

EUROPEAN COUNCIL (1986)



CHAIRS: ANDRÉ SCHULMAN
& BEATRIZ SELHORST

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LETTER TO THE DELEGATES	3
COMMITTEE DESCRIPTION	5
European Council in 2023	5
Difference between European Council and other European entities	6
European Council in 1986	6
Rules of the Council	7
Parliamentary Procedures	7
Procedure Particularities	8
Voting Procedure	8
Powers and Effects	9
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	10
Cold War	10
Nuclear Power Plants	12
Chernobyl Disaster	13
Current Situation	17
TIMELINE OF EVENTS	18
April 1986	18
May	20
June	22
POSITION OF MAJOR COUNTRIES	24
Federal Republic of Germany (West germany)	24
German Democratic Republic (East Germany)	24
Grand Duchy of Luxembourg	24
Hellenic Republic	25
Italian Republic	25
Kingdom of Belgium	25



Kingdom of Denmark	26
Kingdom of Netherlands	26
Kingdom of Norway	26
Kingdom of Spain	27
Kingdom of Sweden	27
Portuguese Republic	27
Republic of Bulgaria	28
Republic of Austria	28
Republic of Finland	29
Republic of France	29
Republic of Ireland	30
Slovenian Republic	30
Swiss Confederation	30
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island	31
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	31
GUIDING QUESTIONS	32
FURTHER READING	33
BIBLIOGRAPHY	34



LETTER TO THE DELEGATES

Hello dear delegates!

Welcome to the 2023 SMUN's European Council! We are André Schulman and Beatriz Selhorst, and we are sincerely delighted to be your chairs at this conference. It is thrilling to chair this committee to discuss an event so important for the world as the Chernobyl Explosion. We sincerely believe this will be a fruitful debate leading to a deep knowledge of the period, the actual incident, and the danger of nuclear power plants. It will help to develop the debate skills of everyone and also bring a lot of fun to all on the committee.

We know that MUN can be a frightening experience, not only for first-timers, so we sincerely encourage anyone that wants any support on any part of the preparation or during the actual debate to please contact us. Any action in which we expose ourselves to strangers is a challenge when discussing such complex and delicate topics becomes even more difficult. We want you to know that everyone has started at some point. Once we, the presidents, went to our first congress and had our first experience, and I'm sure that moment changed our academic life. MUN goes beyond oratory, debate and arguments. MUN creates friendships, introduces you to new people, develops your general knowledge, shows you subjects and views you would never have had contact with if it weren't for MUN, and gives you the confidence to speak in public. All these things are super important to life and all of us.



Furthermore, we highly recommend you all share your best in the research, debate and writing for this committee. We genuinely hope this experience will be pleasant for everyone, and we are very excited to meet and get to know you! We will be very grateful for the dedication and effort of all of you.

We wish you all the best and look forward to seeing you all!

André Schulman

andre.schulman@aluno.esbsp.com.br

(11) 95040-2266

Beatriz Selhorst

beatriz.selhorst@aluno.esbsp.com.br

(41) 99117-5283



COMMITTEE DESCRIPTION

European Council in 2023

The European Council is an official intergovernmental body of the European Union. It serves the aim of European Union (EU) countries of defining the general political direction and priorities of the European Union. The Council comprises the heads of state or government of EU countries, the European Council's President, and the European Commission's President. It provides strategic guidance, sets objectives, and decides on critical economic issues and policies. It plays a crucial role in shaping the overall direction of the EU. It provides a platform for EU leaders to discuss and address critical challenges and opportunities facing the Union.

The European Council comprises the president or prime minister of each member country, along with the president of the European Commission. They meet at least four times annually to discuss and decide on matters. It is crucial to emphasise that the European Council currently does not include all the members of the European Parliament, as it focuses on the highest level of political leadership within the EU.

The European Council is responsible for shaping the agenda and setting priorities for the European Union. This entails tackling critical matters such as the EU budget, climate change, migration, and foreign policy. The decisions made within the European Council carry a mandatory status for all member countries and hold considerable influence over the policies and laws of the European Union.



Difference between European Council and other European entities

The European Council works closely with other EU institutions, such as the European Commission and the European Parliament. While the European Council sets the overall agenda and strategic priorities, the European Commission proposes laws and policies, and the European Parliament debates and votes on them. Together, these institutions form a system of checks and balances to ensure democratic decision-making in the EU.

