



A child holds bullets in his hands. In banditry-ravaged communities in Africa, bullets are exchanged at the same rate as corn kernels.

A Background Guide for the
Disarmament and International Security
Committee

Chairs: Kenshin Ueoka, Kavin (Ken) Srinakaran,

Thailand Model United Nations

- The 6th Annual Conference -

Greetings exalted ones!

I, Kavin (Ken) Srinakaran, will have the pleasure of serving as your CHAIR for the sixth edition of Thai Model United Nations. I am, as of right now, a junior at Concordian International School, taking the full IB diploma. Model UN has immersed me with passion ever since I first raised my placard at my first conference years ago. When I'm not tending to my delegate duties or expanding my horizons in regards to MUN, you will often find me devoting time to my studies, movie theaters, Netflix, and watching more Youtube than I'd be proud to admit. I have particular passions for acting, filmmaking and deep conversations about the human mind but my highest commitment is to making your THAIMUN experience as exquisite as is within my capabilities to do so (nice transition isn't it :P). In that spirit, do not hesitate for a second if you wish to contact me at ken.kavins@gmail.com or, if any of the following is more your style, I am also available on other large social media platform. For the time being, I must bid you farewell, but with an undying eagerness to see you all in March!

Sincerely,

Kavin (Ken) Srinakaran, Co Chair, DISEC

ken.kavins@gmail.com

Greetings, delegates!

It is of my utmost privilege, pleasure, and honor to serve you as your chair for the upcoming THAI MUN VI. Ever since I joined the MUN program in year 9, I've immersed myself in countless heated debates and my love for it remains strong. Although I am one of the youngest chairs in this conference, I promise you a fun, productive and memorable conference. I am currently a year 11 student studying at NIST International School and this upcoming conference will mark my 11th. I still remember my first THAI MUN conference, where my chair did a promising job running a seamless conference. It is my goal for this conference that I leave you all with the inspiration, aspiration, and fun I experienced in both of the THAI MUN conferences I've been to in the past. Feel free to write to me ahead of the conference at 21kenshinu@nist.ac.th with any questions and requests as I am more than happy to help you out. I am very excited to meet all of you at the conference and to supervise the interesting debates we have yet to see.

Sincerely,

Kenshin Ueoka, Co Chair of the First General Assembly

Topics:

- A. The question of implementing the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin (Chemical) Weapons and their Destruction (Biological Weapons Convention - BWC)
- B. The question of the illicit small arms trade in Africa
- C. The question of implementing the UN resolution on The Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS)

Forum: General Assembly I - Disarmament and International Security Committee

Issue: The question of implementing the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin (Chemical) Weapons and their Destruction (Biological Weapons Convention - BWC)

Topic A: Biological Weapons Convention

Introduction

One of the first instances of major chemical warfare was seen in the World War I. The chemical weapons employed ranged from disabling chemicals, such as tear gas, to lethal agents such as phosgene, chlorine, and mustard gas. These chemicals were used to demoralize, injure, and kill entrenched soldiers. The international community (ICRC) banned the use of chemical and biological weapons after World War I and reinforced the ban in 1972 as well as 1993 by prohibiting the development, production, and transfer of such weapons. However, with today's incredibly advanced scientific developments in biotechnology, there has been a recent concern that these restraints on the use of chemical and biological weapons are ignored or disregarded.

Background

History

The history of the use of chemical weapons dates back to 1000 BC. The ancient Chinese used arsenic smoke back then to create “smoke-bombs,” or “soul-hunting fogs,” as they had called it. Arsenic was a substance that was also used in World Wars I and II. Funnily enough, the same substance is used today in cigarettes. In 1995, Sarin, an extremely toxic colourless, odourless liquid, was used for subway train attacks in Tokyo as an act of domestic terrorism. It killed 12 people, injured 50, and caused temporary vision problems for 5,000 others. Different types of chemical weapons used today include blister agents, blood agents, choking hazard agents, nerve agents, tear gas, vomiting agents and psychiatric compounds. Chemical weapons, although incredibly lethal, are less efficient than biological weapons, as much of it is needed to be effective as it produces fewer casualties. The only ‘upside’ to chemical weapons, however, is that the effects are immediate.

Past attempts

There are 2 main international agreements related to this topic delegates should know about. First is the ‘Protocol for the Prohibition of the Use in War of Asphyxiating, Poisonous or Other Gases, and of Bacteriological Methods of Warfare’, also known simply as the 1925 Geneva Protocol aimed to eliminate the use of bioweapons after seeing its ability to intensify loss of life during WWI. The second is the ‘*Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin (Chemical) Weapons and their Destruction*’, also known simply as the Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) opened for signature at London, Moscow and Washington on the 10th of April, 1972, and entered into force 3 years later in 1975. Depositary Governments were the Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. The BWC does not ban the use of biological and toxin weapons but reaffirms the 1925 Geneva Protocol, which prohibits such use. It also does not ban biodefense programs. Terms of Treaty can be found [here](#) (simplified) and [here](#) (full text).

