

# **GA-1: DISEC**

## *Study Guide*

*Şahinkaya  
Model United Nations  
Conference 2018  
April 28 - May 1*

**Agenda Item A: Foreign Military Intervention in  
Internal Conflicts**  
**Agenda Item B: Possible Challenges to Space  
Security and Sustainability**

### Letter from the Secretary-General

Most distinguished participants,

It is an overwhelming honour for me to welcome you all to the fifth annual session of Şahinkaya Model United Nations Conference in the name of the most honourable Deputy Secretary-General Gökhan Şeheri, Director-General Kenan Bora Bulun and all other members of academic and organisation teams. My name is Egemen Büyükkaya and I will be serving as Secretary-General. Witnessing the birth and the evolution of this conference then seeing the particular escalation of it is a distinct feeling for all of us working day and night to bring this conference to reality again this year.

For the last six years, we have achieved a lot with the fellow members of Şahinkaya MUN Club by our utmost compliance and sincerity among us and now we are a huge family with members all around Turkey. In understanding MUN, a full comprehension of the United Nations is initial. The UN is founded on the most important principle of communication, a communication that is able to prevent wars, resolve problems through peace. Notwithstanding the obscure atmosphere of politics in today's world that resolutions are not reached through communication, but through battalions and attritions. MUN is the only way to apprehend the right ways to resolve these international problems in a theatre of diplomacy by you, the leaders of the future. As Şahinkaya MUN we are working diligently with all of our enthusiasm to bring the most realistic committees to the participants as the previous years.

In the fifth year of our conference, we have five committees that not only you can alter the past but also you can shape the present and the future for delegates, the leaders of the future. A conference without its delegates is nothing, as the team of Şahinkaya MUN, our ultimate wish is to organise a conference that you will enjoy and have the most glorious memories. I wish that with this experience you will gain the skills that is necessary to be a part of the globalisation, and you will be aware that the more united we are, the stronger we will become. We are all looking forward to meeting you in April.

Sincerely,

Egemen Büyükkaya

Secretary-General of Şahinkaya MUN 2018

**Letter from the Under-Secretary-General**

Most distinguished participants,

I, as the Deputy Secretary General of the conference and Under Secretary General responsible for GA-1 DISEC, have the honor and privilege to welcome you all to the 5th annual session of Şahinkaya Model United Nations on behalf of our Secretary General Mr. Egemen Büyükkaya, Director General Mr. Kenan Bora Bulun and each and every member of the Organization team and the Secretariat.

I am Gökhan Şeheri, currently freshman economist at Boğaziçi University. I have been in MUN world since my first conference, October 2013. With my more or less 25 conference experience, I always looked for greatness and academic sufficiency. With my friends and colleagues, we worked really hard to achieve our purpose. Our primary objective in MUN is to teach you delegates for gaining a diplomatic stance in your future careers while experiencing an entertaining conference.

Şahinkaya MUN Club has been working very hardy for the last 6 months so that you can experience a stimulating and a satisfying conference. The Secretariat, comprising of intellectually gifted hardworking veteran MUNers, has been a great part of this improvement.

This years GA-1 DISEC offers you a new diplomatic perspective to current global issues with challenging events and instant crises. Agenda items range from the chronic tension in the Middle-East and uprising military movements in different parts of the world. As a consequence of the agenda items being such importance and relevance, the Committee Board expects all of the delegates to prepare thoroughly in advance, understand their given countries view point.

In the I would like to thank the Academic and Operations Teams, PR and Press Teams for their cooperations and their relentless support in making this conference unforgettable for delegates, chairs and observers alike.

With respects and regards,

Gökhan Şeheri

Deputy Secretary General, Under Secretary General responsible for GA-1 DISEC

### Table of Contents

- 1) Introduction to GA-1 DISEC**
- 2) Agenda Item 1: Foreign Military Intervention in Internal Conflicts**
  - a) Introduction to Agenda Item A**
  - b) Definitions**
  - c) Historical Background**
  - d) Current Situation**
  - e) Role Playing Countries**
- 3) Agenda Item 2: Possible Challenges to Space Security and Sustainability**
  - a) Introduction to the Agenda Item B**
  - b) A Brief History of Outer Space Activities- 2006 Russia**
  - c) Existing Legal Framework, International Bodies and Activities -Outer Space” Treaty**
  - d) Conference of Disarmament and Its Efforts**
  - e) Efforts of UN Disarmament Commission (UNODA) and Its Important Outcomes**
  - f) Prevention of An Arms Race In Outer Space (PAROS) Treaty**
  - g) Lacking Points and Issues Regarding Previous Documents**

## 1) Introduction to General Assembly First Committee: Disarmament and International Security (GA-1 DISEC)

As the consequences of World War II, physical and political structure of the world was quite depressing. Political vacuum and lack of diplomatic dialogue between the major military and economic powers of the world advanced separation and further conflicts. In this light, necessity of a new international body led countries to be unified and establish a stable international structure based on mutual respect and common desire for ensuring sustainability and authority to deal with conflicts between nations. In October 24, 1945, the United Nations was established. Soon after as a substitute to “world parliament”, the United Nations was founded as the international forum for counseling and cooperation<sup>1</sup>. Since 1945, establishment of United Nations, the UN has become the biggest intergovernmental organization rather than a community for the maintenance of international security, with its six principle organs allocating the global work of the organizations.

