



SECURITY COUNCIL

Table of Content

| | |
|--------------|---|
| Welcome Note | 2 |
| Introduction | 3 |

Topic A: The Right to Intervene

| | |
|---|------|
| Brief Summary of topic | 4 |
| History and Further Discussion of the Issue | 5-10 |
| UN Past Actions | 11 |
| Current World Issues | 12 |

Topic B: Towards an arms trade treaty: Establishing Common international standards for the import, export and transfer of armaments.

| | |
|---|-------|
| Brief Summary of topic | 13 |
| History and Further Discussion of the Issue | 14 |
| UN Past Actions | 15 |
| Current Situation | 16-19 |
| Relevant Website Links | 20-22 |

SECURITY COUNCIL

Dear Delegates,

I am absolutely privileged to greet and welcome you as Security Council Director to the CAMUN 2012 Conference. Let me take this opportunity to express my enthusiasm and anticipation for the exceptional conference that lies ahead! I hope to be part of a full-throttle, heated debate throughout the three days of conference and witness the creation of innovative and “avant-garde” resolutions. The topics we are going to tackle in this year’s conference are the ‘Right to Intervene’ and ‘Towards an arms trade treaty: Establishing Common international standards for the import, export and transfer of armaments.

I expect this study guide to give you an in depth overview of the topics as a whole and I urge you to research thoroughly prior to the conference.

If you have any questions or doubts or even if you just want to introduce yourself please feel free to contact me at any time! I will be more than happy to help you in any way possible. I’m thrilled to meet you all in the month ahead!

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Alexandra Lazar". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Alexandra" on the top line and the last name "Lazar" on the bottom line.

Alexandra Lazar

Security Council Director

sc.camun@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

The Security Council comprises 15 United Nations member States, of which China, the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Russia, and France hold permanent seats; apart from the above aforementioned permanent members, the United Nations General Assembly selects the additional ten non-permanent members for two-year terms. The Council first convened in January of 1946 in London. Though most sessions today take place at the UN Headquarters in New York, the Security Council has met at locations outside of the Headquarters.

According to Article 24 of the United Nations Charter, all Security Council member states “confer on the [...] Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility, the Security Council acts on their behalf.”

Each Security Council delegation has one vote, and nine out of fifteen votes are necessary to pass all procedural motions. Notably, the five permanent seats (so-called “P5” nations) have veto power, meaning that a negative vote on a Council action from one of these powers automatically supersedes and negates all affirmative votes by other members. The Security Council has the power to mediate negotiations among conflicting parties, appoint special representatives, issue ceasefires, deploy United Nations peacekeeping forces via directives, impose economic sanctions, or resolve to pursue multilateral military action.

Topic A: Right to Intervene

Brief Summary

When and where does the United Nations have the right to intervene? Are there certain criteria or conditions which need to be met before the UN can get involved in a conflict or dispute? Are there certain situations in which the UN has no right to get involved? These questions are essential in establishing the legitimacy of the United Nations' actions. It must be determined under which conditions it is the right or obligation of the United Nations to get involved and take necessary action. Passing a resolution, especially in the Security Council, is in effect a proclamation of the UN's right to intervene in the situation at hand.

When the United Nations had been formed in 1945, following the end of the Second World War, far more power and responsibility was given to the Security Council to ensure the peaceful co-operation of nations and the assurance that nations would not resort to violence and war to solve issues. As the power of the Security Council grew and as the council evolved, the rights to intervene also altered. After the Second World War, due to new attention being given to the law of human rights and criminal law, if a country would commit an act that would breach such laws, it would become an international issue and involve the entire international community. The Security Council has fully accepted its role in the prevention of international conflicts and the protection of civilians in nation-states; however the council has struggled to find acceptance for specific politically charged doctrines (the Responsibility to Protect Doctrine). In order to prevent unilateral interventions, the Security Council must find its place on the international diplomatic scale, within the boundaries of international law, and find common ground on the principles of intervention.

Further Discussion of the Topic

What is Intervention?

