

Model United Nations at UCSD presents
On Saturday April 25th, and Sunday April 26th, 2015

General Assembly – First Committee

Disarmament and International Security



TritonMUN XI



Introduction

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to TritonMUN XI! My name is Ashraf Beshay and I'm a second year majoring in Human Biology here at UC San Diego. I'm an international student from Cairo, Egypt and I am very glad to be serving as the Chair of the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC). My Model UN experience constitutes around 16 conferences, including a conference in The Hague, Netherlands where I was also lucky to visit the International Court of Justice. I've participated in committees that range from Security Council and ICJ to the Human Rights Commission and ECOSOC. Last year, I had the pleasure of serving as the Security Council Chair of TritonMUN X. As you might guess, Model UN is a true passion for me. Not only does it teach me about international issues that impact our world and how to actively partake in resolving pressing matters, but it also gives me the opportunity to travel and make friends from all over the world while getting exposed to different cultures and ways of thinking. Some of my other passions include soccer, watching TV series, and being active in the UC San Diego community. I've very excited to moderate discussions on the issue of Arctic Militarization as it is a unique subject that has the potential of developing quickly. Therefore, our main mission is to implement preventative measures to keep the area safe and secure. I look forward to hearing your thoughts on how we can maintain peace in the area. If you have any questions, I'd be more than glad to answer them; my email is abbeshay@ucsd.edu. I wish you the best of luck in your research and preparation!

Sincerely,

Ashraf Beshay

Disarmament and International Security Chair



TritonMUN XI

Greetings, Delegates!

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to the 2015 Triton Model United Nations Conference here at UC San Diego. My name is Jonathan Chen, a second year Political Science/International Relations double major here at UCSD, and I will serve as your vice chair. My MUN experience started in my sophomore year in high school, and I am experienced in smaller committees including ICC, ICJ, Security Council, crisis committees, and cabinets. Outside of MUN I have worked alongside multiple elected officials and non-profit organizations, with special focus on American politics and U.S – Asia relations. In this particular committee, I look forward to quality research. The issues we will be addressing, Small Arms Trafficking and Arctic Militarization, are important issues that, if not properly addressed, could result in significant devastation to world stability and development. Knowing the cause of a problem is the first step of proposing a solution, and quality research will surely promote more enriched debate during the conference. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me. I look forward meeting you in April!

Sincerely your chair,

Jonathan Chen

joc023@ucsd.edu



Topic A: Small Arms Trafficking in Developing Nations

I. Background

Small arms trafficking refer to the illicit transfer of weapons, accessories, and ammunition that are light, cheap, and easily handled and concealed. Modern military conflicts, including inter-states conflicts and civil wars, are fought primarily with small arms. They also serve as the weapon of choice for “terrorism, organized crime, and gang warfare”,¹ resulting in a breeding ground for small arms trafficking since World War II. While small arms trafficking exist as a world issue, developing nations and regions with military conflicts are especially affected by the cycle: a constant illicit supply of small arms prolongs conflicts, resulting in civilian casualties, and facilitates what the UN call as “a vast spectrum of human rights violations, including killing, maiming, rape and other forms of sexual violence, enforced disappearance, torture, and forced recruitment of children by armed groups”.² In addition, conflicts fueled by small arms trafficking serve as the greatest obstacle to development, indirectly promoting poverty, health issues, lack of infrastructure, and economic failure. Nations most affected by small arms trafficking, and subsequent conflicts, are also mostly “behind in attaining the Millennium Development Goals”.³ The United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs call small arms trafficking as “a worldwide scourge”,⁴ as they are, and continue to be, one of the most direct challenges to world peace and development.

