

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

UMMUN 2007

Background Guide

DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY COMMITTEE



"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

Dear Delegates,

Welcome to the Disarmament and International Security Committee for UMMUN 2007! As members of DISEC, you'll have to discuss pressing issues involving the international community and the need for international security. From technology, disarmament, international cooperation, and illegal weapons trades our committee's focus will encompass many of the major problems affecting the security of the international community today. This year, DISEC has a director and an assistant director, and 4 rapporteur to help you in your research and debate.

Hi, my name is Mike LaForest, director for DISEC this year. I am a Senior at the University of Michigan, majoring in Political Science and Economics with a minor in Mathematics, and plan to work for a strategy consulting firm when I graduate in the spring. This is my fourth year participating in model United Nations and my third involved with UMMUN, after I was a rapporteur for the WHO two years ago, and the Director for DISEC last year. I'm also involved with College Democrats and MSA. I'm really excited about this year's committee, so if you have any questions about the topics, conference, or just college life in general please feel free to ask.

Hi, I'm Mark Fleckenstein. I'm a sophomore at the University of Michigan majoring in economics and political science. I plan continuing my studies at graduate school after my four year stint at Michigan. This is my second year working with University of Michigan Model United Nations and specifically the Disarmament and International Security Committee. I'm really excited for this year's conference; we've got some great topics and surprises in store for the delegates.

We believe we have a good set of topics this year with relevance for each country and we look forward to each of you getting involved in debate. Both us and the rapporteur are here as resources to aid YOU in your research as well as during the conference itself. We like to think we're pretty nice people so if you have any questions regarding the topics, DISEC, UMMUN, or just college life, don't hesitate to ask.

If you have any questions regarding position papers, research, or clarification of the topics please feel free to e-mail either of us. We look forward to hearing some great ideas and seeing some good debate, and are looking forward to seeing you at UMMUN in January!

Mike LaForest
Director, Disarmament and International Security Committee

Table of contents

	Page
.....	
Committee Background and Mission Statement.....	1
Topic Overviews.....	2
Topic A: Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East	3
Background	3
Current Situation.....	4
Bloc Positions	6
Focus Questions.....	7
Important Research Links.....	7
Topic B: Developments in Information, Technology, and Science in the Context of International Security.....	9
Background	9
Current Situation.....	11
Bloc Positions	12
Focus Questions.....	13
Important Research Links.....	14
Topic C: Black Market Arms Trade.....	15
Background	15
Current Situation.....	16
Bloc Positions	17
Focus Questions.....	18
Important Research Links.....	18

Committee Background and Mission Statement

The Committee on Disarmament and International Security (DISEC) serves as the First Committee of the General Assembly (GA) of the United Nations. The committee works in conjunction with the Security Council and the Conference on Disarmament to take measures in pursuing one of the fundamental goals of the UN: the promotion of international security and relative peace among nations. Like other GA committees, DISEC is limited by UN charter in that it cannot specifically dictate any action to be undertaken by any nation or UN peacekeeping forces. However, the final resolutions agreed upon in DISEC are communicated to the GA and Security Council, which possesses jurisdiction to dispatch UN peacekeepers.

DISEC decisions are held in high regard because, as part of the GA, each nation is afforded equal representation in voting procedures while the Security Council is frequently stagnated by the veto powers of the five permanent members. Past resolutions have aided in the passage and enforcement of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) and maintaining the balance between NATO powers and the Warsaw Pact of Europe during the Cold War. Recent terrorist actions have shifted the world's attention to issues of international security and prevention of further attacks. This responsibility falls largely on the three part security foundation of the UN and, therefore, places increased importance on DISEC proceedings. Recent discussions have focused on the establishment of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), nuclear free zones in the Middle East, and various other arms agreements. With greater attention and urgency, DISEC will facilitate discussion on issues with major implications for all nations and attempt to ensure the safety of the global community.

Topic overviews

Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

Over the past few years, Iran has continued to move towards nuclear proliferation, and continues to do so today. As this is an incredibly important question of international security, what steps should the United Nations take in this event/conflict? Should Iran be persuaded to stop? Given an ultimatum? Allowed to finish?

Developments in information, technology, and science in the context of International Security

Advancements in information, technology, and scientific developments have both civilian and military applications; the former for the betterment of societies, and the latter, among other things, towards the creation of weapons of mass destruction. As these advancements are twofold, to what extent should advanced countries share their knowledge with developing countries, and what types of safeguards in information technology should countries be required to have in place to prevent that information from falling into the hands of terrorists and others who may misuse it?

