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Dear ACMUN Delegates,

The study guides that follow are written by the directors of your committee in order to help you in your preparation for the conference. Remember that your own research on the topic area and your country’s policy is essential. The main purpose of this document is, as its name suggests, to simply guide you in your personal research.

Each delegate should come to the conference with a working paper for each topic area. In brief, a working paper is a one-page list of proposals addressing the different aspects of the problem, in accordance with the position of the delegate’s country on the issue. For more information on preparation and the rules and procedures of the conference, please consult the online Delegate Preparation Guide. Also, keep in mind that the directors are more than willing to answer any questions you may have, which you can send to the email addresses provided.

I hope that you will benefit from reading these well prepared and thorough study guides.

Sincerely,

Argyris Tsiaras
Secretary-General
Dear Delegates,
Welcome to the 2nd International Anatolia College Model United Nations Conference.

When I was offered the position of the Director of the Disarmament Committee, I was more than eager to accept it. I hope it is going to be an experience that we will all enjoy.

Let me introduce myself first. My name is Maria-Christina Vogli. I am 16 years old and I attend the German School of Athens. This will be my eleventh MUN experience and my third as a Student Officer. My first MUN Conference was when I was at the eighth grade in the Deutsche Schule Athen, as a delegate of Switzerland in the Human Rights Commission. I was very impressed, it caught my attention and it became one of my extra curricular activities. Besides that, I am also a cinephile, I love going to the Theatre, listening to music, visiting art galleries and last but not least I enjoy going out with my friends. Besides that, I am a member of the environmental and art groups of my school. Another hobby of mine is photography.

The purpose of the study guide on topic area A is to inform you about the concept of the Indian Ocean Peace Zone and its implementation. I give a brief description of the history of the region, and discuss suggestions of possible solutions.

I hope it is helpful to your research!

Good Luck with your resolutions!! See you all in the Conference.

Maria-Christina Vogli
Director
marychrista_strumfita@hotmail.com

Dear delegates,
I would like to welcome you to the second ACMUN, where I have been assigned the position of Deputy Chair of the Disarmament committee.

My name is Panagiotis Progios, and I attend the IB program, which is hosted here at Anatolia College. This is my third MUN, and I could not be more delighted to be a part of this memorable and rewarding event. In this committee, we shall discuss significant contemporary topics that have been contemplated throughout the world by a wide spectrum of people, ranging from inexperienced college undergraduates to renowned world leaders. I am particularly happy to be in the Disarmament Committee, a committee exalted for its solemn and interesting topics, as well as for its importance in the contemporary world. Hopefully, we shall make this UN simulation a memorable event by engaging in a productive and efficient session. This study guide will guide you through the process of resolution-making, and shall assist you in targeting the most important issues raised. This shall be your preparation tool, which you should utilize both prior to and during the ACMUN.

Your Deputy Chair,

Panagiotis Progios
jellenen1606@gmail.com
Disarmament Committee
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TOPIC AREA A

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The area has been the centre of attention of many outside states and due to geopolitical reasons the Ocean was and remains of great importance to the great powers of the day and is the arena of intense diplomatic and military activity. The Indian Ocean is indeed, the epitome of what Samuel Huntington described as the “Clash of Civilizations”. It is the largest and perhaps the most heterogeneous combination of countries. The differences in cultural, political, military, and economic issues do not only refer to the littoral states. There are forty-seven countries, which share the coastal waters of the Indian Ocean, among them states as large as India, with close to a billion people and those like Seychelles with less than 80,000. Its economies range in size from over $250 billion for Australia and India, to less than $400 million for Maldives and Comoros. Its income per capita levels range from $15,000 in Australia and the United Arab Emirates to less than $250 in Mozambique, Tanzania, Madagascar and Bangladesh. The region contains 1/3 of the world’s population, 25% of its landmass, and 40% of the world’s oil and gas reserves. It is the locus of important international sea lines of communication (SLOCs) and it is home to most of the world’s Muslim population as well as India, one of the world’s likely “rising powers.”

The area, before Vasco de Gama’s trip to the Indies in 1497-98, was characterized by regional self-sufficiency and autonomy, which was slowly replaced by the colonial order as Europe projected its interests in the area in order to assert its influence and ensure its economic, political and military control over the area.

In the break up of the Second World War the area played an important part in the military enterprises that took place among the Allies and the Axis powers. The end of the Second World War saw the decolonization process and the emergence of the independence movement, which led to the overturn of the geopolitical order, as we knew it. The Cold War imposed new constraints on the relations of the newly independent states and led to new conflicts. Once more the new states were not able to control their fates. The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Peace Zone was the answer to the conflict of the super powers, and the effort by the littoral states to establish peace and security in the area. It aimed at containing the actions of the two super powers, albeit with no result.

Since the end of the Cold War the emancipation trend from foreign influence continued and it led to further economic and political cooperation among the states. However, the tensions of the Cold War, and those generated by apartheid in South Africa, had complicated the political relations among all nations. The economic relationships were further complicated by South Africa’s isolation, India’s inward-looking policies and Australia’s earlier focus on developing its links with East Asia and across the Pacific. With these three main players as the major economic forces of the Indian Ocean Region having their own problems and preoccupation, no wonder so little attention was paid to trade-investment and economic co-operation. Links in this region remained thin and sporadic in comparison to other regions. In this context, the new geopolitical order demands that military and strategic concerns, as well as peace and security issues, have to be addressed, and they are as important today as they were before.