Illicit trafficking involves two steps: production and distribution. Globally, at least

¹ United Nations. "UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

² Ibid

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid



1134 companies from 98 countries are engaged in production of light weapons and their ammunition; about a dozen countries engaged in production of advanced guided light weapons.⁵ UNODA reported, however, that less information exist on small arms than that of nuclear weapons. Reliable data sets cannot be established as nations and companies are unwilling to publicize information on “production, holdings, trade, legislation, and use⁶” of light weaponry. No accurate figures exist on the number of small arms in circulation, even though UN sources suggest the number is at least 875 million. In 2012, sources suggest that the international small arm trade is estimated to be worth around \$8.5 billion,⁷ an absolute increase from statistics estimated in previous years. UN sources also indicate an annual production rate between 7.5 to 8 million pieces, while information on craft production remains unclear. Civilians purchase more than 80% of the fire arms that are manufactured worldwide each year,⁸ suggesting a majority of illicit firearms transfer tend to be conducted by private entities. However, certain governments also contribute to the illicit trade by “deliberately arming proxy groups involved in insurgencies against rival governments,” and mostly take place in regions of severe conflicts, particularly in African regions. Many small arms were also distributed to developing nations during the Cold War by the U.S. and U.S.S.R,⁹ and subsequently that arsenal continues to be distributed across nations, further enhancing the illicit distribution of small arms.

In developing nations with regions of conflict, more than 90% of civilian casualties are direct results of light weaponry.¹⁰ While persistent small arms trafficking prolong conflicts, they also delay relief efforts, obstruct peace initiatives, and enhance human rights

⁵“Illicit Trafficking.” *Small Arms Survey* - .N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

⁶ United Nations. “UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons.” *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

⁷“Illicit Trafficking.” *Small Arms Survey* - .N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

⁸“Small Arms and Civilian Casualties.” - *Global Issues*.N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

⁹ Ibid

¹⁰ Ibid



abuses. The United Nations suggests that armed conflict, which is directly sustained by small arms trafficking,¹¹ is the main cause of dislocation, hunger, poverty, and delay to human development. According to the World Bank, “nothing undermines investment climates as much as armed insecurity.” While the UN has dedicated much effort to address small arms trafficking, many governments worldwide remain reluctant to cooperate, while companies exacerbate the problem by fueling regional black markets.¹² Small arms trafficking can no longer be ignored, as humanitarian situation in affected regions deteriorate, severely undermining U.N. initiatives and delaying human development.

¹¹ United Nations. "UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

¹² "Illicit Trafficking." *Small Arms Survey* - .N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.



II. United Nations Involvement

Due to its destabilizing nature, multiple U.N. committees and agencies have consistently addressed small arms trafficking. The General Assembly, for instance, adopted numerous resolutions, addresses, and reports on the topic of small arms trafficking. Some of the General Assembly's most recent resolutions reaffirmed proposals and resolutions brought in historical meetings and discussion, while seeking new initiatives that called greater involvement from U.N. member states, more effective tracking protocol, as well as an arms trade treaty.¹³

In 2013, the Secretary General issued a special report to the General Assembly, addressing progress since the second United Nations Conference to Review Progress Made in the Implementation of the Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects and the adoption of the Arms Trade Treaty. The report, the most recent official acknowledgement about illicit arms trafficking, affirmed implementation of General Assembly resolutions 67/41 and 67/58, which broadly addressed small arms trafficking and member states' role.¹⁴ Regions mostly impacted by illicit trade, existing UN efforts, human rights issues, protocols against illicit manufacturing and trading, as well as efforts to establish an international standard regulating arms trafficking have been addressed by the committee in the report.

In April 2013, the Arms Trade Treaty was adopted by the General Assembly and was open for signatories by June. The treaty seeks to "establish the highest possible common international standards for the regulation of the international trade in conventional arms...[including] small arms and light weapons as well as ammunition, parts, and components".

¹³ United Nations. "UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

¹⁴ "United Nations Official Document." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 23 Dec. 2014.



In the same year, the United Nations Trust Facility Supporting Cooperation on Arms Regulation was launched, with the purpose of supporting all aspects of the Arms Trade Treaty, including trafficking regulation and ammunition controls.¹⁵ The programs were supported by UNDP, which sought participation from various countries, regional organizations and NGOs in order to facilitate the Arms Trade Treaty.

