to the plenary meeting of the General Assembly.

In the spirit of democracy and equal recognition, each Member State possesses one vote. An indication of substantive areas of agreement, General Assembly topical debate culminates in resolutions, written lists consisting of perambulatory clauses detailing recognition of the topic and previous steps taken to counter the problem, followed by innovative strategies to counter the issue and its related grave consequences. Resolutions are adopted by simple majority but predominantly by acclamation, whereby no Member State of the committee substantially objects to the document. More than half of all resolutions were adopted by acclamation between 1975 and 1990 and two-thirds have been adopted in the same manner since. Evident of the rise of non-Western dominance, the propensity of the General Assembly to seek consensus rather than majority rule demonstrates the United Nations’ capacity to confront the dire issues, such as the sustainability of international peace and establishment of a proper standard of living for all world citizens, with singular focus. While strictly binding only to internal organs and subsidiary actions of the United Nations, General Assembly decisions demonstrate political and moral authority, garnering public pressure and leading to norm-creation that influences domestic legislatures and initiates new treaties on the regional, sub-regional and global levels.

The effectiveness of the United Nations as a consensus-building organ evolved over the history of the United Nations. At the dawn of the United Nations, the balance of power in the General Assembly centered on the East- West conflict in the Security Council between United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), as the world community looked to the great military and economic powers to determine voting blocs. With the emergence of the Third World due to decolonization and the entrance of 109 Member States to the United Nations between 1955 and 1960, new blocs began to form, including the Non-Aligned Movement originating from the Bandung Conference in 1955. Following the weakening of
USSR-US tensions and rise of the new economic order, the world community faced an economic clash between North and South, industrialized and developing, leading to the formation of the Group of 77. The fall of the USSR gave rise to the modern era of globalization and interconnectedness that has led to a more unified General Assembly, including expanded United Nations involvement in domestic and regional affairs. The Millennium Declaration, passed in 2000, established eight primary goals for the United Nations, demonstrating instrumental progress toward recognition by all Member States that national boundaries and philosophical differences do not separate the needs of all peoples to a healthy and stable life.

While the first session of the General Assembly on January 10, 1946, included only fifty-one Member States—largely the European and Latin American members of the League of Nations—the United Nations now includes 192 Member States, including diverse blocs dominated by Asian and African nations. Regardless of regional or ideological ties, all Member States work toward a better future for the United Nations through co-operation in the General Assembly.

**General Assembly First Committee**

Established to deal with the technological implications of the atomic bomb used against Japan and in development by every other major military power of the day, the General Assembly First Committee of 1946 focused on all political and security questions of the General Assembly’s agenda. Along with the then-unnumbered Special Political Committee, the First Committee provided the stage for the liveliest debates between superpowers during the Cold War, centering on armament stockpiling and territorial balance between Soviet communism and Western capitalism. With the transition of the Fourth Committee’s focus to special political affairs with the culmination of its mission of decolonization affairs, the First Committee today concentrates on issues of disarmament and threats to international peace and security, pursuant of the clause one of Article One of the Charter. The First Committee further works extensively with the Security Council and Conference on Disarmament, as well as overseeing the Office of Disarmament.

The Sixty-Fourth Session of the General Assembly began on September 15, 2009, was scheduled to complete work on December 22, 2009, but continued work through September 13, 2010. During the session, the General Assembly First Committee passed forty-eight specific resolutions (A/RES/64/22-A/RES/64/70)—among them: transparency of military expenditures, combating the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons and prevention of an arms race in space. The Sixty-Fifth Session opened on September 14, 2010 and, following general debate by the plenary session from September 23 to 30, 2010, the First Committee topical discussion began in early October, under the Chairpersonship of Mr. Milo Koterec of Slovakia. During the Sixty-Fifth session, the First Committee addressed items 90-106 of the General Assembly agenda (A/65/50), including the risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East, developments in the field of information and telecommunications in the context of international security, and the relationship between disarmament and development. The Sixty-Fifth Session also faced the ten-year review of the Millennium Development Goals, as the United Nations looks toward the future and aims to shape a better world through consensus and cooperation toward peace.