The Indian Ocean also is home to the world’s newest nuclear- weapon states. India is conducting nuclear tests and is assisted as far as know-how by the USA. India’s relations with Israel have become closer. Pakistan, as well as Iran, and N. Korea, have had their first nuclear test.

In addition, the region constitutes one of the key centers of international terrorism, “the broad incubator of terrorism” in the words of one expert.

The Indian Ocean region suffers from a high level of international and internal conflict and is a key area for international piracy.

Recent developments in Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan now pose additional challenges of violence, terrorism, and instability across the entire Indian Ocean region. It also is the locus of some 70% of the world’s natural disasters.

The Indian Ocean then, is an area that the international community must seek to establish, as a Peace Zone for it can be the centre of nuclear proliferation, violence, instability and terrorism. Perhaps it is time for the Ad Hoc Committee, which was established in order to implement the “Declaration”, to move towards much demanded action that this time must bear fruit.

HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM

Through the decolonization process that begun in 1947 with the Independence of India and Pakistan
and was followed by the independence of one after the other of the territories in the area, we have observed the evolution of a new geopolitical order. By the 1960s the new order was firmly established and new developments were under way influencing the Indian Ocean.

The most crucial was the projection of the political, ideological economic and military power of the two superpowers of the era of the Cold War, that of the US and the USSR. Under the circumstances the emancipation of the states lead to a somewhat distorted equilibrium, since all states were forced to take sides in the conflict of the two world powers even though they were pronouncing their adherence to the Non-Aligned movement (NAM). The multilateral cooperation in the political and the economic fields among the states of the region became difficult to achieve.

The USA moved in the area that they considered ideal for the placement of underwater long-range missiles, with the resulting impact on the area equilibrium. The Soviets, on the other hand, projected their military, ideological and political presence. The Indian Ocean became the plateau of superpower rivalry. It was obvious to the world that the area was crucial to the balance of power that had evolved in the aftermath of the World War 2. The states of the Indian Ocean saw that the security of the area was endangered and in an effort to neutralize it from the dangers posed by external powers, they were quick to support the initiative submitted at the 26th Session of the U.N. General Assembly, by the state of Sri Lanka, October 1971. The initiative proposed the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a peace zone.

The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace

At the initiative of Sri Lanka, later joined by Tanzania, the United Nations General Assembly, at its twenty-sixth regular session in 1971, declared the Indian Ocean "within limits to be determined, together with the air space above and the ocean floor subjacent thereto... for all time... a zone of peace" (A/RES/2832 (XXVI)). While preserving free and unimpeded use of the zone by the vessels, whether military or not, for all nations in accordance with international law, the Declaration called on the "great powers" to halt "further escalation and expansion of their military presence in the Indian Ocean", and to eliminate from the Indian Ocean "all bases, military installations and logistical supply facilities, the disposition of nuclear weapons and weapons of mass destruction and any manifestation of great power military presence... conceived in the context of great power rivalry". (Operative paragraph 2).

The reference to the behavior of the great powers and the reference to the elimination of military installations reflected the concern of the Indian Ocean states about the island of Diego Garcia.

The Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace called for a firm response from countries with global strategic concerns, and that response was far from encouraging. Their attitudes have with few exceptions, ranged between scepticism and scarcely veiled hostility.

At its twenty-seventh regular session in 1972, the General Assembly decided to establish an Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean consisting of 15 members (Resolution 2992 (XXVII)). But, while the Ad Hoc Committee has met regularly each year, and while its membership had expanded to 47 states by 1983, the objectives of the original peace zone concept seem as remote as ever.

The lack of any significant progress led the process to stagnation. The Ad Hoc Committee is now addressing new alternative approaches to the achievement of the goals contained in the Declaration, as well as its own future role.

CURRENT SITUATION

The end of the Cold War meant that Soviet power was curtailed in the region. On the contrary the USA continues to exert its influence in the area and enhance its presence. On the political side the USA developed closer ties with India and Pakistan. On the military side the Fifth Fleet, well established in the region, oversaw strikes against Sudan and Afghanistan in 1998. In turn in 2001, military operations against the Taliban and Al Qaeda were aided by the American navy. Furthermore as India develops into a nuclear power, the USA seeks to establish even closer relations with it.

In pursuit of its interests, the USA, with the British and the Australians, in 2002 and 2003 moved against Saddam Hussein in Iraq, using its military installations in Diego Garcia. The invasion was seen as an
expression of “neo-imperialism” on the part of the USA.

The USA has of course become the key external factor in the region to a greater extent than a few years ago. Overall American power extends over the Persian Gulf and the Arabian Sea, Pakistan, east and northeast Africa, Singapore, and Diego Garcia.

In recent years India has raised its profile and aspires to increase its influence in the Indian Ocean. India has strengthened its relations with littoral states, especially Iran, Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, and most of the ocean’s small island nations. India has also become more active in key maritime zones, particularly in the Bay of Bengal and the Andaman Sea.