Several other U.N. mechanisms, including the U.N. Register for Conventional Arms and Program of Action Implementation Support System have continued to work with U.N. member states, seeking to establish an international guideline for more effective small arms control. The Office for Disarmament Affairs has also issued numerous reports regarding to the most recent development regarding to small arms trafficking and manufacturing, while recognizing some of the greatest arms manufacturers and exporters among member states.¹⁶

The U.N. Security Council has been particularly active on the topic of small arms trafficking, recognizing it as a great threat to international peace and security.¹⁷ Resolution 2117, passed in 2013, recognized the challenges faced by different regions and countries, and welcomed greater participation from member states, referring to the statements and resolutions adopted by Secretary General and General Assembly in the same year. The Security Council calls on parties to armed conflict to comply with “obligations under international humanitarian law to respect and protect humanitarian personnel, facilities, and relief consignments, and to take measures to eradicate the negative impact of the illicit transfer, destabilizing accumulation and misuse of small arms and light weapons on humanitarian actors”,¹⁸ as it also encourages all member states to abide by the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized

¹⁵"United Nations Official Document." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

¹⁶ "UNODA - UN Register of Conventional Arms." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 23 Dec. 2014.

¹⁷ Security Council Meetings related to Small Arms.

¹⁸"United Nations Official Document." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.



crime and its protocols.

Despite numerous resolutions adopted by United Nations, small arms trafficking remain difficult to address as member states – especially leading arms manufacturers – remain reluctant to fully execute existing protocols. While regulations exist, full cooperation from member states is expected in future endeavors, and any further treaties will require greater participation from member states.



III. Bloc Positions

Europe and North America

Most countries in this bloc are developed nations, and consequently retain less armed conflicts and organized crimes. Certain countries, especially those in Eastern Europe, are more affected by uncontrolled small arms trafficking. The South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of the Small Arms and Light Weapons, which is established under the Stability Pact and works alongside UNDP, along with other regional organizations, serve to reduce damages inflicted by small arms trafficking.¹⁹ Several countries, including the United States, China, and Russian Republic, remain the leading small arms manufacturers and exporters in the world, frequently adding complications to the regulation of small arms trafficking as manufacture and trade information for these nations remain unclear.²⁰

Middle East

Decades of civil unrest, international conflicts, and terrorist activities have made Middle East extremely susceptible to small arms, light weapons, and their related trafficking. Since the Arab Spring, the region has experienced a drastic growth of illicit small arms flow. Small arms utilized in previous conflicts now spread to different regions as conflicts intensified and expanded to other nations. Due to a lack of regulation illicit arms trade thrived in the region. Several international agencies – including the League of Arab States and UN Program for Action

¹⁹"South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons." *South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons - SEESAC.org*. N.p., n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

²⁰Malhotra, Aditi. "The Illicit Trade Of Small Arms" *Geopolitical Monitor*. N.p., 19 Jan. 2011. Web. 2 Jan. 2015.



– have developed monitoring programs in the region.²¹ Still, due to the continuation of military conflict and regional governments' inability to act, violent conflict and arms trafficking remain the leading contributors to regional instability.

Africa

Continental Africa is one of the most susceptible regions to small arms trafficking in the world. Decades of inter/intra state conflicts, fueled by regional, ethnic, and religious tensions, promote an environment that breeds violence, which in turn calls for more arms trafficking.²² Nations long affected by military conflicts, including Congo and Libya, are especially affected. Nations in this bloc actively seek to monitor and control flow of illicit arms and a series of regional organizations were consequently established. Efforts to identify and trace the origin of arms were prioritized in many situations, according to international observations.²³ Corruption and unstable transition of power, however, are some of the greatest challenges to these efforts.

Asia and Pacific

Small arms trafficking account for the majority of organized crimes in this region. Since the end of Vietnam War, the region saw rise to a wide variety of criminal activities: anti-governmental insurgencies, narcotic related crimes, as well as other organized crimes. In recent years these activities have grown to become the most serious threats to regional stability. Regional security organizations such as ASEAN have collaborated in recent years in hope to bring down levels of illicit trades.²⁴ Lack of transparency and multilateral cooperation remain the greatest challenge in the region, as countries in the region have become increasingly active in

²¹Malhotra, Aditi. "The Illicit Trade Of Small Arms" Geopolitical Monitor. N.p., 19 Jan. 2011. Web. 2 Jan. 2015.