Intervention can have several meaning in the case of the Security Council's right to intervene. These can be considered as *“actual or threatened military action by a state or group of states, with or without authorization from the Security Council...on the territory of another state or groups of states without permission from that state. A major purpose of the intervention for the intervening state or states is for the protection of individuals or groups of individuals for their own state, where the governing authority of the state or group of states has permitted actual or threatened extreme violations of human rights.”* These “violations” include but are not limited to *“actual or threatened loss of life on a large scale...use of torture or sexual assault on a large scale, and could result in the actual or potential massive displacement of the population.”*

UN Intervention methods

Since the creation of the United Nations, the organisation has faced conflicts of extreme degrees, and has had a difficult time in finding an appropriate role among declarations of national sovereignty and urgent need for the protection of human rights in specific areas of the world. Due to the excessive amount of civil wars after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, ad hoc criminal tribunals had been established *“to clarify and develop international humanitarian and criminal law.”* These tribunals had jurisdiction over crimes such as the armed conflicts in Rwanda and Yugoslavia, as they were national armed conflicts.

The issues concerning legality does not simply refer to the whether or not it is legal of the Security Council to intervene be it on international or simply regional scale, it also concerns the question of whether or not the United Nations and Security Council hold a legal responsibility to intervene.

Types of Intervention

Intervention in the form of economic sanctions can be claimed as humanitarian intervention. These sanctions may deal with economic, political or military issues. Other forms of intervention may include economic conditionality, this occurs

when a country agrees to aid a nation with money; however the economical aid must be spent in the way in which the giving nations dictate it must be spent. Nations may also intervene within other countries for commercial or scientific reasons; these may be allowed to occur under the pretence of “intelligence-gathering” (**GEO**spatial **INT**elligence or **FIN**ancial **INT**elligence).

Other methods in which a nation may intervene within another nation is by arming insurgents, providing asylum or bases and even having the president of the nation assassinated. Further actions that may be considered acts of intervention include the assistance of a nation in political elections for example, the government of the assisted nation may claim another country is intervening and is not allowing the normal process of elections to occur, thus making the elections corrupt. The final forms of intervention that are possibly most common are the attempt to stop a civil war within a nation and maintain peace, and the application of sanctions on nations which breach the human rights laws. Putting sanctions on countries for human rights violations, as the Security Council has done several times one so to Syria, aims to stop the human rights’ violations.

Quite often the economic and political sanctions are used as a tool by *blocs* to force any member state to abide by its *diktat*.

History of the issue of Intervention

Seeing as the Security Council is one of the most vital organs of the United Nations it is essential that it comes to an agreement on the basis of what must be done concerning the right to intervene. The Security Council first accepted its responsibility on the case of intervention after several cases in which nations chose to act unilaterally and regionally. Although the Security Council follows the doctrine of Responsibility to protect, the doctrine simply justifies the intentions of the Security Council in cases of intervention, it does not state a clear and way in which the process of intervention should function.

History of Unilateral Intervention

India and East Pakistan, 1971

The war between India and Pakistan of 1971 was a military conflict caused by the Indian intervention as a response to *Mukti Vahini's* appeal for assistance to help the majority Bengali speaking people gain independence. Lasting only 13 days, it is considered one of the shortest wars in history. During the course of the war, Indian and Pakistani forces clashed on the eastern and western fronts. The war effectively came to an end after the Eastern Command of the Pakistani Armed Forces signed the Instrument of Surrender on December 16, 1971, following which East Pakistan seceded as the independent state of Bangladesh. Approx. 90,000 members of the Pakistan Armed Forces including paramilitary personnel were taken as Prisoners of War by the Indian Army, subsequently to be released after the signing of the Shimla Agreement between the two governments. It is estimated that between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 civilians were killed in Bangladesh, and four hundred thousand women raped by the Pakistani armed forces. As a result of the conflict, a further eight to ten million people fled the country at the time to seek refuge in neighbouring India. As opposed to working and attempting to stop the growing issue within Pakistan, "The United Nations focus was on preventing that repression from leading to an armed conflict between India and Pakistan". The Security Council's response itself was thoroughly inefficient. The Council only met after the outbreak of the hostilities and after several long hours of debate, came to a conclusion that it was best to have the issue moved and debated in within the General Assembly. The only significant resolution that was passed throughout the time of the issue was the resolution that demanded continuation of ceasefire after the Pakistan troops retreated. This conflict illustrates the arguable grounds for intervention without international support.

