

## **HONORABLE DELEGATES,**

Greetings! We are excited that you all will be joining us for the 2019 Mid-South Model United Nations Conference and the Disarmament and International Security Council! My name is Layla Jaber, and I will serve as your chair for this committee session alongside Noor Jaber (yes, we are sisters), who will be the co-chair. I am a Senior Biology major, Religious Studies minor at Rhodes. While this will be my first year serving as a chair, I have participated in MSMUN and MUN throughout my high school and college years. I hope this will be an incredible learning experience for everyone, and I am looking forward to working with a group of dedicated and professional diplomats. With the many important topics to be discussed, I know that there will be lively and critical discussions throughout our time together. I hope that, through these discussions, we are able to work collaboratively and peacefully to help overcome many of the current issues plaguing the global community today. With that, I expect everyone to come well prepared to work, negotiate, and have fun!

Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions or concerns!

**BEST,**

Layla Jaber

Juble-19@rhodes.edu

# NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Non-proliferation agreements among nations in Southeast Asia have sought to ensure peace and diplomatic cooperation within the highly concentrated region. However, the initiatives made by these nations have not been successfully ratified by the security council of the United Nations, who happen to be the only nations that possess nuclear technology that pose as a threat to the region, making Southeast Asia vulnerable and defenseless to possible nuclear attacks. In light of the growing competition in the South China Sea between these nuclear weapon states, incentives for ratifying a treaty that promote peace and neutrality within the region have increased.

In March of 1997, the ten member nations of ASEAN, which include Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines Singapore, and Thailand, established the Bangkok Treaty, otherwise known as the Southeast Asian Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty (SEANWFZ), which prohibits the use of nuclear weapons. According to the terms of the treaty, signatories are not allowed to develop, possess, transport, station, or test nuclear weapons anywhere within and outside the treaty zone. In addition to current Nuclear-Weapon Free Zone (NWFZ) agreements promoted by the United Nations, the SEANWFZ treaty has incorporated additional measures to ensure the security and safety of signatory nations. The scope of the treaty extends to include the territories and their respective continental shelves and the exclusive economic zones of the signatories. Additionally, the treaty also promotes a negative security assurance policy which prohibits nuclear weapon states from using their nuclear weapons to coerce non-nuclear states.

None of the current signatories of the treaty have neither possessed nor manufactured nuclear weapons within their borders. However, the five recognized nuclear-weapon nations, which include the United States of America and China, have yet to sign the treaty, leaving the nations of the SEANWFZ defenseless against potential threats that may be instigated by these five nations. The United States and other nuclear-weapon states claim that their refusal to commit to signing the treaty is due the ambiguity of the scope of the treaty, specifically within the South China Sea since economic zones and continental shelves are not explicitly defined within the treaty. Another reason that many nuclear weapon states, specifically the United States, are reluctant to signing the treaty is attributed to the constraints that negative security assurance has

on their ability to coerce other non-nuclear weapon states who are not members and do not comply with the terms of the already existing Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). However, there have been many changes and technological developments that offer new incentives for these formerly reluctant nations to reconsider becoming members of the Bangkok Treaty.

Additionally, current disputes concerning the South China Sea have made reaching a solution to nuclear proliferation in Southeast Asia much more imperative since the members with claims over the South China Sea are members of ASEAN and the United States and China. In the event that conflict were to escalate even further as a result of conflicting claims within the South China Sea, the region of Southeast Asia needs to have a treaty in place to ensure the safety of surrounding states through ensuring that nuclear warfare and negative security assurance tactics are not employed by nuclear weapon nations to establish claims over the South China Sea.

The ultimate goal of the Disarmament and International Security Committee is to promote cooperation among the international community in an attempt to secure peace and security. Any treaty that is drafted requires adherence to current international laws concerning the use of nuclear weapons, such as the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Through this committee, the participating nations must reach an agreement surrounding a non-proliferation agreement that members of ASEAN and nuclear-weapon states can all agree to in order to ensure safety and security within Southeast Asia.

**THROUGHOUT THE DEBATE WITHIN THIS COMMITTEE, DELEGATES ARE ENCOURAGED TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WHEN FORMULATING POTENTIAL AGREEMENTS:**

Should the disarmament efforts of nuclear weapons be exclusive to only territorial members of a region or should they extend to include all influencing parties within the international arena?

Is the current state of the SEANWFZ Treaty amendable to resolutions proposed by both nuclear and non-nuclear states, or should the entire treaty be redrafted and reconstructed?

What are ways that the terms of the treaty can be more explicit so that nations are more comfortable becoming members of the SEANWFZ Treaty or one that is similar?

Is non-proliferation a reasonable possibility given the political climate of the international world as it stands today?

