

## Security Council Topic 1

### Military Complex

The quest to win at war has led to the development of extremely powerful weapons: Graduating from sticks and stones, mankind has quickly advanced the science of weaponry, moving to arrows, firearms, grenades, flamethrowers, the use of mustard gas in World War I, the development and use of nuclear bombs during World War II, RPGs, advanced hydrogen bombs, nuclear submarines, faster loading weapons and more powerful rifles, biological weapons, sintered metal explosives, lasers, space weapons, and cyber weapons. All of these have the potential to wreak havoc to human life. The problem now is that these weapons are falling into the hands of everyone, and not everyone has good intentions. All too often military weapons are used against civilian targets. The psychological effect of the fear of these weapons is the root of modern terrorism. Since 2012, Syria has resorted to the use of chemical weapons during military offensives, not only in Ghouta but also in Khan Sheikhoun, Ltamenah, Saraqib, and Douma, killing and injuring thousands of people including many noncombatants<sup>1</sup>. North Korea has devoted untold resources in their quest to build nuclear weapons and has threatened to use them. Terrorists have begun to produce their own weapons by reverse engineering conventional weapons like the AK-47 and RPG. The development of military technology has been led by the military-industrial complex. Now more than ever advanced military technology and the military complex pose as threats for the rest of the world. The military complex can best be seen at the SOFEX (Special Operations Forces Exhibition) Conference<sup>2</sup>. SOFEX, held every couple of years, is a huge supermarket for militaries around the world. Over 85 countries attend, including the United States. The conference even offers training for countries that want to learn how to do their worst with the equipment. While the conference has good intentions of supplying countries with the equipment to fight terrorism, it has also provided an avenue for the worst players to acquire high-tech equipment with the potential for deadly consequences<sup>3</sup>. Countries are looking for more advanced ways to expand their arsenal. Some countries like Russia and the United States are looking to create military space programs<sup>4</sup>. Drones and other remote controlled weapons are already being used and countries are investing more into artificial intelligence to fight their battles. Overall, many countries have bought into the hype, allocating ever-increasing budgets to support their appetite for the biggest and baddest weaponry. Arms-trading has also become a major problem. Some countries are selling weapons to poorer countries that do not have the best intentions. China has a long history of trading to anyone as long as it benefits them. The machetes used by the Hutu to commit genocide on the Tutsi and the conventional weapons used by ISIS have been traced back to China. China also has supported the Venezuelan government, the Khmer Rouge (a communist regime in Cambodia from 1975-1979), and North Korea. Russia and the United States have contributed to weapons trade as well. The U.S. has a history of supporting anti-terrorist organizations and Russia has given aid to Afghan-Taliban and the Assad-Regime. While these countries have different intentions they have all put first world weapons in undeveloped nations. This issue raises a few key questions. Should military technology be regulated, restricted, destroyed, banned, etc? Should the Security Council attempt to control the military complex? What steps should the Security Council take to regulate weapons-trafficking?

---

<sup>1</sup> [www.gov.uk/government/news/us-uk-france-statement-on-the-chemical-weapons-attack-in-syria](http://www.gov.uk/government/news/us-uk-france-statement-on-the-chemical-weapons-attack-in-syria).

<sup>2</sup> [www.vice.com/en\\_us/article/mvp/73b/sofex-the-business-of-war-full-length](http://www.vice.com/en_us/article/mvp/73b/sofex-the-business-of-war-full-length).

<sup>3</sup> [sofexjordan.com/Conference](http://sofexjordan.com/Conference).