Vietnam and Cambodia, 1978

Vietnam invaded Cambodia in 1978 in response to the deaths of at least one third of the seven million Cambodian populations under the brutal Khmer Rouge regime. From 1975 to 1978, 200,000 refugees fled the country. The legal definition of the regime's activities falls under crimes against humanity on a

massive scale. After hostilities between Vietnam and Cambodia and the suspension of diplomatic relations by Cambodia, Vietnam requested a UN mission to arbitrate border conflicts in May 1978, which was never undertaken. Finally, in December 1978, Vietnam invaded with immense force and took Phnom Penh in two weeks. The new People's Republic of Kampuchea was announced on 8 January 1979, a peace agreement was only signed on 23 October 1991 in this case, while 200,000 Vietnamese troops remained. Due to the UN's lack of action, Vietnam acted unilaterally claiming both humanitarian concerns and self-defense. The discussion of the intervention by the Security Council in January 1979 after the invasion *"was more a reflection of Cold War politics than a serious analysis of the issues of humanitarian intervention."* General Assembly resolutions continued to condemn the invasion. Despite massive human rights violations, because Vietnam's intervention was tied to larger geopolitical dynamics and motivated by self-interest, it was deemed unjustified violence.

Tanzania and Uganda 1978

In Uganda, Idi Amin, the dictator had obtained power through a coup after independence from Britain, began a reign of terror against anybody who might support his opposition. In 1978, Amnesty International reported that 50,000 to 300,000 people had been randomly killed, and part of those murders should be classified as genocide. When Tanzania continued to offer refuge to Ugandan citizens and the deposed ruler, Uganda declared war, and Tanzanian troops repelled invading Ugandan troops; these Tanzanian troops had proceeded to eliminate all Ugandan troops from Tanzania and even occupied Uganda to ensure the protection of Tanzania from possibly future attacks. The conflict continued despite calls for ceasefires until 10-11 April 1979 and the overthrow of Amin. International powers responded by cutting off all sorts of aid and by withdrawing any diplomatic ties; the United States banned all trade with Uganda and the European Economic Community started linking its aid to human rights observance. Even though the issue had become increasingly violent and nations were taking independent steps to put an end to the violence, the Security Council did not act at all. Self-defense and humanitarian action were put forward as the reasons for intervention by other nations. Tanzania had an interest in

SECURITY COUNCIL

overthrowing the Ugandan leader. The interests of the international community were also important in ultimately approving the intervention, mainly due to its results.

India and Sri Lanka, 1987

In July 1983, a civil war began in Sri Lanka between the Sinhalese majority and the Tamil minority; Tamils of Indian majority were gravely affected by those uprisings. India argued that Sri Lanka was responsible for organizing and provoking the uprisings and wanted to become a moderator, by establishing a relief fund and initiate negotiations. The international community was concerned, as Sri Lanka also requested military assistance. India dropped 22 tons of humanitarian supplies to the Jaffna peninsula, a particularly stricken region, violating Sri Lanka's sovereignty by entering their air space for eight minutes. This show of force intimidated Sri Lanka into introducing negotiations. The intervention was successful in producing the Indo-Sri Lankan agreement of 29 July 1987, which was intended to end the Sri Lankan Civil War between militant Sri Lankan Tamil nationalists and the Sri Lankan military. The issue was not brought to the Security Council.

History of Security Council Intervention

Somalia

Following the eruption and escalation of the civil war in Somalia in 1991, the UN strived to subside the suffering that was caused as a result of the intense conflict. Out of the 4.5 million people living in Somalia, over half were in severe danger of starvation and malnutrition-related disease, mostly in the drought-stricken rural areas. The UN was engaged in Somalia from early in 1991 when the civil conflict began. UN personnel were withdrawn on several occasions during periodic flare-ups of violence. A series of resolutions were passed by the Security Council (Resolution 733 and 746) and diplomatic visits eventually helped impose a ceasefire between the two key parties, signed at the end of March 1992. By the end of this crisis, it had been evident that the international community accepted intervention as being a legal act, as they responded to the General's Assembly urgent call for action.

Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia suffered in the breakdown of the Soviet Union as forces carved out their own nations after the death of Joseph Broz Tito, the wartime leader. In Yugoslavia, the UN intervened in several ways: humanitarian works, imposing sanctions, no-fly zones to deliver assistance to Bosnia, and the prevention of ethnic cleansing. This conflict was also an example of an open armed conflict in a European country, and *“involved unlawful armed intervention by other states.”* The best accomplishment of the Security Council was Resolution 770, which insisted on *“all measures necessary”* for the delivery of humanitarian aid but the failures in Kosovo and Bosnia has come under international scrutiny.