Though garnering some criticism for static discussion and ineffectuality, the General Assembly and in particular the First Committee remains to be the world forum for open discussion of the issues facing the safety and security of all world citizens. In 2011, the First Committee worked toward addressing desertiﬁcation, land degradation and drought within the context of the UN Decade for Deserts and the Fights Against Desertiﬁcation (2010-2020). Additionally, a resolution was passed regarding the prevention and control of non-communicable diseases (A/66/L1). The Sixty-Seventh session continued its progress in combating traﬃcking in persons, further encouraging Member States to more actively contribute to a global solution (A/67/L.62). In 2013, the Sixty-Eighth Session passed a resolution (A/RES/67/39) requesting a meeting on nuclear disarmament in order to remove the danger of nuclear war.

*This topic is reproduced, with permission, from the NMUN*NY GA1 Background Guide, available at [http://nmun.org/ny_archives.html](http://nmun.org/ny_archives.html)
I. Debating the Inalienable Right to use Nuclear Materials for Peaceful Purposes

- Under what circumstances does the right to nuclear development extend and how should the international community engage to protect that right?
- What actions can be taken to better enforce the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons?
- How can verification measures be strengthened to ensure peaceful uses of nuclear material?
- How can safety and security concerns be balanced against the right to increased access to nuclear technology?

Ongoing events regarding the Islamic Republic of Iran highlight the debate over peaceful uses of nuclear materials—namely, ensuring that peaceful purposes do not lead to, or mask, development and proliferation of nuclear weapons. Article IV of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) explicitly addresses the inalienable right to peaceful purposes in stating, “Nothing in this Treaty shall be interpreted as affecting the inalienable right of all Parties to the Treaty to develop research, production, and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes…” Importantly, while international debate on nuclear technology often centers on energy production, the peaceful use of nuclear materials broadly extends from the fields of agriculture and food safety to medicine and scientific research. Just as the scope of peaceful uses expands beyond nuclear energy, the arguments for and against those uses have broadened beyond traditional security concerns. Understanding this debate therefore requires a close analysis of nuclear technology, the role of the international community in safety and verification, and the changing debate as new states express peaceful, nuclear ambitions.

The inherent “problem” of nuclear development is the dual-use capability of nuclear materials—at low levels of enrichment, nuclear material is usable for energy production, but with further enrichment that material can then be used for weapons development. Although some nuclear energy reactors are designed to use uranium in its natural form—predominately Uranium-238—as fuel, the majority of reactors worldwide require uranium that is enriched to 3.5% Uranium-235. This enriched form is often referred to as reactor grade or low-enriched uranium. However, uranium can also be further enriched and, at 20%, Uranium-235 is referred to as highly enriched uranium. At 20% enrichment, fissile material can be used to create a crude nuclear weapon, although 85% enrichment is needed for weapons-grade material.

While passage of the NPT codified the right to peaceful nuclear development, it was the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that marked the first international commitment to peaceful nuclear development. Amongst its three main pillars of Safety and Security, Science and Technology, and Safeguards and Verification, the IAEA is perhaps most visible in its verification role. A central role of the IAEA is the inspection of nuclear facilities to sample and inventory nuclear materials to ensure that material is being used solely for peaceful purposes and not diverted to weapons development or proliferation. Additionally, the IAEA’s Department of Safeguards verifies declarations made by Member States regarding their nuclear material and activities. Specifically, the IAEA’s safeguards comprise a three-tiered system of traditional measures, strengthening measures (developed in 1992 to reinforce the traditional measures and referred to as the “Additional Protocol”), and integrated safeguards (created in 1998 to combine all safeguard measures and increase efficiency). Non-nuclear-weapons states that are party to the NPT agree to accept safeguard measures as set by the IAEA. There are those states, however, that follow specially developed rules. India, Israel, and Pakistan, though not party to the NPT, have special arrangements with the IAEA for site inspections. As a member of the NPT, Iran has agreed to safeguards and inspections but only at declared sites. Finally, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, in contrast, withdrew completely from the NPT in 2003, severing its responsibilities to the IAEA safeguards system.