<sup>4</sup> [www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/aug/10/space-force-everything-you-need-to-know](http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2018/aug/10/space-force-everything-you-need-to-know)

## Security Council Topic 2

### Rules of Engagement

Rules of Engagement (ROE) are the internal rules or directives used by military forces (including individuals) that define the circumstances, conditions, degree, and manner in which the use of force, or actions which might be construed as provocative, may be applied<sup>1</sup>. For police, the rules of engagement tend to focus on public safety and are based on the concept of using the minimum force necessary to uphold the law and ensure public safety. Similar to this, most military rules of engagement state that “if there is any chance of creating civilian casualties, or if you don’t know whether you will create civilian casualties, and you can withdraw from the situation without firing, then you must do so”. Overall, ROE stress importance of protecting human life. Lately, there has been much controversy over the ROE regarding terrorism. Terrorists have become creative in their ways of fighting first-world countries, often using the ROE as cover for their benefit. One way that terrorists exploit the concept of ROE is that they normally do not wear uniforms so that they can blend into the civilian population. This has caused a major problem called undercover terrorism. In Iraq and Afghanistan, terrorist are dressed just like civilians so finding the difference between the two is almost impossible. In most cases, soldiers do not find out until it is too late. Usually, soldiers will suddenly be ambushed and have to carefully distinguish between civilian and terrorist. In other situations, soldiers may be coming up on an area with likely targets but will be denied permission to attack due to the possibility of there being civilians. For example, a cavalry group in 2012 tracking an unknown vehicle with combatants dressed as civilians were denied permission to attack because they were unsure of whether or not the occupants of the vehicle were actually terrorists. Eventually, they stopped the vehicle but were brutally injured because there was a suicide bomber inside. Another example is when terrorists in Somalia and Palestine use civilians as human shields to prevent soldiers from shooting at them. According to common ROE, soldiers are not permitted to shoot if there is a chance that they might harm civilians, and in some militaries, soldiers must first ask permission to attack an area. Many people advocate taking the lives of some civilians to send a message to terrorists that militaries will not so easily be manipulated while others advocate the ROE. Another problem with the ROE with terrorism is declaring areas a war zone<sup>2</sup>. During World War Two, legislatures would declare parts of Europe a war zone basically telling all civilians to get out of the war zone so they do not become mistaken as a bad guy. In the war against terrorism, countries like the United States, France, Russia, the United Kingdom have been afraid to truthfully carry out their job due to fear of bad public relations. Military forces are required by their own ROE to positively identify (PID) each and every target before “engaging”<sup>3</sup>. This means that the soldiers must identify the bad guys before they can shoot back. This can cause problems as a PID is totally up to interpretation from the soldiers, who must make split-second life and death decisions. Overall, terrorist have found ways to exploit the ROEs used by many first-world nations and with rules that are general, soldiers do not know how to respond in special scenarios. Should we have standard ROE? Do soldiers have to right to defend themselves? What should the priorities for ROE be? Should ROE focus on the security of military personnel or civilians? What can be done to combat undercover terrorism?

---

<sup>1</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rules\\_of\\_engagement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rules_of_engagement)

<sup>2</sup> [johnreed.com/blogs/john-t-reed-s-blog-about-military-matters/81816899-the-rules-of-engagement-are-the-problem](http://johnreed.com/blogs/john-t-reed-s-blog-about-military-matters/81816899-the-rules-of-engagement-are-the-problem).

<sup>3</sup> [www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/haditha/themes/roe.html](http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/pages/frontline/haditha/themes/roe.html).

## Security Council Topic 3

### Conflict Accountability: How international acts of aggression affect children

As this council often addresses threats to world peace and aims to promote coalitions to ensure the security of persons across the globe, the solutions are often centered around imposing sanctions or responding to conflicts and tension with violence. While these are typically legitimate solutions, it is imperative to remember that acts of aggression have significant consequences. Each delegate must decide to assume the responsibility of protecting their citizens from what often seems like a tragic, although inevitable consequence of warfare.

This topic specifically focuses on children. When the council decides to engage in war, the results often include communities being torn apart and governments falling to corruption. In the aftermath of the chaos, families are separated, the death count is high, and society is often in debt as weapons are expensive. Innocent children, simply trying to survive are the victims of the “cost of war.” Currently, the number of displaced people by conflict exceeds 50 million. In addition, conflicts resulting in lack of accessibility to treatment facilities and scarcities regarding vaccinations and health care have led to over 1.5 million children dying each year as a result of preventable diseases.