Rwanda

Now a cause which has garnered worldwide attention, the case of Rwanda is a tragedy in the history of international intervention. The civil war between the Hutu and Tutsi ethnic groups, encouraged by colonial associations put in place by the powers that used to rule Rwanda and their political and economic aspirations, resulted in a horrific genocide. The Security Council was accused of *“applying double standards to Africa and Europe”* when it decided to reduce forces; by that point 200,000 people had died. The genocide only ended after 100 days, with 800,000 deaths. The International Criminal Tribunal in Rwanda convicted several people on genocide charges. Rwanda contributed in large part to the current conflicts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Burundi, by forcing refugees into those countries and prompting further ethnic violence. Intervention in the DRC was in line with the UN’s traditional function preventing or containing international armed conflict, but attention was paid to humanitarian concerns in later resolutions. The UN justified intervention because of *“increasing human rights and law violations, including mass rapes of women.”*

Beyond Patterns of Intervention

Even though the Security Council clearly demonstrated its willingness to intervene, *“the delivery of assistance and the implementation of the decisions were poor.”* The UN needs to work with the support of local populations, even if it does not have the consent of the state, in order to use force in a territory. It can be therefore convincingly argued, that *“when the decision is made that such*

action is necessary, a series of principles and guidelines must be developed and strictly followed” for the success of UN-sponsored intervention, as the legal scholar Chiara Giorgetti emphasized. The UN has administered territories when it found that the states were unable to do so themselves. The correctness of this nation-building role is part of the question of standards for sustained intervention. This history of intervention for humanitarian reasons, by states alone or by the United Nations, gives the Security Council a framework for developing future guidelines for interventions free from political bureaucracy. Through these improved interventions, the Security Council can prevent the disturbing amounts of human rights violation that have been committed in the past century alone.

UN Past Actions

Doctrines and Debates

After half a year of tough debating, the Security Council validated its support for the responsibility to protect doctrine in Resolution 1674. The doctrine however has only been appealed to twice since its creation due to the lack of clarification of the concept, its boundaries and the methods in which it should be applied. The Security Council has evidently acknowledged the intervention is within its responsibility, however in order to make the Council more effective, it must work towards more practical and effective methods of intervention to protect innocent civilians.

In a realistic view of the world and in nations where leaders attempt to mass exterminate their own citizens, refuse to give up power for the benefit of their citizens or even continue to hold their power through the use of violence with the masses, the Security Council must act immediately to address these growing and ever-present issues that disrupt world peace and security. The absence of a clear international law justification causes time-consumption as nations hesitate on the basis of how to respond to an issue, and this in itself causes the loss of life that could be saved if the council had a clear ruling as to how and when to intervene. The council must act immediately to solve this issue, not to simply avoid criticism for being inefficient or inactive, but to prove that the council has the ability to deal with fragile matters and lend credibility to interventions that may otherwise not be supported if nations were to act unilaterally.

Current/Recent World Issues

Syria

Should the UN have already intervened? Why did some members feel that they had no right to intervene? What conditions have to be met before the UN has a right to intervene? Should we examine and analyse why China and Russia still feel that the council has no right to intervene but other countries such as France and UK feel that the conditions warrant intervention?

Libya

The Security Council Resolution 1973(2011) stated that NATO may enter Libya to protect and secure the civilians. Did the UN resolution, which was the basis of NATO intervention, overstep its legal bounds? The resolution promoted civilian protection and not the disposal of the Ghaddafi regime. Some argue that NATO's intervention went beyond civilian protection and aided the Libyan opposition in defeating Ghaddafi's forces. The UN may have used the resolution to aide one side in the conflict against the other, thus influencing the outcome. This could be seen as an abuse of the right to intervene. It brings a new question to the forefront. To what extent can UN intervention be justified, without turning the organisation into a political tool?