The European Union and the European Council are distinct entities within the European integration framework. The EU is a political and economic union comprising multiple member countries cooperating to promote peace, stability, and shared prosperity. It encompasses various institutions, including the European Commission, the European Parliament, and the Council of the European Union, which collectively work on formulating and implementing policies across multiple areas, such as trade, environment, social affairs, and foreign relations. In contrast, the European Council is a specific institution within the EU. Its primary role is to provide the EU with general political guidance and strategic direction. While the European Council influences the EU's agenda and policies, it does not perform legislative functions. Instead, it issues conclusions and guidelines that steer the work of other EU institutions.

European Council in 1986

The European Council was a pivotal moment for advancing European integration, as it laid the groundwork for creating a single market and enhanced



cooperation among member states. These developments strengthened the integration process and paved the way for further progress in the years to come.

In 1986, the European Council comprised twelve member countries – Germany, France, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, Ireland, United Kingdom, Greece, Spain and Portugal. These leaders met regularly, generally four times yearly, to address pressing issues. Decision-making was based on reaching a consensus, meaning all leaders had to agree to decide. This process aimed to ensure that all member states' interests were considered.

During this period, some of the issues discussed by the European Council included completing the Single European Act (SEA). This act aimed to create a single European market, guaranteeing the free movement of goods, services, capital, and people, also focusing on strengthening economic cooperation, promoting regional development, and enhancing Europe's role on the international stage.

The decisions made by the European Council in 1986 had a lasting impact on Europe. The completion of the Single European Act laid the foundation for establishing the European Single Market, which has greatly facilitated trade and economic integration among member countries. The increased cooperation and coordination achieved through the European Council played a crucial role in shaping the European Union's development and expanding its influence.

Rules of the Council

Parliamentary Procedures

The European Council does not follow similar parliamentary procedures as the ones seen in Model United Nations. Instead, decision-making is based on negotiation



and compromise between member countries. Members of the European Council must engage in discussion and diplomacy to come to an agreement that satisfies all member states. In the context of a MUN debate, it is essential to emphasise the need for diplomacy, negotiation, and compromise when discussing issues before the European Council.

Procedure Particularities

In 1986, the European Council operated through a consensus-based approach among its member nations. This mechanism ensured that all leaders agreed, thereby giving due consideration to the interests of every member state. In the context of a MUN debate, it is necessary to note that this decision-making procedure may result in lengthier and more complex negotiations among member countries.

As a historical conference, it is a requisite to remember that the committee's context changes everything. To clarify the role of the European Council in 1986, we first have to emphasise that the European Union does not yet exist. Therefore any argument or point made considering the European Union will be disregarded.

Voting Procedure

Since the European Council operates based on reaching consensus, that means that if even a single member state objects to the voting in a resolution, the resolution won't pass. Instead, all decisions must be made through agreement, which means that all member countries must agree to the decision for it to be adopted. This procedure gives each member state an equal voice in the decision-making process. In order to fit into the MUN rules, our voting procedure will happen with roll call, and the delegates will not be able to abstain — that means that



in this committee, we will not have the option of just being present at the beginning of each session. Those who disagree with the majority must make a speech explaining why they have this opinion. After the against speeches, the council will have the choice of choosing a representative to make a speech in favour of defending the resolution; if the delegate that previously positioned himself against the resolution still sustains its position, the chairs will be entertaining other motions promoting further debate.

Powers and Effects

The European Council has significant capabilities in shaping the policies and direction of the European Union. As the leaders of member countries come together to discuss and make decisions, their agreements carry significant weight and impact. The procedures of the European Council, mainly the focus on consensus and diplomatic negotiation, means that each member state has an equal and influential voice in the decision-making process. In the context of a MUN debate, it is essential to emphasise the significant impact and weight that decisions made by the European Council can have on the EU as a whole. Remember that there is no legal binding in the EU resolutions, mainly for countries that are not in the EU, so entertaining any measures for countries outside the EU won't have any impact unless the countries agree with such measures.



HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Cold War



After World War II, a geopolitical and ideological conflict emerged that lasted until the late 20th century, the Cold War. The United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) were the primary adversaries. They had contrasting ideologies, with the USA promoting democracy and capitalism while the USSR championed communism and state-controlled economies. Intense rivalry, an arms race, and a nuclear standoff between the superpowers characterised the conflict. Both nations amassed vast atomic arsenals, resulting in the mutually assured destruction (MAD) doctrine. Using nuclear weapons by either side would lead to catastrophic consequences for both.