Despite the way some countries have regarded the safeguards system, following the disclosure of Iraq’s clandestine nuclear weapons program in the early 1990’s, efforts were made to strengthen the IAEA’s safeguard system, culminating in the Additional Protocol document. This protocol increased the scope of safeguards to include research and development of nuclear technologies and greater access to inspection sites. At present, the Additional Protocol has been signed by 142 states and entered into force in 116 states. These case studies and varying situations demonstrate why the issue of safety and verification is paramount in debating the right to peaceful use of nuclear technology.

Understanding the political debate in creating the NPT, and particularly Article IV, also lies at the heart of the current nuclear debate. The NPT essentially established a three-way bargain between nuclear weapon states (NWS) and non-nuclear weapon states (NNWS)—NWS agreed to work toward disarmament while NNWS...
agreed to not seek nuclear weapons. The third section of the bargain, contained in Article IV, sought to balance tensions between developed and developing countries by guaranteeing the global South’s right to nuclear development for peaceful purposes and charging the global North with facilitating that right through technology transfer. Current arguments, however, debate to what extent and how nuclear development should be facilitated by citing safety and security concerns of broader access to nuclear material.

With growing global energy demand and increased environmental pressure, many experts predict a coming “nuclear renaissance” in energy production—approximately 60 new reactors are currently being built with 150 additional reactors planned to be active in the coming decade. Undeniably this proliferation of nuclear technology, even for peaceful purposes, poses serious safety and security concerns for the entire globe. Yet, while valid, those concerns must balance the nuclear development aspirations of Member States. The work of this committee should therefore focus on balancing both security concerns and development rights to meet the challenges of a coming nuclear renaissance to the current non-proliferation framework.

II. The Role of Media in the Context of International Security

- How has the development of the Internet and the media revolution affected international security? Has this revolution increased or decreased the role of states?
- Can new sources of information such as Wikileaks constitute a threat to international security?
- Can actions be taken to prevent some forms of media from becoming the voice of terrorist groups?

The world is now more connected than it was ten years ago, as technologies and means of communications have developed. The percentage of people in the world who use the Internet has risen from roughly 10% in 2005 to 36% in 2011. These new technological developments are rapidly changing the media landscape and driving a media revolution. This revolution of media has occurred through the development of new communication tools such as the Internet and mobile devices, and also through greater access to more common media such as radio or television, especially in developing countries. This media revolution is also symbolized by the arrival of social media, which encourages users to interact and not just passively watch or listen to the news. To understand the issues, this guide covers the role countries have in shaping the way media behaves internationally, the use of media by civil society, and also the role of media when reporting to citizens on international issues and conflicts.

A common way of conceptualizing the role of media in international affairs is to mention the “CNN Effect.” The CNN Effect was defined by Steven Livingstone as viewing media as “1) a policy agenda-setting agent, 2) an impediment to the achievement of desired policy goals, and 3) an accelerant to policy decision-making.” In other words, the term tries to capture the idea that media, because it reports directly to citizens, has an influence on governments’ policy making. It originated in 1995, during the Bosnian War, when it was argued that 24-hour news coverage influenced the United States’ and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization’s (NATO) decision to intervene in the region. On the other hand, one can also argue that international news channels play a role in favor of states as they contribute to the expansion of their cultural influence. For example, one recently created channel, France 24, is an initiative of the French government and its Web site states that, “its mission is to cover international current events from a French perspective and to convey French values throughout the world.”

Another example of such channels is the Qatari channel Al-Jazeera. It demonstrates how much influence such a media tool can generate. The channel helped expand Qatar’s cultural influence—in the Arab world but also in western countries—and develop its role in regional diplomacy. The channel also played a key role during the uprising of the people of Tunisia and Egypt, demonstrating the new features of modern media and how they have an impact on international issues. It was one of the only media outlets capable of reporting directly from Tahrir Square in Cairo in 2011, and it thus played an important part in shaping the way the uprising was reported to people outside of Egypt. During the Tahrir Square uprising, the Egyptian government that was being challenged by its population even considered Al-Jazeera to be a threat and decided to close down the offices of the network in Cairo. In spite of this, the sources used, the use of social media, and the local population actually magnified the impact of Al-Jazeera. Thus, the combination of social media and satellite television has created a new media space. As Marc Lynch believes, this combination of media also helped to facilitate the debate over the Arab Spring by providing facts and images along with the necessary framing.

