

# PMUNC 2014

## Disarmament and International Security Committee

Chair: *Harvey Ren*

Director: *Diego Negron*



## Contents

---

Introduction.....	3
Topic A: Drone Usage in Modern Day Warfare.....	6
The War on Terror and Drones.....	7
Legality and Controversy of Drones.....	9
Topic B: Nuclear Disarmament and Nonproliferation.....	15
The Nonproliferation Treaty.....	16
Recent Controversies.....	16
North Korea.....	17
Iran.....	17

## Introduction

---

As World War II ended, members of the international community found it necessary to create a cross-national committee under the United Nations that would be able to establish overarching principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security.<sup>1</sup> As a result, the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) emerged as the First Committee of the General Assembly (GA). DISEC works to promote the creation of multilateral disarmament agreements, the implementation of international standards and regulations regarding certain types of weapons, and the establishment of collective measures to collectively reduce the amount of armaments across the world.

Unlike the United Nations Security Council, DISEC does not have the power to directly intervene in matters concerning the global community. Rather, as a subsidiary

organ of the General Assembly, DISEC aims to either present a solid legal foundation for GA resolutions or to offer advice to the Secretariat or Security Council when requested upon. However, this in no way means that the impact that DISEC can have is in itself limited; the most truly creative and innovative solutions emerge as a result of mutual cooperation and discussion. As a Member State of the Assembly, each delegation has the right to one vote. Votes taken on important issues, such as budgetary questions or recommendations on peace and security, require a two-thirds majority of the 193 Members States (regular procedures require only a simple majority).<sup>2</sup> Recently, DISEC representatives have aimed to reach consensus on issues, rather than deciding on a formal vote. This is how the President of the DISEC, after discussing with members and reaching agreements, can propose a

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter4.shtml>

---

<sup>2</sup><http://www.un.org/en/ga/about/background.shtml>

resolution without a vote.<sup>3</sup> This is turn should not be interpreted as a light task; the disputing interests of Member States mostly ensure that consensus is rarely achieved. Nevertheless, delegates should be knowledgeable of the possible trade-offs and concessions of their respective nations when entering debate during committee. The Committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission<sup>4</sup> and the Geneva-based conference on Disarmament<sup>5</sup>. In order to further promote transparency among nations, it is the only Main Committee of the General Assembly entitled to verbatim records coverage.<sup>6</sup>

First Committee sessions are structured in three distinctive stages:

1. General Debate
2. Thematic Discussions
3. Actions on drafts

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup><http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/DisarmamentCommission/UNDiscom.shtml>

<sup>5</sup><http://www.unog.ch/80256EE600585943/%28httpPages%29/BF18ABFEFE5D344DC1256F3100311CE9?OpenDocument>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.un.org/en/ga/first/index.shtml>

### ***General Debate:***

During committee, this stage will be represented through a generally short period of time where delegates will be able to express their concerns regarding the issues at hand. After several Members have spoken, the Dias would then proceed to entertain a motion to vote on which topic should be discussed first. Given the volume of DISEC, it is most likely that only one topic will be discussed throughout the whole committee session.

### ***Thematic Discussions:***

This stage will be represented through specific discussions and moderated caucuses on whichever topic is selected. In this committee, the two topics that are to be discussed are: Drone Usage in Modern-Day Warfare (Topic A) and Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation (Topic B).

### ***Actions on drafts:***

Throughout the various sessions, delegates are expected to maintain a high



level of debate. However, in reality, most of the work and dialogues that will take place occur outside the committee room or during unmoderated caucuses, where different delegates will form different clusters or

blocs depending on their nation's respective viewpoints. During these meetings, Member States should begin to draft working papers that will eventually become resolutions if approved.

## Topic A: Drone Usage in Modern-Day Warfare

### *Introduction:*

An unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV), more commonly known as a drone, refers to an aircraft that does not require a physical human pilot to operate. Drones can be used for surveillance and transmission of images from the ground to control centers, but more importantly, can be used to fire air-to-ground missiles at targets. There are numerous types of drones, the most common are:

1. MQ-1B Predator: used for what the military calls “medium-altitude, long endurance” missions and for intelligence gathering
2. MQ-9 Reaper: used primarily in a “hunter/killer role”, and secondarily for intelligence.
3. RQ-7 Shadow: used for reconnaissance, surveillance, target acquisition and battle damage assessment.