Throughout the conflict, the United States and the Soviet Union were involved in a heated rivalry due to their conflicting ideologies. The European continent was a crucial battleground for this confrontation, marked by the continent's division, proxy wars fought by other nations, and the looming threat of nuclear annihilation. These repercussions continue reverberating throughout European politics, security, and society, shaping their development and trajectory.

During the Cold War, both superpowers engaged in space exploration to showcase their technological capabilities. The Soviet Union achieved the milestone of launching the first artificial satellite, Sputnik, in 1957, while the USA accomplished the monumental feat of landing on the moon in 1969. The conflict also had significant implications for Europe, becoming a platform for demonstrating alignment with the USA or the USSR. The Eastern Bloc, led by the USSR, consisted of Eastern European nations under communist influence, while Western Europe, supported by the USA and NATO, embraced capitalist democracy. The partition of Germany into East and West Germany after World War II represented the division in Europe. The Berlin Wall, constructed by East Germany in 1961, created a physical barrier between East and West Berlin, serving as a potent symbol of the continent's division.

Europe experienced proxy conflicts during these years as the superpowers backed different sides in regional competitions. The tensions were particularly heightened during the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 when the placement of Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba created a dangerous standoff between the USA and the USSR. As the arms race and the development of atomic weapons continued to escalate, tensions between the two nations reached hazardous levels. Both countries



stockpiled nuclear arsenals, leading to the doctrine of mutually assured destruction (MAD), which meant that using nuclear weapons by either side would result in catastrophic consequences for both.

Nuclear Power Plants

Nowadays — 1986 — nuclear power plants play a significant role in Europe's energy landscape, contributing to electricity generation and energy security. The need for diverse energy sources underscores their relevance, reduced reliance on fossil fuels, and a desire to minimize greenhouse gas emissions. Nuclear power plants are a significant source of electricity generation in several European countries, including France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and Sweden. These plants produce a substantial portion of the electricity homes, industries, and businesses consume. Nuclear energy's ability to provide a consistent and reliable baseload power supply made it a crucial component of many countries' energy mix. Nuclear power is seen as a means to enhance energy security by reducing dependence on imported fossil fuels, particularly oil and natural gas. This is particularly important given the geopolitical uncertainties and oil supply disruptions that Europe experienced during the 1970s, such as the oil crises of 1973 and 1979. The diversification of energy sources was a key driver for expanding nuclear power. European countries sought to balance their energy portfolios by incorporating nuclear energy alongside other sources, such as hydroelectric, natural gas, and renewables like wind and solar power. For some European countries, nuclear power represents a way to achieve greater energy independence. Governments can reduce their reliance on energy imports by



producing electricity domestically through nuclear reactors and enhance their energy sovereignty.

Chernobyl Disaster



On April 26, 1986, the world witnessed one of the most catastrophic nuclear disasters – the Chernobyl nuclear accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant in the Ukrainian SSR (Soviet Socialist Republic) was a catastrophic nuclear accident that had far-reaching consequences that released a massive amount of radioactive materials into the atmosphere. This event had extensive political and European implications, shedding light on the need for robust safety measures and international cooperation in atomic energy. During a safety test at Reactor Number 4, a combination of design flaws and operator errors led to a sudden power surge,

triggering an explosion and the release of a massive amount of radioactive material into the atmosphere. The blast caused immediate devastation, with the nearby city of Pripyat evacuated and surrounding areas severely contaminated. The incident exposed the vulnerability of nuclear power plants and raised serious concerns about the safety standards and emergency protocols.

The Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant is located near Prip'yat, in the Ukrainian SSR, part of the Soviet Union. The plant consists of four RBMK-1000 reactors, a type of graphite-moderated nuclear reactor. On April 26, 1986, during a late-night safety test in Reactor No. 4, a series of errors and design flaws led to an enormous chain reaction that resulted in a massive explosion and the release of a tremendous amount of radioactive material into the atmosphere. The reactor's core overheated, causing a steam explosion that blew the 1,000-ton reactor cover off, and a subsequent graphite fire released a significant amount of radioactive particles into the atmosphere. The explosion and ensuing fire released a plume of highly radioactive particles into the atmosphere, which spread across vast areas of Europe, affecting Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine the most. The immediate impact was devastating, claiming the lives of two plant workers on the night of the explosion and evacuating thousands of nearby residents. The accident caused immediate acute radiation sickness in several plant workers and firefighters who responded to the fire.