**RESOURCES:**

[https://www.nonproliferation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/12/nwfp\\_treaty\\_bangkok\\_southeast\\_asia.pdf](https://www.nonproliferation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/12/nwfp_treaty_bangkok_southeast_asia.pdf)

[nwfp\\_treaty\\_bangkok\\_southeast\\_asia.pdf](https://www.nonproliferation.org/wpcontent/uploads/2013/12/nwfp_treaty_bangkok_southeast_asia.pdf)

<http://nwp.ilpi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Southeast-Asia-nuclear-weapons.pdf>

<https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker#!/conflict/territorial-disputes-in-the-south-china-sea>

<https://carnegietsinghua.org/2017/02/10/nuclear-weapon-states-and-southeast-asia-nuclear-weapon-free-zone-pub-67965>

# UNITED NATIONS OFFICE OF DRUGS AND CRIME

The United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), formed in 1997, was established with the bona fide intention to assist member states with their struggles against illegal drugs, crime and terrorism. Formed from the merging of the UN Drug Control Program and Center for International Crime Prevention, UNODC strives to reduce transnational crime, international terrorism, and the world wide drug problem facing many nations today. Through UNODC, DISEC intends remove terrorism and drug threats across the globe. Currently, UNODC is dealing with issues surrounding governmental corruption, cybercrime, firearm usage, and, most relevant to this committee session, drug trafficking and drug prevention/ treatment protocols.

Drug trafficking is defined as the illegal manufacturing and distribution of illicit substances within and across borders. The most common drugs trafficked include cocaine, methamphetamine, oxycodone, and marijuana. Many countries are struggling with drug trafficking, including Mexico and Latin American countries, the Middle East, and Asia. In Mexico, violence surrounding drug related crime increased over 26%, resulting in over 55,000 deaths. Extreme violence from both drug cartels and governmental response towards the war on drugs has displaced thousands of civilians. The effects of these cartels extends far beyond the borders of Mexico, with countries where drugs are shipped from or to- including the United States and European countries, being affected with bouts of violence and harm done to citizens. Latin American countries are a central hub for drug production, with countries in the Andean regions- including Columbia, Peru, and Bolivia- producing the highest amounts of cocaine and countries in Central America and in Mexico serving as major transporting centers for drugs to other countries around the world.

On the other side of the world, the illegal distribution of opiates to almost every continent via several routes from Afghanistan has been deemed the top priority of UNODC to date. In the Philippines, Rodrigo Duterte, the current president, has unleashed a harsh campaign against drug trafficking within the country. The UN HRC has already called for

MSMUN XXXVIII | RHODES COLLEGE | 2000 N. PKWY MEMPHIS, TN 38112

Duterte to cease the bloody campaign and allow for an external investigation into the campaign, which has killed mostly poor urban Filipinos. He has refused to do so.

The issue with drug trafficking and sales can not be resolved within one country alone; the issue requires global collaboration. Despite understanding that these drugs, especially those considered hard drugs, have damaging effects on the health of users and on the security of affected countries, drug trafficking remains all too common among members of our global community. It is important to note that despite efforts to educate against drug use and criminalization laws to deter users and sellers, drug consumption and sales have remained steady on a global level. Often referred to as the ballooning effect, even when one country eradicates drug usage, the problem simply moves to neighboring countries. And, while acts of force against drug cartels and distributors can seem like the most effective strategy, using force amplifies gang violence against enforcers. The UN urges member states to seek out alternative methods to cease the issue of drug trafficking.

As a direct result of increased drug trafficking, UNODC is concerned with helping those facing the disease of addiction. An estimated 26 million people in the world are facing a severe drug problem. Members of our scientific community have properly identified drug addiction as a disease and understand that there are biological, genetic, social, and physiological factors that must be addressed when considering successful treatment for those addicted to drugs. However, while UNODC has been working on developing rehabilitation programs in member states, progress is limited. There are several cultural, religious, and economic barriers that must be considered in order to successfully establish rehabilitation programs in member states. With fentanyl overdoses fueling the opioid crisis in North America and tramadol fueling it in Africa and the Middle East, the UN is calling for a multidisciplinary response to help rehabilitate those affected by addicting drugs before the issue becomes more widespread.

**ULTIMATELY, DRUG TRAFFICKING AND DRUG ADDICTIONS GO HAND IN HAND. SOLUTIONS TO ONE PROBLEM CAN ASSIST SOLUTIONS**

**TOWARDS THE OTHER. THIS DISEC COMMITTEE URGES MEMBER NATIONS TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS WHEN DRAFTING RESOLUTIONS:**

Consider current strategies for combating drug trafficking in your nations. Have they been successful? Why or why not?

The issue of drug trafficking extends beyond one nation's borders. This suggests a global initiative must be put in place to combat the issue. Would such an initiative be successful? Why or why not?