Due to the fact that drones have only been in usage for about a decade, there is minimal infrastructure governing their use. Since drones do not require an operator on board for the attack to occur, the use of drones in modern day warfare has raised questions about liability and responsibility for those who are killed in drone strikes. This has increasingly become an issue because the countries where the strikes occur have no jurisdiction over the operator controlling the drone and authorizing the attack. As of 2011, individual governments ran almost 700 active drone development programs. Opponents of drone usage argue that drones violate national sovereignty, one of the most fundamental and important principles of international law, as well as with basic human rights, such as the right to privacy or legal presumption of innocence.

Drones have been increasingly used in warfare, especially by the United States. With the lack of transparency and regulation, it is difficult to distinguish between an accident and a targeted killing as

drones can be programmed precisely to target a certain area and often cannot detect unexpected civilians in the area. Drone warfare has already claimed the lives of many and it is only fitting that the controversy surrounding whether the international community should ban drone usage altogether shall be addressed by DISEC.

### *The War on Terror and Drones*

It was with great fear and disbelief that the world witnessed the destruction of the World Trade Center towers and the loss of over 3,000 people on September 11, 2001. This incident, forever burned into the world's conscience as 9/11, resulted in the United States declaring and waging war on 'terror'. After more than 10 years of this ongoing crusade against terrorism, there have been some rewards. On May 2, 2011, Osama Bin Laden, founder and head of the Islamist militant group al-Qaeda, was successfully executed. Al-Qaeda has received several blows to its structural organization and has been arguably weakened by these

U.S. initiatives. Additionally, numerous insurgencies were subdued. But at what cost? The Congressional Research Service, a think tank that provides analysis for members of the US Congress, wrote in a 2010 report that Congress had approved a total of \$1.086 trillion for its military operations, since the Sept. 11, 2001 attacks on Washington and New York.<sup>7</sup> Others argue that the cost is even higher; the Washington Post newspaper reported a month after President Barack Obama declared combat operations in Iraq to be over that the true cost of that war alone could surpass the \$3 trillion mark.<sup>8</sup> The War on Terror, launched by President George W. Bush, has led to the death of more than 300,000 people. This includes 116,657 civilians, between 76,000 and 108,000 insurgents, 25,297 Iraqi and Afghan soldiers, and 8,975 American, British, and other coalition forces.<sup>9</sup> These daunting high figures have led political officials to look for alternative means to

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.dw.de/high-cost-little-gain-the-us-war-on-terror-is-short-on-dividends/a-15070322>

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> <http://owni.eu/2011/05/05/the-war-on-terror-in-numbers/>

reduce the casualties of war. Naturally, unarmed aerial vehicles (UAV), or drones, seemed only appropriate to deploy and even develop.

On January 2012, President Obama shocked the nation by admitting that the U.S. did in fact deploy drones within its own borders and other areas of the world. Its usage of drones on American territory is restricted to surveillance of the drug trade and illegal immigration across its border with Mexico. However, the U.S.'s focus has been in Afghanistan, where drones have been able to gather information on enemy locations and drop 'targeted' bombs without the risk of any American casualties. President Obama stated that "a lot of these strikes" have been in Pakistan's Federally Administered Tribal Areas, along the border with Afghanistan, where many members of the Taliban are known to be.<sup>10</sup> The President argued that: "for us to be able to get them in another way would involve probably a lot more intrusive military actions than the one

we're already engaging in". According to the New America Foundation, it is estimated that in Pakistan, between 1,953 and 3,279 people have been killed since 2004 -- and that between 18% and 23% of them were not militants. In Yemen, the group estimates, between 646 and 928 people have been killed in a combination of drone strikes and airstrikes, and that 623 to 860 of those killed were militants.<sup>11</sup> However, only about 2% of those killed by drone strikes have been "high-level" targets.

Across Somalia, Yemen, and Pakistan, the Obama administration has launched more than 390 strikes in the five years since the first attack on January 23, 2009; eight times as many were launched during the entire Bush administration. Even though drone strikes under the current administration have killed as nearly as six times as many people as were under Bush, the casualty rate, the number of people killed on average in each strike, has dropped from eight to six under Obama.<sup>12</sup> According

---

<sup>10</sup><http://www.cnn.com/2013/02/07/politics/drone-s-cnn-explains/>

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.



to a report conducted by CNN, the civilian casualty rate has fallen too, as strikes during the Bush years killed nearly more than three civilians in each strike on average. The diminishing casualty rates could be due to possible improvements in drone and missile technology, rising tensions between Pakistan and the US over the drone campaign, and greater pressure from the public to reduce drone usage.