Foremost among these organizations is the General Assembly, one of the six principle organs of the United Nations, has a specific role in the Organization since it is the only broad-based organ recognizing the sovereign equally and each member state has the same right of vote.

In order to encounter the political, economic and social issues in attainment of the aims of the UN in its Charter, the General Assembly is divided into six committees.

- 1) The First Committee: Disarmament and International Security
- 2) The Second Committee: Economic and Financial
- 3) The Third Committee: Social, Cultural and Humanitarian
- 4) The Fourth Committee: Special Political and Decolonization
- 5) The Fifth Committee: Administrative and Budgetary and General
- 6) The Sixth Committee: Legal

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.wikizero.info/index.php?q=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnL3dpa2kvVW5pdGVkX05hdGlvbNfR2VuZXJhbF9Bc3NlbWJseQ>

Duties of some of the main committees had some changes over time, before 1970s, The First Committee was the Political and Security Committee (POLISEC) and there was also a plentiful number of political matters that an unnumbered main committee called the Special Political Committee also sat. With the decreasing number of such matters to be addressed committees came to a state forming the current structure of the six main committees.

General Assembly First committee established to deal with the technological implications of the nuclear weapons and advancement in military subjects. The First Committee of 1946, focused on all political and security questions of the General Assembly's agenda. Though getting a lot of stick for ineffectuality, the General Assembly and the First Committee are still remaining as a global forum for open discussion of the issues about safety and security of all world citizens.<sup>2</sup> Today, the First Committee concentrates on problems of disarmament and threats to international peace and security.

## **2) Agenda Item A: Foreign Military Intervention in Internal Conflicts**

### **a) Introduction to the Agenda Item A**

Since the end of the Second World War, the focus of war has progressively shifted away from wars between states to wars within states. Since the end of 60s more and more groups seem to challenge the state militarily. Consistently, other states intervene in those intra-state conflicts to protect their interests or maintain stability in the region. Especially since the end of the Cold War, when the balance of power between the NATO and the Warsaw Pact broke down, many policy-makers seem to be challenged with the decision whether to intervene in civil wars. Addressing the problem realistically, states are basically concerned about their own security, which would suggest that they only intervene when vital national interests are under risk. On the contrary, other research shows that ethical and domestic issues can actually affect the decision to intervene. Since the Peace of Westphalia (1648), foreign military intervention to internal conflicts has been perceived as an 'ultimum remedium' of problem solution. In case of a conflict occurring in a state, there are other options with priority to solve the issue from the outside, including diplomatic measures or the possible involvement of a third party as an adjudicator such as another state or organizations like UN or the NATO.<sup>3</sup> This variety of alternatives implied by the term "intervention" causes confusion and this confusion makes it

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.osgoodcenter.org/GA1\\_Background\\_Guide.pdf](http://www.osgoodcenter.org/GA1_Background_Guide.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit\\_rc3bcttershoff.pdf](https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit_rc3bcttershoff.pdf)

challenging to develop models and options unless there is an certain definition of the “intervention”.

As aforementioned, intervening in an intrastate conflict is a difficult decision made by the political leader of the intervening state. Primarily, they evaluate the political costs which includes calculations about the casualty rate, financial costs and media attention. Secondly, decision makers also encounter legal issues while evaluating the possible intervention since the ‘sovereignty’ is a crucial aspect in making the decision. Beyond policy makers and leaders, states are equal subjects in the international system, there is no rank order. The principal of self-determination of nations and non-interference into internal affairs is an essential in international law. According to Article 2/7 of the UN Charter, “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state [...]” (United Nations, 1945). Some researchers suggested that the concept of sovereignty has to be reconsidered and definition of “a threat to international peace and security”, as mentioned in chapel VII of the UN Charter has to be re-evaluated.