²²Ibid

²³"Illicit Trafficking." *Small Arms Survey* - .N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

²⁴Malhotra, Aditi. "The Illicit Trade Of Small Arms" Geopolitical Monitor. N.p., 19 Jan. 2011. Web. 2 Jan. 2015.



light arms exportation.²⁵

Latin America and Caribbean

In recent years this bloc experienced an increase in scale for small arms trafficking, primarily due to intensified gang violence and cross border criminal activities. Civilians in this nation also tend to acquire illicit firearms on large scale, mainly due to concerns over securities.²⁶ Regional countries have expressed interests in jointly countering organized crimes and small arms trafficking by imposing strict legislation and better monitoring networks, while also collaborating with UN agencies in the region.²⁷

²⁵ United Nations. "UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

²⁶ Godnick, William, Robert Muggah, and Camilla Waszink. "Stray Bullets: The Impact of Small Arms Misuse in Central America." (n.d.): n. pag. Oct. 2002. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

²⁷ Rodgers, Dennis, Robert Muggah, and Chris Stevenson. *Gangs of Central America: Causes, Costs, and Interventions*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey, 2009. Small Arms Survey, May 2009. Web. 2 Jan. 2015.



IV. Questions to Consider

1. Though variations exist, violence often breeds small arms trafficking. Hence, would it be more effective to first stop violence, or to eradicate sources of arms trafficking?
2. Different regions/countries often face different challenges that are sometimes latent. Political motives and corruption often serve as the perfect camouflage for small arms trafficking. Sometimes, these issues cannot be operated on international platforms alone. What are some possible initiatives to wipe out these latent motives?
3. U.N. and other international agencies reported that information on small arms trafficking is difficult to obtain. What role, if any, do respective national governments play, either to enhance or sabotage efforts to investigate small arms trafficking?
4. Consider existing solutions – treaties, protocols, etc. Are they effective? What are their limitations, pros and cons? Are nations faithfully executing them as abided?
5. All illicit trafficking require dealers. Who are the dealers in this situation?
6. Consider existing resolutions. Do they require further amendments, or are they fundamentally flawed in a way that requires additional actions?



V. Suggested Sites

<http://www.un.org/disarmament/> - United Nations: Disarmament

<http://www.poa-iss.org/Poa/poa.aspx> - United Nations Program of Action

<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/> - Survey on Small Arms

<https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/> - Central Intelligence Agency



VI. Bibliography

- Godnick, William, Robert Muggah, and Camilla Waszink. "Stray Bullets: The Impact of Small Arms Misuse in Central America." (n.d.): n. pag. Oct. 2002. Web. 02 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/B-Occasional-papers/SAS-OP05-Central-America.pdf>>.
- "Illicit Trafficking." *Small Arms Survey* - .N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/de/weapons-and-markets/transfers/illicit-trafficking.html>>.
- Malhotra, Aditi. "The Illicit Trade Of Small Arms" *Geopolitical Monitor*. N.p., 19 Jan. 2011. Web. 2 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.geopoliticalmonitor.com/the-illicit-trade-of-small-arms-4273/>>.
- Rodgers, Dennis, Robert Muggah, and Chris Stevenson. *Gangs of Central America: Causes, Costs, and Interventions*. Geneva: Small Arms Survey, 2009. Small Arms Survey, May 2009. Web. 2 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/B-Occasional-papers/SAS-OP23-Gangs-Central-America.pdf>>.
- "Small Arms and Civilian Casualties." - *Global Issues*. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014. <<http://www.globalissues.org/article/78/small-arms-they-cause-90-of-civilian-casualties>>.
- "South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons." *South Eastern and Eastern Europe Clearinghouse for the Control of Small Arms and Light Weapons* - *SEESAC.org*. N.p., n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.seesac.org/>>.



"United Nations Official Document." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

<http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S%2FRES%2F2117%282013%29>.

"United Nations Official Document." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 23 Dec. 2014.

<http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A%2F68%2F171>.

"UNODA - Small Arms and Light Weapons." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Nov. 2014.

<<http://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/salw/>>.

"UNODA - UN Register of Conventional Arms." *UN News Center*. UN, n.d. Web. 23 Dec.

2014. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/Register/>>.



