

The Doon School Model United Nations
Conference 2019

Background Guide

CDisarmament and
CInternational Security.
CCommittee





DSMUN '19

Secretary General

Vikram Jain

President

Nandil B. Sarma

Chairperson

Ansh Raj

Deputy Chairpersons

Aviral Kumar

Sairajan M.S.

THE DOON SCHOOL,

Mall Road,

Dehradun-248001,

UK, India

chair.disec@doonschool.comwww.dsmun.in**Secretary General's Address**

Dear delegates,

As the Secretary General, It is my honour and privilege to welcome you all to the 13th Doon School Model United Nations Conference. DSMUN has been growing exponentially and actively augmenting the level and intensity of crises, debate and co-operation with each passing year. It is a legacy that we hope to continue and reinforce with this year's conference.

In an ever volatile, dynamic and adaptive international status-quo, it becomes increasingly vital for us as students- and thereby potential actors in the same system of compromise- to deliberate, discuss and formulate the groundwork of bi-lateral and multi-lateral ties that are to be established in the future.

With firm precedence, it would not be wrong to say that delegates, having attended this conference in the past, have developed a deeper and a more empirical understanding of diplomacy, compromise and conflict. While the Viceroy's Executive Council strives to ensure the peaceful transfer of power from the British to the Indian Union in 1946, the NATO contemplates the feasibility of occupying Antarctica. From condemning theocracies to enforcing climate laws, DSMUN will be an invigorating amalgamation of resolving and debating dissidence, dispute and disparity.

Besides whiling away my time watching typical Netflix Rom-coms, I find myself engrossed in reading about the framework and history of international and national politics. I am in- charge of the historical and political society and the editor of various publications in school. Having participated in various MUNs in India and abroad, I have had the opportunity to serve DSMUN in various capacities, and subsequently feel privileged to be given the opportunity to be at the organisational apex of the conference this year.

I eagerly await your presence at Chandbagh.

Warm regards,

Vikram Jain



DSMUN '19

Secretary General

Vikram Jain

President

Nandil B. Sarma

Chairperson

Ansh Raj

Deputy Chairpersons

Aviral Kumar

Sairajan M.S.

THE DOON SCHOOL,

Mall Road,

Dehradun-248001,

UK, India

chair.disec@doonschool.comwww.dsmun.in**President's Address**

Greetings!

As the President of the Doon School Model United Nations Society, it gives me immense pleasure to invite you to the 13th Session of the Doon School Model United Nations Conference. Being at the pinnacle of a conference that finds itself amidst the top ranks in the country, both in terms of global outreach and quality, has been an absolute honour. However, we at Doon constantly strive to outdo ourselves and promise that this edition of DSMUN will outdo all of its predecessors be it in terms of organizational skill, quality of debate or participation not just from the South Asian region but from around the world. It is with this vision in mind that I extend my heartiest welcome to each one of you to this year's conference.

The scope of this year's DSMUN will not remain confined to conventional committees. Keeping this in mind, we have expanded DSMUN's committee choices incorporating some bold and new ideas. With the introduction of highly challenging committees such as Lincoln's War Cabinet (1864), Viceroy's Executive Council (1946), Union Council of Ministers (1984) and the Rajya Sabha, we aim to pull off a conference not limited to one's imagination. This year's committees are aimed at developing informative deliberations and solutions to issues: both of global and national significance. Discussions pertaining to context of historical events allows one to explore the multitude of possibilities and find answers to the fundamental question of 'what if'. Having said so, the essential Model UN committees still remain intact providing an interesting challenge in terms of debate, wit and diplomacy to one and all.

As for myself, I am currently surviving the ISC curriculum and hold a keen interest in Politics and History. I deeply enjoy playing sports be it athletics or football. If not on the sports field, you can probably catch me commenting on Tottenham Hotspurs bleak chances of clinching a trophy. I also serve as the School Captain of the Doon School and the Editor-in-Chief of the Yearbook, one of the school's flagship publications.

Looking forward to seeing you all in August.