The Soviet authorities initially downplayed the accident's severity, which raised questions about transparency and the credibility of information shared with the international community. However, as radiation levels increased in neighbouring European countries, the gravity of the situation became apparent, prompting



European nations to demand greater accountability and cooperation. The Chernobyl Incident had significant political and social effects in Europe. It highlighted the risks of nuclear energy and the need for stringent safety measures. The disaster also underscored the potential transboundary impacts of atomic accidents, emphasising the importance of international cooperation in addressing nuclear safety issues collectively. As radiation levels began to rise in other European countries, there was a growing sense of uncertainty and fear. The incident highlighted the potential risks of nuclear energy and raised questions about the safety standards and emergency protocols of atomic power plants across the continent. European governments faced pressure from their citizens to take immediate action and strengthen safety measures to prevent similar disasters from occurring within their borders.

Politically, the Chernobyl Incident exposed shortcomings in the Soviet Union's handling of the disaster. In the immediate aftermath, Soviet authorities attempted to downplay the accident's severity and were slow to share information with the international community. Various European nations have raised significant concerns regarding the credibility and reliability of data from the Soviet Union. These concerns stem from the need for more transparency and delayed response in providing access to critical information. The Soviet Union must address these issues to ensure the trust of its global partners and facilitate cooperation in scientific and economic endeavours. Socially, the Chernobyl Incident had profound impacts on affected communities. Thousands of people were evacuated near the power plant, leaving their homes and possessions behind. The evacuations disrupted lives and led to displacement, with many families forced to rebuild their lives in unfamiliar places.



The Chernobyl Incident also exposed the vulnerability of neighbouring countries to the transboundary effects of nuclear accidents. Winds carried the radioactive plume across Europe, contaminating vast areas in Ukraine, Belarus, Russia, and other European nations. This raised concerns about the need for international cooperation and collective responsibility in addressing nuclear safety issues. The incident served as a wake-up call for European countries to recognise the interdependence of their safety measures and the potential consequences of nuclear accidents beyond national borders. Large areas around the power plant became uninhabitable, forming the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone as a sad reminder of the disaster's enduring legacy. The disaster also left a lasting impact on health, the environment and communities, and the consequences of the Chernobyl Incident remained a cause for concern. Large areas around the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant became uninhabitable due to the high radiation levels, forming the Chernobyl Exclusion Zone. This served as a poignant reminder of the consequences of nuclear accidents and the importance of safeguarding the environment from such catastrophes.

The Chernobyl Incident serves as a backdrop for discussions on nuclear safety and the future of European nuclear power plants. The disaster underscored the need for international cooperation in sharing information, expertise, and best practices to prevent future accidents and mitigate their consequences. The incident has sparked debates on the balance between the benefits and risks of nuclear energy, the necessity of transparent communication in times of crisis, and the responsibility of European nations to ensure the safety and security of their citizens and the environment.



Current Situation



This council meeting will take place on 26th June 1986. The events leading to this crisis were already working. The cold war caused a technological race that had risky technologies. The Chernobyl incident raised a lot of concerns in countries in Europe. The citizens can see the consequences of a nuclear accident or attack. This is why this committee is being held to determine measures in times of crisis, establish transparency in risky situations, determine steps to prevent future accidents and decide what to do moving forward. This committee is perfect for reaching solutions for a crisis such as this one, since all decisions will need to be made with unanimous agreement between all nations, making all of the resolutions reached by this committee beneficial for every country.



TIMELINE OF EVENTS

1970 - Construction of the city of Pripyat begins. Construction of the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plants (ChNPP) begins.

September 26th, 1977 - The first power plant reactor starts to operate.

1982 - A partial core meltdown occurred in reactor No. 1. The extent of the accident was not made public until 1985. The reactor was repaired and put back into operation within months. At this point, three more reactors were operating, and the fourth was being constructed.

April 1986

25th - Test preparation began, and one turbine was shut down. During the test, the emergency core cooling system was disabled.

26th - During a safety test, the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant experiences a catastrophic nuclear accident at Reactor No. 4, releasing a massive amount of radioactive materials into the atmosphere.

At 1:20 am, the first explosion occurs, followed by the radiation release and a second explosion. At 2:15 am, a crisis meeting was called. At 3 am, the situation was reported to the deputy secretary for the nuclear power industry. By 6:35 am, all fires, except the one inside Reactor Four, had been extinguished. At 8 pm, the Pripjat inhabitants gathered to witness the flames from the burning graphite without knowing the risks of the radiation.