These events also demonstrate that non-state actors can now easily use media, which is especially important to international security. These actors can be insurgents inside a country, but also non-governmental organizations, civil society, or even terrorists groups. The development of new technology and media over the past few years has made it easier for these actors to communicate with the rest of the world and pass on their message, helping
them acquire legitimacy with the public and further their cause. For example, during the protests in Iran, when protesters used Twitter to coordinate their actions and receive help from foreign actors, new forms of media played a significant role. The Internet also constitutes a large tool for propaganda, often used by terrorist groups, which also sometimes benefit from the support of TV networks and channels. This is the case with Hezbollah, which controls the channel Al Manar in Lebanon and uses it to broadcast its messages and actions against Israel. The enhanced role of non-state actors through media poses the question of states’ intervention in the matter. To prevent negative impact, some states have turned to censorship, such as in China where Facebook is censored. The use of the Internet by non-state actors also poses the question of control over the Internet. Currently, the Internet is managed by the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), which some see as a tool for the United States (US) to extend its cultural hegemony. Thus, while non-state actors have benefited from the development of new media, states also seek to extend their powers through these developments, which in turn fuels tensions.

Finally, the recent phenomenon of Wikileaks has demonstrated how much the role of media and information in international security has changed. Wikileaks is even more of an untraditional information source than those described before, because it works by relying on anonymous contributions from sources around the world for the purpose of promoting better transparency. One of its purposes, by broadcasting “secret” files and information including diplomatic cables, is to end diplomatic secrecy to allow better transparency for the citizens of the world. Some, however, see the activity of this organization as dangerous and believe that it could have deleterious consequences on diplomatic relationships and even national security. It is interesting to note that most states have reacted similarly to released information and are in agreement that Julian Assange, founder of Wikileaks, should be held accountable by all means. Nonetheless, while most see it as already being a threat to US national security, as the US was primarily targeted by the cables release, others believe that its actions will only lead to more secrecy and less transparency in international relations. As media and its technology evolve, they change the way we think about the media’s role and impact on international security and raise new issues as described above. Most importantly, the impact on international security exists because media now affects not only states, but also non-state actors, and therefore media and security becomes a much more complex issue than what it has been in the past.

### III. Spreading Nuclear Free Zones

- What barriers exist to the creation of additional nuclear weapon free zones?
- Can incentives be developed to encourage broader support for nuclear weapon free zones by Member States?
- What gaps and limitations exist in current treaties and international frameworks regarding nuclear weapon free zones?

In the first resolution of the United Nations (UN) General Assembly (GA), *Establishment of a Commission to Deal with the Problems Raised by the Discovery of Atomic Energy*, Member States affirmed the goal “for the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.” In the spirit of that goal, the concept of nuclear weapon free zones (NWFZs) was first enumerated in Poland’s Rapacki Plan to prevent the deployment of nuclear weapons in Poland, Czechoslovakia, West Germany, and East Germany. Numerous proposals for a NWFZ in Central and Eastern Europe followed, but growing Cold War tensions halted early efforts to create such zones. In 1974, the GA revived discussions on NWFZs with the creation of a comprehensive study on all aspects of NWFZs. The following year, GA Resolution 3472 defined the concept of a NWFZ as “any zone…which any group of States, in the free exercises of their sovereignty, has established by virtue of a treaty or convention whereby: (a) The statute of total absence of nuclear weapons to which the zone shall be subject…is defined.”

At present there are five regional treaties establishing NWFZs in 33 Latin American and Caribbean states, 13 south Pacific states, the ten members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), five central Asian states, and 50 African states. Beyond the five regional zones, four international agreements govern the prohibition of nuclear weapons in the Antarctic (1961), outer space (1967), the seabed (1972), and the moon (1982). Additionally, in 1992 Mongolia became the first state to seek single-state nuclear weapon free status. Garnering broad international support, GA Resolution 55/33S, *Mongolia’s International Security and Nuclear-Weapon-Free Status* formally recognized Mongolia’s weapon’s free status in 2001.