Warm Regards,

Nandil B. Sarma

Introduction to the committee

Welcome delegates! It is my honour to welcome you to the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) for DSMUN, 2019. The DISEC has consistently found itself to be one of the most engaging and stimulating committees that DSMUN has to offer, and this year, in an attempt to maximise the potential for an enriching debate, we will be discussing only one, branching agenda:

Regulation of the Arms Trade

This Background Guide shall serve as the introductory point upon which you can further develop your research, as well as gauge the approximate direction we feel the committee would proceed towards. While the nature of any MUN Committee is dynamic to a great degree, the guide should give you an idea of the kind of discussion and debate we expect, as well as how to go about it. It is highly recommended that delegates study the references we have provided at the end of the guide to gain a basis for their research. However, the guide is not extensive enough to constitute the entirety of your research, and if you wish to succeed it is imperative that you conduct further exploration of your own.

The DISEC, being the largest committee at DSMUN, has several procedures that slightly differ from a standard committee. Delegates will be expected to have read up on both the functions and procedures of the DISEC. Additionally, they must also be aware of any past actions taken by the UN with regards to the agenda. The Executive Board will readily entertain any queries at any point of time. We will be judging you not only on the quality and authenticity of your research, but also on your ability to lobby and interact with fellow delegates, give speeches and develop comprehensive solutions that have the room to improvise and adapt to any development

I hope you all find both Chandbagh and our committee to be an enriching experience!

DSMUN '19

Agenda

Regulation of the Arms Trade.

Introduction

Since the dawn of Civilisation, warfare has been an intrinsic part of human culture. As empires rose and fell, religion, trade, art and the sciences flourished, but while the dominance of each sphere has ebbed and flowed over the centuries, warfare and the tools used to wage it have persisted, thrived and developed. Every century of human history has been dominated by those who innovated in the art of destruction; whether it be the Phalanx Legions of Classical Rome, the Keshik Horse-Archers of the Mongol Khanate, or the Star-Spangled Atomic Bombs that devastated Hiroshima and Nagasaki. The advent of gunpowder became the impetus that drove the English to conquer half the world, while the development of weaponised aircraft lent an entirely new dimension to the Second World War. With every successive era, the nations of the world have sought to outdo one another in terms of both the quality and quantity of their military output.

Today, the desire to achieve military superiority, or the 'Arms Race' as it has been termed, has adopted a different persona. Up until the end of the Second World War, most nations directly utilised the weaponry they acquired to expand and conquer; international cooperation was unheard of, and annexations and invasions, which would be nearly impossible (or disguised) today, were commonplace. The crux of the debate

wasn't the distribution of arms itself, but rather the application of them – How far was a nation willing to go, how much was it ready to invest, to achieve victory?

Once the United Nations was formed however, the political landscape changed; having witnessed destruction and death on a level hitherto unheard of, most nations readily supported the formation of the UN. The creation of the UN Charter meant that the likelihood of another full-scale conflict or direct military incursion would be greatly reduced, but the innately conflict-fuelled nature of human society found another avenue of conflict – Proxy Warfare.

The goal is no longer to dominate another nation through tangible military power, but rather develop one's own 'National Security'. This is done through the accumulation of weapons and a constant scramble to gain the latest military hardware and technology. The larger and more sophisticated stockpile of weaponry a nation has, the more powerful it is considered. Again, this power doesn't manifest itself in direct application; rather, it provides the nation with 'soft' power, or the ability to influence the course of political events and amass greater political clout by using its military might as its instrument. In the 21st Century, this might is assessed on a multitude of metrics – each nation seeks to bolster every possible aspect of its army, whether that means increasing or developing a nuclear arsenal, introducing

the most advanced ballistic weaponry to its troops, or investing in the latest aircraft. Every country desires an edge, however minute, over its competitors, and this demand has made the Arms Trade a highly profitable yet cutthroat market.