27th - At 2 am, the operation of Units 1 and 2 stopped. At 10 am, helicopters begin to drop sand, boron and lead, and two hours later, the radiation levels drop and start to rise again, reaching their maximum level. At 2 pm, buses were used to make a primary evacuation of the Pripyat residents.

Soviet authorities initiate an emergency response and evacuate nearby residents from Prip'yat and surrounding areas. The severity of the disaster becomes evident, but the Soviet government downplays the extent of the damage and radiation levels.

28th - Radiation levels have increased significantly in various European countries. Scandinavian countries, particularly Sweden, detect unusually high radiation levels in the atmosphere and trace it back to the Chernobyl accident. The Soviet Union confirms the disaster after international inquiries. Concerns over the secrecy and limited information provided by Soviet authorities fuel scepticism and criticism from the international community.

9:30 am, Staff at the Forsmark Nuclear Power Plant in Sweden detect a dangerous surge in radioactivity. At 9 pm, Moscow TV news announces an accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant. At 11 pm, the Danish nuclear research laboratory reports that a maximum credible accident has happened in the Chernobyl atomic reactor.

29th - The Soviet Union officially notified the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) about the Chernobyl accident, providing limited information. An American reconnaissance satellite provided Washington analysts with photos of Chernobyl. The first Soviet photos of the Chernobyl accident were censored by the removal of smoke



before being printed in the newspapers. Polish authorities decide to distribute iodine tablets in the northeast to infants and children to protect them from thyroid cancer.

30th - Western nations doubted the accuracy of the information provided by the Soviet government. The Soviet Union acknowledges the Chernobyl disaster, but the details released remain vague and downplay the severity of the situation. The Soviet government begins permanently evacuating the residents of Pripyat, the city closest to the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant.

May

1st - International concern grew over the severity of the Chernobyl disaster, and Western countries requested detailed information from the Soviet Union response to the radioactive cloud spreading across Europe, several countries implemented protective measures. In Sweden, restrictions are placed on outdoor activities and the consumption of locally-produced food. And in South West Germany, parks and public spaces were closed due to the high radiation levels.

2nd - The Soviet media started to provide limited information about the Chernobyl disaster but still downplayed its impact. And a 30-kilometre evacuation zone was designated around the reactor, leading to the evacuation of approximately 90,000 people. France imposes restrictions on consuming certain foods, particularly mushrooms and game animals, to prevent contamination from the Chernobyl fallout.

3rd - Sweden publicly announced that the radioactive cloud over their country came from the Chernobyl disaster.



5th - An embankment starts to be built on the Pripyat River to try and prevent it from being contaminated.

6th - Emissions of radionuclides drop from 8 million to 150,000. Kiev radio warned its audience not to eat leafy vegetables and to stay indoors as much as possible due to the radiation risks.

8th - IAEA states that Moscow started encapsulating the reactor, especially by pouring concrete under it, preventing it from reaching groundwater.

10th - According to the IAEA, the fire is extinguished, but the temperature in the reactor is still relatively high. Meanwhile, a Ukrainian government official states that the reactor is still burning, and firefighters continuously try to extinguish the fire.

12th - The European Commission convenes an extraordinary meeting to address the Chernobyl disaster's impact on food and environmental contamination. Cooperative measures are discussed among member states.

14th - The United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution urging the Soviet Union to provide more accurate and timely information about the Chernobyl disaster. The resolution calls for international cooperation and assistance in dealing with the consequences of the accident.

Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev made his first public address about the Chernobyl disaster, admitting that it was a "serious accident" and promising to be more open about the situation.



15th - The Chernobyl disaster is a significant topic of discussion during the European Council meeting in Luxembourg. Member states share information and coordinate their responses to the crisis.

16th - The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) released a report on the Chernobyl disaster, estimating that the accident released 50 million curies of radioactive material into the atmosphere.

20th - Construction begins on the "sarcophagus," a large concrete structure to cover the damaged reactor and contain the spread of radiation.

22nd - A Soviet government committee orders the distribution of iodine preparations.

28th - The European Community issues a report on the extent of radioactive fallout in European countries, outlining contamination levels and the risks posed to the public.

June

3rd - Several European countries, including the UK, temporarily restricted importing certain food products from contaminated areas in Eastern Europe.

