INTERPOL

Topic: Addressing Biosecurity 50 Years After the Biological Weapons Convention

Table of Contents

Director's Letter

Dear Delegates,

I am excited to welcome you to the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) at the first edition of J-MUN in 2024! My name is Chloe Krepick, and it is my pleasure to serve as your director for INTERPOL. I am a sophomore at Seattle Preparatory School who enjoys both the excitement of public speaking and coaching middle school speech for the Impromptu category**.** I am thrilled to welcome you to INTERPOL and cannot wait to see how you grow and improve as a delegate over the course of the conference.

INTERPOL is a 100 year-old committee that has grown and developed immensely to become what it is today. What started as the International Criminal Police Commission back in 1923 was created as a collaboration of lawyers and police officials from 24 different countries to discuss cooperation on solving crimes and the newest identification techniques has expanded to a network of 196 countries working at everything from identifying stolen art to tracking financial crimes and even facial recognition programs. A fun fact for you: INTERPOL became infamous for sending out alerts known as 'Red Notices' starting in 1947 to track wanted fugitives around the world which also happens to be the premise of the 2021 film of the same name starring Ryan Reynolds, Dwayne "the Rock" Johnson, and Gal Gadot.

The topic for this committee will be *Addressing Biosecurity 50 Years after the Biological Weapons Convention*. Although the development, production, acquisition, transfer, stockpiling and use of biological and toxin weapons was prohibited after 187 state-parties ratified the 15 articles of the Biological Weapons Convention (the BWC), the growing issue of bioterrorism and

several accusations of countries who have supposedly ratified the convention holding biological weapon programs has caused the need to re-address how countries currently are upholding the convention. INTERPOL has worked extensively to promote biosecurity, including holding the first ever Global Biosecurity Conference in 2024 to raise awareness of biological threats and has in the past partnered with other U.N. organizations such as the World Customs Organization, the World Health Organization, the World Organisation for Animal Health, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, and the UN Office for Disarmament Affairs in an effort to increase biosecurity on a global scale. This topic considers the implications of preventing biological terrorist events and where to draw the line on research for biological terrorism defense programs and how it may enable countries to violate the accords of the BWC.

While this background guide provides you with many helpful resources pertaining to this topic, it is always highly encouraged that you complete your own outside research around the topic, specifically the Biological Weapons Convention and INTERPOL's role is creating a future where countries can be equipped to promote biosecurity while upholding peace and preventing their research from falling into the wrong hands. It is also highly encouraged to complete additional research into your countries history with biological weapons beyond what is provided to you in the bloc positions and role descriptions.

I am so happy to welcome you to this unique committee that will allow you to expand your knowledge and stretch your understanding in a topic you may have not considered in your daily life. My hope for this committee is that it will not only be a place where you can excel but be a place where you can improve and be the best delegate that you can be. My chair and I look forward to seeing you all at the conference. INTERPOL is looking for the next generation's brightest minds! I hope this letter has not been a PLAGUE to read.

Best,

Chloe Krepick

Director | International Criminal Police Organization

Jackson High School Model United Nations 2024

Topic Introduction

The Convention on the Prohibition, Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, or what is now known as The Biological Weapons Convention (the BWC) was a convention negotiated by the United Nations Conference of the Committee on Disarmament in Geneva, Switzerland and became open for signature on April 10, 1972. While the 1925 Geneva Protocol had previously banned the use of biological weapons, countries still had been able to stockpile and develop biological weapons. The BWC, comprised of only fifteen articles, required that state parties were never to produce, stockpile, or retain by any other means:

1. "microbial or other biological agents, or toxins whatever their origin or method of production, of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes;
1. weapons, equipment or means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict." [*UNODC*]

Since the original review convention in 1980, supplemental review conventions have occurred every five years to strengthen the overall effectiveness of the convention [*Mapbox*]. The Biological Weapons Convention currently has one hundred and eighty-three state-parties and four signatories (Egypt, Haiti, Somalia, and Syria). There are only ten states who are neither signatories nor have ratified the BWC. These states include Chad, Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Israel, Kiribati, Micronesia, and Namibia [*NTI*]. The BWC came into effect on March 26, 1975, and any state that had not ratified the BWC before it came into effect had the option to adopt the BWC at any time.