Take Afghanistan for example, where there are currently 1.6 million recognized orphans. These children are often left to the streets, as orphanages lack resources, humanitarian organizations lack funds, and governments lack stability. In many instances they are abused, taken advantage of, and malnourished. They are not provided with opportunities to succeed or to get an education, but are left to fend for themselves; they are never taught right from wrong. A substantial portion of the next generation in these regions plagued by conflict are left in horrifying situations and know nothing but conflict and violence; these are the future leaders and decision makers of such nations. In Afghanistan, over 100,000 children under the age of 5 die each year and fewer than 50 percent of children are provided with opportunities to get secondary educations. Moreover, forced marriages, child pornography, unregulated labor, and human trafficking plague the region; for instance, over 40 percent of children have entered legal marriages prior to the age of 18. Appallingly, under 1 percent of the youth population receives early childhood education and over 40 percent of children are left without adequate care.

The circumstances are not insular as there are over 143 million certified orphans around the world. Adoption processes are very difficult, and in many nations programs are seemingly nonexistent. In Afghanistan, seldom aid groups even attempt to help with adoption services, as it is culturally looked down upon and extremely difficult. It takes years, sometimes decades of waiting and persistence in working towards adopting a child from a war torn region.

For example, cultural barriers include policies that dictate only certified, practicing islamic families can adopt children in nations such as Afghanistan. Moreover, the concrete proof of the parents no longer being able to take care of the children that is required to start the process is hard to accumulate in the midst of conflict and chaos. The adequate structures are simply not in place in a large portion of the world to care for and protect children from abuse and violence. These innocent children are not provided with access to stable sources of food, water, and protection, but are rather left to the streets without an education or guidance.

What policies could be enacted to ensure decision makers fully comprehend the results of their actions? What kinds of efforts would benefit the children in these situations? Could throwing billions of additional dollars into inadequately structured programs fix the problems? Does your nation care more about “winning” the conflict than settling the situation? Can some conflicts be eliminated through rational decision making or less aggressive policies? How can solutions be effectively initiated? Rather than prolonging the situation and causing turmoil leading to generational conflict, try to consider solutions that may be superior in minimizing damage and resulting in peace.

### Sources

"Afghanistan Conflict, 2001–." Gale Student Resources in Context, Gale, 2018. Student Resources In Context, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ2181500104/SUIC?u=bato56210&sid=SUIC&xid=74950390>.

"Afghanistan Statistics." UNICEF for Every Child, UNICEF, 18 Dec. 2013, [www.unicef.org/infobycountry/afghanistan\\_statistics.html](http://www.unicef.org/infobycountry/afghanistan_statistics.html).

Latifi, Ali Muhammad. "The Challenges of Adopting Afghan Children." Generation Progress, Voices, 10 Aug. 2019. [genprogress.org/voices/2010/08/11/15580/the-challenges-of-adopting-afghan-children/](http://genprogress.org/voices/2010/08/11/15580/the-challenges-of-adopting-afghan-children/)

Miliband, David, and Ravi Gurumurthy. "Improving humanitarian aid: how to make relief more efficient and effective." Foreign Affairs, July-Aug. 2015. Student Resources In Context, <http://link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/A421819606/SUIC?u=bato56210&sid=SUIC&xid=7319b59a>.

Trijssenaar, Cecile. "Adoption from Countries at War or Suffering a Natural Disaster." International Adoption Guide, International Adoption Guide, 16 July 2018, [www.internationaladoptionguide.co.uk/from-which-countries-is-it-possible-to-adopt-from/adopting-from-countries-at-war-or-natural-disasters.html](http://www.internationaladoptionguide.co.uk/from-which-countries-is-it-possible-to-adopt-from/adopting-from-countries-at-war-or-natural-disasters.html).

Wahidy, Farzana, and Shikiba Babori. "Afghanistan's Orphans." Universes in Universe, Nafas Art Magazine, Apr. 2008. [universes.art/en/nafas/articles/2008/afghanistans-orphans/](http://universes.art/en/nafas/articles/2008/afghanistans-orphans/).