Topic B: Arctic Militarization

I. Background

The Arctic Region is the northernmost area of the globe, also commonly referred to as the North Pole. It is not a place one thinks about often when it comes to human presence, let alone weaponry and militarization. However, as the icecaps melt due to the unfortunate global warming phenomenon, more routes become available for different uses such as trade. The Arctic is rich in resources; it has undiscovered natural resources that include what is estimated to be 30% of the world's natural gas and 13% of its oil.²⁸ Therefore, it is expected that with time, nations will scramble to establish themselves in the Arctic to exploit its resources.

For the most part, the Arctic is viewed as an unoccupied region that nations have slowly begun to establish their presence. However, there are some initiatives from countries to collaborate on the use of the Arctic. Most importantly, the Arctic Council, the largest intergovernmental committee pertaining to the Arctic Region, was established in 1996 serves to ensure that there is communication between countries regarding Arctic presence.²⁹ There are 8 members in this council: the United States, Canada, Russia, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden. All these nations possess territories in the Arctic region and are therefore granted the membership status. There are also 26 observer states that include France and the United Kingdom. Additionally, there are permanent participants of the council, all of which are organizations that represent different indigenous peoples of the Arctic such as the Russian

²⁸Singh, Abhijit. "The Creeping Militarization of the Arctic." *The Diplomat*. The Diplomat, 16 Oct. 2013. Web. 7 Dec. 2014.

²⁹Gabriel, Dana. "U.S. Arctic Ambitions and the Militarization of the High North." *www.globalresearch.ca/*. Global Research, 24 July 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.



Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North and the Arctic Athabaskan Council.³⁰ The Arctic Council focuses on environmental issues rather than military and security purposes. The Council's policy forbids the discussion of topics relevant to security. Just recently, members of this Council signed the "Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution Preparedness and Response in the Arctic"³¹ to be able to effectively respond in the event that oil pollution accidents were to happen.

A few nations are trying to utilize the arctic for their own geopolitical purposes. Most notably, Russian President Vladimir Putin has announced that Russia will be establishing naval bases in the Arctic and those should be functional by December 1, 2014 and it is making headway on that. It is currently attempting to build a naval facility there.³² This came in response to claims made by Canada to certain areas in the Arctic. Some Norwegian Scientists said they had seen a Russian submarine emerge in the Arctic. "A convoy of 10 Russian warships – led by missile cruiser Peter the Great and accompanied by four nuclear-power icebreakers," crossed the Arctic Ocean, covering a distance of 2,000 miles.³³ Also, Canada has been organizing an operation called Operation Nanook held at several locations in the Arctic as a way of "asserting Canada's sovereignty."³⁴ In many instances, different nations have made claims to the same regions. This shows a clear disconnect between countries with regards to territorial claims. For

³⁰Coffey, Luke. "No European Union Membership in the Arctic Council." *Www.heritage.org*. The Heritage Foundation, 05 Apr. 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.

³¹Gabriel, Dana. "U.S. Arctic Ambitions and the Militarization of the High North." *Www.globalresearch.ca/*. Global Research, 24 July 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.

³²Bora, Kukil. "Russia Is Building A Network of Military Bases In The Arctic." *Business Insider*. Business Insider, Inc, 25 Nov. 2014. Web. 09 Dec. 2014.

³³Singh, Abhijit. "The Creeping Militarization of the Arctic." *The Diplomat*. The Diplomat, 16 Oct. 2013. Web. 7 Dec. 2014.

³⁴"Operation NANOOK." *Www.forces.gc.ca/*. National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, 17 Nov. 2014. Web. 11 Dec. 2014.



instance, the Lomonosov Ridge, “an underwater mountain chain”³⁵, raises one of the most contentious debates as Canada, Denmark, and Russia make the same claim to it. Canada believes that the area is an extension of the Canadian Ellesmere Island, as Denmark argues that it’s an extension of the Greenland’s mass, and Russia contends it’s an extension of the Russian continental shelf.³⁶ Claims are submitted to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea(UNCLOS).

³⁵Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. www.ufrgs.br/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

³⁶Ibid.