The BWC was partially effective in influencing state parties to discontinue whatever biological or chemical weapons program they may have formally had, but nevertheless some countries manage to elude the BWC despite being state-parties. Countries such as China, Egypt, Iran, Israel, North Korea, Russia, Sudan, Syria, and even the United States have faced allegations as having a current biological or chemical weapons program, raising doubt as to if the BWC was really effective in preventing global biological warfare [*ACA*].

Topic History

Usage of biological and biochemical weapons in warfare can be traced back to the 14th century when Mongol forces catapulted plague infested bodies into the Black Sea port of Caffa (near modern day Ukraine) to weaken their opponents [*Britannica*]. Some historians even believe that the bacteria may have spread its way to Italy and caused the Black Death, the deadliest pandemic to have ever occurred. This tactic of throwing bodies infected by the plague into enemy territory can also be seen some three hundred years later, when a Russian army was able to barricade the Swedish forces they were fighting into Reval (present-day Estonia) and throw the bodies infected by the bacteria into the city, effectively infecting their opponents with disease [*National Library of Medicine*]. Being intentionally inflicted with a dangerous disease is terrifying enough, but what if the threat is not apparent until it is too late? This question makes this next reported usage of disease as a weapon arguably more terrifying than any such use beforehand.

During the 16th century, the European world was obsessed with the idea of manifesting destiny- what they saw as “rightfully” expanding westward and conquering land even if there were already inhabitants. Native Americans had not had the exposure to diseases that the Europeans had, so when the settlers came to take their land, it came with unintended side effects. Unintended breakouts of smallpox devastated the European and Native American population alike, it was then when Philadelphia based colonel Henry Bouquet realized how the settlers could steal native american land without getting their hands dirty. Bouquet used smallpox infested blankets to “gift” to Native Americans, and while it is not clear what success the blankets had

with spreading the virus, the population was struck hard nonetheless, with a death toll ranging around 90% of the native population [*HISTORY.com*].

While early biological weapons had existed for centuries beforehand, during World War I is when the weapons immensely grew in popularity. Horses in the U.S. vital to carrying equipment and resources were injected by their German counterparts with anthrax and a microbe known to cause glanders, a life threatening disease to horses [*National Archives and Record Administration*]. The deadly mixture of biological toxins did their job, and thousands of horses were killed, deeply hindering the United States. This events spurred countries such as the U.S., Japan, and even the United Kingdom to start developing their own biological weapons, and while none are recorded as being used in the next World War, a notable experiment where Japan tried to release nearly 15 million flies infected with the plague backfired, and more than 1,700 Japanese troops were killed [*U.S. Naval Institute*]. Biological weapons such as anthrax and herbicide Agent Orange [*U.S. Department of Veteran Affairs'*] were among those used in the Vietnam war, and while no weapons were actually used, the arms race during the Cold War extended to the research and development of biological weapons.

Moving forward into the 1990s to the early 2000s, the greatest threat from biological weapons switched from warfare to terrorism. In 1995, a former Aryan nations member was killed by a letter containing anthrax [*Federal Select Agent Program*]. Only one week after 9/11, the U.S. was faced by a different form of terrorism. Countless letters laced with anthrax were sent throughout the mail, killing five and injuring seventeen. This event became the worst biological attack in U.S. history and spurred two separate executive orders aiming at strengthening biosecurity [*the Federal Bureau of Investigation*].

While the uses of biological weapons have greatly declined since the Biological Weapons Convention signed by 187 state parties and four signatories prohibited the development, production, acquisition, transfer , stockpiling, and use of biological toxins and weapons, an uncertain future lies ahead [*The Nuclear Threat Initiative*]. With many countries covering up or outright admitting to their development of biological weapons even while being a part of the convention, there is doubt whether biological warfare and bioterrorism will really be eradicated in the future.

Current Situation

The Biological Weapons Convention (the BWC) was established in 1972 and ratified in March of 1975 by all countries except for four signatories and ten countries who have neither signed nor ratified has been the subject of current discourse and tension over countries who have supposedly adopted the BWC yet still hold alleged biological weapons programs or research facilities. Allegations from Russia over both the United States and Ukraine currently holding a biological weapons program used in warfare have spurred debate as to what really qualifies as having ratified the BWC, and have raised doubts as growing threats of biological terrorism occur in recent years if a convention established 52 years ago can adequately address the growing issues surrounding biological weapons.