Of equal if not greater importance are the links that India has established with external factors in the Indian Ocean. The USA, Israel, Japan, and France are among them. These links derive from India’s growing economic clout and from well-designed diplomacy. The successes of India’s ambitions depend on:

- Relations with the regional environment
- Performance of the economy
- Avoiding domestic communal discord
- The reception of India’s ambitions by the USA, China and Pakistan

The emergence of India as regional power is to be expected and it will have a transforming effect on the Indian Ocean basin. One should expect that among its effects would be the emergence of a more integrated area and as a result, a more prosperous and globally a more influential region. Moreover, its rise is expected to be welcomed by the USA and other western powers to the extent that it counteracts China’s challenge as a new rising power. However it should be noted that a multipolar world is consistent with China’s image of the world. Therefore, even though India’s emergence will be seen positively, on the part of Beijing, it would, on the other hand be disturbing to the extent that India’s ambitions would not be strictly limited to its own region, as is the case with most powers, it will seek to further its influence in other areas of the region.

China is keen to protect its trade – one third of its Gross Domestic Product is from foreign trade, of which most travels through the Indian Ocean. China therefore, will seek to secure its access to the trade routes of the Indian Ocean.

China has sought to establish close ties with Myanmar and with Pakistan, which includes Chinese assistance to the nuclear weapons program of Pakistan; thus China sought to increase its influence in the Indian Ocean through Myanmar and Pakistan. On the other hand India has upgraded its nuclear program and with USA help extended its influence to Indonesia, by joint military exercises in the Andaman Sea and in the Bay of Bengal.

Globalization saw the intensification of rivalry as far as trade and natural resources are concerned. In order to reach the Persian Gulf region you have to cross the Indian Ocean, its strategic importance therefore is crucial. 25% of oil shipments use the Indian Ocean to reach the USA, not to mention 50 other strategic materials. Myanmar and Bangladesh are seen as future suppliers of important natural resources. In 2001 the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) established a free trade area to give China increased influence in the area. The promotion of cooperation in the socioeconomic sphere among the states in the region promotes development and as a result, the aim of security. There is also the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) that helps to promote socioeconomic development. Following the tsunami disaster the Asian African Partnership in their Summit in Jakarta adopted a Declaration on Asian-African Partnership, which aimed at creating “a region at peace with itself and the world”. Thus by enhancing cooperation in areas such as trade, industry, finance, energy, health, tourism, agriculture, and water resources, the overall purpose of peace and security is served. Despite this, with the major powers competing in order to retain their military presence in the area, which they consider imperative for their interests, the possibility to turn the area into a Peace Zone seems more like a dream.

New threats to the region

The probability of conflict in the area is still high due also to the new threats that have emerged with the new landscape of power that developed after the end of the Cold War. Terrorism is one of the major threats in the area. Al Qaeda and the Taliban are operating in the area making it insecure and unstable.
The proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is the other new threat of the area. The development of nuclear technologies by Iran, North Korea, Pakistan, and India is a new reality. Measures to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons, transfer, and transport of arms, in an area with so many rivalries are difficult to perceive. This threat becomes even higher when it is combined with terrorism and the desire of terrorists to have the means to exercise terror.

The prevalent tendency for piracy is another threat to this unstable environment. In fact piracy is raging in the area whether it concerns supplies, drugs, or water. Somalia, where there is need for humanitarian assistance, is an example of such a case. Terrorists find that Somalia could serve as a shelter, as it is close to the Arabian Peninsula.

Likewise the transport of arms from the Peninsula poses a great threat to the stability of Somalia. Islamists have received shipment of arms in Somalia and these have travelled via Eritrea from the Middle East. This is in addition to a flow of resources and financial backing from South Yemen or Saudi Arabia. Obviously if such a situation remains uncontrolled the repercussions will be dire for the stability of the region.

Proposed Solutions concerning the "Declaration"

Since the drafting of the Declaration of the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace much has changed, especially after the end of the Cold War. The declaration has fallen almost in total inaction. However the new strategic situation calls for a new glance at the declaration. It is precisely the development of new circumstances that demand an effort to address the situation.

Firstly, it should perhaps be considered whether the ideas, wording and goals of the Declaration should be changed to be closer to the new issues that have arisen in the Ocean. Among these are the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, terrorism, and piracy.

Secondly, it should be considered whether the permanent members of the Security Council could participate in the process. They should perhaps see if there is room to compromise certain of their ideas concerning their presence in the Ocean.

Thirdly, since some of the states of the region have become peripheral powers they should perhaps propose solutions concerning self imposed limitations to their actions.

Fourthly, the Ad Hoc Committee should be reevaluated. If it cannot be the body for the implementation of the "declaration", can it be a forum for exchange of views, and a forum for reconciling opposing views? Can it be a body of crisis prevention and management?

Fifthly, is it possible to put forward confidence-building measures that can be discussed in the Ad Hoc Committee?

Finally, following these exchanges of views new feedback could be given to the United Nations, so that they can find ways to mediate.

Perhaps the above proposed approaches, rather than solutions, are difficult to materialize immediately, but what they can achieve is to start the discussion on a more realistic basis. This in turn can raise the interest of the delegates and move from inaction to action.

BLOC POSITIONS

This part of the study guide is to give delegates an idea of the views of the major groups of countries that will be represented in the committee.

There are the countries that wish to see the "declaration" materialize. They believe in freedom, peace, and security and want to pursue these ends by fulfilling the goals of the "declaration". One possible motivation for this stance could be the cessation of civil conflicts in the area. These countries see the "declaration" as a means to this end. Examples include the islands in the Chagos Archipelago.