The BWC bans:

1. The development, stockpiling, acquisition, retention, and production of:

- a. Biological agents and toxins "of types and in quantities that have no justification for prophylactic, protective or other peaceful purposes;"
 - b. Weapons, equipment, and delivery vehicles "designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict."
2. The transfer of or assistance with acquiring the agents, toxins, weapons, equipment, and delivery vehicles described above.

Although this is legally binding, there has been instances and suspicions of countries developing, possessing, or using them. To quote to the [Nuclear Threat Initiative](#), "Only 16 countries plus Taiwan have had or are currently suspected of having biological weapons programs: Canada, China, Cuba, France, Germany, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Japan, Libya, North Korea, Russia, South Africa, Syria, the United Kingdom and the United States. There is a widespread consensus against the possession and use of biological weapons. Most countries are party to the Biological and Toxin Weapon Convention, but there is no way to know whether countries are complying with their commitments."

It is important to note here, that recent advances in biotechnology, combined with the force of globalization, enables most countries with adequate pharmaceutical and medical industries to develop biological weapons using their knowledge and tools.

Benefits of Biological Weapons

As biological weapons are extremely efficient, as not a large amount is needed to affect a large population/area, it can be used to quickly end a war without a much larger body count if the war were to drag on."Many components of biological warfare are highly concentrated, so just a few drops of certain bacteria, toxins and other agents can literally kill millions of people once they hit the water supply or air within a community." This allows for the "clean" elimination of the enemy without largely damaging the landscape as a nuclear weapon would.

If utilized for good, rather than evil, it could help fight terrorism as its weapons are extremely easy to disperse. For instance, if a government seeks to eliminate a terrorist group, it could introduce a biological weapon into its water supply, or disperse it over the area of their encampment. This would eradicate the threat without having to destroy villages nearby with the use of drones or firearms. Biological weapons

have been called the “Lazy Man’s Atomic Bomb” for a reason. This is because it can be produced and used by any nation. With an adequate medical and pharmaceutical industry, a nation would be able to self-produce biological weapons. This would allow developing nations to better defend themselves and be up to par with nations that possess nuclear weapons.

The Detriments of Biological Weapons

Due to the fact that these weapons are “live” as they are bacteria and viruses, it cannot be 100% effective, can be unpredictable and difficult to control. This could cause mass collateral damage in the form of innocent lives, including children, who may not be actively participating in the conflict. Instead of simply killing the enemy soldiers, it may spread throughout the population and wipe out an entire country. Additionally, the components of biological weapons are able to maintain its lifespan for long periods of time in water or on the ground, which means that it is essentially irreversible once it is deployed.

Relevant countries and parties

The United States of America

When World War II erupted and bioweapons gained potency and significance, the USA officially started their biological weapons program under President Franklin D. Roosevelt. After the war when some light was shed upon the aforementioned Geneva Protocol and BWC, the USA under Richard Nixon ended all ‘non-defensive’ aspects of the program. However, the United States still have an ongoing [National Biodefense Program](#). To quote, “Through this National Biodefense Strategy, the United States Government will optimize its own efforts, and harness the work of essential partners—inside government and outside, domestically and internationally—to understand, prevent, prepare for, respond to, and recover from the full range of biological threats that can harm the American people and our partners.”

Syria and Russia

There was an incident on the 7th of April in Syria whence more than 40 people were killed in a suspected chemical attack on Douma, which was the last rebel-held town in the Eastern Ghouta region. According to an [article by the BBC](#), despite the positive tests conducted by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), Violations Documentation Center (VDC), Union of Medical Care and

Relief Organizations (UOSSM), Syria Civil Defence (White Helmets), and World Health Organization, the “Syrian government denies ever using chemical weapons, and its ally Russia says it has evidence that the incident was staged with the help of the UK.” Although the issue and debate of who is responsible for this incident in itself is very controversial, the current question addresses implementation of the BWC as a whole, with consideration of these events.

According to [the NTI](#), the Soviet Union’s chemical weapons program produced most types of known chemical warfare agents in immense quantities and developed the world's largest chemical warfare infrastructure. To quote, “Following the fall of the Soviet Union, Russia became involved with U.S. Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) programs aimed at destroying chemical warfare agents and converting chemical warfare infrastructure and personnel into civilian roles; the CTR agreement expired in 2013 and Russia signed a new bilateral Protocol with the United States.” Russia is known to possess the infamous ‘newcomer’ to nerve agents, *Novichok*; a highly potent chemical weapon created by the Soviet Union that is 5-10 times more toxic than VX, its precursor. On March 2018, a former Russian spy and his daughter were found seriously ill on a bench in Salisbury, poisoned by Novichok. Police linked the attack to another poisoning in June in which Dawn Sturgess and her partner Charlie Rowley were exposed to Novichok in nearby Amesbury, after handling a contaminated perfume dispenser. The UK, along with few other nations have accused Russia of the attacks; however, at a UN Security Council meeting in September to discuss the attack, Russia dismissed evidence presented by the UK as "lies". More information about Novichok poisoning can be found [here](#).

