CENMUN 2024

BACKGROUND GUIDE

Committee- Disarmament and International Security Committee {DISEC}

Agenda- International Security and Complete Disarmament, for Protection against Open Threats and World War III

LETTER FROM THE EXECUTIVE BOARD

Dear Delegates,
Welcome to CENMUN 2024!

We Welcome You as this Year's Delegates at CENMUN 2024 in DISEC. While Detailed Knowledge of the Committee is provided in the Background Guide, to give you a brief introduction, The Agenda for DISEC to be convened in This Year's CENMUN is "International Security and Complete Disarmament, for Protection against Open Threats and World War III". Throughout the Committee Sessions, the Board will be helping You to understand the Traits of Diplomacy, Logical Analysis, and Argumentative Debating. Although Very Comprehensive and Factual, this guide provides only a Basic Agenda Idea. The Delegates under no circumstances should limit their research to this guide. This guide is just to make the delegates understand the agenda and the way to make their addresses. We expect from Members of this Committee that you respect Everyone's views, maintain general decorum, and most importantly, understand the gravity of these issues and discuss effective solutions. In case of any queries or clarifications, feel free to contact the EB. We Look Forward to Seeing You!
Best Wishes,

Sarthak Pandit   Abhinav Somani
Chairperson   Vice-Chairperson
sarthakpandit4316@gmail.com   abhinavsomani@gmail.com

DISEC Mandate

The United Nations (UN) Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) was created as the first of the Main Committees in the General Assembly when the charter of the United Nations was signed in 1945. Thus, DISEC is often referred to as the First Committee. DISEC was formed to respond to the need for an International forum to discuss peace and security issues among members of the international community. According to the UN Charter, the purpose of DISEC in the General Assembly is to establish 'General Principles of Cooperation in the Maintenance of International Peace and Security, including the Principles governing Disarmament and the Regulation of Armaments and also to give "Recommendations with regard to such Principles to the Members or to the Security Council." Although DISEC cannot directly advise the Security Council's decision-making process, the UN Charter explains that DISEC can suggest specific topics for Security Council consideration. Aside from its role in the General Assembly, DISEC is also an institution of the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA), formally named in January 1998 after the Secretary-General's second special session on disarmament in 1982. The UNODA is concerned with disarmament at all levels—nuclear weapons, weapons of mass destruction, and conventional weapons—and assists DISEC through its work conducted in the General Assembly for substantive norm-setting support to further its Disarmament Initiatives.

Formal Debate:

1) General Speaker's List (GSL) - This is basically a speech that allows a delegate to present his/her introductory stance on the crisis in the beginning of the committee. It will allow the countries to understand the various standpoints of other countries as we begin with the debate. There shall be Yields or Points of Information for this speech. The default time limit of this speech is 90 seconds.

2) Special Speaker's List (SSL) - This is a speech which enables a delegate to present his/her country's stance on a particular topic. It works similar to a GSL while the only difference is stances being on a topic rather than an entire agenda. It has a default time limit of 1 minute 30 seconds (90 seconds). It has all the yields and points similar to a GSL.

Informal Debate:

1) Moderated Caucus - These are motions that are used to give specialised speeches on subtopics of the whole agenda. They have a maximum individual speaker's time limit of 2 min and total time limit of 20 mins. The recommendation for a moderated caucus must include a time limit for Delegate remarks and a time limit for the entire caucus (e.g. "The nation of [country name] moves for a five minute moderated caucus with a 30 second speaking time."). This can also be extended by a time duration that is equal to half the total time limit it was raised for, by proposing a motion to extend.

2) Unmoderated Caucus - This motion allows the delegates to enter an informal session which the delegates can use for lobbying, documentation and other purposes. This can also be extended by

raising a motion similar to a moderated caucus with only the time limit for the entire caucus.

Points:

Point of Personal Privilege-
Personal Inconvenience e.g. inaudibility of some part of the speech of another delegate **CAN** interrupt an active speaker

Point of Order
Used to point out inaccuracies in procedure and if allowed, even on factual inaccuracies within the speeches of other delegates
CANNOT interrupt an active speaker

Point of Parliamentary Inquiry
Used to clarify doubts on the rules of procedure
CANNOT interrupt a speaker

Point of Information
Used to ask questions to other delegates on their speeches
CANNOT interrupt an active speaker

Yields:

Yield to Points of Information
Yielding the remaining time to other delegates so that they can question you on the speech you made.

Yield to Another Delegate
Yielding remaining time to some specific delegate to let her/him make her/his speech. Prior consent to the yield by the other delegate is necessary.

Yield to the Executive Board
Yielding the remaining time to the EB. Such yielded time is deemed elapsed by the EB but not always. Such time usage is up to the discretion of the EB.