Powerful Countries involved in the region

This bloc is made up of those states that due to their interests military, economic, or political, do not wish to see the "declaration" materialize. The USA, United Kingdom, France are such states. These can use their diplomatic ties to adversely influence the stance of states of the region towards the implementation of the "declaration", they also wish to maintain these ties to further their interests in the region. The presence and transport of nuclear power is also a driver for this thought. The following is the historical background of these countries in the region, which is connected with their current policy.
The United States of America

Initially the U.S. involvement in the region was relatively less compared with the USSR. The U.S. considered the Indian Ocean as "peripheral to U.S. interests": they were rather expecting the British to take over the responsibility of protecting western interests in the area. In turn they expected the Australians and the French to do the same. Furthermore they wanted to bolster the ability of the pro-western regional states to defend themselves, and assert their ideological preferences while in competition with the USSR.

The U.S.A. saw that its interests would be protected by a series of actions that did not include stretching the resources of the U.S.'s Navy. One of these actions was the creation of various pacts between the states of the region that would promote peace in the area (i.e. The ANZUS Treaty and the Southern Asian Treaty Organization). Another action was the supply of arms to Iran, Pakistan and Iraq as part of its policy of containment, which went counter to the USSR's interests, as the threat of communist takeover was one of primary threats that could spur American action, as in the Thai case to combat Communist Laos troops.

However the major concern of the US was the Gulf area, which was of military interest and also of economic vested interests. Many US companies had invested in oil in Saudi Arabia.

The Arab – Israeli conflict of 1973 and the oil embargo of 1973-74, upgraded the importance of the Indian Ocean in the eyes of the USA. The Americans saw the stability in Iran and Saudi Arabia as vital to their interests. This in turn led to the idea that the island of Diego Garcia was essential to the interests of the USA and as a result the island that was granted to the British, became a communication base facility. Finally the USA developed a permanent commitment in the region. As President Carter in January 1980 declared in the "Carter Doctrine" at the State of the Union address, their commitment to the Gulf was in reference to the increased ease of deployment to secure unimpeded access to oil resources.

The following quotes from President Carter’s State of the Union speech depicts exactly the position of the USA at that point of time following not only the oil embargo but also, the invasion of Afghanistan by the USSR

"...The crises in Iran and Afghanistan have dramatized a very important lesson: Our excessive dependence on foreign oil is a clear and present danger to our Nation's security. The need has never been more urgent. At long last, we must have a clear, comprehensive energy policy for the United States…”

"Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force…”

"We've increased and strengthened our naval presence in the Indian Ocean, and we are now making arrangements for key naval and air facilities to be used by our forces in the region of northeast Africa and the Persian Gulf."¹

When President Carter issued this edict the United States did not actually possess any forces capable of performing this role in the Gulf. To fill this gap, Carter created a new entity, the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF), an ad hoc assortment of U.S.-based forces designated for possible employment in the Middle East. In 1983, President Reagan transformed the RDJTF into the Central Command (Centcom), the name it bears today. Centcom exercises command authority over all U.S. combat forces deployed in the greater Persian Gulf area including Afghanistan and the Horn of Africa. At present, Centcom is largely preoccupied with the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, but it has never given up its original role of guarding the oil flow from the Persian Gulf in accordance with the Carter Doctrine²

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom was an imperialist state that used its Indian Ocean possessions mainly for economic reasons and in order to safeguard the lines of communication so that sea routes used by the British merchant fleet and the British Navy would remain free. The British possessions were one of the main sources of wealth. The Financial Times of the 19th December 1966 drew attention to the importance of the colonies by pointing out that " it is seldom realized that income earned abroad by U.K. companies has now reached two fifths of the profits earned at home".

¹ State of the Union 1980
The nationalistic military movements created difficulties and were followed by the independence of many colonies. India, among them, the "jewel of the crown" as it was often referred to, due to its economic importance. British dependence on oil producing countries meant that the Middle East was of tremendous importance. The area was however then as it is now often in an explosive situation. This made the presence of the British Navy necessary to keep the area open to ships.

The investments in Australia, India, Pakistan, South Africa and Malaysia were equally important. Britain had to revise its strategy concerning the overseas possessions. It decided to withdraw from the mainland and retain its island bases. In this way it was able to control the lines of communications as the Royal Navy could use the islands for landing, fueling and as communication centers.

The countries of the Ocean reacted to the British naval presence and refused to see it as anything else but direct military presence. Both India and Sri Lanka expressed their concerns. On 8th October 1969 Sri Lanka stated in the UN General Assembly her concern that it was a dangerous tendency that could invite similar action by other powers. Indonesia asked that the Indian Ocean should remain neutral and appealed to the powers to treat it as such.

France

France's policy regarding the Indian Ocean is mainly based upon its interests in the African and Arabian regions. These concerns were historical, political, cultural and economic. France is keen on spreading the French language and culture especially in the Malagasy Republic, Mauritius, the Seychelles, the Comoros, and the Republic of Djibouti. However, the paramount interests of the French are the raw materials especially energy supplies as oil that are in abundance in the region of the Indian Ocean. For this reason the French continued to support a military presence of about 5000 troops, as a deployment from France by air or by sea, would take a long time to arrive. As a result France explicitly declared that it "is concerned about the freedom of navigation and trade in the Indian Ocean as a whole and is reluctant to support the neutralization of that ocean as endorsed by the U.N. General Assembly in 1971