China and Japan

China has been supportive of the disarmament of bioweapons, by acceding to the Geneva Protocol and ratifying the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC). The OPCW has conducted more than 300 inspections in China to confirm Beijing's declarations. To quote [the NTI](#), “Past United States government assessments have accused China of not declaring the full extent of its chemical weapons program, past and present though the most recent CWC compliance report released by the State Department in March 2012 does not list China as a country with any compliance issues.” Historically, China has suffered great losses during WWII when Japan attacked China using chemical weapons and then abandoned them on Chinese territory when they retreated. After countless years, the two governments produced a memorandum, where Japan will provide financial and technological aid to China to properly dispose of

the abandoned weapons. However, “the project has experienced cost overruns, allegations of corruption, and slow progress on implementation.” This is a prime example which shows how governments can negotiate all they want, but due action and progress is often difficult to achieve.

Japan’s 1947 constitution limits its weaponization, therefore, Japan does not possess any programs for the development of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) or their delivery systems, though experts widely believe that Japan has the technical capability to produce such weapons. The island nation relies on other nations, mainly the USA, to protect them from threats such as North Korea.

Possible Solutions

The Pandora's box has been opened almost a century ago and time (as we know it) is a one-way road. There are various options to address the current issue, but some threaten aspects of national sovereignty. Some ideas include:

- 1) Changing conditions of the BWC to be strict on compliance and requirements
- 2) Creating a new convention involving more countries and tighter regulations
- 3) Increasing awareness of the general public of the issue through educational seminars.
- 4) Putting in place an international body with more authority than the OPCW and other existing systems in place to manage and conduct investigations to ensure compliance with the BWC or a new convention.
- 5) Conducting research on measures to mitigate the effects of biological weapons (i.e. creating a vaccine against Novichok)
- 6) Last resort: Bombing and burning all government facilities responsible for developing and producing chemical weapons, violent protests, etc.

Guiding Questions

Here are some questions to get you going:

1. Have your nation ever possessed biological weapons in point in history?
 - a. If so, how were they used?
 - b. How has your nation’s biological weapons impacted other nations?

2. Has your nation ever suffer long term damage from biological weapon attacks from other countries?
 - a. If so, who were they and why were you attacked?
 - b. Was it possible in any way to prevent this attack from happening?
 - c. How does this damage impact your nation today?
3. To what extent is this statement true? “*Weapons don’t kill people. People do.*” What is the perspective of your nation?
4. How much control should the UN have over the decisions made by individual countries? Where should be draw the line between ‘Maintaining peace’ and ‘Breaching national sovereignty’?

Bibliography

- “2018 National Biodefense Strategy.” *Homeland Security Digital Library*, United States. Federal Emergency Management Agency, 5 Oct. 2018, www.hsdl.org/c/2018-national-biodefense-strategy/.
- “The Biological Threat.” *Nuclear Threat Initiative - Ten Years of Building a Safer World*, www.nti.org/learn/biological/.
- “Chemical and Biological Weapons.” *Comité Internacional De La Cruz Roja*, 1, 25 July 2016, www.icrc.org/en/document/chemical-biological-weapons.
- “China.” *Nuclear Threat Initiative - Ten Years of Building a Safer World*, www.nti.org/learn/countries/china/chemical/.
- “Disarmament and Related Treaties – UNODA.” *United Nations*, United Nations, www.un.org/disarmament/publications/more/treaties/.
- “Fact Sheets & Briefs.” *Can the U.S. and Russia Avert a New Arms Race? | Arms Control Association*, www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/bwc.
- Frischknecht, F. “The History of Biological Warfare: Human Experimentation, Modern Nightmares and Lone Madmen in the Twentieth Century.” *EMBO Reports*, vol. 4, no. 6S, Jan. 2003, doi:10.1038/sj.embor.embr849.
- Lombardo, Crystal R. “ConnectUS.” *ConnectUS*, 5 Aug. 2015, connectusfund.org/12-integral-pros-and-cons-of-biological-warfare.
- “Peace and World Security Studies.” *Www.hampshire.edu*, www.hampshire.edu/pawss/peace-and-world-security-studies.
- “Russia.” *Nuclear Threat Initiative - Ten Years of Building a Safer World*,

www.nti.org/learn/countries/russia/chemical/.

“Russian Spy Poisoning: What We Know so Far.” *BBC News*, BBC, 8 Oct. 2018,
www.bbc.com/news/uk-43315636.

Schneider, Barry R. “Biological Weapon.” *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Encyclopædia Britannica, Inc., 27
Nov. 2017, www.britannica.com/technology/biological-weapon.

“Syria War: What We Know about Douma 'Chemical Attack'.” *BBC News*, BBC, 10 July 2018,
www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-43697084.

Forum: General Assembly I - Disarmament and International Security Committee

Issue: The question of the illicit small arms trade in Africa

Topic B: Illicit Small Arms Trade in Africa

Introduction

There are at least 800 million small arms and light weapons in circulation in the world today.