The situation in Libya, where rebel forces against the government of Col. Muammar Qaddafi have borne the brunt of violence from the national military forces, has particularly stoked debate on intervention. Resolution 1973, passed by the Security Council on March 17, 2011, with ten votes in favour and five abstentions, introduces a no-fly zone and authorizes "all necessary measures" to protect civilians. It was argued that this no-fly zone would be ineffectual without promising further military action: *"Libya is a case where force could work and where it will be deployed only after non-coercive methods have proved unavailing, as the doctrine of the responsibility to protect requires."* Although Libya claimed it would stop the violence, warfare in the rebel areas continued. Countries including the United States, the United Kingdom, and France began a systematic air attack. On 27 June 2011 the International Criminal Court issued a warrant for the arrest of Qaddafi. When Qaddafi was killed by Libyan rebels in

late October, the United States and its allies were commended for helping to bring about his demise. Was his killing justified? The Transnational Council, recognized as Libya's current governing authority, requested the continued presence of NATO air patrols through December 2011; however, the Security Council voted unanimously on October 27, 2011 to end its mission Libya. The efficacy of the Transnational Council's leadership in Libya remains to be seen. Although the Security Council has decided to end its air patrol mission, Libya remains a deeply unstable nation that may require more international aid in the future.

Topic B: Towards an arms trade treaty: Establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of armaments.

Brief Summary

Small arms are contributing to the protracting of civil wars, increase in the amount of civilian conflicts and disrupt the development of states after a conflict has finished. These arms are exploited especially in places where there are terrorists, organised crimes and other criminal acts. These armed aggressions are endangering human society as human rights are being breached as well. It is becoming increasingly difficult for governments to control the small arms trade due to the rising number of these illegal weapons being available, especially where the economies and governments of the country are unstable and weak because of armed conflict.

Moreover, economies of the big powers like the USA and the Russian Federation depend on the arms trade as a significant of their GDP comes from and it so are reluctant to drastically reduce their arms businesses especially since the world economy is going through a turbulent phase. There is a wide gap between the MEDCs and the LEDCs further causing dilemmas for the production of an Arms Trade Treaty that would include all areas from both MEDCs and LEDCs which would be beneficial for both as the real problem actually lies in countries like Somalia and Mexico. Another major issue is to control the transfer of illegal arms

so that these arms do not reach the hands of human rights violators whose misuse would not affect society as a whole negatively.

History and Further Discussion of the Issue

The collapse of the Cold War has triggered numerous civil conflicts; the root causes of which lie in racial and ethnic differences, accompanied by the issue of refugees and by internally displaced individuals. Anti-personnel landmines and small arms have further aided to these civil conflicts. In these circumstances, besides the traditional concept of "state security," the importance of "humanitarian security" has increased, and the importance of addressing the spread of conventional weapons has also grown. States can use weapons in conformity with the UN Charter; however the unregulated arms trade does not ensure that arms are only traded on the basis of the UN Charter. An excessive build up of armament within any nation is bound to threaten other nations and thus build up tensions within the international community.

More arms also mean a higher risk of misuse and diversion. Due to these high risks to internal / international security, all nations are expected to co-operate and act responsibly in terms of such trade of armament. In all parts of the world, the availability of conventional weapons and ammunition has led to human suffering, repression, crime and terror among innocent civilians. The irresponsible transfer of conventional weapons can destabilize security in a region, enable the violation of Security Council arms embargoes and contribute to violations of the human right laws. These factors have contributed to the recent drive calling for the global regulation of the conventional arms trade, which has garnered support from politicians and the civil society.

Events in the Middle East and North Africa have reminded governments that they cannot continue to operate like used to previously without any change. Each government has a responsibility to ensure that any weapon or any type of ammunition should not fall in wrong hands. The Arms Trade Treaty that is currently under negotiations will ensure this by requiring governments to refuse transfers of conventional arms if there is a substantial risk of serious human rights violations, war crimes or terrorist acts.

The inability of the current establishments to effectively prevent the negative effects of the arms trade, and to establish norms for responsible arms transfers, is a topic of extensive discussion. It was argued that a key challenge for the design of effective arms regulation was to reconcile the need for global regulation with the political and pragmatic requirement for authority over transfer decisions to remain at the national level. Current international controls exist in a diverse body of international legal agreements, which do not cover all regions. These range from the broad framework of rights and responsibilities provided by the UN Charter to specific obligations set out in arms control treaties; for example the conventions on landmines and cluster munitions. While an international rule does exist for the regulation of the trade in conventional weapons, it is ineffective in establishing the parameters for acceptable, ‘responsible’ arms trade, and in constraining ‘irresponsible’ transfers.