II. United Nations Involvement

The first conference organized by the United Nations revolving around the international laws of the seas occurred in Geneva in 1956. Four significant conventions took place in this conference and they were “the Convention on the Territorial Sea and Contiguous Zone; the Convention on the Continental shelf; the Convention on the High Sea and the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of Living Resources of the High Seas,” ending in the year of 1958.³⁷ Another conference, held in New York in 1973, had the goal of writing binding legislation. By 1982, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) was ratified, while implementation started November 16, 1994 and continues to this day. This is a treaty with an approved framework that regulates the usage of the seas and marine environment to ensure equity and fairness.³⁸ It also strives to preserve the living resources in the seas. The UNCLOS defines navigational rights and addresses matters of sovereignty.

In addition, coastal countries such as Russia and Norway have submitted requests for territorial claims to the United Nations.³⁹ Some requested have been granted, mostly those of Norway, while others await a verdict. It is therefore crucial to make the right decisions with territorial grants, as that would give a nation the right over an area of the Arctic Circle.

³⁷Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. www.ufgrs.br/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Singh, Abhijit. "The Creeping Militarization of the Arctic." *The Diplomat*. The Diplomat, 16 Oct. 2013. Web. 7 Dec. 2014.



III. Bloc Positions

Northern Coastal Nations

Countries like Canada, Russia, Norway, Sweden, Finland, Iceland, and Denmark are conveniently situated near the Arctic. That makes exploiting the North Pole a lot more tempting as they can easily use it for strategic plans and economic prospects. Consequently, many of these states have made territorial claims to sea regions and land areas in the Arctic Circle.⁴⁰ The close proximity to the Arctic makes its use more beneficial to them than any other bloc. Canada, for example, has 40% of its landmass in the Arctic. As a member of the council, Canada has developed strong salience on this matter and handles most of its foreign policy pertaining to the Arctic in the Arctic Council.⁴¹ The Kingdom of Denmark, composed of Denmark, Faroe Island, and Greenland, has published its strategic policy in the Arctic. This document affirms Denmark's commitment for a "peaceful, secure and safe resolution to the region, with self-sustaining growth, cooperation with the indigenous people and attention to the climate change".⁴² Finland has also published its Arctic Policy Strategy in 2010 that focuses on seven priority fields: security, protection of the environment, defense and inclusion of indigenous people, European Union, institutionalization of the Arctic Council, and infrastructure for the region and the economy. Finland's strategy gives great importance to the economic sector and emphasizes Finland's technical expertise for exploitation of the Arctic's natural resources.⁴³ Norway has similar pillars to that of Denmark and Finland and has a high stake in gaining from the Arctic.

⁴⁰Stroobants, Nathalie. "Militarization of the Arctic." *Study-Guide – DISEC*(2014): n. pag. 2014.emimun.org. Emirates International Model United Nations. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

⁴¹Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. www.ufrgs.br/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

⁴² Ibid

⁴³ Ibid



Since Norway possesses the technology to drill for oil, it has plans to drill for oil in the Barents Sea. Norway has recently had a strain on its relationship with Russia, however, as it has attempted to bring NATO into the Arctic, which is in direct contrast with Russia's defense policy. Norway is committed to the UNCLOS framework to the resolution of disputes and it is of its interest to avoid major conflict in the Svalbard archipelago.⁴⁴

The Russian Federation has one of the most assertive policies in the region. In accordance to its 2008 policy, "*Fundamentals of state policy of the Russian Federation in the Arctic for the period up to 2020 and beyond*", the Arctic is a priority for the Russian government, especially the development of its energy reserves. Russia has recently approved the usage of the Northern Sea Route as a national passage, which goes against the interests of many other countries. Russia has cooperated with Norway in the past and the two have made joint naval exercises in the region as well as established commercial ties. Although Russia's Arctic policy does not mention any direct threat, it does not deny the possibility that it will attempt to grab as many resources as it can from the region.⁴⁵

All of these nations have strong opinions on the matter as they are directly linked to the Arctic. This gives these nations high access to the resources in the region and priority over diplomatic matters in the region. With this advantage, however, comes the threat of arctic militarization. As these nations can easily reach the North Pole, they pose a higher risk in the long run of initiating military campaigns and seizing the Arctic for military purposes. This is not to imply that they have malicious intentions but rather to understand that they are the key players in this undertaking.