Among concerns of bioterrorism, the 2001 anthrax attacks have caused many countries to start counter-bioterrorism initiatives. However, many of these counter-bioterrorism initiatives are completing the same research that a biological weapons program may need and may enable a country to be able to rapidly start up a biological weapons program if they desire. Due to the BWC, research was destroyed by countries formally carrying biological weapons programs in accordance with the convention, so should countries with research for other purposes be required to shut those programs down?

Another issue plaguing the world has been whether accidental laboratory created biological weapons or naturally occuring weapons in substances such as herbicides should be treated the same as the purposeful engineering of biological weapons. A case that has brought this issue to light is the COVID-19 pandemic and doubts raised around the origins of the virus with rumors surrounding an accidental lab leak. This begs the question of the responsibility of

individuals versus a country from actions committed and if that country should bear responsibility in destroying the biological weapons or preventing the individual from retaining the resources required to create certain types of biological weapons.

Many countries have also been formally accused or known to have held biological weapons programs in spite of having supposedly ratified the convention. Another important issue brought up is whether countries bear the responsibility for past actions or violations of the BWC even if the country no longer holds a biological weapons program.

The issues of individual versus nationwide responsibility in engineering both accidental and purposeful biological weapons as well as the issues surrounding separating current versus past biological weapons programs and whether counter-bioterrorism programs qualify as research for biological weapons programs are issues that need to be addressed 52 years after the creation of the Biological Weapons Convention, one of the first blueprints toward worldwide peace.

Bloc Positions and Role Descriptions

Bloc A - Pro-Biological Warfare

Countries who are either yet to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention, or have undisputed allegations of developing offensive biological weapons.

China-

Known biological weapons programs- While China has no official report on any existing Biological weapons programs, U.S. intelligence has determined that they have the resources to start a program in a short period of time and has identified past programs set up by China. There is also speculation that the Covid-19 virus could have been a result of a lab leak.

Biological weapon defenses- China started a 20 year program in 2007 to research biological weapon defenses and vaccines.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Although China has ratified the B.W.C, their stances have remained ambiguous through allegations of biological weapons programs.

Allies- Syria, North Korea, Egypt, Iraq, Cuba, Russia.

Syria-

Known biological weapons programs- Syria has an ongoing and brutal chemical weapons program used by the Syrian Regime in the ongoing Syrian civil war that leads to believe that they are also in possession and have the capabilities of creating a biological weapons program.

Biological weapon defenses- Amid the civil war, there has not been the security to develop a biological weapons defensive program while focus has been on the offense.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Syria has signed the Biological Weapons Convention, but has never put the treaty into effect and ratified it.

Allies- China, Russia, North Korea, Iran, Egypt, Lebanon

North Korea-

Known biological weapons programs- North Korea is heavily suspected of maintaining a current biological weapons program, but there is little definitive information about that program. In the past they have produced weapons such as smallpox and anthrax, but there is no reliable and up to date information about the extent of their program.

Biological weapon defenses- North Korea has 15 types of biological weapons they can deploy at any time, but have no known vaccinations or defenses against attacks besides retaliation.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- North Korea is a party to the BWC but has never given any indication of having disbanded their program.

Allies- China and Russia

Egypt-

Known biological weapons programs- Claims of an Egyptian biological weapons program have been in circulation since the 70s' after statements from Egypt that seemed to confirm the existence of a biological weapons program.

Biological weapon defenses- Besides working on an offensive biological weapons program, Egypt has extensively and publicly worked on a defensive program for biological weapons.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Egypt has signed but is yet to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention.

Allies- Russia, France, Germany, the UK, and the US.

Iraq-

Known biological weapons programs- Although Iraq has not been considered a biological weapons threat since 2009, they still are known to have the resources and the potential to be in possession of numerous biological weapons.

Biological weapon defenses- Iraq's programs remain ambiguous, but there is no known development of defensive measures to biological weapons.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Iraq is both a party and has ratified the Biological Weapons Convention.

Allies- Egypt, Iran, Syria, and the US.