Black Market Arms Trade

After the fall of the Soviet Union, many of the safeguards in place surrounding the storage and oversight of their Nuclear Weaponry also crumbled apart. As a result, their Nuclear stockpiles have not been properly accounted for, they have been moved around, and it is a distinct possibility that some of their nuclear arms may have been lost/taken. With this possibility out there, as well as the "black market" trading of arms in general, what safeguards should be put in place to monitor the flow of arms between countries, and specifically to track and pick up any possible "black market nuclear arms?"

Topic A: Nuclear Proliferation in the Middle East

Introduction

Many factors come into the mix of the issue of Iran's nuclear program. The question of the intended purpose of the program arises first and foremost. From the Iranian perspective, it is the unalienable right for the Iranian people to develop a peaceful nuclear program created solely for civilian purposes such as energy production. Most nations would agree with this premise were it not for speculation that Iran was in fact secretly developing a nuclear weapons program. The question of international security arises next with the United States and several European states supporting the latter view of a secret weapons program. This speculation has roots in Iran's less than full cooperation with International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspections in recent years. In addition, a general atmosphere of distrust between the US, which labeled Iran as part of the "Axis of Evil" in 2003, and Iran, led by its new leader Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, has not allowed much room for negotiations.

Background/History

The history of Iran's nuclear program begins surprisingly with strong US and European backing of the pre-Islamic Revolution regime in Iran from the 1950s up until the revolution in 1979. American and European corporations including Siemens, General Electric, AEG, and others invested billions during this period to help develop the then Western-friendly regime's nuclear program, which aimed at developing 23 plants by 2000 which would produce 23,000 MW of electricity for the developing country. Under the progressive Shah Mohammad Pahlavi, Iran signed the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty in 1968 and ratified it in 1970. The NPT is aimed at preventing further proliferation of nuclear weapons while at the same time allowing nuclear energy for strictly civilian purposes.

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

4

The revolution temporarily put the program on hold, and when it resumed, this time it would be based on indigenously produced materials. During this period, Iran worked with the IAEA, the nuclear watchdog of the UN, under its Technical Assistance Program until US pressure forced the IAEA to stop the program. The Iran-Iraq War created another standstill in the program. Iran did not seek to resume the program again until 1990, and signed deals with Russia and China between 1995 and 1996 to help resume their program.

New developments in the conflict began in 2002 when Alireza Jafarzadeh, a prominent Iranian dissident, leaked information about secret nuclear sites including an underground uranium enrichment facility and a heavy water facility. Iran voluntarily allowed the IAEA, under the Additional Protocol, to inspect the sites and it concluded no weapons program was being developed. In November 2004, the IAEA's report on Iran's nuclear program comprehensively listed Iran's violations of the NPT including its failure to inform the IAEA of importing and using Chinese uranium for conversion and enrichment activities, experiments with the separation of plutonium, and black market centrifuge purchases. On February 4, 2006, the IAEA voted to report Iran to the UN Security Council, and shortly after, Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad announced on April 11, 2006 that Iran had successfully enriched uranium. This accelerated the international response and on July 31, 2006 the UN Security Council passed Resolution 1696 which gave Iran a deadline until August 31, 2006 to suspend uranium enrichment until the IAEA could once and for all conclude the program's fully civilian intentions. Iran refused to suspend enrichment, declaring its unalienable right to nuclear power. This refusal has prompted possible sanctions by Western states, led by the US, and possible UN sanctions.

Current Situation

Currently, Iran does not yet possess nuclear weapon capabilities. Diplomatic authorities estimate it would take about five years for Iran to transcend the technical hurdles for creating a nuclear weapon, but given the government's prudence it may be ten to fifteen years before they finally produce an actual nuclear weapon. Experts believe Iran has yet to produce sufficient fissile material as well as build an actual working warhead, obstacles of which must be overcome in order for Iran to develop its nuclear weapons capability.

The Iranian government, however, claims to be developing its nuclear program for power-generating reactors intended for peaceful use rather than for weapons technology. Yet experts believe the same technology used by Iranian scientists to develop their nuclear program can also provide fissile material for a nuclear bomb. The United Nations furthermore set an August 31st deadline to halt its uranium enrichment and reprocessing activities which Iran neglected to comply with. This defiance parallels its failure to adhere to other IAEA and UN resolutions.