The Soviet Union

The USSR became interested in the Indian Ocean as a result of the evolution of the new geopolitical order during the Cold War. It was also the USA's presence that played an important part in the involvement of the USSR in the region. The Soviets felt that the presence of the American fleet had to be countered. The Soviet fleet could not be compared in capability with the American one, therefore they focused their attention on land-based power, which not only allowed them to provide military backing in Ethiopia in 1977 and occupy Afghanistan in 1979, but also to sell arms to states of the Indian Ocean and become competitors of the western powers. In doing so the USSR could portray herself as an alternative choice and as a "friend" to these countries and later on they signed treaties of peace and friendship with them. Besides that the USSR could keep a higher profile as a superpower that could face the USA and that it could exert ideological and political influence to the newly independent states. Among the states that signed a treaty of "peace and friendship" with the USSR was India which, even though was among the non-aligned states, had a pro-soviet stance particularly during the years of government by Indira Ghandi. One should also keep in mind that Laos, North Vietnam, Congo and Indonesia all received either troops or military assistance of some sort from the Soviets. The USSR managed to project its power and somehow countered the American presence in the waters of the Indian Ocean, but it failed to stop the Americans from establishing long-range nuclear ballistic missiles, which directly threatened the Soviet mainland and could be launched from the submarines that were stationed in the American base of the island of Diego Garcia. Out of fear of the nuclear presence of the U.S.A., they proposed in 1964 the declaration of the area as a nuclear-free zone, which eventually led to the Naval Arms Limitation Talks in 1977-78. The talks however, ended as a result of the soviet assistance to Ethiopia.

As far as the economic dependence in the region, it should be noted that the Soviets did not need the raw materials that other western powers needed. Higher in the Soviet's priorities was the political and ideological influence that could be exerted in these states.

The Moderates

These include India and China. These states feel that the ideals of the declaration "are of value but at the same time do not want to give up their rights of occupation and possession. Ties with other governments, particularly those with incentives, could also be holding them back from being a part of the
first bloc. The need to protect their trade could also deter them from supporting the "declaration".

**QUESTIONS A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER**

This section should serve as an outline for the delegates to formulate their ideas for resolutions that will be put forward in the conference.

If the "Declaration" is removed then a new frame of agreement should be invented. This should include the peripheral powers as well as the world powers. A frame of practical steps must be produced so that we can have tangible results. A good starting point could be the resumption of a conference where the positions of interested parties can be discussed and compromises reached.

The following are suggestions to be included in resolutions:

1. Should the Declaration for the Indian Ocean as a Zone of Peace be revised?
2. If yes what should be included in the goals, if it is removed?
3. What can be done to face the problems of the region?
4. What can be done for economic, political, and military security?
5. How can security be preserved?
6. Is there a need for the establishment of a new agreement that will promote security concerns in the area?
7. If yes who should be among the major players?
8. Should the world powers act as guarantors to the new agreement?
9. What can be done about states that maintain military presence in the region?
10. Should their craft and bases be removed? How can this be carried out?
11. Should the mandate of the Ad Hoc Committee be changed?
12. If yes, what should it focus on? How can their processes be more beneficial?

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH**

- [http://www.fao.org/docrep/s5280T/s5280t0s.htm](http://www.fao.org/docrep/s5280T/s5280t0s.htm)
- [http://www.indonesiamission-ny.org/NewStatements/1c101805.htm](http://www.indonesiamission-ny.org/NewStatements/1c101805.htm)
- [http://archive.pakobserver.net/200610/11/Articles02.asp](http://archive.pakobserver.net/200610/11/Articles02.asp)
- [http://www.isn.ethz.ch/about/css/](http://www.isn.ethz.ch/about/css/)
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APPENDIX A: MAPS OF THE REGION

Source: http://www.outofbounds.com/assets/images/OOB_Indian_Ocean.jpg
Written by Maria-Christina Vogli, Director
**Topica Area B**

**STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

The question of the weaponization of space, otherwise referred to as PAROS (prevention of an arms race in outer space), is a recent and highly emergent issue that has been monopolizing the attention of the global community. The main issue that PAROS deals with is the use of space. The widely accepted and adopted concept is that the exploration of space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, shall and ought to be conducted in a non-belligerent way. The main conflict between the blocs of countries is the threat that the impending arms race in outer space is posing, which is a threat to international safety and security. It is this particular issue that has been hogging the attention of the global community, and it is this issue that the Disarmament Committee will confer upon, and attempt to provide a resolution to.

**HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM**

The issue of outer space, though recent, has triggered a worldwide interest, and has been safeguarded by a series of treaties and committees so far. This section will examine the sequence of treaties, agreements and resolutions that have attempted to cope with the issue of space so far.

The first instrument that ought to be examined is the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS). It was formally established by the UN in 1959, having as its purpose to protect outer space and ensure that all international cooperation was conducted in peaceful uses of outer space. Functioning under the auspices of the United Nations, it has encouraged scientific research and safeguarded space till now. It is mainly comprised of two subcommittees, one Legal and one Scientific and Technical. The prominence of this Committee is evident and self-explanatory, as it has issued over the years a series of documents and agreements, through which it has ensured the prevention of militarization of space. The five Treaties that have been negotiated and that are most significant are:

1. **The Outer Space Treaty**: the Outer Space treaty basically encompasses the principles and guidelines regarding space activity, exploration and use of outer space.
2. **The Rescue Agreement**: the Rescue Agreement deals with the return of objects launched into outer space, an issue that is important, as it is inextricably linked to the issue at hand (though not directly connected to weaponization, it does talk about the increase in debris, which is a major effect of weaponization)
3. **The Liability Convention and**
4. **The Registration Convention**: the Liability Convention and the Registration Convention also deal with the aforementioned topic of debris in outer space and the detrimental effects debris has.
5. **The Moon Treaty**: the Moon Treaty focuses on lunar activity and safeguards the moon, being the closest natural celestial body to earth, and of prime significance to conducting outer space related activities. It ought to be denoted here, that the Moon Treaty is considered to be a Treaty of minimal success, due to the limited number of countries signing, ratifying and adhering to it. Therefore, the nations that have signed it, as it actually opposes both militarization and weaponization, are limited and it should not be a big part of your argumentation.