The vast majority of civilians who are dying in war zones around the world are dying at the hands of various armed groups who rely on a near infinite supply of cheap, easy and efficient weapons to rape, threaten, intimidate and brutalize civilians at every turn.

Cheap? How Cheap?

In some parts of the world, you can buy an AK-47 for as little as \$10. In some parts, it is easier to get access to an automatic rifle than it is to get access to clean drinking water.

Most countries in the world that are currently at war are in the global south - with a staggering total number of over 40 million people who have either died or been displaced as a result of such that violence. On the other hand, the top 20 exporters of small arms in the world consist mostly of countries in the global north.

This raises an important question: *Why is it that most of the weapons are produced in the developed world but end up in the developing world?* - Keep in mind this question as we continue to explore this topic.

With the Cold War coming to a close, global attention turned to the prevalence of localized armed conflict (low-intensity conflict - estimated to have caused million+ deaths in the past decade - 90% of which are civilian casualties from the indiscriminate use of violence). SALW, small arms and light weapons, lies at the heart of such violence.

According to the UN Panel of Governmental, *small arms* is defined as “arms designed for personal use. They can be maintained, carried and used by one person,” which consist of:

- Revolvers and Self-loading pistols
- Rifles and Carbines
- Assault Rifles
- Sub-machine guns and Light machine guns

Light weapons can be defined as “weapons that can be maintained, used and carried by small groups (2-3 persons), or transported by small vehicles or pack animals,” which consist of:

- Heavy machine guns
- Hand-held under-barrel
- Mounted grenade launchers
- Portable anti-aircraft guns
- Portable anti-tank guns
- Recoilless rifles
- Portable launchers of anti-tank missile and rocket systems
- Portable launchers of anti-aircraft missile systems (MANPADS)
- Mortars of calibres of less than 100 mm

SALW are not only used by militias, insurgents and combatants in conflict zones around the world but are often widespread amongst terrorist groups and crime syndicates as well. As SALW are concealable, lightweight and easy to transport and handle, the ways in which they can be smuggled are limitless. The unauthorized action of obtaining small arms is a universal concern due to the lightweight nature and low cost of these weapons, making them extremely easy to smuggle. The broad introduction of these weapons contribute to making peaceful areas, as well as conflict zones more dangerous, and the resulting instability creates a cycle of high demand for weapons. The total value of the global market for arms is estimated to be \$60 billion per year, with 10-20% of that being illicit trade.

The proliferation of small arms trade is no doubt a relevant issue in developed nations such as the US - where gun control has been a topic of much controversy. However, the nature of SALW trade in developed countries differs significantly from the rest of the world. Therefore for the purposes of a more

structured debate, we will focus on the SALW trade in developing nations (Emphasis on Africa) faced with feeble law enforcement, protracted conflict zones and weak state protection. Developing countries also face the dive of economic growth and foreign investment, diversion of government resources from important public services such as health and education, and deprivation of the labor and skills of small arm victims, some of whom are recruited into militias and gangs since young.

Sample Case Study: Somalia

In order to further understand the source and impact of the small arms trade, a case study of small arms in Somalia will be referenced. Somalia has experienced two decades of continuous civil conflict and is considered, to an extent - a failed state, where the government has lost all its authority over society. Both the US and the USSR has been sponsored NATO-caliber arms in Somalia (as part of the Cold War proxy theatre) since 1960. In 1991, civil war broke out across Somalia after rebels ousted President Mohamed Siad Barre - and when the Barre regime collapsed, the state's ammunitions stockpiles were looted, leading to a large proportion of such weapons falling into the hands of non-state actors. The residents (1.3 million) of Mogadishu , the capital of Somalia, was estimated to have owned more than a million guns. Furthermore, the fact that more arms were trafficked to Somalia through neighboring countries such as Saudi Arabia, Sudan and Yemen did not help. When the Cold War ended, an excess of small arms stockpiles flooded the international market, reaching developing countries such as Somalia where demand was very high.

Conflict continued till 2006, whereby radical offshoots of the ICU, such as Al-Shabaab, began waging jihad and igniting a new round of civil war - resulting in neighboring Ethiopia to become one of the largest weapon suppliers in sub-Saharan Africa, supplying SALW to opponents of Al-Shabaab.

Small arms does not end with the cessation of war. Like virus, once small arms are present in a country, they present a continuous risk - especially in societies with large accumulations of weapons. They frequently outlast peace agreements and are taken up in post-conflict period by criminal gangs and individuals concerned about personal security. In effect, this creates a 'culture of violence' whereby gun ownership does not simply stand for power and status, but becomes a requisite for survival and the most 'obvious' response to settling political and personal disputes - civilians are compelled to arm themselves for protection.