Foreign Policy
Understanding and articulating the foreign policy of the assigned country is pivotal for delegates. Foreign policy serves as the guiding compass that navigates a nation's interactions on the global stage. It encapsulates a comprehensive set of principles, objectives, and strategies that shape a country's stance on various international issues, including peacekeeping operations and crisis response. Deviating from one's country's foreign policy without a valid justification is considered a significant error for a delegate. In the context of the UNSC, delegates are tasked with representing the intricate nuances of their respective nations' foreign policies. This entails a profound exploration of historical precedents, regional alliances, and the overarching diplomatic philosophy that informs a country's approach to International Relations. The examination should extend to the Nation's commitments to the United Nations Charter and its willingness to contribute resources, both human and financial, to UN peacekeeping missions.

Role of the Executive Board
The primary responsibility of the Executive Board is to assist in guiding the debate, although it is the committee members who ultimately influence the direction and dynamics of the discussion. Delegates, being integral constituents of the committee, are encouraged to openly express their opinions and perspectives without reservation. Nonetheless, the Executive Board retains the authority to raise questions and request clarifications at any juncture, aiming to enrich the debate and gauge participants' comprehension.

Introduction-

Since the 'War to End All Wars', the World has seen the 'Peace to End All Peace' lead to the horrors of the Second World War, Proxy Wars through the Cold War and, today, violent conflicts that increasingly affect civilians disproportionately and cross the red lines laid by the laws of armed conflict. The machinery of war and the available firepower has increased dramatically. The risks of a third world war are enormous. If we add in all the means and methods of warfare – conventional, nuclear, cyber, drones, and so on – we have the military potential to destroy ourselves entirely.

Violence is raging in the Middle East, Europe and Russia are poised on the edge of conflict over Ukraine, the United States is once more engaged in military action in Iraq and, as NATO pulls out, Afghanistan is vulnerable. Other flashpoints over disputed islands in the South China Sea, tensions on the Korean peninsula and over Kashmir are just some of the easily identified points of escalation. Many factors have supported the reduction in armed conflicts including the withering of proxy wars, UN sponsored peace processes and economic development. Research by the Human Security Report demonstrates that peace negotiations and cease-fire agreements reduce violent conflict even when they fail.

The Laws of Armed Conflict and Human Rights Laws along with the International Criminal Court, War Crime Tribunals, Economic and Military Sanctions and Domestic Justice Commissions serve to protect civilians. Although nuclear weapons possession or use, outlawed for most countries, are yet to be globally forbidden, international law has proscribed the possession and use of devastating weapons systems such as chemical and biological weapons, antipersonnel landmines, cluster munitions and blinding lasers.

Vision of Disarmament as a Crucial Path towards Sustainable Peace and Security-

The Evolution of International Security in the World are exacerbating, the suffering of victims of armed conflict through the growing risk of the use of nuclear weapons; the terrible impact of war in cities, including the use of heavy explosive weapons in populated areas and the destruction of critical civilian infrastructure; the immediate and long-lasting humanitarian consequences of the use of antipersonnel mines and cluster munitions; concerns over inadequately controlled transfers of arms and ammunition; and the increasingly significant role of advanced technologies, such as cyber, artificial-intelligence (AI) and space-based technologies, coupled with growing levels of autonomy in weapon systems. This reality is something that we, this Committee and the wider international community cannot ignore. If we are to take effective collective action to address these challenges, then **DISARMAMENT** and existing international law must form a common ground.

The Threat of Nuclear Weapons with Respect to World War 3-

Nuclear weapons profoundly challenge the basic premises of DISEC: Weapons capable of spreading radiation across borders and down generations, causing horrific injuries and often untreatable illness, and poisoning the environment for decades – if not centuries – to come are fundamentally incompatible with the principles of distinction, proportionality and, above all, humanity.

In light of their catastrophic humanitarian consequences, it is extremely doubtful that nuclear weapons could ever be used in accordance with the principles and rules of Disarmament. Any use would be abhorrent to the principles of humanity and the dictates of public conscience. The same applies to any threat – whether irresponsible or soi-disant "responsible" – of the use of such weapons, be it for defensive, deterrent or offensive purposes, using strategic or so-called tactical nuclear weapons.

Today, we are witnessing disturbing developments that risk eroding the decades-long taboo against the use of nuclear weapons. More than 50 years after the entry into force of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the risk of nuclear weapons being used is at its highest since the darkest moments of the Cold War. In the face of growing international and regional tensions, nuclear rhetoric has increased alarmingly, and nuclear deterrence theories are regaining vigour. The modernization of nuclear arsenals continues unabated, with the development of smaller nuclear weapons claimed to be more "usable" and intended for tactical military use in combination with conventional capabilities. Despite the commitments made at NPT Review Conferences, the role of nuclear weapons in military doctrines and security policies is, rather than diminishing, actually growing.