Within this guide, we have provided an overview of major issues the Arms Trade is causing in the world today. The guide begins with a look at the rapid growth of the Arms Trade Industry and the attempts of both the UN and its member countries to regulate it. This is followed by a look at the major aspects of the Industry that have become problematic for international peace, as well as a look into the darker side of the Arms Trade – Illegal Trafficking, State-Sponsored Conflicts and Black Markets. With the aid of this guide and your own research, the Executive Board hopes that the committee will be able to develop resolutions that expertly address each issue whilst also keeping the individual rights of member countries intact. Ultimately, the goal of the DISEC is to ensure a safer, more cordial world for the people of tomorrow, where nations do not need to point guns at one another to achieve something. We hope that, in one way or the other, the committee is successful in steering us towards this goal.

The Growth of the Arms Trade

As mentioned earlier, the formation of the UN and the conception of international cooperation in general saw a major shift in military-based politics. Since the direct usage of military force would not only be heavily condemned, but could even but met with a collective response, countries began to focus on developing the aforementioned soft power. The emphasis shifted from the direct application of weaponry to the accumulation of it. Countries today tend to utilise any potential market for their arms, and likewise acquire arms from nearly any source they have access to. It is this 'pragmatic' yet ethically dubious outlook that has turned the Arms Industry into one the most lucrative businesses in the world, with the money being invested reaching a staggeringly high amount.

In 2019, the total revenue generated from arms deals exceeded well over 100 Billion USD, an unprecedented number, while the total money invested globally added up to a whopping 1.3 Trillion USD. Unsurprisingly, the USA contributed the lion' share to this number, allocating a total of 680 Billion USD towards military expenditure (nearly 3.8% of their GDP). Following America, the Chinese, Saudi Arabia, France and India round out the remaining five countries with the largest expenditure. In addition to making it onto this list, India is also the largest

importer of arms in the world, acquiring most of its weaponry from the Russians.

The rising demand for arms isn't restricted to just global powers. Smaller countries across the world also provide lucrative markets for contractors and suppliers. Many of these nations utilise this weaponry for conflict-driven purposes such as rampant civil wars and aiding extremist groups to threaten their rivals. Furthermore, many countries don't possess comprehensive laws regarding the possession of weapons, and the resultant ease of access to a firearm for the average civilian increases the chances of gun violence, organised crime and trafficking.

Although the current scenario has proven to be highly favourable for many countries, there have still been attempts from both the UN and its individual member states to regulate the Arms Trade in an attempt to mitigate its negative effects.

Attempts at Regulation

The first significant treaties that aimed to place a regulation on the Arms Trade were signed in the aftermath of the First World War. Amongst these, the Geneva Convention of 1925 is particularly important, as it prohibited the use of biological and chemical weapons (however, it's worth noting that this proved ineffective, as the Second World War proves. In fact, their actual storage,

production and transfer were gradually prohibited over 1972 and 1993). The horrors of World War II, including the introduction of the Atomic Bomb to the world, saw a host of nuclear weapons non-proliferation and test ban-treaties being signed. During the Cold War, the USA and USSR also signed several treaties which limited the usage of their strategic weapons. Furthermore, governments have been successful in the abolishment of dangerous explosives such as landmines, as well as other types of armaments.

Despite the rampant expansion of the Arms Industry, arms trade and transfer monitoring has increased significantly.

The SIPRI Arms Transfers Database, developed in 1950, contains information on all officially sanctioned arms transfers, significantly improving the transparency that international bodies had on the matter. Additionally, guidelines for any form of international arms transfers were established by the UN in 1996. In terms of arms trade, the problem stems from the fact that most states have individual regulations, laws and procedures regarding the procurement and trade of arms both within their borders and at an international level. Although there are several multilateral voluntary export and import agreements, the discrepancies are visible when we see that few treaties exist which legally bind their member states into limiting the trade.