Further Sample Study to Explore

I. Flow of Arms to South Sudan

A. Points

1. Cold War theatre - As state law enforcement weakened and borders turned porous, foreign armed groups began to move into South Sudan, bringing along weapons, conflict and instability.
2. According to a UN report, China has sold over \$20 million in military equipment to South Sudan. Although China has stopped selling arms to South Sudan in 2014 as part of the arms embargo, large numbers of them still remain in circulation, many in the hands of non-state individuals.
3. Sudan is a prime example of how geopolitics played into SALW proliferation

B. Questions to consider

1. What are the socio economic and geopolitical factors behind SALW trade?
 - What are some immediate, medium-term and long-term measures to manage these?
2. What are the vested interests involved? What are the different levels of engagement needed to resolve these?

II. Mexico on Gun Smuggling and Cartel Violence

A. Points

1. Large proportion of US firearm directly flows to Mexico in a legal fashion through commercial sales - but approximately more than a quarter are diverted into the hands of non-state individuals.
 - SALW fuel cartel violence - as seen in: Mexico's homicide rate is 5x that of the US
 - Law enforcement are weak -- 63% of Mexicans do not trust their municipal police force; lack of funds and resources
2. SALW can contribute to the escalation of criminal violence
 - With reference to Africa, Illicit small arms have led to the violence intensification of inter-community tensions and conflicts over scarce resources. For instance, low-scale cattle rustling has been a feature of rural life in eastern Africa for centuries. However, approximately 20

years ago cattle rustlers began to acquire small arms illicitly, leading to hundreds of people getting killed and communities getting displaced - with the Karamojong and Pokot nomadic cattle herders believed to be the perpetrators (In April 2003, 2,000 Pokot cattle rustlers from Kenya killed 28 people and displaced thousands in eastern Uganda in a raid using illicit firearms).

3. Firearm sales from developed → developing countries are often legal - but fall into the wrong hands due to a lack of adequate monitoring

B. Questions to consider

1. How can law enforcement be strengthened? What gets in the way?
2. How can we stop legal trade from going into illegal hands? (to fix the lack of adequate monitoring)

Past Action

The subject of SALW was first addressed and broached by the UN in 1991, where Resolution A/RES/46/36 mandated an expert panel surveying the type and flow of illicit small arms around the world. In 1998, the UN Office on Disarmament (UNODA) was created both to promote nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament in conventional weapons such as landmines and small arms.

Arms Trade Treaty

The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) established a common standard for the international trade of conventional weapons. The treaty aims to:

- Reduce illicit small arms trade
- Reduce human suffering caused by illegal and irresponsible arms transfers
- Improve regional security and stability
- Promote accountability and transparency by state parties concerning transfers of conventional arms

The treaty has been signed by 130 states to date - this includes the top few arms exporters such as the US, UK, Germany, France, Italy and Spain.

Points to keep in mind is that the Arms Trade Treaty does not place restrictions on the types or quantities of arms that are bought, sold or possessed by states. In addition, it also does not impact a states

domestic gun control laws or other firearm ownership policies. It thus however focuses mainly on the monitoring of arms exports such that they do not violate existing arms embargoes and tracking of export destinations for greater data on SALW flows.

Questions to consider:

- *Why do some countries disagree with the SALW treaties?*
- *Considering the different levels of invasiveness for each measure (e.g. research, monitoring, embargoes, arms regulations), how can UN balance effective solutions with respect for individual nation's sovereignty?*

Programme of Action to Prevent Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects (PoA) - (2001)

Under this program, governments agreed to improve national small arms laws, import/export controls and stockpile management - and to engage in cooperation and assistance. This is further clarified in (which are ideas you can use in your own resolution):

- Determined to reduce the human suffering caused by the illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects and to enhance the respect for life and the dignity of the human person through the promotion of culture of peace
- To undertake a United Nations, within existing resources, for examining the feasibility of developing an international instrument to enable States to identify and trace in a timely and reliable manner illicit small arms and light weapons
- To consider further steps to enhance international cooperation in preventing, combating and eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons
- Encourage the UN and other appropriate international and regional organizations to undertake initiatives to promote the implementation of the Programme of Action
- Also encourage all initiatives to mobilize resources and expertise to promote the implementation of the Programme of Action and to provide assistance to States in their implementation of the Programme of Action
- Further encourage non-governmental organizations and civil society to engage, as appropriate, in all aspects of international, regional, subregional and national efforts to implement the present Programme of Action

In 2005, they also adopted the **International Tracing Instrument (ITI)**, which requires States to ensure that weapons are properly marked and that records are kept. Furthermore, it provides a framework for cooperation in weapons tracing - fulfilling one of the commitments governments made in the Programme of Action.

- *Improving weapons tracing is now part of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*
- *Meetings and National Reports on PoA and ITI are always combined*

Bamako Declaration - on an African Common Position on the Illicit Proliferation, Circulating and Trafficking of Small Arms and Light Weapons (2000)

The Bamako Initiative aims to increase the availability of essential drugs and other healthcare services for Sub-Saharan Africans. The declaration also calls for a greater harmonization of the legal instruments at sub-regional level and collaboration at regional and international levels to address insecurity, human rights violences and increasing transnational cross border treats in West Africa, as well as a stronger commitment and political will to end the impunity and fight corruption.