4th - The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) convenes a special session to discuss the Chernobyl disaster. The Soviet delegation assures the IAEA that the situation is under control, but experts from other countries express concerns about the lack of transparency.



6th - The First Ministerial Meeting of Affected Countries happened. Belarus, Russia, and Ukraine, the three countries most affected by the disaster, held their first ministerial meeting to coordinate their response and share information.

8th - The European Parliament adopted a resolution on the Chernobyl disaster, urging international cooperation and assistance for affected regions. It also calls for the establishment of a European Radiation Monitoring System.

15th - The United Nations General Assembly holds a special session to address the Chernobyl disaster's global implications and coordinate international assistance to affected countries.

19th - The European Community establishes a Radiation Monitoring Network to monitor radioactive contamination levels across member states and coordinate information sharing.

26th - European countries, along with other nations, are invited to a meeting of the European Council to discuss safety measures after the Chernobyl accident and the future of European nuclear power plants, alongside some financial, technical, and humanitarian assistance to Ukraine and neighbouring countries affected by the Chernobyl disaster.



POSITION OF MAJOR COUNTRIES

Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany)

There needed to be a more immediate response from the government, and when it came, it came from different agencies suggesting different actions for the citizens. There were only a few airborne radiation detectors in Germany at the time, and no legal foundation was in place for spreading information and actions about nuclear disasters. That is why after the incident, Germany strongly believes that there must be many regulations to prevent and remediate future disasters.

German Democratic Republic (East Germany)

Officially, life in East Germany continued as usual after the incident. The government decided to hide the information about the possible impacts of the accident and downplayed it for the citizens. All news about the incident was only made by the government trying to assure the population it was safe. The State Office for Nuclear Safety and Protection From Radiation (SAAS) put readings that secured no risk of an accident. People that were publicly against nuclear power plants were punished in the country.

Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

The contamination in the country was lower than in nearer countries, but it was still affected. There were temporary restrictions on the sale and consumption of certain food products. Still, the radiation levels were too low for immediate consequences, raising fear of the long-term effects. Overall, Luxemburg wasn't as affected by the



accident, but it still raised concerns in the country. Overall, Luxemburg isn't involved, is not interested in nuclear power plants in the country, and is concerned for its safety if there are other disasters.

Hellenic Republic

The impact on the country was limited, mainly compared to other affected countries. The region had a low environmental impact, but it was soon controlled. The principal wishes of the country are to establish monitoring programs, take measures to restrict contaminated food, and raise awareness about nuclear safety and international cooperation.

Italian Republic

Northern Italy was significantly affected by the fallout. This raised concerns about the products produced in northern Italy transported to the rest of the country. There weren't any immediate health impacts. The most affected regions have a high risk of long-term cancer development. Still, Italy's consequences aren't as significant as other countries. There are currently three working nuclear power plants in the country, and one was already shut down in 1982.

Kingdom of Belgium

All the impacts caused in Belgium were minimal and had only minor predicted long-term consequences. The Kingdom of Belgium wants to establish measures to state public safety and supports discussion about what matters should be considered to prevent future problems. Currently, the country has five nuclear power



plants, two of them only getting to begin operations last year, so a ban on nuclear power would have a substantial economic impact on Belgium.

Kingdom of Denmark

Denmark strongly believes that this incident calls for international cooperation regarding nuclear disasters. The country wasn't heavily affected by the crisis, but some water bodies and other environmental and fresh resources were temporarily contaminated. Denmark wants to establish monitoring programs to assess contamination levels in Europe. In 1985, the Danish parliament exterminated all nuclear power plant projects.

Kingdom of Netherlands

The Netherlands passed through similar problems to the rest of the countries in Europe. It wasn't close to being too affected, but there was still the contamination of natural resources and fresh food. The Netherlands were willing to cooperate with the international community to address nuclear incidents. The country currently has one working nuclear power plant and was already invested in researching and establishing measures to dispose of nuclear waste before the disaster.

Kingdom of Norway

Norway wasn't close enough to be affected by short-term health effects, but the concern with the contamination of food products was severe. Also, Norway had a limited but worse environmental impact because of the crisis, leading to the contamination of a lot of soil, water and so on. There is a need to entertain serious



monitoring of Norway's products and natural resources, and public awareness of the risk of nuclear energy has risen a lot. Norway already shut down two nuclear power plants but still has two actively generating energy.