Within the 20th Century, perhaps the most prominent arms control agreement at an international level is the UN Register of Conventional Arms, established in 1991. Its main function is to monitor the flow of weapons trade and ensure that there's no concentrated build-up of arms to the extent that it could become destabilising within any one area. Another significant arms trade control agreement is the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies, which has been signed by 41 countries; however it is not a binding agreement. Regardless, its primary goal is to promote transparent and responsible transfers of conventional arms in order to, again, prevent destabilising accumulations of arms. In addition to these, a multitude of agreements exist on arms control issues such as codes of conduct on exports, brokering, production and distribution. Over the last few years, the role of various NGO's has also considerably increased in terms of placing regulations on the arms trade. These groups have been campaigning for stricter regulations regarding transfers and trade of arms, making it clear that since the tense events of the Cold War there has been an increased demand from all facets of society to place greater regulation on the industry.

Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations does acknowledge the inherent

right of all states to individual or collective self-defence and by extension the right to manufacture, import, export, transfer, and retain conventional arms. Therefore, in the eyes of most, conventional arms are legitimate and often necessary tools utilised by governments, militaries, police forces and civilians, contrary to weapons of mass destruction. This makes the process of placing regulations on them infinitely more complex, because the situation isn't viewing states merely as exporters and importers of arms; various enterprises and the interests of several groups and individuals also have to be factored. No two states utilise identical methods of maintaining their security, or for that matter even have similar goals regarding the development of their security, and so it becomes tricky creating a set of regulations that are easily accepted and politically feasible at globe-encompassing level.

Over the course of the committee, some questions the delegates should aim to answer include:

- *To what extent should regulations be placed on the Arms Trade, and how will these regulations affect states of varying size and military power?*
- *Is it feasible to create a globe-spanning set of regulations? If not, how should the varying degrees of regulations be administered, and on what basis, regional or political will they be allocated?*

Issues tied to the Growth of the Arms Trade

Economic

Many states actively involve themselves within the Arms Trade solely due to how lucrative the business is. While this may serve the interests of a particular nation and further their own 'National Security', the ramifications it can often have on the global front tend to be quite problematic.

The US has built its status as the world's most powerful economy on the revenue it generates from exporting arms across the world. From an American standpoint, this is ideal, but the situation becomes much more morally questionable when one realises that the majority of its arms are exported to the Middle East, war-torn countries and terrorist-controlled states included. Amongst these, the Saudis are America's largest customer, financing the massive influx of arms through their bountiful oil-fields.

The first major economic issue regarding the arms trade is the domination of world powers in it. In an ever-increasing bid to attain greater soft power, these countries allocate large amounts of their budget towards the acquisition of arms, on a level that smaller countries simply cannot compete at. This not only creates a growing disparity between the two groups in terms of military power, but also allows the powerful nations to control the market – although they

acquire the majority of arms, they also seek markets to sell their own products and generate revenue. Their customers almost always tend to be smaller nations, who must now trade at the prices set by those who control the product. Many of these countries aren't even economically capable of partaking in such trade; they are in the middle of a brutal war or contain a highly corrupt and crime-infested government.

The second issue deals with the amount of funds nations are allocating towards the Arms Trade, often at the cost of greater development within their own borders. The obsession with gaining a greater foothold in the 'Arms Race' has reached an extent where many governments allocate money which could (and in many cases, should) be used to further grow their own economy and develop areas such as education, healthcare and social welfare. These spheres, and as a consequence the people living in these states, often suffer heavily as a result. For example, it is both interesting and unfortunate to note that Saudi Arabia, although an incredibly wealthy state, is also one that would rather allocate anywhere between 8.9 to 10.3% of its total GDP (or 30.4% of its total government spending) on military expenditure rather than to improve the state of its Women's Rights and the educational and social opportunities provided to them.

When discussing the economic aspect of the arms trade, some issues the delegates should aim to address include:

- *Should the disadvantage smaller countries face within the Arms Trade against Global Powers be addressed? If so, how can we achieve a conclusion which both addresses the problem and considers the interests of the more powerful countries?*
- *Should greater regulations be imposed on states regarding their allocation of funds towards the military, especially when it comes at the expense of internal welfare and development?*

Political

The advent of the Cold War changed the face of military politics dramatically; gone were the days of open warfare and widespread carnage. Instead, military interaction took on a far more subtle, implicit nature. Earlier, we discussed the concept of soft power as one of the primary reasons behind the growth of the arms trade. With open conflict becoming limited to an extent after the formation of the UN and the subsequent emphasis on international cooperation, nations still desired a way to impose their agendas upon international politics.