One of the common feature that both the Bamako Declaration and the UNPoA address is the establishment for national focal points (NFPs) - which are coordination bodies responsible for devising a national arms control action plan, as well as facilitating small arms control research, monitoring and the formulation of policy and legislation.

There are many African states that have created NFPs such as Kenya, Botswana, Namibia and Rwanda. However, many African governments have struggled to have a meaningful impact on illegal transfers as they lack the capacity to police their borders and points of entry effectively - as well as to secure state weapons stockpiles. Furthermore, there are currently no body at the continental level that regulates the arms trade in Africa.

Resolution 2220 (May, 2015)

The Security Council passed Resolution 2220, containing information on small arms and new provisions aiming to strengthen UN coordination and action of small arms, promoting an effective implementation of UN arms embargoes and support of the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT).

The resolution stressed that states must foster environments whereby people feel secure and safe - as the illicit transfer and misuse of SALW cause significant loss of life and contribute to instability.

Ultimately, the Council stressed the importance of increased security measures, training of professional personnel and assisting countries in its creation of proper procedures for the handling of SALW.

It should be carefully noted that 6 out of 15 Security Council members abstained from voting on Resolution 2220:

- Angola
- Chad
- China
- Russia
- Nigeria
- Venezuela

Possible Solution

The regional and international agreements identified above provide a road map for reducing the illicit small arms trade, both globally and in Africa. Implementing these agreements requires significant and sustained political will and a steady infusion of resources, but also with consideration to national sovereignty. While the responsibility for implementation lies primarily with African governments, the international community must also do its part.

- I. The ATT and PoA can be revised, or a new protocol and be created in order to address specific issues and set guidelines for governments
 - A. The ATT makes no mention of combating the illegal production of small arms
- II. Expand foreign aid programmed that target the illicit arms trade
 - A. Increase in funding for programmes that help African governments acquires the vehicles, equipment and training they require to control their land borders, seaports and airspace
 - B. Donor States should work closely with recipients to ensure that they have the capacity to use and maintain the equipment properly
- III. Increasing security and establish clearer communication to root out the illegal trading occurring within rebel and terrorist groups - as well as to reduce and prevent smuggling across borders
- IV. Examine and create an effective way to implement private workshops (similar to those in Peshawar and Pakistan) to create a system of control - ensuring that manufacturers are held accountable and monitored

- V. Create an effective way to mark and trace weapons upon production as well as encourage other nations to keep appropriate and accurate records
- VI. Measures addressing the corruption of officials and police forces
 - A. Training Programs
 - B. Equipments
 - C. Resources for Authorities
- VII. Reduction of Corruption within governments as international mutual legal assistance and information exchange is important in promoting stability and peace
- VIII. Cutting off arms transfers to regimes that repeatedly violate UN arms embargoes and aggressively investigate the networks of front companies run by Africa's 'merchants of death'

Guiding Questions

In addition to 'Questions to Consider' presented above, here are some more guiding questions to help you get started:

- I. Are small arms a problem in your country? What are your country's gun laws? What action did your government take in regards to illegal guns?
- II. What are some global choke points in the illegal arms trade? What can the UN and member nations do to better control these areas?
- III. What is your country's opinion on the ATT? What are some issues with the current guidelines from the ATT that are preventing countries from signing and ratifying it?
- IV. What are the roles of authorities and police forces in handling SALW? What resources do authorities and police forces need in order to effectively combat illegal trading, misuse and other issues involving SALW?
- V. How should governments address terrorist groups and armed parties that cause violent conflicts and disrupt stability?

Bibliography

"Guns Are Not the Problem." *The Toronto Star [Toronto, Ontario]*, 29 Sept. 2018, p. IN11. *Global Issues in Context*,
link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A556229043/GIC?u=thcis&sid=GIC&xid=e18ec6ad. Accessed 6 Jan. 2019.

Haymes, Thomas. "Africa's Small Arms Trade: An Infection of Guns and Chaos." *History Behind the Headlines: The Origins of Conflicts Worldwide*, edited by Sonia G. Benson et al., vol. 6, Gale, Detroit, MI, 2003. *Global Issues in Context*,

link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ2309006001/GIC?u=thcis&sid=GIC&xid=ba1fdc9d.

Accessed 6 Jan. 2019.

Klare, Michael T. "Arms Transfers and Trade." *Encyclopedia of American Foreign Policy*, edited by Richard Dean Burns et al., 2nd ed., vol. 1, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, NY, 2002, pp. 105–116. *Global Issues in Context*,

link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/CX3402300018/GIC?u=thcis&sid=GIC&xid=0e5ca67d.

Accessed 6 Jan. 2019.

Oxford, Troy. "Small Arms, Mass Destruction." *PBS*, WNET, 28 Nov. 2011,

www.pbs.org/wnet/women-war-and-peace/features/small-arms-mass-destruction/.