Kingdom of Spain

The consequences were minor for Spain since it is far from the accident. Still, there was contamination of the environment and food of the country. The disaster raised awareness of the problem in the country and made Spain seek to monitor the products and settings of the country for nuclear risk. The government currently has eight nuclear power plants in operation.

Kingdom of Sweden

Sweden held a solid and urgent opinion on discussing safety measures after the Chernobyl accident and its critical impact. As the most affected country after the USSR, Sweden's reaction to the Chernobyl incident was marked by heightened public concern over the potential spread of radioactive fallout across its territory. Its opinion was characterised by strong advocacy for nuclear safety, increased transparency, and a commitment to diversify energy sources while emphasising the importance of international cooperation to prevent future nuclear disasters.

Portuguese Republic

Having no operational nuclear power plants on its territory, Portugal has approached the issue cautiously and pragmatically. Given its geographical distance from the Chernobyl incident, Portugal has been concerned about the potential transboundary



effects of nuclear accidents on European nations and chose to focus on advocating for stringent atomic safety measures, international cooperation, and the minimisation of risks associated with nuclear energy. Its cautious approach, informed by its distance from Chernobyl and its commitment to environmental protection, would have contributed to constructive discussions on ensuring the safety of European nuclear power plants and preventing similar incidents.

Republic of Bulgaria

Having operational nuclear power plants on its territory, Bulgaria would have approached the discussions with a practical and cautious perspective, considering both the benefits and risks of nuclear energy. The Chernobyl accident would have prompted Bulgaria to critically evaluate its nuclear safety measures and policies. Its practical approach, drawn from its own experiences, likely has focused on promoting collaboration, knowledge sharing, and technical assistance to ensure the safe operation of European nuclear power plants while learning from the lessons of the Chernobyl incident.

Republic of Austria

Austria is known for its long-standing opposition to nuclear energy and its commitment to environmental protection. Austria has a nuclear-free policy and strong concerns about the safety risks associated with nuclear power. It also highlights the benefits of renewable technologies in meeting energy demands while minimising environmental risks. Austria is in a position against nuclear energy and to adopt renewable energy sources. Its commitment to environmental protection and



nuclear-free policy would have shaped its stance, emphasising promoting safety, transparency, and the responsible management of energy resources.

Republic of Finland

With operational nuclear power plants, Finland enhances safety standards across European facilities. It believes in collaborative networks for sharing safety information, joint training, and coordinated emergency responses. Finland's proactive stance would underscore the importance of effective emergency response protocols, transparent public communication, and public engagement to build trust. It advocates technological innovation to improve nuclear safety, recognising the environmental impact. Finland is committed to maintaining high nuclear safety standards, supporting international collaboration, and leveraging its experiences to enhance European nuclear practices while safeguarding the environment and public well-being.

Republic of France

There were concerns about the safety of food, the environment and further long-term risk to the health of the citizens. There is a myth that some government officials state that the radioactive cloud stops at the border, but that isn't true. The government is willing to take all the measures to protect the citizens from possible risks. France went through a severe nuclear accident in 1969 in one of its power plants. Today the country has 13 active nuclear power plants.



Republic of Ireland

While radiation exposure levels weren't immediately harmful, there were worries about potential long-term health effects, including increased cancer risk. The food and environmental contamination was also limited. Still, it inspired the country to want cooperation to address measures to prevent any further remediation of the disaster that happened. Ireland has anti-nuclear solid lobby groups that lead to the drop of a nuclear project and currently has no nuclear power plants.

Slovenian Republic

In summary, the Chernobyl disaster had minor effects on the Slovenian Republic, particularly concerning radioactive contamination of food and the environment. The impact was relatively limited compared to regions closer to the Chernobyl site. The disaster contributed to discussions about nuclear safety and energy policies in Slovenia. Slovenia has a joint power plant with Croatia that went online in 1983.

Swiss Confederation

Ticino was the most affected city in Switzerland. The country was struck by a radioactive cloud four days after the explosion. The authorities banned fishing in specific places and recommended that pregnant women didn't eat fresh foods. The milk from cows contaminated with radioactive particles may have reached the shelves of markets in the country. Switzerland has built six nuclear reactors currently, but one of them, Lucens, was decommissioned only one year after its inauguration due to a partial core meltdown.