Past Actions

The Arms Trade Treaty is the name of a potential multilateral treaty that would control the international trade of conventional weapons. The treaty is in the preliminary stages of development and has not yet been officially negotiated. It was first addressed in the UN in December 2006 when the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 61/89 “*Towards an Arms Trade Treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms*”. Resolution 61/89 requested the UN Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States on the feasibility, scope and draft parameters for a comprehensive, legally binding instrument establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer of conventional arms, and to submit a report on the subject to the General Assembly at its sixty-second session. 94 States submitted their views, which are contained in the 2007 report. UN member states led by the UK endorsed a resolution to negotiate the Arms Trade Treaty (ATT) in 2009, “*a legally binding instrument on the highest possible common international standards for the transfer of conventional arms*”. The Treaty is to be negotiated in a series of Prepcom (Preparatory Committee) leading up to a final negotiating conference in 2012.

States have for years been called upon to monitor and regulate arms transfers. Any risk assessment required by an ATT would essentially be an element of monitoring and regulating arms transfers. Arms-exporting States should exercise the highest degree of responsibility and effective control in these transactions. Effective control over arms exports should involve thorough and objective assessment on a case-by-case basis for each export application. However, ad hoc or isolated incidents of armed violence should not trigger a responsibility to prohibit an arms export. Rather, such responsibility should be triggered by specific types and levels of armed violence, for example those that warrant the attention of the exporter States based upon the nature, severity, scale, and pervasiveness of the armed violence. For example, will the activities be serious violations of international human rights law or international humanitarian law?

Do the activities constitute crimes under international law such as torture, enforced disappearance, war crimes, crimes against humanity, or genocide? Will the transfer of conventional arms under review facilitate or perpetuate such violations?

The Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (also known as ABM Treaty) is a treaty between the USA and the former USSR (Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Ukraine) that was signed on 26 May 1972 and entered into force on 3 October 1972. It was terminated on 13 June 2002 after the USA officially withdrew from it. It is an agreement between these states on limiting both ABM defensive systems and strategic nuclear offensive systems.

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is an international treaty with an aim of preventing the expansion of nuclear weapons. The treaty entered into force on 5 March 1970. There are currently 189 members of the treaty including the five big powers. Still, there are four states that are not a party to this treaty and are believed to have control over nuclear arms – India, Pakistan, North Korea and Israel. The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty is yet to enter into force as it needs the endorsement of the Annex 2 States to do so. Presently, 157 member states have ratified it.

A/RES/61/89 (2006) and A/RES/63/240 (2008) “Towards an arms trade treaty: establishing common international standards for the import, export and transfer

of conventional arms”. It recognises the importance of creating an arms trade treaty that will establish international rules and regulations about the import, export and transfer of conventional arms in order to achieve world peace. They also urge countries to show transparency over such issues.

Current Situation

The ATT is specifically focused so far on the import, export and international transfer of conventional arms, including weapons, ammunition, and related parts and components. Proponents of the ATT have been calling for a treaty that will make the international trade in such arms more responsible and ensure that effective control is exercised over their import, export and international transfer. The UN Security Council has cited the “*recurring problem*” of the absence of a normative framework for States to guide their decisions regarding arms imports, exports and international transfers leads to the proliferation of arms, particularly in “zones of crisis”. In order to be an effective global instrument, the ATT will need to elaborate a comprehensive system to control the cross-border movement of all conventional arms – weapons, munitions and associated equipment and services. If an ATT is to contribute to the prevention and reduction of homicides perpetrated with small arms and light weapons (SALW), and specifically firearms, 142 of these items must also be subject to the terms of the Treaty. All imports, exports and international transfers of ammunition should also be subject to prior official authorization or licensing decisions. Some nations have raised the need for criteria to deny transfers where the arms could be used to facilitate “*violent crime*”. UN General Assembly resolutions on the ATT also refer to crime as one of the consequences of an absence of common international standards on the import and export.

Necessity of the Treaty

Its aim is to foster regional and international confidence-building. Transparency in armaments can help to determine whether excessive or destabilizing accumulations of arms take place, it may encourage restraint in the transfer or production of arms, and can contribute to preventive diplomacy. Since its inception in 1991, the UN Register has received reports from 173 states. Global military expenditure has increased significantly in the decade since 1998, with

the vast majority of spending concentrated among relatively few (predominantly Western) states. This suggests that even narrow agreements among a limited number of states can nonetheless result in broad coverage of the global arms trade. However, it was noted that it might be the unregulated minority that is associated with the most irresponsible practices.