The solution to this dilemma, as many found out, was relatively simple – it was no longer a question of “What are we going to use on our rivals?” but rather “What are we capable of using, and are our enemies aware of our strength? The idea is that the higher the quantity and

quality of the military arsenal, the more the nation is able to project its influence amongst other nations. It is unlikely that a powerful nation will directly intimidate another nation using tangible military force to get what they want (Russian annexations of Crimea aside); instead, they will develop contact with that nation, make them aware of their military capabilities, and provided that said nation is threatened by the extent of their power, coerce them into doing as they wish. The exchange also has a more ‘beneficial’ side – Many powerful nations market the benefits of allying with them by promising protection and a supply of arms, an offer many economically weak and politically unstable countries leap at.

For many countries, the acquisition of arms is not only to further increase their influence, but is also a matter of prestige. This holds especially true for world powers, who constantly seek to showcase the power and prestige of their armed forces. A prime example of this would be the Chinese; having turned into a global powerhouse since their turbulent beginnings in the 1980’s, the People’s Liberation of Army of China (PLA) increased their military expenditure for the 24th consecutive year in 2019 to a huge 250 Billion USD (nearly thrice the amount Saudi Arabia, the next closest nation on the list, invested). In fact, since 2000, the Chinese have also invested in their navy and built more warships than India, South Korea and Japan, their

closest regional competitors, combined. This huge increase in military expenditure is reflective of China's belief that they are now the dominant power in the region, and should consequently possess an army indicative of such.

In terms of the political aspect, the primary question that props up for the committee to address is:

- There is a very popular and strong argument that the militarily-influenced power politics the more powerful nations have a tendency to play is not only unethical, but incredibly disruptive to solving the issues the Arms Trade has created. Is this a problem worth addressing, and if yes, then how?

Small Arms

Since the early 1990's, conventional and small weaponry has become symbolic of the international security agenda since the end of the Cold War. Today, it is common knowledge that small arms have played a significant role in fuelling a greater number of conflicts and enabling various terrorist organisations. According to the Small Arms Survey conducted in 2005, small and light weapons account for an estimated 60-90% of the direct conflict deaths each year.

What is easily forgotten but crucial to remember is that small arms have the largest potential to be trafficked and traded illicitly, given they are easy to conceal and relatively cheap. The lack of control and transparency with regard to

the small arms trade and acquisition has been made evident both through the attempt of the UN and several member states to regulate its flow, and the attempts of various NGOs to address the topic. To some benefit, the campaigning did lead to the UN Conference on Curbing Illicit Trafficking of Small Arms, held in 2001, which formed a framework to introduce better domestic controls on the exports of small arms. However, its results are vague and relatively intangible, and there was no noticeable decrease in either arms exports or conflict deaths. On the contrary, military expenses of many major world power actually peaked since the War on Terror started in 2001, especially (and unsurprisingly) that of the U.S. A large share of these funds go to foreign military to conflict-filled areas, especially the Middle East, in order to develop 'a strategic role in the war on terror'. Ultimately, all this really achieves is an increased propagation of violence, and often also includes the breaching of human rights in the conflict-heavy regions.

It is essential that when dealing with this issue, the delegates aim to develop solutions which specifically target the inefficiency of control over Small Arms and to monitor and regulate their trade.

Illegal Issues

i. Arms Trafficking

Up till now, we've only dealt with the Arms Trade and the issues surrounding it at a politically visible and legal level.

While there are more than enough issues on that front, there is also a darker and more subdued aspect of the Arms Trade which is not as easily accessible.