A crucial agreement that is highly significant and ought to be thoroughly examined by all delegates is the 1998 agreement. Being the most recent agreement between the Government of Canada, Governments of the Member States of the European Space Agency, the Government of Japan, the Government of the Russian Federation, and the Government of the United States of America, this agreement should be viewed as a model agreement between the nations, and should function as a blueprint for the delineation of future treaties and resolutions. A key point of this treaty is the fact that NASA is acknowledged as the leading agency in coordinating the member states’ extraterrestrial activities and contributions.

A treaty that has been signed by the striking majority of the nations and should also be denoted here is the Partial Test Ban Treaty. This treaty, which has been signed by 130 countries and ratified by 113, basically prohibits all test detonations of nuclear weapons. There is however one regulation, which is the fact that underground detonations are acceptable. Later on, the Comprehensive Test Ban treaty prohibited all detonations of nuclear weapons in all environments, outer space included. This treaty of course is crucial, as it is directly linked to the PAROS.

It is understandable, that the aforementioned Treaties are important for the reason that objects in space as a direct result of the arms race in outer space will be one of the dire consequences. A resolution should take into consideration of the past and utilize past errors or successes in order to
corroborate information about the current situation.

Another very pertinent example in history so far is the instance of the Cold War, which lasted 50 years and has affected both policies and the current spatial situation. To begin with, we know that the documents published by both countries for one another were clearly propagandized, so we are talking about lack of transparency and distortion of factual knowledge. For instance, the US documents and books published about the 1917 Russian revolution were affected by the Cold War, and that subsequently contributed in creating a notion of the Revolution, which connected Bolshevism and Stalinism to totalitarianism. We also know that the arms race between the two nations lead to them perpetually competing against one another, that evidently affecting the global community and polarizing the public opinion. Through this recent yet significant example, we can infer much information about the current state, as well as about the current blocs and policies that prevail in the PAROS department.

Last but not least, a significant issue is the recent Millennium Declaration, in which a:: member states of the United Nations agreed to many things, one of them being the key framework for global collaboration, which was established. It ought to be accentuated that in many of the goals set by the Millennium Declaration, ongoing scientific research conducted in space is the key. This brings us to PAROS, and raises the question to what extent limitations in space would affect the situation in earth. Since many of the goals set by the Millennium Declaration are of humanitarian context, the possible ramifications are too substantial to be neglected. Therefore, it is conspicuous that we can draw a straight line from PAROS to current issues that are extraneous to outer space.

On the whole, the history of PAROS, though very small, is also very dense and concentrated. Keeping up to date is significant for this issue, something that you can do via the “Suggestions for further reading” section.

CURRENT SITUATION

In this section, the main issues that the contemporary world is trying to address will be delineated and slightly tackled. To begin with, I ought to mention that since this is a hypothetical issue, since we are talking about prevention of an arms race, there cannot be a definition of a current situation. However, the focus will mainly be upon ongoing events, debatable issues that will most likely arise during our session, and countries’ perspectives.

Firstly, the issue will be discussed here, as divided in the following categories:

- Military use of space
- Scientific use of space
- Development through space-based means
- Commercial use

Military use of space: Here, a distinction between weaponization and militarization ought to be made, as the two are not equated. When talking about weaponization of space, we are referring to placing objects of destructive capacity in orbit around earth. However, militarization is completely different. A possible definition would be placing objects in orbit around earth that facilitate the military department in the sectors of communication, monitoring, control, navigation through Global Positioning System (GPS) and satellite use. However, it should be highlighted that most states agree on the militarization of space but disagree upon the weaponization of it, so a distinction is necessary in order to differentiate between the both and avoid confusion. Nevertheless, in this case we are not debating upon whether or not weaponization is beneficial or detrimental. We are debating upon the prevention of an arms race in outer space, and at this point you need to consider whether both militarization and weaponization could have a potential impact upon the world at this point. For instance, an arms race could be induced both by a deployment of weapons of mass destruction and by up-to-date military equipment that enhances a nation’s
military efficiency. Both sides, the affirmative and the negative towards PAROS, should state which issues should be addressed and, most importantly, why.

**Scientific use of space:** This particular aspect is connected to your previous assessment of military use of space. More specifically, the way in which you and your country interprets the scientific use of space, will be directly correlated to the way in which PAROS will be assessed. It is understandable, that scientific innovations and scientific development in general have been facilitated tremendously due to spatial development, and due to the use of outer space. However, we have to examine, to what extent the scientific use of space is a façade or not. For instance, it is a fact that all powerful countries, such as the USA, China and Russia, have very strong space programs, which lay emphasis on scientific discovery. A proper assessment of them has to be established, and correlated to the military use of space.