⁴⁴Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. www.ufrgs.br/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

⁴⁵Ibid



European Union

The European Union Commission applied to become an observer of the Arctic Council in 2009 but was rejected.⁴⁶ The fact that the EU is not an intergovernmental body but rather a multinational organization makes it fail to meet the guidelines for an Arctic Council observer status. Making the decision to grant the EU observer status “erodes the importance of state sovereignty in the Arctic”⁴⁷. The individual constituents of the European Union do have their independent stances, however. France is the only nation that does not own Arctic territory and yet has an ambassador responsible for representing France on Arctic matters and constantly being informed of recent developments.⁴⁸ The UK is also very interested in using the Arctic region; its interests mainly revolve around the new shipping routes that opened up and the energy sources discovered. British oil companies are expressing their desire to be part of this Arctic exploitation undertaking.⁴⁹ The main point of focus in the policy of the Netherlands is responsible use of the Arctic to ensure no environment harm occurs. Dutch Shell is one of the major oil companies developing plans to use the Arctic seas for their purposes.⁵⁰ Poland’s main objective is to advance research in the Arctic region. It is willing to provide the people and the infrastructure needed to accomplish this task.⁵¹

⁴⁶Coffey, Luke. "No European Union Membership in the Arctic Council." *Www.heritage.org*. The Heritage Foundation, 05 Apr. 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.

⁴⁷Ibid

⁴⁸Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. *Www.ufrgs.br/*. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

⁴⁹ Ibid

⁵⁰ Ibid

⁵¹ Ibid



East Asia

Japan, China, and South Korea are all observers of the Arctic Council. China wishes to enjoy the fishing opportunities in the Arctic as well as accomplish key strategic objectives involving the diversification of its energy assets. Since China is dependent on other nations for its oil supply, it has a large interest in ensuring that it has energy coming in from less volatile sources. With the possibility of the Arctic containing energy resources, China is probing into the quantity of energy and is working towards attaining access to these sources. While it is important to note that China does not have a strategic plan, it is committed to the UNCLOS legal framework for settling territorial disputes.⁵² Japan's interests revolve around scientific research regarding the marine species in the Arctic and the climate changes occurring. Additionally, following the disaster in Fukushima, the attainment of new sources of energy has become paramount to the nation of Japan.⁵³ As the largest ship builder, the Republic of Korea has commercial interests in the region. The Republic of Korea can benefit from the natural resources and commercial routes that can be established in the Arctic. The ROK is also conducting Arctic research in the region and has recently launched an icebreaker named Araon to conduct it.⁵⁴

⁵²Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. www.ufrgs.br/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

⁵³Ibid

⁵⁴Ibid



IV. Questions to Consider

1. Does any nation have the right to any specific area in the Arctic? If yes, how should such territorial decisions be made?
2. What are the regulations that should be set to the use of the Arctic region?
3. How can the militarization of the Arctic Region be prevented?
4. Consider the actions taken to ensure proper use of the Arctic. Were they effective or not? If not, what measure could be taken to ensure that they are?
5. Should the United Nations become more involved with future developments? If yes, in what way?
6. What do you think of the membership composition of the Arctic Council? Should it change? If yes, in what way?
7. How do you see the Arctic Council taking action in the event that unwanted escalations take place? What authority should it have?
8. As the Disarmament and International Security Committee, what role can we play to maintain peace in the North Pole?



V. Suggested Sites

Agreement on Cooperation on Marine Oil Pollution and Response in the Arctic -

<http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/05/209406.htm>

UFRGSMUN Journal – Extensive Overview of Topic + Country Policies-

<http://www.ufrgs.br/ufrgsmun/2013/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/The-Militarization-of-the-Arctic-Political-Economic-and-Climate-Changes.pdf>

Russian Military Developments in the Arctic Region -

http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=43064&cHash=9c531cc0c50a96c2100e4970d72ec6a8#.VKkhmGTF82I

The Diplomat – Broad Overview -

<http://www.russia-direct.org/analysis/can-un-law-sea-stop-militarization-arctic>

Reuters on the Arctic Environment and UNEP -

<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/18/us-unep-arctic-idUSBRE91H0A820130218>



VI. Bibliography

"Ad Hoc Arbitration Under Annex VII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea." *UNCLOS*. Permanent Court of Arbitration, 2009. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

<http://www.pca-cpa.org/showpage.asp?pag_id=1288>.