Sen, Amartya. "It's Time for Global Control of Small Arms; A Terrible Trade." *International Herald Tribune*, 26 June 2006, p. 6. *Global Issues in Context*,

link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A147456752/GIC?u=thcis&sid=GIC&xid=dc275a07. Accessed

6 Jan. 2019.

"Small Arms – UNODA." *United Nations*, United Nations,

www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/salw/.

"Small Arms." *The Columbia Encyclopedia*, by Columbia University and Paul Lagasse, 8th ed., Columbia University Press, New York, NY, 2018. *Credo Reference*,

search.credoreference.com/content/topic/small_arms. Accessed 6 Jan. 2019.

Forum: General Assembly I - Disarmament and International Security Committee

Issue: The question of implementing the UN resolution on The Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS)

Topic C: PAROS

Introduction

Since their ancient emergence, mankind has always been intrigued by space and its limitless and mysterious potential. Throughout the years, developed nations have acquired enough technology and skill to build highly dangerous and potent weapons on land, underwater, in the sky, and even in space. Today, the challenge for the coming generations is to maintain peace through disarmament in a world where several nation states such as but not limited to Russia, USA, and China already possess the technology to launch weapons into space. The General Assembly adopted and distributed the UN resolution on “Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space”(PAROS) with the aim to prevent an arms race occurring in space, and maintaining international peace, security, and cooperation.

The issue itself can be divided into two main categories:

Militarization of Outer Space and Weaponization of Outer Space

In regards to militarization of outer space, militaries all over the world rely on communication satellites - in association with Global Positioning Systems (GPS) - for ‘peaceful purposes.’ While their peacefulness remains profoundly doubtful, it must be noted that there are satellites which could be used for controlling bombing raids and other malicious purposes. Therefore, the issue of militarization of space should be deeply explored to ensure the safety and security of all nations around the globe.

Weaponization of outer space mainly refers to the transportation of potentially destructive satellite devices into the space orbit. Weapons which use space as a medium to travel before hitting their targets such as hypersonic technology vehicles or missiles which carry dual characteristics - destroy space assets - are also considered part of weaponization of outer space.

In the present date, there is no authenticated proof of any known weapons being deployed into outer space. However, China - in the year 2007, and the United States - in the year 2008, has successfully demonstrated anti-satellite capabilities. The United States is also believed to have been working on the development of a ballistic missile defence shield - but do do note that the idea of developing the missile defense itself could be considered an offense under the deception of ‘defence’. Nations across the globe should be alarmed.

Background

Precursors to the UN resolution on The Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space (PAROS)

Outer Space Treaty (1967)

On the common consensus that space should be used for peaceful purposes, this treaty built the basis for space law, banning all weapons of mass destruction from space. However, it did not ban any other type of weapons. It also stated that no particular country is allowed to 'claim' any object in space, such as the moon.

The Rescue Agreement (1968)

This is a follow up of the Outer Space Treaty above, expanding into Article V with details about what happens to astronauts and technology when landing in other countries. It states that all members of the treaty should help astronauts in need, and protects the rights of astronauts who land in other countries. Furthermore, it states that if space technology lands on the territory of another country, it must be returned to the home country. Note: the Apollo 11 mission was conducted in 1969 a year after, with the first man on the moon.

Liability Convention (1972)

This convention expands on space junk and the responsibilities of nations when conducting experiments and other projects in space. It outlines that if an item put in space inflicts damage on another nation, the state or country of where the item came from is responsible. There are several examples of this convention in motion. In 1978, the USSR satellite *Kosmos 954* crashed in Canada, leaving radioactive pieces across Northern Canada. Canada charged the USSR 6 million Canadian dollars. Second, In 1979, NASA's Skylab crashed in Australian territory and was fined 400 dollars.

Convention on Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1976)

With an explosion in the number of satellites and other objects in space, the UN required all nations with objects in space to register them and report the orbits of all their items. According to the [Index of Objects Launched into Outer Space maintained by the United Nations Office for Outer Space Affairs \(UNOOSA\)](#), “over 91% of all satellites, probes, landers, crewed spacecraft and space station flight elements launched into Earth orbit or beyond have been registered with the Secretary-General.”

Moon Agreement (1984)

With an ever-growing interest in exploiting the natural resources in space with unknown potential by the international community, this agreement states that the moon and all natural objects and resources in space should benefit all countries and people, but none in particular (an extension of idea that no one ‘claims’ space in the Outer Space Treaty above). Therefore, it bans any military use of the moon. Unfortunately, it is a failure as a treaty since only 5 countries have ratified it. There are two main reasons behind this, firstly because none of the countries had space programs that can send humans into space, and secondly, because it may be of human nature to wish to gain absolute possession of hard-earned resources without sharing it to every other nation.