These developments bring us closer day by day to a nuclear catastrophe – whether intentional, due to a miscalculation or accidental. Clearly, they also go against the obligation of NPT States Parties to take effective measures towards nuclear disarmament, and against the many commitments undertaken in past NPT Review Conferences. Nuclear risk-reduction measures and tangible progress towards nuclear disarmament are urgently needed.

The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW), which, so far, has 69 States Parties and a further 28 signatories, has made a significant contribution towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. It prohibits them in an unequivocal and comprehensive manner, given the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of their use.
The TPNW is an indispensable part of the nuclear disarmament architecture and complements and reinforces other existing relevant instruments, such as the NPT, the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) and regional treaties establishing nuclear-weapon-free zones.

Growing Danger related to Autonomous Weapons System and Cyber Security with regards to Disarmament-

The unconstrained development and use of autonomous weapon systems presents unacceptable humanitarian, ethical and legal risks that the international community must address today. States must expressly prohibit unpredictable autonomous weapons, which we understand as systems that prevent users from being able to anticipate and limit their effects.
We are particularly concerned by autonomous weapons, including swarms, that are controlled by machine-learning software that writes its own rules, is not understandable or explainable, and – worse still – might alter its own functioning over time.

This should be coupled with a prohibition against systems designed or used to target humans. As emphasised in the statement by the Secretary General of the United Nations, "the autonomous targeting of humans by machines is a moral line that we must not cross". And from a legal perspective, we find it difficult to envisage a realistic combat situation in which the use of an autonomous weapon system against a person would not pose a significant risk of violating International Humanitarian Law.
Then, for all other systems, there must be a combination of limits on the types of target and on the duration, geographical scope, scale and situations of use, plus a requirement to ensure effective human supervision and timely intervention and deactivation.
Industry, militaries and the general public are increasingly looking to their governments to demonstrate leadership, and to provide clarity on this issue. Over the last year, we have been encouraged by the growing momentum among States towards establishing an effective framework of prohibitions and restrictions.

There have been strong statements from regional groups, in particular across the Latin America and Caribbean region.

Furthermore, after nearly ten years of discussions, the Group of Governmental Experts of the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons has set out a structure of non-binding prohibitions and restrictions. While that structure could form the basis for new international rules, States must now go beyond merely recalling existing legal frameworks and negotiate a legally binding instrument that establishes clear and specific red lines regarding which autonomous weapons are prohibited and how others must be restricted.

Current armed conflicts have demonstrated the growing significance of cyber and other digital threats, and the potential for AI, particularly machine-learning techniques, to increase their scale and severity. Urgent action is required from States and other stakeholders in response to these developments. An additional matter of serious concern is the growing involvement of civilians – individuals, hacker groups and companies – in digital operations related to armed conflicts. The more civilians take part in military operations, and the more civilian infrastructure, such as civilian satellite communication or cloud infrastructure, is used for military purposes, the greater the risk of civilians and civilian infrastructure being targeted. This trend risks undermining the universally supported principle of distinction and must be reversed.

Growing Concerns about International Security in context with Open Conflicts-

Instead of One global conflict that would quickly escalate towards Nuclear War, World War III might be fought in the form of a chain of regional conflicts. From the war in Ukraine, to the war in Gaza, to tensions in the South China Sea, the Taiwan Strait, and the Korean Peninsula, regional conflicts have involved all the great powers, either as combatants or in proxy roles. Except for Russia's invasion of Ukraine and Israel's ghastly war in Gaza, the other regional hotspots have yet to erupt as full-blown conflicts; if they do, the two largest superpowers, China and the United States, could be at war.

The bad news is that these conflicts are escalating in the face of futile efforts to mediate. After a feeble Ukrainian counteroffensive over the summer, Russia is now on the offensive in Ukraine. Meanwhile, China is providing more help to Russia, which is exacerbating already threadbare China-U.S. relations. In the South China Sea and close to the Taiwan Strait, the navies of China and the United States are sailing ever closer to confrontation.

Meanwhile, Israel's assault on Gaza continues to kill and maim the people of the besieged territory and the Middle East is on the brink of a wider war. Israel's attack on an Iranian consulate in Syria for the first-time led to direct retaliation from Tehran. Israel responded with a missile attack on Iran that could now see much greater escalation in the region.

In Africa, the situation is no better. Festering conflicts exacerbated by climate change and resulting displacement fuel a pipeline of humans seeking refuge in Europe, which is tearing apart societies in both continents. Federal arrangements across a wide range of complex

societies such as Ethiopia, Somalia, and Sudan have all but collapsed and fuel vicious incipient or actual civil wars.