United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Island

Due to wind patterns, there was a concern about the country's contamination by the nuclear fallout. Still, the impact was much smaller than in other countries. The UK immediately started to monitor food items for possible contaminations. Mainly, the disaster affected a small amount of the United Kingdom and was crucial for spreading awareness and debate about nuclear safety. The country currently has fourteen nuclear power plants generating energy, two ready to connect to the power grid and another two being constructed.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

As the Crisis happened in its territory, it was significantly affected. Besides the casualties during the accident, the nearby town had to be evacuated, and a large exclusion zone was created. Many health issues were quickly detected in the workers that survived, the first responders and the civilians that lived nearby. The contamination led to long-term environmental damage due to the radioactive contamination. During this crisis, the displacement of people, loss of livelihoods, and strain on healthcare systems and infrastructure were some of the challenges faced by the USSR. This disaster weakened Soviet political relations and already had low stability, so the country is trying to downplay the tragedy. There are currently 12 working nuclear power plants in the USSR.



GUIDING QUESTIONS

1. What is your country's position on the cold war?
2. Does your country have nuclear plants or projects to implement them and what is your vision on other countries implementing them?
3. How does the Chernobyl catastrophe impact your country?
4. With which countries do you have alliances and intrigues in the EU?
5. Do you plan to raise public awareness about nuclear safety?
6. How does your country assess the overall impact of the Chernobyl accident on European nuclear power policies and safety measures?
7. In which ways should you address potential concerns and objections from other nations regarding your proposed safety measures and policies?
8. What is the importance of nuclear power plant safety and regulations for your country after the accident?



FURTHER READING

Chernobyl - HBO (but it is available on amazon prime)

<https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpreter>

<https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx>

<https://en.unesco.org/courier/october-2000/chernobyl-political-fall-out-continues>

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_22_2662

<http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2016/ph241/lebovitz1/docs/cia-sov-78-10078x.pdf>

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-7-2011-05-10-ITM-017_EN.html

<https://eu.boell.org/en/2021/04/26/35-years-after-chernobyl-experience-uncontrollability-must-be-part-our-debate>

<https://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/appendices/early-soviet-reactors-and-eu-accession.aspx>

<https://www.iaea.org/topics/chornobyl>

<https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/statements/enduring-lessons-chernobyl>

https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20638/1986_june_-_the_hague__eng_.pdf

https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20589/1989_june_-_madrid__eng_.pdf

<https://archives.eui.eu/en/fonds/32209?item=CA-16>

<http://aei.pitt.edu/4954/1/4954.pdf>



BIBLIOGRAPHY

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chernobyl_disaster

<https://www.britannica.com/event/Chernobyl-disaster>

<https://academic.oup.com/ije/article/28/5/941/724293>

<https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx>

<https://www.iaea.org/topics/chornobyl>

<https://www.iaea.org/publications/7717/chernobyl-looking-back-to-go-forward>

<https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1188&context=madrush>

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/jamesrodgerseurope/2021/05/01/how-the-chernobyl-nuclear-disaster-shaped-russia-and-ukraines-modern-history/?sh=3bbcc56539ac>

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3655243>

<https://en.unesco.org/courier/october-2000/chernobyl-political-fall-out-continues>

<https://en.unesco.org/courier/september-1990/chernobyl-and-after>

<http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2016/ph241/lebovitz1/docs/cia-sov-78-10078x.pdf>

<https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp08s01350r000300900002-4>

https://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/CRE-7-2011-05-10-ITM-017_EN.html

<https://eu.boell.org/en/2021/04/26/35-years-after-chernobyl-experience-uncontrollability-must-be-part-our-debate>

<https://www.world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/appendices/early-soviet-reactors-and-eu-accession.aspx>

<https://www.iaea.org/topics/chornobyl>

<https://www.iaea.org/newscenter/statements/enduring-lessons-chernobyl>



https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20638/1986_june_-_the_hague_eng_.pdf

https://www.consilium.europa.eu/media/20589/1989_june_-_madrid_eng_.pdf

<https://archives.eui.eu/en/fonds/32209?item=CA-16>

<http://aei.pitt.edu/4954/1/4954.pdf>

<https://www.lowyinstitute.org/the-interpretor>

<https://world-nuclear.org/information-library/safety-and-security/safety-of-plants/chernobyl-accident.aspx>

<https://en.unesco.org/courier/october-2000/chernobyl-political-fall-out-continues>

https://ec.europa.eu/commission/presscorner/detail/en/statement_22_2662

<http://large.stanford.edu/courses/2016/ph241/lebovitz1/docs/cia-sov-78-10078x.pdf>