Many significant divisions have arisen between vetoing members of the UN security council in light of this current conflict. Given Iran's incompetence on this issue, the United States and other western powers have pushed for United Nations sanctions against it. On the other hand, China and Russia have both urged for patience over the issue and expressed their lack of support for severe punishments against Iran. More specifically, Russian and Chinese scientists have played a crucial role in Iran's nuclear program development. Furthermore, the Russian government has agreed to support Iranian government in its launch of the Bushehr nuclear reactor September 2007. This reactor will be fully operational by November 2007.

Diplomatic concerns also arise from Iran's geographic proximity to Israel due to its previously expressed distaste and criticism of the state. The Israeli conflict poses much concern over the potential outbreak of chaos that could erupt should Iran further develop its nuclear

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

6

program. Given the regional conflicts and Tehran's record of defiance of Western policies and decisions, this situation has the potential to explode into a very dangerous global conflict.

Bloc Positions

Iran:

Iran states that its nuclear program is for the sole purpose of the generation of nuclear power for civilian use. Because of its rapid growth in both population and industry, Iran feels that the use of nuclear energy would provide for a more efficient source of energy over oil. In addition, in the long run, operating under nuclear power would be much less expensive than burning fossil fuels, especially since the cost of oil development has been rapidly increasing. Also from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran has the legal right to enrich uranium and feels that it should be allowed to diversify its energy sources.

United States:

Because of the recent declaration of the successful enrichment of uranium by Iran, the United States has openly stated that they are concerned about the nuclear research currently being done in the Middle East nation. The primary source of concern comes from the fact that Iran supports international organizations such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Palestinian Islamic Jihad movement, which they claim are terrorist groups. By developing nuclear weapons, Iran may supply them to these and various other terrorist organizations. Currently the United States believes that Iran does not need to use nuclear power as a source of energy because of the large oil supply.

Israel:

Israel is very concerned about Iran's nuclear program, as they believe that if weapons of mass destruction are developed, they would be used against Israel. Iran currently does not recognize

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

7

the existence of Israel. Because of the fact that Israel is within missile range of Iran, and because of the relationship that Iran has with Hezbollah, Israel feels that its national sovereignty is being threatened and is prepared to retaliate against any attack by Iran.

China:

China had provided Iran with uranium hexafluoride and nuclear research facilities several years ago. They continue to support Iran's nuclear program for the generation of nuclear energy.

Russia:

Russia, like China, supports Iran's nuclear program and wants to aid them in establishing their own indigenous source of nuclear power.

European Union:

The European Union does not feel that the purpose of Iran's nuclear program is for the development of nuclear power as a source of energy. The EU had requested Iran to suspend its enrichment of uranium, to which Iran had agreed, just to build a measure of confidence between the two sides. Additionally, the EU had proposed to help Iran build a safe, economic, and proliferation-proof nuclear power program, but Iran rejected the proposal.

Focus Questions

Is it right to control which countries can and cannot have nuclear power? 2) How should the international community respond to rogue states' nuclear programs or programs that could lead to weapons of mass destruction? 3) Are sanctions a feasible solution to the current conflict with Iran?

Research Links:

UN Resolution 1696

<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/sanction/iran/2006/0731resolution.htm>

IAEA's 2004 report on Iran

<http://www.fas.org/nuke/guide/iran/iaea1104.pdf>

IAEA website

<http://www.iaea.org/NewsCenter/Focus/IaeaIran/index.shtml>

UN Website

www.un.org/english

CNN

www.cnn.com

BBC

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/>

References

Dr. Farhang Jahanpour. "Iran's Nuclear Threat: Exploring the Politics." Oxford Research Group. 2006, June. <<http://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/publications/briefings/IransNuclearThreat.htm>>.

Johnson, Rebecca. "Iran's Nuclear Programme: EU-3 Snubbed as Iran begins Uranium Conversion at Isfahan." Disarmament Diplomacy. 2005. <<http://www.acronym.org.uk/dd/dd80/80news01.htm>>.

Sahimi, Mohammad. "Iran's Nuclear Program." Payvand Iran News. 2003, Oct. 2. <<http://www.payvand.com/news/03/oct/1015.html>>.

"State Sponsors: Iran." Council on Foreign Relations. 2006, July. <<http://www.cfr.org/publication/9362/>>.

Statement by H.E. Dr. M. Javad Zarif. 2006, July 31. <<http://www.un.int/iran/statements/securitycouncil/articles/69.pdf>>.