### *Legality and Controversy of Drones*

This increased use of drones by the United States has had two recognizable consequences on the world geo-political scene. As other countries recognize the cost-effectiveness of drone warfare and the lack of legal precedents on the matter, more and more governments are pursuing the development of drones for their own use. Interestingly enough, the United States is demonstrating a lack of interest in developing drone technology. The military plans to spend \$2.4 billion on unmanned aerial vehicles, or UAVs, in 2015, compared to the original \$5.7 billion that the military

requested in the 2013 budget.<sup>13</sup> Conversely, however, other countries have shown strong interest in developing unarmed deadly vehicles. The only countries that currently possess armed drone programs are the United States, the United Kingdom, Israel, China and (possibly) Iran, Pakistan and Russia.<sup>14</sup> Also, both South Africa and India have expressed much interest on the matter. According to a recent report from the RAND organization, 23 countries have developed or are developing armed drones (view maps).

---

<sup>13</sup><http://www.defenseone.com/technology/2014/05/every-country-will-have-armed-drones-within-ten-years/83878/>

<sup>14</sup>[http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research\\_reports/RR400/RR449/RAND\\_RR449.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR400/RR449/RAND_RR449.pdf)



It is important to point out that not every country needs to produce its own weapons. China, for example, could export UAV technology to different nations, as it is already doing with “Wing Loongs” (knock-off predators) in Saudi Arabia. If anything, this future accessibility will further contribute to the “roboticization” of war in the Middle East. This massive potential production of drones urges the DISEC community to establish clear and concise guidelines regarding the “proper” use of drones in the battlefield or inside national borders. This is imperative as nations that once said they would never acquire such weapons are now expressing interest in them. Peter Singer, Princeton professor, ethicist, and author of “Wired For War: The Robotics Revolution and Conflict in the 21st Century”, argues that: “what was once viewed as science fiction, and abnormal, is now normal...Nations in NATO that said they would never buy drones, and then said they would never use armed drones, are now saying, ‘Actually, we’re going to buy them.’ We’ve seen the U.K., France, and Italy go

down that pathway. The other NATO states are right behind”.

This growing interest is alarming as disputes over sovereignty and human rights could emerge and deteriorate diplomatic channels, as was the case with the United States and Pakistan. Since 2001, Pakistan has provided assistance in counterterrorism efforts by capturing more than 600 al-Qaeda members and their allies.<sup>15</sup> Following the tragic, accidental killing of 24 Pakistani soldiers in November 2011 cross-border incident involving NATO’s International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF), Pakistan closed its ground lines of communications (GLOC) to both U.S. and NATO cargo as a way to protest drone usage in Pakistan. At that time, President Asif Ali Zardari condemned the U.S. for its infringement on human rights. It was not until July 2012 that cargo lines were re-opened. This incident has had numerous political repercussions on the international community’s opinion on drone warfare. Current Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz

---

<sup>15</sup> <http://www.state.gov/r/pa/ei/bgn/3453.htm>

Sharif stated during his speech at the 68th United Nations General Assembly at the UN headquarters in New York that US drone strikes are a violation of international law and infringe on Pakistan's sovereignty.<sup>16</sup>

Ben Emmerson, Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms, initiated a secret investigation following this tragic event. After meeting with high-ranking Pakistani officials, Emmerson concluded that the U.S. drone campaign "involves the use of force on the territory of another State without its consent and is therefore a violation of Pakistan's sovereignty".<sup>17</sup> In his report, Emmerson highlighted important points regarding the use of drones that are normally overlooked by U.S. officials. Militants are known to demand food and shelter from families against their will, so it follows that some women and children in

those homes can be potentially be killed by a strike. Also, militants that know they are being targeted park their cars next to homes of innocent people and then hide a few houses away, so the drone operator ends up targeting the wrong house. Finally, tribesmen carry guns all the time, thus leading to other erroneous strikes. Some have even gone to the length of establishing that drones are actually counterproductive and are not in the United States' interest. Akbar Ahmed, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institute, stated that: "if we are killing five or 10 or 15 militants, we are also creating 100, 200, 200,000 enemies for the U.S. For this new kind of warfare, the costs are enormous".<sup>18</sup> These points only emphasize that stringent and concise legal parameters have to be established at this DISEC meeting in order to further promote transparency.