What sort of rehabilitation programs currently exist in your nation and have they been successful? What more can and should be done to help addicts?

Should prescription pain medication be regulated more severely?

**RESOURCES:**

<https://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/opioid-crisis/index.html>

<https://www.philstar.com/headlines/2018/06/23/1827213/38-un-rights-council-members-urge-philippines-stop-drug-war-deaths>

<https://www.brookings.edu/research/asia-international-drug-trafficking-and-u-s-china-counternarcotics-cooperation/>

<https://www.cnn.com/2018/10/21/health/drug-report-un-failure-intl/index.html>

<http://www.drugpolicy.org/issues/international-drug-war>

# REGULATION OF UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES

The use of unmanned aerial vehicles, commonly known as drones, have sparked an international discussion regarding lawful use of drones in global airspaces. Drones have been used by countries for reconnaissance, peacekeeping, transportation, and, most concerning, for targeted airstrikes and military defense. While the use of drones has existed throughout history, the increased deployment of drones within the past fifty years is alarming. The lack of transparency, understanding, and accountability surrounding the use of drones has led to a plethora of civilian casualties and unrest in many countries. For instance, the embrace of military drone usage by the Obama administration in 2009 as a tactic for counterinsurgency and counterterrorism efforts in the Middle East, has led to the increase of civilian casualties which have been justified as “collateral damage”. In countries such as Pakistan, Somalia, and Yemen, the United States has conducted numerous drone strikes on the terms of threatening circumstances. These strikes have led to over two thousand civilian deaths in Pakistan alone. In 2013, an airstrike on a vehicle conducted by the US in Yemen led to the deaths of twelve passengers, including three children and a pregnant woman. This attack epitomizes the lack of transparency and accountability for military airstrikes because the target was neither confirmed to be in the vehicle nor a clear member of Al- Qaeda. Russia is working on developing military drones to carry weapons for use in Syria. Also as military strategy against US drone use in Syria, Russia has proceeded to hinder US military operations by jamming the GPS systems of US drones. The lack of transparency of a country’s use of drones in a foreign country without accountability from the international community will continue to set a precedent for improper and unethical use of drones as a military tactic. In addition to the direct damage that results from the use of drones, the mental and emotional trauma of drones are a major concern as they are present and actively searching and targeting public spaces rather than being limited to designated warzones, thus targeting citizens’ sense of security and safety.

However, the use of drones can be an effective peacekeeping strategy as well. The United Nations has deployed surveillance and military drones in many countries, including the Democratic Republic of Congo and Chad, in attempts to survey regions to increase situational awareness. Regions of interest were those with rebel groups, and surveillance has been deemed successful against rebel groups in the DRC. However, these victories were not faced without backlash. Questions regarding what is to be



done with information collected by the UN drones and how to prevent information leaks have risen. Another question is whether or not it is lawful for non-military personnel to operate drones in warzones because, as seen in the DRC, many times civilian contractors were operating drones rather than UN officials. This becomes problematic when, during times of hostility, there is no clarity on who may or may not be subject to an attack. At all costs, we seek to avoid civilian casualties, but when drones with military objectives are controlled by civilians, the lines become muddled.

The United Nations Charter forbids a state from using military force in coercion against a sovereign state unless a state clearly and freely agrees. If no consent is given, then the UN sees permissible to the use of force in times of self defense or human rights/ international rights violations. Ambiguity in the terms self defense, such as defining what is qualified as self defense has resulted in potential misuse of drones by countries. We must better define the conditions under which self defense permits the use of force beyond those already asserted as international law.

The ultimate goal of the Disarmament and International Security Committee is to promote cooperation among the international community in an attempt to secure peace and security. It is imperative that that regulations surrounding drones requires, most importantly, adherence to the international human rights law alongside increased transparency and accountability surrounding the use of drones. Countries, whether actively using drones or hosting- willingly or unwillingly- foreign drones, must collaborate in what ways, if any, drones in foreign territories can ethically, safely, and legally be used to promote safety and limit civilian casualties. It is the responsibility of this body to insure the protection of civilians during times of conflict as well as the protection of national sovereignty. This committee must focus on creating a standard of ethical drone usage in the international community and should focus on setting new standards for their usage that are effective in today's culture of conflict.

## **RESOURCES:**

<https://www.justsecurity.org/8712/unhrc-adopts-drones-resolution/>

<https://unoda-web.s3-accelerate.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/assets/publications/more/drones-study/drones-study.pdf>

<https://www.paxforpeace.nl/our-work/programmes/drones>

<https://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/after-dead-are-counted-20141120.pdf>

<http://cast.ru/eng/products/articles/russian-uavs-in-syria.html>