BBC News. "Iran Reactor Launch Agreed." 26 September 2006. Retrieved 14 October 2006 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/5380874.stm>.

BBC News. "Iran Defiant on Nuclear Deadline." 31 August 2006. Retrieved 14 October 2006 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5300292.stm.

BBC News. "Iran Nuclear Weapons 'Years Away.'" 6 September 2006. Retrieved 14 October 2006 from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/4217824.stm.

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

9

Topic B: Developments in Information, Technology, and Science in the Context of International Security

The United Nations often finds itself dealing with many conflicting priorities in the international arena. One such difficulty is the inherent tension between promoting the notion of economic development and preserving the current security balance. The UN has the complex task of regulating the economic development of nation-states; a line the body must walk carefully. This regulation includes limiting the spread of select information, technological and scientific advancements to civilian and non-military industrial uses in order to prevent their misuse and subsequently, possible security ramifications. However, impeding development in multiple industries and select nations is a tenuous subject, as it is often interpreted, correctly or not, as repression.

Background

In 1963, the United Nations held an Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology, the first of its kind, to discuss the transfer of critical patented and un-licensed technologies to developing countries. The Advisory Committee was a precursor to beginning discussion of investment allocations for research and development of new technology among UN nations. The United Nations Conference on Science and Technology for Development was established solely for the purpose of promoting development and the spread of scientific knowledge to produce a greater quality of life internationally. However, a serious discrepancy between the sheer amount of researchers, resources and funding existed between industrialized nations and developing nations. In 1982, only 3% of total research and development expenditures around the globe were

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

11

invested in developing nations and only 13% of the global scientific workforce were situated in these developing nations (Pfetsch, 1982).

Alan Deardorff, professor of International Economics at the University of Michigan, defines a developing country as, "A country whose per capita income is low by world standards" (Deardorff, 2006). Such world standards are often defined by the United Nations and non-governmental organizations such as the World Bank. However, the argument that many developing nations have advanced, and continue to do so, is that there exist structural barriers to advancing their own development. The argument being, simply, that the lack of resources and experts at the disposal of these nations makes it much harder to cultivate national wealth and prosperity through industrial development (Pfetsch, 1982). How are poorer nations supposed to compete in a global economy when larger economies are attracting all of the investment, research and technology? Developing nations are forced to compete with developed countries without the structural technology and investment that allowed developed nations to develop.

During the late 1960's and early 70's, through coalitions such as the "Group of 77" and the "Non-Aligned Countries", developing nations have pressed the United Nations to take action to, "facilitate the transfer of patented and non-patented technology, licenses, know-how, technical documentation, and new technology" (Pfetsch, 1982). Throughout the last half of the last Century, the United Nations worked on cultivating support for economic development through the transfer of information and technology from industrialized, wealthy nations to developing ones; in some cases, vice versa, as the process has, at many times, been cooperative.

Current Situation

While developing nations continue to struggle industrializing and competing in a global market with structural disadvantages, the UN continues to strive for new ways to promote development and the strengthening of developing economies. However with development has brought security concerns; the United Nations has been concerned with the misuse of scientific information and technology to strengthen military capability. The recent speculation of Iran's nuclear program has magnified the problem in the eyes of the United Nations, non-governmental organizations and numerous concerned nation-states. Recent UN Disarmament resolutions have focused on combating the misuse of such transferred technology and information.

The 60th UN General Assembly Resolution 60/45, while affirming commitment to facilitating development, expresses concern that, "these technologies and means can potentially be used for purposes that are inconsistent with the objectives of maintaining international stability and security and may adversely affect the integrity of the infrastructure of States to the detriment of their security in both civil and military fields" (Dept. for Disarmament Affairs, 2005). Another resolution from last year's session, Resolution 60/51, stresses the implications for misuse of transferred technology, "military applications of scientific and technological developments can contribute significantly to the improvement and upgrading of advanced weapons systems and, in particular, weapons of mass destruction" (Dept. for Disarmament Affairs, 2005). The United Nations is currently at a crossroads in the sharing of information technology debate as industrialized nations are beginning to become very skeptical to the belief that the UN can regulate the use of transferred information.