Facing increasing international pressure, the United States released on May 2013 a report titled "US Policy Standards

<sup>16</sup>

<http://www.presstv.com/detail/2013/09/28/326418/rein-in-terror-drones-pakistan-tells-us/>

<sup>17</sup>

[http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia\\_pacific/un-us-drones-violate-pakistan-sovereignty/2013/03/15/308adae6-8d8a-11e2-adca-74ab31da3399\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/asia_pacific/un-us-drones-violate-pakistan-sovereignty/2013/03/15/308adae6-8d8a-11e2-adca-74ab31da3399_story.html)

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.ibtimes.com/drones-which-countries-have-them-surveillance-military-operations-map-1264271>

and Procedures for the Use of Force in counterterrorism,”<sup>19</sup> where the guidelines regarding the use of lethal force are defined.

The following principles sum up the report:

- 1) Near certainty that the terrorist target is present;
- 2) Near certainty that non-combatants will not be injured or killed;
- 3) An assessment that capture is not feasible at the time of the operation;
- 4) An assessment that the relevant governmental authorities in the country where action is contemplated cannot or will not effectively address the threat to US persons
- 5) An assessment that no other reasonable alternatives exist to effectively address the threat to US persons.

Additionally, the report emphasizes that “whenever the United States uses force in foreign territories, international legal principles, including respect for sovereignty

and the law of armed conflict, impose important constraints on the ability of the United States to act unilaterally – and on the way in which the United States can use force. The United States respects national sovereignty and international law”. The document even goes on to define non-combatants as “individuals who may not be made the object of attack under applicable international law”.<sup>20</sup> It also specifies that males of military age may be non-combatants; not every male of military age in the vicinity of a targeted strike are deemed to be combatants. The current UN investigator on drones, Ben Emmerson, welcomed the Obama’s administration’s publication of its rulebook, as it debunked the myth that the US is entitled to regard all males of military age as combatants, and therefore, legitimate targets.

As DISEC, we are urged to strive for the most precise, creative, and just solutions. Delegates should be prepared to

<sup>19</sup>[http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/2013.05.23\\_fact\\_sheet\\_on\\_ppg.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/uploads/2013.05.23_fact_sheet_on_ppg.pdf)

<sup>20</sup>

<http://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2013/05/24/white-house-briefings-lay-out-new-drone-rulebook-but-questions-remain/>



offer concrete proposals regarding the implementation of legal parameters that ensure the protection of human rights and the sovereignty of each nation.

## Topic B: Nuclear Disarmament and Non-Proliferation

---

### Early History

The first instance of the utilization of nuclear weapons occurred in 1945, when the United States famously dropped two atomic bombs (Fat Man and Little Boy) on the Japanese cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima, following Japanese attacks on the United States naval base at Pearl Harbor. Each bomb was devastating, causing a total of 140,000 deaths between the two by the end of the year. Five years later, as many as 340,000 people had died from the two explosions. Following this, an international outcry came out against the possibility of a nuclear arms race.<sup>21</sup>

The United States and Soviet Union asserted that they were all for putting nuclear weapons and development under international control; however, it was soon discovered that the Soviet Union had been

actively developing their nuclear arms program in an attempt to catch up to the United States, and by 1946, no one believed the attempt to prevent a nuclear arms race had succeeded. Other countries followed suit in developing their own nuclear arms programs, and by 1964, (in addition to the United States and Soviet Union which had successfully tested H-bombs), the United Kingdom, France, and China also had successfully tested nuclear arms.<sup>22</sup>

In the 1960s, political leaders and experts became increasingly concerned that if this continued at its current trajectory, countries would soon cross the nuclear threshold. Thus, the United States and the Soviet Union decided to negotiate an international treaty prohibiting the spread of nuclear weapons without banning the use of nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.<sup>23</sup> The result was the Non-Proliferation Treaty, or NPT.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup>[http://www.nobelprize.org/educational/peace/nuclear\\_weapons/readmore.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/educational/peace/nuclear_weapons/readmore.html)

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid.

<sup>24</sup><http://www.state.gov/t/isn/npt/>

### *The Non-Proliferation Treaty*

The NPT was opened for signatories in 1968 and went into force in 1970.<sup>25</sup> In 1995 the Treaty was extended indefinitely. 190 countries have signed the treaty, more than any other arms treaty in the world.<sup>26</sup> There are two classifications of states under the treaty: nuclear-weapon states (NWS) and non-nuclear-weapon states (NNWS). The nuclear-weapon states include: the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France, and China. All countries have signed the treaty with the exception of Israel, India, Pakistan, and newly, South Sudan.<sup>27</sup> There are three major pillars of the treaty—non-proliferation, disarmament, and peaceful use of atomic energy. Articles I and II of the treaty hold that NWS agree not to aid NNWS in the development or acquisition of nuclear weapons, and NNWS promise against the pursuit of such weapons. Article III tasks the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), a watchdog agency within

the UN<sup>28</sup>, with the inspection of NNWS' nuclear facilities. Article IV recognizes the right of NNWS to develop nuclear technology for peaceful purposes to its furthest extent, as well as encourages the “fullest possible exchange” of nuclear-related energy and information (for non-weapons purposes) between NWS and NNWS. DISEC has a crucial role in deciding how best to enforce the terms of the NPT and how to encourage countries to sign on and abide by the NPT's terms.