**Development through space-based means:** For nearly half a century, the peaceful cooperation of nations in outer space has been very prolific, in that it has greatly facilitated development in areas ranging from communications to internet connections. On the whole, the current state of the world and the map of technological innovations would have admittedly been limited. At this point, we should contemplate the ramifications of an arms race. As it has been mentioned before, debris in outer space can be quite precarious, mainly due to the fact that it poses a threat to many satellites and it can be rather catastrophic. Debris is naturally one of the major consequences of the arms race that is discussed here, and therefore, this issue is inextricably linked to militarization and weaponization. At this point, it is obvious that it is all connected to how you will define your country’s stance. One simple statement for or against PAROS will shape your policy upon the military and scientific use of space, as well as the development through space-based means.

**Commercial use of space:** This category is directly connected to the previous one. The multitude of goals that have been achieved so far have been predicated upon spatial activity. Therefore, to endanger spatial activity would mean to endanger the commercial use of space, which is can be directly correlated to the global economy. This is yet another limitation that ought to be considered, when ruminating upon the issue of PAROS. It is of stupendous significance that a way to deal with PAROS without jeopardizing the commercial, scientific and in general benign use of space is found.

Another issue that ought to be tackled is benefits and aspirations. The countries that have a very prominent role are China, Russia and the USA (without that excluding other countries from being equally significant in the process). More specifically, Russia and China, whose cooperation is evident, have been issuing work papers and sponsoring PAROS meetings continuously, which conveys their support for prevention of an arms race in outer space. Recently, China has launched an anti-satellite missile, which seems to be contradicting its statements about PAROS, albeit the fact that the missile was aimed at one of China’s own satellites. That raises many questions, such as whether or not these countries are being mobilized by ulterior motives, or whether there are interests that have initiated this process of trying to safeguard space in order to prevent a new arms race.

On the whole, if you oppose arms race in outer space, and oppose both weaponization and militarization for that matter, that would impact upon the use of space in order to develop scientifically and non-scientifically. Therefore, you would have to set up limitations about the above uses of space, and suggest ways of implementation. It is evident, that in an issue as complex as that, all the branches are interwoven and interconnected. How your country defines its policy is what it all boils down to, and that will be the framework upon which you shall construct your resolutions.

**Bloc Positions**

The matter of PAROS is a complex matter. To begin with, the countries that possess nuclear power in the contemporary world are the following:

1. United States
2. Russia
3. United Kingdom
4. France
5. China
6. India
7. Pakistan
8. North Korea
9. Israel

Another formation of blocs of countries can be formed, via the fashion in which the countries have voted for the official UN resolutions, which displays each nation’s individual policy and credos.

The formations that can be deduced are the following:
Countries whose official stance opposes PAROS:
In many cases, the United States of America oppose the resolutions. Nevertheless, there are cases where the USA abstains from the voting procedure.

Countries whose official stance approves of PAROS: Afghanistan, Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Gabon, Georgia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of the Congo, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Countries that tend to abstain: Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and United Kingdom.

Another alliance model that you could utilize in order to form blocs is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, commonly referred to as NATO, which is a considerable force in alliance shaping nowadays.
how it is linked to NATO.

These are just guidelines that have to do with the directions in which the delegates will move. They are not the prerequisite formations of the ACMUN, nor do they hamper the procedure. Bear in mind that during lobbying, many solutions, compromises and other agreements between countries are likely to, and probably will, take place. These models thought to play a key role in confirming the main stance of a country, and an amalgamation of the above blocs would probably help you define your country’s policy. That is where knowing one’s policy comes in, and how well informed one is. For instance, as you can see, the abstentions are many in the above case. However, it is evident that we would want to avoid a sea of abstentions, so try to find more about what your country supports to avoid polarization. It is also important that you do no fall into pitfalls such as the fact that because the USA, Russia and China are all Nuclear Weapon States, therefore they all support the same policy. For instance, the collaboration between the Russia and China is great, as they draft proposals together (see bibliography), and as we can see they actually oppose the USA’s stance.

QUESTIONS THAT A RESOLUTION MUST ANSWER

This is the most important part of the study guide. It will facilitate the process of your writing your resolutions. In this section, the basic and most crucial parts that your resolution must tackle will be delineated. Remember that though not obligatory, following the directions provided will ensure the putting together of a solid and considerably ample resolution, which is the first step to a good Committee Session, and subsequently, to a good MUN.

The basic information that your resolution must adhere to, is the following:

- Definitions: As everything in space can constitute grave danger, i.e. it only takes a small rock to destroy a satellite of incalculable cost, it is crucial that you define or at least outline what constitutes weaponization of outer space. Definitions are a key part of the MUN as a whole. It is how you will define the topic that will define the lobbying, the debate and eventually the final resolution. What is more, you can consult the working paper issued by China and Russia, where definitions are discussed upon vital topics, such as Outer Space, Space Weapons, etc. (You will find a citation to this working paper later on)

- Another issue that should be tackled is the use of space. As you have figured out through your individual research, it all eventually boils down to why or why not should outer space be used as an environment free from weapons, and all activities conducted in it should have a benign and peaceful nature or purpose. For a more comprehensive analysis of the use of space, I would recommend the following form of categorization:

  **Military Use**
  **Scientific Use**
  **Commercial Use**

This form of categorization would facilitate the assembling your information, and would create a more lucid and pertinent resolution. Be cognizant of the fact that the more analytical and thorough your resolution is, and the more you analyze the topic and break it down, the better results it will produce.