Much as during the last world war, Latin America serves as a bystander, sometimes taking sides, but otherwise marching to its own regional dynamic, which is fragile but generally pacific. One has to go back to the mid-1990s to recall an incident of inter-state warfare in the Americas.

The new edition of war deploys weapons such as drones and unmanned surface vessels that are rewriting the rules of warfare – for the first time, once-insurmountable commanding positions are subject to precise targeting at little cost. Fortunately, this more effective, targeted warfare, while it more precisely kills civilians using AI algorithms, makes it less likely that weapons of mass destruction will be needed.

The Post-World War III world is one of perpetual short-term transaction, trading increasingly threatened and scarce resources, and forging smaller impermanent interest groups based on trade and connectivity.

CASE STUDIES-

The Russia-Ukraine War

Background: Russia's longstanding war with Ukraine, which escalated dramatically with Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, is the largest military conflict in Europe since World War II. Starting with Russia's 2014 annexation of Crimea, it stems from long-standing tensions over Ukraine's geopolitical orientation, with Russia seeking to maintain its sphere of influence and prevent Ukraine from aligning with the West, especially NATO and the United States.

Threat of Escalation: The conflict poses a significant risk of escalation to a broader war, potentially involving NATO. Russia's nuclear rhetoric, its military actions near NATO borders, and the potential for miscalculation or accidents all contribute to this danger. The heavy involvement of Western nations in supplying Ukraine with arms and intelligence further raises the stakes, as does the potential for the conflict to spill over into neighbouring countries.

The Israel-Palestine Conflict

Background: The Israel-Palestine conflict is a protracted and multifaceted dispute with deep historical roots, centred on competing claims to land, resources, and self-determination. The conflict has been marked by numerous wars, periods of intense violence, and failed peace negotiations.

Threat of Escalation: While the conflict has primarily been localised, it has the potential to draw in regional and international actors, escalating into a larger war. The involvement of external powers, such as the United States and Iran, in supporting opposing sides, the potential for spillover into neighbouring countries like Lebanon and Syria, and the volatile political landscape in the region all contribute to the risk of a wider conflagration.

The China-Taiwan Conflict

Background: The China-Taiwan conflict is rooted in the unresolved political status of Taiwan, which China claims to be a breakaway province. Tensions have increased in recent years, driven by China's growing military power and assertive stance on reunification. Taiwan, meanwhile, seeks to maintain its de facto independence.

Threat of Escalation: This conflict poses a major threat to regional and global stability, with the potential to escalate into a major power war involving the United States. China & military buildup, its increasingly assertive actions around Taiwan, and the stated US commitment to defend Taiwan in the event of an attack all contribute to the possibility of a direct military confrontation. The strategic importance of Taiwan, particularly its role in global semiconductor production, makes the stakes even higher, raising the potential for a conflict that could have devastating economic consequences.

CONCLUSION-

The use of heavy explosive weapons in populated areas continues to be a major cause of civilian harm in armed conflict. We believe that shared humanitarian values and IHL, together with a strengthening and prioritisation of disarmament, provide the basis for States and the wider international community to take effective action to address the pressing challenges the Secretary-General has listed. The multilateral treaties, resolutions, processes and proposals considered by this Committee provide indispensable tools to uphold the protection of civilians affected by armed conflict around the world. We urge all States to embrace, adopt, develop and implement them.

It is precisely for a deteriorating security context, and for growing strategic risks, that multilateral disarmament was conceived. The international community must restore the vision of disarmament as a crucial path towards sustainable peace and security, and we stand ready to continue assisting you in your efforts.

Questions a Resolution must Answer (QARMA)

1) What are pragmatic and feasible ways to bring an end to the above-mentioned conflicts? Keep in mind that each of these has been going on for decades, so bringing an end to them will require structural solutions and not just the end of current hostilities.

2) A complete disarmament, keeping in mind the current geopolitical environment, seems unlikely. In light of this, what mechanisms can be adopted to mitigate the risk of an accidental or unintended escalation of conflict?

3) How can it be ensured that new-age technologies, like Artificial Intelligence, do not become means of war and further exacerbate these existing conflicts?

4) How can the lessons learned from past disarmament treaties and agreements be leveraged to develop new and effective mechanisms for ensuring international security?

5) How can we account for non-military threats to international security in the 21st century, such as resource scarcity, which have the potential to exacerbate existing conflicts?

6) To what extent are existing international organisations equipped to address the complex and interconnected security challenges of the 21st century? What reforms or new institutional arrangements might be necessary to enhance international cooperation and prevent large-scale conflicts?