Excluding the large industry within which nations operate and exchange arms, there is also a huge network of illegal arms trafficking spread across the world. While the legal Arms Industry provides weaponry to countries, these black-market circles provide an assortment of weaponry to a large variety of customers which include turbulent countries embroiled in civil war, dictatorial regimes, and various terrorist and extremist organisations.

The areas where these covert circles are running rampant are easily distinguishable by their lack of countries with stable economies, good social development and law enforcement. Excellent examples include war-ravaged regions in the Middle East such as Yemen and Syria, or countries such as Colombia and Venezuela in Latin America, who are infected by organised crime groups and have law enforcement of questionable efficiency. Barring these regions, many countries that are economically weak within the Sub-Saharan regions of Africa are also regions where illegal trafficking is common.

The issue when dealing with illegal trafficking is how politically delicate the situation can get.

When a country is identified as a hotspot, the first and foremost priority of member nations should be to earn the cooperation of the country where the trafficking is taking place, rather than flinging accusations and antagonising them.

Many countries are uncomfortable with other states or even international bodies such as the UN working within their orders, especially the more unstable ones which are common hubs for illegal arms dealers, because they feel threatened or insecure. Some countries don't even entirely admit to having an illegal network prevalent within their borders, because that can seriously question the efficiency of their law enforcement and internal security. All these factors must be considered when dealing with the illegal Arms business.

ii. State-Sponsored Conflict and Terrorism

Many major players in world politics tend to utilise proxy outlets to inflict damage upon their rivals. While this includes using other, smaller states as proxies, as was the case on a multitude of occasions during the Cold War, many countries go so far as to support and arm terrorist and extremist groups to serve their ends.

While from a nationalistic standpoint this may seem incredibly efficient and effective for the country's agenda, all it serves to do is further promote violence and instability in the regions where these groups operate, robbing the surrounding areas of a chance to ever fully recover from their losses. Many times, this can even backfire and create a powerful, and unpredictable, terrorist army which not

only further destabilises their operating territory, but can even threaten the nation that originally funded them. A prime example of this was the Al-Qaeda and the USA; the latter, funded and trained the former in order to combat the Soviet Troops in Afghanistan. Ironically, it is the same Al-Qaeda that is responsible for the most catastrophic act of terrorism on US soil, the 9/11 attacks. Another example of governments funding terrorists or organised crime groups to further serve their ends is the Yemeni Civil War

Example: Yemen Civil War

The Yemeni Civil War, which began in 2015 and is still happening, is between the Yemeni Government, which is internationally recognized, and the Houthis Rebels, a group of separatists discontent with the running of the state. The Houthis have been accused on multiple occasions of being proxies for Iran, due to their shared following of the Shia sect of Islam. The USA and its ally Saudi Arabia have alleged that the Houthis receive weapons and training from Iran, an accusation that both parties have staunchly denied. The African nation of Eritrea has also been accused of providing Iranian weaponry and resources to the Houthis, in addition to providing medical support for injured Houthi fighters. The Eritrean government has also denied these claims, claiming that to their mind, the Yemeni Civil War is an internal matter which

requires no interference from any outside party.

Meanwhile, the Yemeni government has enjoyed significant international backing from the United States and the oil barons of the Persian Gulf. U.S. drone strikes were conducted regularly in the Yemenese region of Sana'a, their targets being Al Qaeda outposts situated in the Arabian Peninsula. The United States was also a major weapons supplier to the Yemeni government. Saudi Arabia provided financial aid to Yemen until late 2014, ceasing it afterwards due to the Houthi occupation of Sana'a and their increasing power within the state.

According to Amnesty International, the United Kingdom was also involved in supplying a coalition spearheaded by the Saudis which attacked various terrorist targets in Yemen. In addition to these two, several areas of the country are also controlled by the ISIL and an Al-Qaeda splinter group, both of which only serve to further the violence and feed off of it.

Ultimately, the question that arises is not which side is ethically just and should be funded, because if that was the case neither would come out on top – both the Yemeni Government and the Houthis are responsible for many acts of brutality which they carried out mercilessly, easily committing several humans' rights violations.