Cuba-

Known biological weapons programs- Cuba has a dual use program that both manufactures biotechnology and has the capabilities to potentially manufacture biological weapons as well. Cuba has also not provided any statements in response, and is heavily suspected to have biological weapons programs.

Biological weapon defenses- Cuba is known to have produced counter bioterrorism measures.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Cuba has signed and ratified the Biological Weapons convention, however, they have been accused of not following through multiple times.

Position allies- China, Russia, Syria, and Vietnam.

Russia-

Known biological weapons programs- After the collapse of the U.S.S.R., Russia became the inheritor of the regime's biological weapons despite assertions from the government against it. Many western countries have investigated and accused Russia of having biological weapons programs despite what the country says.

Biological weapon defenses- Russia has been transparent about neither their supposed biological weapons programs nor any defensive programs that they may have.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Russia has signed the Biological Weapons Convention, but has been linked to a 2014 Ebola outbreak in West Africa and various other biological lab leaks.

Position allies- Iran, Cuba, Syria, China, North Korea, Vietnam, Iraq, and Egypt.

Bloc B - Counter Bioterrorism

Countries who do not necessarily disagree with creating and stockpiling biological weapons as long as they are used for a defensive program.

United States-

Known biological weapons programs- During WWII, the US had an extensive biological weapons program but has had no such program since1969 in compliance with the BWC.

Biological weapon defenses- After the 2001 Anthrax attacks, the United States grew concerned over national security and has since devoted 3.1 billion dollars to researching and preventing terrorist attacks. The extent of the research has raised alarms over violation of the BWC, but no official investigation has been raised.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- The United States has ratified the BWC, but believe that the country needs to be prepared for a biological weapons attack.

Allies- Egypt, Germany, the UK, France, Netherlands, and Greece

Germany-

Known biological weapons programs- While Germany has a long and dark history with usage of biological weapons during WWI and WWII, the biological weapons programs are now entirely defensive with much of Germany's resources being put into counter bioterrorism programs.

Biological weapon defenses- As said above, Germany puts much emphasis on counter bioterrorism programs and believe it is important to be well prepared in the event of a bioterrorist event.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Germany has never been accused or alleged of using biological weapons since they dismantled the program after WWII. They also have ratified the BWC.

Allies- the US, France, Egypt, and Japan.

The U.K.-

Known biological weapons programs- From 1934 to the 1950s, the UK ran a biological weapons program. The UK also ratified the BWC and issued a joint statement with the US and Russia in 2005 affirming their support of the convention.

Biological weapon defenses- Even though their defensive biological weapons program has long since discontinued, the UK still is in control of an extensive defensive biological weapons program in case of any cases of bioterrorism.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- The UK has ratified the BWC and believes that with the caveat of counter biological weapons programs, that there should not be research into biological weapons.

Allies- The US, France, Germany, Japan, and Australia.

Lebanon-

Known biological weapons programs- Lebanon has never had a known offensive biological weapons program, but has invested much resources into preserving biosecurity.

Biological weapon defenses- Lebanon has incorporated various biosafety and biosecurity measures aimed at reducing the risk of a threat from biological weapons.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Lebanon has ratified the BWC and is against developing offensive biological weapon programs.

Allies- Syria, Iran, the US, and France

South Africa-

Known biological weapons programs- South Africa formerly held an extensive Apartheid-era biological weapons program that was dismantled in 1993, but is not known to have had an offensive biological weapon program since then.

Biological weapon defenses- South Africa holds a counter biological weapons program, and could potentially have collected intelligence or research of biological weapons after they send a delegation into Iraq.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- South Africa firmly upholds the BWC, but may be in possession of undeclared and yet to be destroyed biological weapons from Iraq.

Allies- China, Russia, Egypt, Iran, Germany, and the US.

Iran-

Known biological weapons programs- Although Iran ratified the BWC, they have been accused of developing and stockpiling biological weapons most notably in the 1990s with dual use biotechnology programs.The most widely accepted conclusion is that iran has developed dual use biotechnology, but there is no sufficient evidence proving they are used for purposes in violation of the BWC.

Biological weapon defenses- Iran has a well developed pharmaceutical industry that could be used for biological weapons defenses. Additionally, their dual-use of biotechnology is helpful in providing sufficient defenses against potential attacks by biological weapons.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Iran has signed and ratified the BWC, and despite potential violations remains unlikely to ever deploy biological weapons they may be in possession of or in possession of the resource for.