Although the treaties above address the placement of weapons of mass destruction in space, they do not prevent any other type of weapon in space. Since states were on a common consensus that they were insufficient to protect the ‘common heritage of mankind’, the UN General Assembly’s Special Session on Disarmament mandated that negotiations should take place in the Conference on Disarmament (CD) and drafted PAROS. This document was edited and voted on a number of times. Simply, the terms of the treaty are as follows:

- Recognizes the limitations of existing laws and the Outer Space Treaty, in that by itself it does not guarantee the prevention of an arms race in outer space
- Advocates for further measures to prevent an arms race in outer space with an emphasis on states with space capabilities
- Let the Conference on Disarmament (the UN disarmament negotiating forum) to establish an ad hoc committee regarding PAROS resolution issues. (Note: Ad hoc is a Latin phrase meaning literally "for this", stating that the resolution isn't intended for other purposes)

Bloc Positions

The majority of UN states are concerned that the weaponization of space will lead to an arms race, thus they believe that a multilateral treaty is the only way to prevent such issue. The resolution should not limit space access but should focus on the prevention of deployment of weapons in space.

Existing Legal Framework Regarding the PAROS issue

Date	Document name	Development
1959	Resolution 1472 (XIV)	UN General Assembly established the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS)
1963	Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests In the Atmosphere, In Outer Space and Under Water	Prohibited all test detonations of nuclear weapons except for those conducted underground
1967	Outer Space Treaty	Forms the basis of international space law - governing the activities of states in the exploration and usage of Outer Space
1968	Rescue Agreement	Agreement on the rescue of astronauts and the return of objects launched into outer space
1971	Agreement relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization 'Intelsat'	https://treaties.un.org/doc/Publication/UNTS/Volume%201220/volume-1220-I-19677-English.pdf
1972	Liability Convention	Convention on International liability for damage caused by space objects
1975	Registration Convention	Convention on the registration of objects launched

		into outer space
1979	Moon Agreement	Agreement governing the activities of states on the moon and other celestial bodies
1985	Convention on the International Maritime Satellite Organization (INMARSAT)	Oversees certain public satellite safety and security communication services provided via the Inmarsat satellites. Further Info: http://www.imo.org/en/about/conventions/listofconventions/pages/convention-on-the-international-maritime-satellite-organization.aspx
1993~2011	CD DOCUMENTS	All related to PAROS

Possible Solution

- I. Formation of Group of Governmental Experts (GGE)
 - A. Main objective is to solve the issue of PAROS and to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings/miscommunications regarding activities in outer space.
- II. Transparency and confidence-building measures in outer space (TCBMs)
 - A. Draft calls for the state parties not to place any weapons in outer space, not to install any weapons on celestial bodies and not to use or threaten to use any kind of force against outer space objects.
 - B. Draft also calls upon member states to use the outer space strictly for peaceful purposes and follow the guidelines under the international law. In addition, the draft calls upon establishment of an executive organization to regulate additional protocols needed, record complaints against treaty violations and take measures to prevent violation of the treaties.
- III. Create an international code of conduct for outer space activities

Guiding Questions

Here are some questions to get you going:

- 1) How has your country been involved in space?
 - a) Can your country send objects into space?
 - b) Does it send up objects with the help of another country?
 - c) How might it be involved in space in the future?
- 2) What are some reasons that states might want weapons in space? Do we even need more weapons than we already have?
- 3) What 'counts' as a "Space weapon"? Many countries have weapons on the ground that can reach objects in space. Some missiles enter space before reaching their target. Are they space weapons?
- 4) Consider the fact that the GPS system made life easier and more effective for a lot of people, but is also used by militaries to identify and conduct long distance attacks. If any technology (even those meant for good) can have dual-capabilities, how do we stop countries from abusing them?
- 5) Perhaps an international association to establish a program that checks devices sent into outer space (?)
 - a) A classification system to help discriminate objects from weapons which are deployed into space (?)

Bibliography

Nuclear Files: Library: Correspondence: Robert Oppenheimer: Letter, December 23, 1953,

www.nuclearfiles.org/menu/key-issues/space-weapons/basics/introduction-weaponization-space.htm.

“How Many Satellites Are Orbiting the Earth in 2018?” *Pixalytics Ltd*, 22 Aug. 2018,

www.pixalytics.com/sats-orbiting-the-earth-2018/.

Pappalardo, Joe. “Space Weapons Are Coming and Nothing Can Stop Them Now.” *Popular Mechanics*, Popular Mechanics, 15 Feb. 2018,

www.popularmechanics.com/space/satellites/a15884747/no-treaty-will-stop-space-weapons/.

“Prevention of an Arms Race in Outer Space .” *Preparing for the 21st Century*,

fas.org/programs/ssp/nukes/ArmsControl_NEW/nonproliferation/NFZ/NP-NFZ-PAROS.html.

“Proposed Prevention of an Arms Race in Space (PAROS) Treaty.” *Nuclear Threat Initiative - Ten Years*

of Building a Safer World,

www.nti.org/learn/treaties-and-regimes/proposed-prevention-arms-race-space-paros-treaty/.

Ts. “United NationsOffice for Outer Space Affairs.” *The Outer Space Treaty,*

www.unoosa.org/oosa/osoindex/index.jsp?lf_id.

robert.wickramatunga. “United NationsOffice for Outer Space Affairs.” *The Outer Space Treaty,*

www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/spaceobjectregister/index.html.