Bellona. "UN Appeals to Oil Majors to Leave the Arctic Alone - Bellona.org." *Bellona.org*.

Bellona, 20 Feb. 2013. Web. 02 Jan. 2015. <<http://bellona.org/news/fossil-fuels/oil/2013-02-un-appeals-to-oil-majors-to-leave-the-arctic-alone>>.

Blank, Stephen. "The Russian Arctic: Between Economic Development and Accelerating Militarization." *Jamestown.org*. The Jamestown Foundation, 07 Nov. 2014. Web. 03 Jan. 2015.

<http://www.jamestown.org/programs/edm/single/?tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=43064&cHash=9c531cc0c50a96c2100e4970d72ec6a8#.VKkhmGTF82I>.

Boutilier, Sasha. "Topic II: The Militarization of The Arctic." *Topic II: The Militarization of The Arctic* (n.d.): n. pag. Web. 2 Jan. 2015.

<http://nimunweb.com/files/historical_topic_papers/DISEC%20Topic%20II.pdf>.

Coffey, Luke. "No European Union Membership in the Arctic Council." *Www.heritage.org*.

The Heritage Foundation, 05 Apr. 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.

<<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2013/04/no-european-union-membership-in-the-arctic-council>>.

Gabriel, Dana. "U.S. Arctic Ambitions and the Militarization of the High

North." *Www.globalresearch.ca/*. Global Research, 24 July 2013. Web. 04 Jan. 2015.

<<http://www.globalresearch.ca/u-s-arctic-ambitions-and-the-militarization-of-the->



- [high-north/5343760](#)>.
- Judd, Daniel. "UN Security Council." *Yale MUN SHANGHAI* (n.d.): n.p. *YMUNChina*. Yale Model United Nations. Web. 2 Jan. 2015. <http://ymunchina.yira.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/YMUNS_UNSC-1.pdf>.
- Konyshev, Valery. "Can UN Law of the Sea Stop Militarization in Arctic?" *Russia-direct.org*. Russia Direct, 06 Jan. 2014. Web. 02 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.russia-direct.org/analysis/can-un-law-sea-stop-militarization-arctic>>.
- Koranyi, Balazs. "Arctic Needs Protection from Resource Rush as Ice Melts: U.N. Body." *Reuters*. Thomson Reuters, 01 June 2012. Web. 03 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.reuters.com/article/2013/02/18/us-unep-arctic-idUSBRE91H0A820130218>>.
- "Operation NANOOK." *Www.forces.gc.ca*/. National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces, 17 Nov. 2014. Web. 11 Dec. 2015. <<http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-canada-north-america-recurring/op-nanook.page>>.
- Singh, Abhijit. "The Creeping Militarization of the Arctic." *The Diplomat*. The Diplomat, 16 Oct. 2013. Web. 7 Dec. 2014. <<http://thediplomat.com/2013/10/the-creeping-militarization-of-the-arctic/>>.
- Spohr, Alexandre. *The Militarization of the Arctic: Political, Economic and Climate Challenges* 1 (2013): 11-70. *Www.ufrgs.br*/. UFRGS Model United Nations Journal. Web. 03 Jan. 2015. <<http://www.ufrgs.br/ufrgsmun/2013/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/The-Militarization-of-the-Arctic-Political-Economic-and-Climate-Changes.pdf>>.
- Strader, Olin. "Arctic Council Security Agreement: Preventing Militarization and Ensuring



Stability and Security - Part I." *The Arctic Institute - Center for Circumpolar Security*

Studies. The Arctic Institute, 17 Jan. 2012. Web. 02 Jan. 2015.

<<http://www.thearcticinstitute.org/2012/01/1213-arctic-council-security-agreement.html>>.

Stroobants, Nathalie. " Militarization of the Arctic." *Study-Guide – DISEC*(2014):

n.p. 2014.*emimun.org*. Emirates International Model United Nations. Web. 03 Jan.

2015. <<http://2014.emimun.org/files/2014/01/DISEC-Study-guide.pdf>>.