Allies- Lebanon, Egypt, South Africa, Syria, Iraq, Russia, Japan, and the US.

Bloc C - Anti-Biological Warfare

These Countries are firmly against both developing offensive and defensive biological weapons and research.

Switzerland-

Known biological weapons programs- Switzerland has never and will never be in the possession of biological weapons. They are against all forms of creating, researching, and stockpiling and were among the first to ratify the Biological Weapons Convention in their own city of Geneva, Switzerland.

Biological weapon defenses- Switzerland has no known biological weapon defense programs.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Switzerland has both signed and ratified the BWC is in support of banning production and stockpiling of all forms of biological weapons.

Allies- Japan, Vietnam, South Africa, Egypt, Germany, the Netherlands, Greece, Australia, and Cuba

France-

Known biological weapons programs- France actually has had an on and off biological weapons program that was finally dismantled in 1972. France was able to weaponize various toxins, but has ratified the BWC since 1984 and since condemned all forms of biological weapons.

Biological weapon defenses- France has no known biological weapons programs, but with past biological research probably has the resources to create one.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- France has ratified the BWC and stands against all forms of biological warfare and weapons.

Allies- The UK, Germany, the US, Lebanon, and Egypt

Japan-

Known biological weapons programs- Japan had one of the most prolific biological weapon programs during WWII, where they notably tried (and failed) to drop flies infected with the plague on their adversaries. However, they have ratified the BWC and since then have (apparently) destroyed all of their biological weapon research.

Biological weapon defenses- Japan holds no known biological weapon defenses.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Japan ratified the BWC in 1982 and has been against all forms of biological weapons since then.

Allies- Switzerland, Iran, the UK, Australia and Germany

Greece-

Known biological weapons programs- Ancient Greece included some of the first recorded uses of biological weapons but some of the last for the country. Greece has never held any sort of biological weapon program.

Biological weapon defenses- Counter bioterrorism is a relatively new concept for Greece, and not one that the country has accepted, even following attacks on the 2004 Olympic games in Athens.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Greece has signed and ratified the BWC.

Allies- Switzerland, the UK, the US, France, and Germany.

The Netherlands-

Known biological weapons programs- The Netherlands has never had any known biological weapons programs.

Biological weapon defenses- The Netherlands has measures to detect countries who may be violating the BWC, but has no defensive programs in the event of a biological weapon attack on the countries.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- The Netherlands is against all forms of biological weapons, especially biotechnology or bioweapon defense programs that may be of dual use for developing such weapons.

Allies- Switzerland, the US, and Germany.

Australia-

Known biological weapons programs- Australia has never held any known biological weapons programs, nor been suspected of having one.

Biological weapon defenses- Australia's approach to biosecurity is quite interesting, with its main defenses against any sort of attack being containment facilities located around the country and would go as far as to contain humans that have been affected. However, they stand against traditional biosecurity programs that may require violation of the BWC to be developed.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons- Australia condemns any kind of biological warfare and has signed and ratified the Biological Weapons Convention.

Allies- Japan, Switzerland, the UK, and the United States,

Vietnam-

Known biological weapons programs- While Vietnam has no known biological weapons programs, they were accused of being supplied with a biological component known as Yellow Rain by the Soviet Union that was used during the Vietnam war. Vietnam was also the victim of considerable damages inflicted by U.S. created herbicides during the same war.

Biological weapon defenses- Vietnam identified biotechnology as a national priority for growth in 1994, however, their biological defense program remains weak and is a veritable weakness for the country.

Current stance on the use of biological weapons-Vietnam has ratified the BWC and has been aiming on upping biosecurity in the country.