Global arms production has been progressively concentrated in just a few defence companies, which should facilitate effective monitoring and regulation. Despite the signing of several international agreements covering chemical, biological and nuclear weapons, as well as bans on specific weapons such as landmines and cluster bombs, there is still no binding treaty regulating the trade in conventional weapons. Campaigners have called on governments involved to ensure that no weapons or munitions are sold to human rights abusers. But some countries fear that the treaty could damage their arms industries. Despite the continuing global economic recession, total sales by the world's largest arms producers in 2009 went up by 14.8 billion dollars from the previous year to reach 401 billion dollars, a real increase of 8 per cent, according to new data on international arms production released by SIPRI (Stockholm International Peace Institute) on 21 February 2011. Can we come to a consensus and collaborate to make the world a peaceful and secure place for future generations?

The top 15 Arms-Suppliers from 2003 to 2008

| Rank | State | % of total | US\$ (mil) |
|------|---------------|------------|------------|
| 1 | United States | 30.51 | 34,901 |
| 2 | Russia | 24.95 | 28,536 |
| 3 | Germany | 10.01 | 11,450 |
| 4 | France | 8.40 | 9,607 |

SECURITY COUNCIL

| | | | |
|----|--|------|-------|
| 5 | United Kingdom | 4.49 | 5,132 |
| 6 | Netherlands | 3.32 | 3,803 |
| 7 | Italy | 2.41 | 2,761 |
| 8 | Spain | 1.86 | 2,123 |
| 9 | Ukraine | 1.82 | 2,083 |
| 10 | Sweden | 1.76 | 2,012 |
| 11 |  | 1.75 | 2,007 |
| 12 | China | 1.67 | 1,908 |
| 13 | Canada | 1.16 | 1,322 |
| 14 | Switzerland | 1.10 | 1,262 |
| 15 | Belgium | 0.62 | 704 |
| | All others | 2.53 | 2,889 |

SECURITY COUNCIL

Useful Links

Topic A:

1. <http://www.cfr.org/libya/libya-responsibility-protect/p24480>
2. <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter5.shtml>
3. <http://www.economist.com/node/11376531>
4. <http://www.un.org/preventgenocide/rwanda/responsibility.shtml>
5. <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/36/a36r103.htm>
6. <http://jicj.oxfordjournals.org/content/7/3/555.abstract>
7. <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/40236/llyod-n-cutler/the-right-to-intervene>
8. <http://worldpublicopinion.org/pipa/articles/brafricara/71.php?lb=braf&pnt=71&nid=&id=>
9. http://www.icrc.org/eng/assets/files/other/irrc_852_kioko.pdf
10. <http://www.eurasiareview.com/23112011-right-to-intervene-and-right-to-protect-dilemmas-of-humanitarianism-in-syria-analysis/>

SECURITY COUNCIL

Topic B:

1. <http://www.armstreaty.org/>
2. <http://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/ArmsTradeTreaty/html/ATT.shtml>
3. <http://www.controlarms.org>
4. <http://www.oxfam.org/en/campaigns/conflict/controlarms/why-we-need-global-arms-tradetreaty>
5. http://www.unidir.org/bdd/fiche-activite.php?ref_activite=431
6. <http://www.suite101.com/content/global-arms-trade-treaty-one-step-nearer-a355694>
7. <http://www.sipri.org/research/armaments/transfers/controlling/att>
8. <http://www.reuters.com/article/2010/07/12/us-arms-treaty-un-idUSTRE66B6FO20100712>
9. <http://www.defenceagainstcorruption.org/our-work/international-bodies/un-arms-tradetreaty>

10. <http://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/ArmsTradeTreaty/html/ATTMeetings2009-11.shtml>
11. <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/gadis3335.doc.htm>
12. <http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/news/un/un-100712-voa01.htm>
13. <http://www.un.org/disarmament/convarms/ATTPrepCom/>
14. <http://www.poa-iss.org/bulletinboard/Default.aspx?g=posts&m=1460>
15. <http://www.un-ngls.org/spip.php?article2078>
16. <http://www.reachingcriticalwill.org/legal/att/prepcom2/index.html>