With the entry into force of the African Nuclear Weapon Free Zone in 2009, NWFZs cover 56% of the globe’s landmass and 60% of UN Member States. Importantly, zones do not include international waters, where freedom of the seas bars prohibition, and although banned from deploying nuclear weapons into outer space,
international law allows for the transit of nuclear missiles through space—as is the case of intercontinental ballistic missiles. Another inhibitor to the spread of NWFZs is the presence of nuclear-weapon state territories and interests within those zones. For example, ASEM has spent the last 12 years negotiating with the five recognized nuclear-weapon states (China, Russia, France, the United Kingdom, and the Unites States of America) to agree not to violate the zone with the use or threat of nuclear weapons. Initially, all five states were set to sign the protocol on July 12, 2012, but recent reservations from four of the five states have postponed signing. Stated reservations include the right to self-defense and free passage of nuclear-powered ships and aircraft carrying nuclear weapons.

Additional NWFZs have been proposed in the Arctic, South Asia, the Korean Peninsula, Central Europe, and the Middle East although progress has stalled on nearly all of the proposed zones. All proposed zones have come about because of perceived threat, but have been deterred because of political tensions. For example, after India’s nuclear test in 1974, Pakistan proposed the South Asian zone to the UN GA. Despite recent discussion at the 2000 Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, India and Bhutan are opposed to such a zone, particularly one that excludes the People’s Republic of China. In the same year, Iran and Egypt proposed a Middle Eastern zone, beginning perhaps the longest historical discussion of a possible nuclear free zone. The UN Security Council, GA, expert analysis, NPT review conferences, and multiple Middle Eastern peace plan talks endorse such a Middle Eastern zone. The proposal, however, remains stalled over the issue of Israel’s nuclear status, with Arab states demanding Israel’s accession to the NPT and Israel requiring a comprehensive regional peace plan before disarmament. Similar discussions on a zone in the Korean Peninsula and Northeast Asia have failed following the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea’s testing of nuclear weapons. Belarus’s 1990 proposal for a nuclear weapon free zone stretching from the Black Sea to the Baltics has been obstructed by the eastward expansion of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the European Union. For similar reasons, progress on an Arctic NWFZ remains mired in the issue of NATO’s “nuclear umbrella” treaty obligation to Member States as well as the Russian Federation’s and the United States’ nuclear policies. While passage of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty signaled a shift in nuclear policy, both states continue nuclear-powered submarine patrols through the Arctic. Russia, in particular, views the Arctic as key to its nuclear deterrence policy, viewing its Northern Fleet (equipped with long-range nuclear weapons) as its most important naval asset.

Despite the challenges of expanding NWFZs, progress in line with the GA’s expressed goals is attainable in a number of regions. Of the 40% of Member States not encompassed by NWFZs, 22 are not nuclear weapons states, members of a military alliance, or members of a security pact—12 states in the Middle East, 6 in South Asia, and 4 in Eastern Europe. It is therefore imperative to discuss the opportunities present to spread NWFZs, which include expansion of existing zones or the creation of new zones to include the above-mentioned 22 states. However, these are not the only options. To truly work toward a nuclear-weapons-free world, serious debate on the issues of self-defense, deterrence, regional conflict, existing military agreements, and the transit of nuclear-powered vessels must also to occur.
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**History of the General Assembly First Committee**


_The Council on Foreign Relations is a think-tank dealing with questions of international politics and US foreign relations. This article constitutes a useful additional reading for delegates wishing to learn more about the UN GA and the issues it faces. It also provides a brief critical assessment of its role, serving as a global forum for world peace, and how it fulfills it._


_This Web site is a good database for further research. It provides background and explanations of the First Committee’s activities. It is also a source for records from past resolutions, votes, and statements from Member States. Unlike other sources that tend to focus on the GA as a whole, this source has the advantage of focusing particularly on the First Committee, and provides links to resolutions and voting records in the First Committee for the past 10 years._
I. Debating the Inalienable Right to use Nuclear Materials for Peaceful Purposes


In this position paper to the European Union Non-Proliferation Consortium, Franceshini lays out a new nuclear energy map as more states seek nuclear energy development. Delegates should pay particular attention to the “bargain” between nuclear states and non-nuclear states in drafting the NPT. Delegates should also refer to the analysis of the debate on interpretation of Article IV of the NPT.