Allies- Switzerland, Russia, Cuba, the US, and China

Case Study #1

The Usage of Herbicides by the United States during the Vietnam War

From 1962 to 1971 during the Vietnam War, the United States Air Force dropped around 19 million gallons of herbicides on Vietnam, the largest of which was known as Agent Orange. This operation, known as 'Operation Ranch Hand' had the military objective of damaging Vietnam's tree cover and drying up their crop productions [*The National Library of Medicine*]. However, Agent Orange was far from the deadliest biological toxin used in warfare. A rainbow of chemicals named for the colors of their shipment barrel known as 'Rainbow Herbicides' (which included Agents Orange, Orange II, Orange III, Super Orange, Green, Pink, Purple, Blue, and White) were sprayed over SouthVietnam. While the soldiers who sprayed these chemicals were told that they were merely used to damage the foliage and would have no effect on the people they were inadvertently spraying it over, this was far from the case. Along with destroying over 3.2 million acres of land, more than half of the herbicides contained chemicals known as dioxins, known carcinogens that affected both the soldiers spraying the chemicals and the 4 millions Vietnamese they had sprayed [*HISTORY.com*]. Agent Orange and other herbicides have caused hundreds of thousands of birth defects in Vietnamese children, a multitude of different types of cancer, skin conditions, blood diseases, cardiovascular disease, liver dysfunction and even type 2 diabetes [*U.S Department of Veteran's Affairs*]. In an effort to resolve the effects postbellum, the United States has spent 400 million dollars up to this date as well as 125 million dollars to those suffering from disabilities caused by Agent Orange and other herbicides [*United States Institute of Peace*]. However, this response begs a question: can money really make up for the lives lost due to the horrific biological weapon?

Case Study #2

The Post-9/11 Anthrax Attacks

The 2001 anthrax attacks, also referred to as Amerithrax [2001 Anthrax Attacks Fast Facts] occurred a little more than a month after the tragedy of September 11. The first known causality was a photo editor who worked at the Sun who contracted anthrax poisoning after inhaling a white substance that was included in a letter mailed to him and over the series of two months there would be four more victims and seventeen causes of anthrax poisoning after opening letters that included anthrax spores. The perpetrator was initially thought to be foreign because of the letter's anti-american rhetoric, but were soon indemnified by experts as to be written by a native english speaker [20 Years Later, A Survivor and Scholar Reflects on Amerithrax | American University, Washington, D.C.]. Initially, former US-army bioweapon specialist Steven Hatfill was suspected as being the perpetrator, and it wasn't until 2008 where he would be exonerated after a breakthrough in the case showed overwhelming evidence against Dr. Bruce Ivins, a former researcher at an Army bio weapon laboratory linking him to the crime. However, Dr. Ivins took his own life before he could be charged with anything [Amerithrax or Anthrax Investigation — FBI]. The 2001 anthrax attacks highlighted the weaknesses of the national security of the United States to threats coming from within their own country as well as the ineffective prosecution of the perpetrator after a fixation on the now-exonerated Steven Hatfill [Recounting The Anthrax Attacks: Terror, The Amerithrax Task Force, And The Evolution Of Forensics In The Fbi]. After the attacks, the U.S. created the National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center (NBACC) to help heal shortcomings in the national

security system and respond to the highlighted vulnerabilities [National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center | Homeland Security] but there is doubt as to whether a threat can be handled as well if it is coming from inside the country.

Guiding Questions

- Is the knowledge or development of biological weapons necessary for security?
- Does ratifying the Biological Weapons Convention eliminate the possibility of running a covert biological weapon program?
- Is the research behind counter biological terrorism programs in some cases just as damaging as the research behind a biological weapons program?
- Would an accidentally created biological weapon carry the same connotations as a purposely created biological weapon?
- If a biological weapon is accidentally created, does the country who created it bear the responsibility of destroying it?
- At what point does an accidental lab leak or biological hazard become a biological weapon?
- If an individual of their own accord uses a country's resources to commit acts of bioterrorism in another, does that country bear responsibility for the act?
- Is there any bona fide way to prove if an individual is acting for themselves or for their country?
- Is internal biological terrorism an even greater threat to today's society than biological warfare?
- If two countries are at war and one of them possesses and uses biological weapons whether or not they have supposedly ratified the biological weapons convention, can the other country justify their own usage of biological weapons as self defense?

- Do countries who have used biological weapons in the past without knowing the full extent of the damages owe compensation for unintended consequences postbellum?
- Is developing herbicides and other biological toxins developing biological weapons?
- Should countries with former biological weapons programs be required to destroy research they have already invested in?

Citations

"2001 Anthrax Attacks Fast Facts." *CNN*, Cable News Network, 25 May 2023, www.cnn.com/2013/08/23/health/anthrax-fast-facts/index.html.