- Suggest realistic and manageable ways to implement the changes you suggest. Do not forget that everything that is suggested ought to be substantiated through realistic ways of implementation. When you propose a means of solving a particular issue, or when you propose, for instance, the establishment of a committee, you need to clearly elucidate upon this. The more thorough your resolution is, the more effective your points will be.

- A sufficiently researched and well-prepared resolution has to refer to what could the possible effects of weaponization of outer space be, and correlate them to the main concept of prevention of an arms race in outer space. A brief summary of historical examples or other situations which resemble this one can further consolidate the points made and establish the foundations of a good resolution.

- Lastly, the role of the current Commissions or Treaties established and their part in current affairs should be asserted. You must also draw a line between the proposals you make and the role of the current instruments. More specifically, by connecting the current situation as a whole to the prospective future situation, the resolution acquires a case line and increases in strength of evidence. Hence, the brief list of questions that is established and should be answered by a precise and concise resolution is the following:

  **For countries opposing PAROS**

  **Potential Preambulatory Clauses**

- What is defined as arms race?
• What are its potential effects?
• Through which evidence can we draw information about the effects of arms race?
• What do we define as outer space?
• What can be characterized as a space weapon and what is its value?
• What can be inferred from previous conferences and treaties about outer space, and to what extent does it apply to the contemporary society?
• Why is it important that outer space is weaponized?
• What would the beneficial effect be on the global community?

Potential Operative Clauses
• How can prevention a failure?
• What ways are there in order to implement weaponization of outer space and why does this not constitute a danger, based on the use of weapons?
• How will they be financed?

For countries supporting PAROS

Potential Preambulatory Clauses
• What is defined as arms race?
• What are its potential effects?
• Through which evidence can we draw information about the effects of arms race?
• What do we define as outer space?
• What can be characterized as a space weapon and what is its limitation?
• What can be inferred from previous conferences and treaties about outer space, and to what extent does it apply to the contemporary society?
• Why is it important that outer space is safeguarded from weaponization?
• What would the detrimental effect be on the global community?

Potential Operative Clauses
• How can prevention a success?
• What ways are there in order to implement the safeguarding of outer space and why does not doing so constitute a danger, based on the use of weapons?
• How will the monitoring of space or any other measure proposed, be financed?

For countries with a neutral stance about PAROS

Potential Preambulatory Clauses
• What is defined as arms race?
• What are its potential effects?
• Through which evidence can we draw information about the effects of arms race?
• What do we define as outer space?
• What can be characterized as a space weapon and what is its limitation and value?
• What can be inferred from previous conferences and treaties about outer space, and to what extent does it apply to the contemporary society?
• What are the main points about outer space that ought to be safeguarded, if any?
• What would the overall effect be on the global community?

Potential Operative Clauses
• What could be the potential culminations of PAROS?
• To what extent will monitoring activity in space, if any required, be limiting spatial activity?
• How will the monitoring of space or any other measure proposed, be financed?

The main issue is that everything that is stated in your preambulatory clauses ought to be substantiated or tackled in the operative clauses. Remember that the preamble talks about the situation and the operative clauses specifically suggest what to do about the situation. All of your actions ought to be stated in the operative clauses, and there should be a lucid connection between your preamble and your operative clauses.

Self-explanatorily, these questions will comprise the main body of your resolutions. However, you should not hesitate to add to what has been said and integrate parts of your personal investigation.

CONCLUSION
To summarize, by following the aforementioned guidelines you will be ready to benefit from ACMUN to the fullest, as well as cope with the procedure effectively. This guideline should be utilized thoroughly, as it encompasses everything you need to know, and will guide you through the process of preparing for the ACMUN.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER READING
Here lies a list of sources that you could examine in much more rigor. They could be integrated into your research and will provide you with the very basic information you need to know about this topic, as well as with other data significant in order to decide where one’s country stands.

The following site has been proved to be very helpful to all delegates. Understandably, it provides information about all countries and helps you realize where you stand (https://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html)
Look up for basic definitions or brief elaborations upon terms and treaties at http://en.wikipedia.org. Definitions that you could examine are arms race, outer space, the five important treaties, space law, space race, PAROS, historical occasions of arms race, such as the post-cold war era and the first world war, and militarization of outer space. For instance, you could consult the following sites:


Look at past resolutions at http://www.un.org/ga/documents/gares52/res5237.htm, as the way in which the actual UN nations have cooperated is integral since it shows the path that you and your country follows. Other resolutions may be found at http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/51/ares51-44.htm, http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/50/ares50-69.htm. It is also very beneficial in the sense that Wikipedia or pages with the .edu suffix. Look for online articles, not as a source of information, but as a source of a broader understanding of the situation. The more you are acquainted with the topic, the better you will cope with it. Furthermore, this site contains an account of countries and their notion of PAROS. It is very helpful and valuable to most countries. Follow this link, which will redirect you to http://www2.unog.ch/news2/documents/newsen/dc04033e.htm, which contains the working sheet of Russia and China, as mentioned before. Lastly, look at major and reliable broadcasting networks such as news.bbc.co.uk for a wider and more concrete perspective. For instance, articles which can help you are the following:


If possible, find books elaborating upon this topic, or other similar topics, such as arms race or the importance of the use of space. Some book recommendations that you could order or supply from a local library or bookstore are:


On the whole, as long as you research and are acquainted with the subject, you will be able to cope with everything that comes up. So, I recommend that you attempt to enrich yourselves with knowledge upon this topic to the greatest extent possible.
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