The debate over whether shared information and technology should be scaled back or enforced more heavily will only be compounded by the current perceived threats to international security. Iran's nuclear program has served as a warning to industrialized nations that their contributions to increasing development in other nations are being used for military purposes; purposes that threaten their security and, in many cases, hold the world in the balance (Xinhua, 2006). Industrialized nations are now beginning to question the UN's enforcement and the defense of certain developing countries that such information is, really, only used for civilian purposes. The current situation with North Korea's suspected nuclear tests will certainly only compound this debate in the coming months.

Bloc Positions

United States: The United States is very skeptical of the ability of the United Nations to enforce correct conduct concerning transferred scientific and technological information. The United States is especially skeptical concerning military technology that falls in the gray area of civilian and military usage. "The United States is leery of having the UN, composed mainly of nations that do not possess advanced missile technology, administering such a nonproliferation arrangement" (Dutra, 2004). It has recently voted against aforementioned resolutions concerning the sharing of information and technology (Dept. for Disarmament Affairs, 2005).

United Kingdom: The United Kingdom has a somewhat similar stance concerning the sharing of critical technology and information. While being less staunch about not cooperating with development initiatives, the UK is concerned with the misuse of such

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

14

information for military purposes. However, the UK will cooperate if persuaded. It split recent resolutions by favoring resolution 60/45 and objecting to resolution 60/51 (Dept. for Disarmament Affairs, 2005).

Russian Federation: The Russian Federation is publicly concerned with the misuse and spread of potentially threatening military technology. However, there is more to the Russian perspective than stopping the proliferation of military technology, as the Russian Federation has been known to sell their military technology (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 2005).

People's Republic of China: China has a perspective similar to the Russian Federation. While it opposes proliferation of military technology outright, it has been linked to buying Russian technology and a supposed increase in military buildup (Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, 2005).

While many industrialized nations are more concerned with the possible misuse of technology and scientific information, developing nations large and small are usually in favor of increased opportunities for development while conscious of negative ramifications.

Focus Questions

What can the United Nations do to increase enforcement capabilities on using information and technology for benevolent purposes? What can the UN do to separate critical information from that of more civilian industrial needs? What can the UN do to increase cooperation between developed and developing nations in sharing technological advancements and increase development? What are the underlying political theories in the

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

15

debate? Are industrialized nations trying to contain technological power and prevent developing nations from accruing power?

Research Links

<<http://disarmament.un.org/>>.

<<http://www.unctad.org/>>.

References

Deardorff, Alan V. *Terms of Trade*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Inc, October 2006.

Department for Disarmament Affairs. "Disarmament Resolutions and Decisions of the Sixtieth Session of the United Nations General Assembly". 2005.
<<http://disarmament.un.org/ddapublications/res-dec60.pdf>>.

Dutra, Michael. "Strategic Myopia: The United States, Cruise Missiles, and the Missile Technology Control Regime". *Journal of Transnational Law & Policy*. Fall, 2004.
Lexis-Nexis. <www.lexis.com>.

Pfetsch, Frank R. "Science and Technology in the North-South Debate". *International Political Science Review* 3.3 (1982): 343-344.

"Joint Games; Russia And China Are Putting On A Show". *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*. Aug. 19, 2005. Lexis-Nexis. <www.lexis.com>.

"Iran Resumes Nuclear Research Activities." *Xinhua News Agency*. Jan. 10, 2006.
<http://news.xinhuanet.com/english/2006-01/11/content_4037355.htm>.

Topic C: Black Market Arms Trade

Introduction

Currently, more than six hundred million arms and weapons are in circulation globally, and are responsible for over five hundred thousand deaths each year. The United Nations is committed to combating the illegal use and trade of such weapons. The United Nations, through series of mandates, has outlined the types of weapons with which the Department of Disarmament Affairs is most concerned. A large majority of these weapons have been left over from the Cold War, yet continue to circulate the globe.¹ The United Nations is primarily concerned with the growing trend of illegal trade because such illicit trade and use has been linked with increasing intensity in civil conflicts, prolonging the duration of conflict and encouraging violent responses. The United Nations Policy on Small Arms calls on member states to implement weapons programs to demobilize such forces in order to create a stable regional environment.

Background

In 1995, the United Nations General Assembly issued a resolution (50/70B) in order to recognize the disturbing trend of illicit light weapons trade. This resolution came in light of the genocidal acts of violence in Rwanda, in which small arms played a significant role. Truly the acts of the Rwandan genocide shed immense light on the destructive and disastrous effect that light weapons had on intra-state conflict. Stephen D. Goose, the Washington Director of the Human Rights Watch Arms Project, stated that, "Rwanda is only the latest example of what can happen when small arms and light weapons are sold to a country plagued by ethnic, religious, or nationalist

¹ "Light Weapons and the Proliferation of Armed Conflicts". United Nations Development Program. <www.undp.org/bcpr/archives/brochures/small_arms/small_arms.pdf>.