It is essential to understand that conflicts such as these will only intensify so long as other nations

are able to fuel the fire of enmity and profit on the death of thousands of innocents. Of course, it is no easy task to address complex situations such as these, but we urge the committee to develop solutions through which we not only stop the funding of these conflicts, but also work towards getting closer to solving the conflicts themselves.

The Arms Trade Treaty: Purpose and Failure

From the UN Website:

“The Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) is a multilateral treaty that regulates the international trade in conventional weapons. Conceptualised in 2014, The ATT is an attempt to regulate the international trade of conventional weapons for the purpose of contributing to international and regional peace; reducing human suffering; and promoting co-operation, transparency, and responsible action by and among states.”

Fundamentally, the ATT aims to address nearly most of the issues we have brought up over the course of this guide. Unfortunately, its inability to do so stems from a point we’ve touched upon earlier. In total, 101 States ratified the treaty, while another 34 signed it, but didn’t ratify. The latter number includes both the USA and Israel, two major military powers (the former being the strongest in the world). Before we delve into the issue, it’s key to understand the difference between Signing and Ratifying:

Signing: When you sign a treaty but do not ratify it, you essentially say that your country, to an extent, agrees with the contents of a treaty, but still wishes to discuss and approve the treaty within their internal administration before ratifying it. It essentially equates to being on standby

Ratifying: Once you have ratified a treaty, you have accepted its terms and clauses, and are bound by them. Ratifying a treaty also displays your nation’s support towards that particular idea.

Now that this has been clarified, let’s understand the crux of the problem. All the states involved within the treaty, even those who have ratified, possess a multitude of legal systems and political outlooks on the arms trade and its regulations that are simply not completely compatible. Due to this, the Treaty is incapable of being universally accepted, and thus ultimately fails its intended purpose.

Within the committee, a key goal of the delegates would be to analyse the ATT and, after factoring in the views of the member states, altering and rectifying its clauses to hopefully serve its original function. Perhaps, given the right circumstances, an entirely new treaty could be devised, one that improves upon the original in every way it can, and is successful in that it is able to secure everyone’s ratification.

Guidelines

External Topics: Delegates must remember that the scope of the committee isn't limited to whatever is present within this background guide. If a delegate has researched extensively and has material to contribute to the committee which falls under the purview of the agenda, he is recommended to do so (eg. The lack of clarity regarding Gun Laws within many Nations).

Foreign and Domestic Policy:

Delegates are expected to have read up on and be well aware of their countries foreign and domestic policies, especially regarding the Arms Trade, as well as being aware of their diplomatic relations with other states. If a delegate strays too far from their country's foreign policy, he or she will be heavily penalised for undermining the authenticity of the Committee.

Realistic Solutions: Similar to the last point, delegates will be expected to develop solutions that are politically and economically feasible. Creativity is always welcomed, however, there is a difference between thinking out of the box, and being in another box. Improvisation and adaptability will be highly rewarded, but ultimately the course of the committee must have a realistic consistency.

Thorough Solutions: The solutions delegates formulate should not only be

feasible, but also as fool-proof as possible. Often, it is easy to not account for a certain possibility and leave a discrepancy within your idea; it is imperative that when you are structuring your debate, you plan ahead to ensure that there is no scope for a loophole to develop, one that could be exploited by other delegates, questioned by the press, and penalised by the Executive Board.

Organisational Knowledge: Although DSMUN is a School Event, it is ultimately a simulation of the United Nations, and thus conduct and procedure within the committee should follow suit. The delegates must possess an idea of how the Committee operates, and the real-life functions and powers of the DISEC.

References

<http://www.un.org/disarmament/covarms/armstrade/>

<https://www.globalissues.org/issue/73/arms-trade-a-major-cause-of-suffering>

<https://sur.conectas.org/en/arms-trade-regulation-sustainable-development-next-15-years/>

https://www.armscontrol.org/factsheets/arms_trade_treaty

<https://sipri.org/databases/financial-value-global-arms-trade>