"About the BWC." *Biological Weapons Convention*, Mapbox, bwc1972.org/home/the-biological-weapons-convention/about-the-bwc/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2024.

"Agent Orange." *U.S. Department of Veteran's Affairs*, U.S. Department of Veteran's Affairs, 10 Oct. 2023, www.publichealth.va.gov/exposures/agentorange/.

"Amerithrax or Anthrax Investigation." *History*, FBI.gov, www.fbi.gov/history/famous-cases/amerithrax-or-anthrax-investigation. Accessed 23 Aug. 2024.

"Biological Weapons Convention (BWC)." *The Nuclear Threat Initiative*, NTI, 12 July 2024, www.nti.org/education-center/treaties-and-regimes/convention-prohibition-development-production-and-stockpiling-bacteriological-biological-and-toxin-weapons-btwc/.

"Biological Weapons Convention." *United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs*, United Nations, disarmament.unoda.org/biological-weapons/. Accessed 23 Aug. 2024.

"Bioterrorism: A Brief History." *Federal Select Agent Program*, Federal Select Agent Program, 10 Sept. 2020, www.selectagents.gov/overview/history.htm.

Blakemore, Erin. “Agent Orange Wasn’t the Only Deadly Chemical Used in Vietnam.” *History.Com*, A&E Television Networks, 14 Sept. 2017, www.history.com/news/agent-orange-wasnt-the-only-deadly-chemical-used-in-vietnam.

Books, CLCJ. “Recounting the Anthrax Attacks: Terror, the Amerithrax Task Force, and the Evolution of Forensics in the FBI.” *Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Book Reviews*, Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey, 1 June 2021, clcjbooks.rutgers.edu/books/recounting-the-anthrax-attacks-terror-the-amerithrax-task-force-and-the-evolution-of-forensics-in-the-fbi/.

Carus, W Seth. “Biological Warfare in the 17th Century.” *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 22 Sept. 2016, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4994373/.

“Chemical and Biological Weapons Status at a Glance.” *Chemical and Biological Weapons Status at a Glance | Arms Control Association*, Arms Control Association, Jan. 2024, www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/cbwprolif.

Kiger, Patrick J. “Did Colonists Give Infected Blankets to Native Americans as Biological Warfare?” *History.Com*, A&E Television Networks, 15 Nov. 2018, www.history.com/news/colonists-native-americans-smallpox-blankets.

“National Biodefense Analysis and Countermeasures Center: Homeland Security.” *U.S. Department of Homeland Security*, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, www.dhs.gov/science-and-technology/national-biodefense-analysis-and-countermeasures-center. Accessed 3 Oct. 2024.

October 15, 2021. “20 Years Later, a Survivor and Scholar Reflects on Amerithrax.” *American University*, American University, 15 Oct. 2021, www.american.edu/spa/news/twenty-years-later-a-survivor-and-scholar-reflects-on-amerithrax.cfm.

Pfeiffer, David. “‘Tony’s Lab.’” *National Archives* , National Archives and Records Administration, 2017, www.archives.gov/publications/prologue/2017/fall/tonys-lab.

Polmar, Noram. “Japan’s Deadliest Weapons.” *U.S. Naval Institute*, U.S. Naval Institute, Oct. 2020, www.usni.org/magazines/naval-history-magazine/2020/october/japans-deadliest-weapons.

Schneider, Barry R. “Biological Weapons in History.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, inc., 6 Aug. 2024, www.britannica.com/technology/biological-weapon/Biological-weapons-in-history.

Sen, Ashish Kumar. “Addressing the Harmful Legacy of Agent Orange in Vietnam.” *United States Institute of Peace*, The United States Institute of Peace, 27 Jan. 2022, www.usip.org/publications/2022/01/addressing-harmful-legacy-agent-orange-vietnam.

“The U.S. Military and the Herbicide Program in Vietnam.” *Veterans and Agent Orange: Health Effects of Herbicides Used in Vietnam.*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 1 Jan. 1994, www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK236347.

“Veteran’s Diseases Associated with Agent Orange.” *U.S. Department of Veteran’s Affairs*, U.S. Department of Veteran’s Affairs, 10 Dec. 2013, www.publichealth.va.gov/exposures/agentorange/conditions/index.asp.