This Web site provides a wealth of information about the work of the IAEA. Beyond general information about the creation of the IAEA, this Web site also contains a repository of technical and statistical data. The Web site also provides delegates with current news and information through the IAEA’s News Centre. The IAEA’s Web site is also useful in researching peaceful uses of nuclear technology through the agency’s Nuclear Sciences and Applications department.


This chapter from the Programme for Promoting Nuclear Non-Proliferation’s (PPNN) Briefing Book details the evolution of international law as it pertains to peaceful uses of nuclear energy. Delegates should be mindful that while the PPNN only discusses the relation to nuclear energy, a wide range of uses for peaceful nuclear energy exist. Delegates should also note the arguments and debates detailed from NPT review conferences.


The NPT serves as the foundational document for multilateral discussion on nuclear affairs. With 189 parties to the treaty and numerous resolutions from the General Assembly affirming its importance within the last few years, the NPT continues to play a central role. Most recently, and of further importance to delegates, are the recommendations of NPT review conferences available through the “Preparatory Committee and Review Conferences” link.

II. The Role of Media in the Context of International Security


This report analyses the relationship between terrorism and the media. It contains a wide range of examples on how terrorists groups, at national and international levels, use media for propaganda and to communicate with their allies as well as their enemies. Because the report is relatively recent, it takes into account the important changes modern media is going through and how terrorists are using these changes to their advantage.

This essay underlines issues related to the question of the settlement of an international organization in charge of controlling the Internet. The author voices the concerns of UN Member States who wish to establish a multilateral treaty as an alternative to the present situation, as they feel that the US has too much oversight on the ICANN. Cukier later wrote an update to this essay, titled “No Joke,” which delegates should also consider reviewing as a follow-up.


The author of this article is the creator of the term “CNN effect” that was used for the first time during the Bosnian War. He explains that international news coverage can influence a state’s international agenda because it triggers awareness from citizens and shapes their expectations towards their government. This is a good source for delegates who wish to understand better how media coverage can influence a population, and, through this, push for certain issues on the international agenda.


In this article, Marc Lynch describes the new media space that was created by the development of both technology and new forms of media. He shows that this new media space served as a catalyst for the Arab Spring, and that the situation in Tunisia had an impact on the whole Arab world because of new media. Important to note is that this article was written during the Tunisian revolution, but before the uprising in Egypt, Libya, or Syria.


The authors of this article discuss the impact of Wikileaks on diplomatic secrecy following the release by the organization of US diplomatic cables. According to the authors, while the intent of Wikileaks is to call for more transparency in international relations, its actions will only contribute to reinforce secrecy. Since the security implications of the Wikileaks phenomenon are sometimes difficult to grasp, this article will help delegates understand the situation better.

**III. Spreading Nuclear Free Zones**


Although this magazine article broadly advocates for Canadian leadership on the creation of an Arctic NWFZ, it specifically cites reasons for optimism and doubt on the possibility of its creation. Delegates will find the information important to understanding both sides of the argument and expand those arguments to other regions. Delegates can also find further information on the Arctic NWFZ through the linked articles on ArcticSecurity.org.


In each treaty establishing NWFZs, a separate protocol is developed for the five recognized nuclear states to effectively “join” the zone. The recent negotiations between ASEAN and nuclear weapon states clearly demonstrates to delegates the issues preventing wider agreement on NWFZs. While this source explains issues surrounding the southeast Asia NWFZ, delegates can gain a deeper understanding by further researching political debates surrounding the other regional zones.


The Center for Nonproliferation Studies seeks to prevent nuclear proliferation through increased information exchange and analysis. The NWFZ Clearinghouse provides broad information on the creation of each current regional weapon free zone treaty. The Clearinghouse also contains information on the political situations and agreements, which led to each zone’s creation. Delegates
should take particular note of the “Lessons Learned” and “Challenges” sections to better understand the political debate of NWFZs.

United Nations General Assembly. (2011). Resolution 66/25. Retrieved on July 27, 2012, from: http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/RES/66/25. This resolution provides an example of how the international community can encourage the creation of nuclear weapon free zones. The resolution further cites over three decades of previous resolutions that have encouraged the creation of a Middle East NWFZ. Importantly, this series of resolutions and the surrounding debate will demonstrate to delegates the challenge of creating a new NWFZ.