### *Recent Controversies*

As apparent from this treaty, the international community has always tried to limit, control, and eventually eliminate the use and proliferation of nuclear weapons. However, in recent years this has not always been so successful. Controversies have arisen surrounding the purported or documented use or development of nuclear weapons.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup><http://www.un.org/disarmament/WMD/Nuclear/NPT.shtml>

<sup>27</sup>[http://www.nobelprize.org/educational/peace/nuclear\\_weapons/readmore.html](http://www.nobelprize.org/educational/peace/nuclear_weapons/readmore.html)

<sup>28</sup><http://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/nptfact>

*North Korea*

North Korea announced in 2002 that it was reopening its nuclear weapons program, violating a 1994 agreement to abandon nuclear ambitions in order to construct two lightwater nuclear reactors and to receive oil shipments from the US. North Korea claimed they were justified in doing so because oil shipments had ceased.<sup>29</sup>

Later in 2003, the Six-Party Talks began between North Korea, South Korea, Japan, China, Russia, and the United States in the hopes of denuclearizing the Korean peninsula. However, talks have been suspended since 2009. After the death of Kim Jong Il, Pyongyang agreed to suspend nuclear tests in exchange for food aid from the US in 2012. But after a dispute with the US over launch of a missile later that year, Pyongyang declared the agreement void. In 2013, North Korea announced that all nuclear facilities at Yongbyon would be reopened. North Korea conducted nuclear weapons tests in 2006, 2009, and 2013.

<sup>29</sup> <http://www.globalissues.org/article/698/north-korea-and-nuclear-weapons>

In May 2014, imagery showed activity at one of the major reactors. As of October 2014, imagery suggests that this reactor may be shut down or working at reduced power.<sup>30</sup>

*Iran*

Iran's nuclear crisis has arisen as a result of suspicions by world powers that Iran has not been honest about its nuclear program, has been hiding things, and is seeking to build a nuclear bomb.<sup>31</sup>

Iran began its nuclear development program in the 1950s with the aid of the US's Atoms for Peace Program. Iran signed the NPT in 1970. Iran had ambitious plans. However, following the Iranian Revolution in 1979, the Ayatollah Khomeini declared the nuclear program "un-Islamic" and had it terminated. In 1984, Khomeini reversed this, and sought international support to continue constructing the Bushehr reactors.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> <http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/north-korea/>

<sup>31</sup> <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-11709428>

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/iran/>

In 2002, Iran's nuclear program became public when an opposition group revealed secret activity including construction of a Uranium enrichment plant at Natanz. The IAEA began to investigate, and could not find evidence to validate Iran's assertion that nuclear progress was strictly for peaceful purposes.

Thus, the US and EU began to press Iran to stop its enrichment of uranium.<sup>33</sup>Talks broke down, however, with the 2005 election of President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. The IAEA reported Iran to the UN Security Council for violation of the NPT. The Security Council has repeatedly mandated that Iran stop its enrichment program, also imposing sanctions. The US and EU began imposing additional sanctions in 2012.

Talks have progressed somewhat since the election of President Hassan Rouhani. President Obama and President Rouhani held the first direct talks between their

respective countries since 1979 in September 2013.

Following this progress, a Joint Plan of Action was created between IAEA and Iran, which held that a "mutually-agreed long-term comprehensive solution that would ensure Iran's nuclear programme will be exclusively peaceful," would be attained by July 20, 2014. A comprehensive accord was not reached by this deadline. The deadline has now been extended to November 24, 2014.<sup>34</sup>

Additionally, today, there continues to as well be widespread fear of terrorist organizations such as ISIS obtaining nuclear weapons. This would present an incredible threat to international security.

DISEC's purpose as a committee is to find solutions to reduce the overall number of nuclear arms in the world, set guidelines for global security regarding these matters, as well as find a place for nuclear energy in the context of noncompliant rogue states and a growing demand for alternative energy sources.

---

<sup>33</sup><http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-11709428>

---

<sup>34</sup><http://www.nti.org/country-profiles/iran>