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

17

strife. In today's wars such weapons are responsible for most of the killings of civilians and combatants". The surge in the popularity of such weapons is closely linked with the strength of the national economy of its consumers. Small arms, because of low cost, easy availability and access, were a major element of the level of brutality in such a conflict.² The United Nations Conference on the Illicit Traffic in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, held in 2001, took a major step forward by agreeing upon the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat, and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons, in All Its Aspects. The Program of Action established multinational efforts to identify and collect weapons obtained illegally and bolster states' ability to track illicit light armaments. The Program continues today receiving backing most recently from the General Assembly's 2005 World Summit

Current Situation

The United Nations currently deals with the illicit trade of small arms, light weapons, and nuclear stockpiles in numerous peacekeeping and enforcement operations. While the United Nations has made some progress, the elusive small arms trade is still strong. Programs like those in Liberia, in which peacekeepers offered a cash settlement of three hundred dollars for each weapon submitted, are not effective. Often in such programs, combatants will trade in dysfunctional weapons or use the entitlement to purchase more lethal weapons. Also such programs have little effect upon the trade itself. While the programs may limit the result of proliferation it does not address the availability of such weapons or the persons involved in peddling them. DISEC feels that until it can limit the availability of these weapons, ends based programs will fall short of the

² Goose, Stephen D. and Frank Smyth. "Arming Genocide in Rwanda: The High Cost of Small Arms Transfers". Foreign Affairs. September/October 1994. <<http://www.foreignaffairs.org/19940901faessay5140/stephen-d-goose-frank-smyth/arming-genocide-in-rwanda-the-high-cost-of-small-arms-transfers.html>>.

"Do not follow where the path may lead. Go instead where there is no path and leave a trail." Muriel Strode

18

mark. While the United States is the leading supplier of legal arms in the world. Nearly all illegally trafficked arms come from ex-Soviet countries or their satellite States.³ Thus the United Nations still desperately needs more efficient and encompassing solutions to the problem of the small arms trade particularly focusing on the origins of black market weaponry.

Bloc Positions

United States - The United States has been on board and cooperated with previous initiatives to combat small arms to some extent. However, the US Ambassador to the United Nations, John Bolton, has outlined explicitly that programs should deal only with the tracking of "military-style." While the United States supports the concept of eliminating illicit trade, it also has specific limitations to such support as a leading circulator of legal arms.

United Kingdom - The UK has pledged full support to the United Nations programs dealing with the eradication of the illicit arms trade. It has even made strides on a national level to increase cooperation and progress the state of disarmament.

Russian Federation - The Russian Federation has strong reservations to the current course of action Taken by the UN.⁴ Many implications from the sale of military weapons, to the weapons left over as a result of the Cold war complicate Russia's position. Russia believes that the UN's actions limits the sovereignty of the Russian nation in trade and may be used to prevent further military action. Also, Russian costs would be very high in trying to contain their post dissolution arms.

³ "Illegal Small Weapons Pose Global Threat". *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. July 9, 2001.

⁴ Hiltermann, Joost R. "UN Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects". January 8, 2001. <<http://www.hrw.org/about/projects/arms/un-0108-paper.htm>>.

Focus Questions

What role does national stockpiling and its security play in the proliferation of black market arms?

How can DISEC support non-proliferation policies while still respecting the right of member countries to remain armed?

Useful Web Resources

www.undp.org/bcpr/archives/brochures/small_arms/small_arms.pdf – UN Small arms

www.foreignaffairs.org/19940901faessay5140/stephen-d-goose-frank-smyth/arming-genocide-in-rwanda-the-high-cost-of-small-arms-transfers.html – Rwanda Genocide

www.disarmament.un.org/cab/salw.html – UN Disarmament

www.iansa.org/media/liberiapr_140803.htm.htm - Liberia

www.cdi.org/friendlyversion/printversion.cfm?documentID=629 – US position

www.unicef.org.uk/unicefuk/policies/policy_detail.asp?policy=5 - UNICEF

www.hrw.org/about/projects/arms/un-0108-paper.htm – Small Arms

www.china-un.org/eng/zghlhg/cj/qxwq/t29281.htm – Chinese Official UN Statement