The UN Convention on Genocide (1951) defines genocide as a “crime under international law which they [the contracting parties] undertake to prevent and to punish“ (United Nations, 1948), but it lacks the obligation for other states to intervene when such acts are committed or likely to occur. The three reasons behind this deficiency are selection of drafters of the Genocide Convention for not establishing universal jurisdiction, reliance on international law on allowing military intervention in internal conflicts and intention to being a multilateral operations for intervention under UN mandate. International law apparently allows military intervention into internal conflict despite the principle of sovereignty, thus it is different from a real change to restricted and responsible sovereignty due to uncertainty of the law and absence of obligations for other states to participate in interventions.<sup>4</sup> This makes intervention more complicated. Military intervention is not only the extensive type of intervention but also the most expensive one. It is necessary for participating states to control different variables and even sometimes an intervention might cause more problems than existing ones.

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit\\_rc3bcttershoff.pdf](https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit_rc3bcttershoff.pdf)

Therefore, third-party states are willing to intervene militarily only if their own interests are at stake.<sup>5</sup>

Costs and benefits of an intervention can also be thought as risks and capabilities of an intervener which affect the decision to intervene. Certain countries have more capabilities in a conflict than others in terms of military and economic strength or due to alliances respectively colonial traditions. Similarly, some states might have a higher tolerance for risk exposure or a different perception of the threat posed by a particular intrastate conflict. These risks, which result from action or inaction in response to a civil conflict, can either be political or security threats.(6) The costs and benefits for the political leaders of a possible intervening country are usually defined on two levels: domestic and international. Domestic costs and benefits are mainly formulated in terms of political outcomes. International costs and benefits also includes audience costs although they are often depicted as issues of national security or world peace. If an intervention is successful, it maximizes political benefits and minimizes political costs, whereas failure would do the opposite. As it has become clear, military intervention in intrastate conflicts is the outcome of rational evaluations. States decide whether to intervene or not relying on the evaluation of possible political costs and benefits including considerations of risks and capabilities. It is improbable that a decision-maker will decide to intervene into an intrastate conflict when there is no reasonable expectation of successful outcome or the costs of intervention outweigh any potential benefits originate from an intervention.

If the decision to intervene in an intrastate conflict is the result of internal processes in the intervening country, it is unlikely that the potential response of the government or opposition in the state in which will be intervened enormously influences this decision. When a country engages the option to intervene or not, it evaluates the possibility of success of intervention and takes potential international and domestic costs under consideration. The domestic and international costs of intervention by a third-party into intrastate conflict usually accrue two different aspects. On the one hand, there are human and material costs, including equipment, logistics, supply and human casualties. On the other hand, there are other costs which emerge from the action of a domestic or international public concerned with whether the leadership is

---

<sup>5</sup> [https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit\\_rc3bcttershoff.pdf](https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit_rc3bcttershoff.pdf)

successful or not at the intervention. Moreover, the intervention decision is a function of the subjective estimate of the outcome of the intrastate conflict and the role of intervention attributed to that outcome. Therefore, the position of the political leadership towards a specific intervention strategy is reflected in the subjective estimates of the potential success of an intervention.<sup>6</sup>

## b) Definitions

### *North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)*

NATO maintains foreign relations with many non-member countries across the globe. Shortly after the World War II, five Western European countries, Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, determined to develop a common defense system and to strengthen the ties between them to resist the growing threat posed by Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). Soon after they realized that this could only be achieved if the United States and Canada were tied in this defense system. In April, 1949 the Washington Treaty eventually brought into being an alliance of independent countries. Thus, NATO was established as an inter-governmental organization providing a forum in which member states could consult on any issues that they would discuss and take decisions regarding political and military matters affecting their security. During forty years NATO performed well on its main task of dealing with the potential threat from the East. Then, the unraveling of the communist regimes in Eastern Europe seemed to putting an end to the East-West conflict. Until 60's hopes for an evermore united Europe free of serious conflicts were disappointed, until the Cold War.<sup>7</sup> The Cold War was also unable to resolve numerous conflicts, whose roots occasionally go back to the centuries instead it merely stopped them. Former Yugoslavia and the Caucasus region are vivid examples of reemerging nationalism.



<sup>6</sup> [https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit\\_rc3bcttershoff.pdf](https://ruettershoff.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/bachelor-arbeit_rc3bcttershoff.pdf)

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization>

Although these particular conflicts do not seem to directly affect the security of NATO members or of the Western European region as a whole, the threat of conflict spread in the age of nuclear arms requires ways to cope with such conflicts.. Military power seems to be an invaluable source of stability and security and the only means to maintain or enforce peace.

### ***UN Bodies and the Security Council.***

According to the sixth chapter of the UN Charter (Articles between 39 and 51), any conflict threatening international peace and security must be intervened under determined circumstances. However, there are some factors that need to be certain (acknowledged by all) for the intervention to be justified.

To exemplify:

1. There has to be a threat to the national security.
2. It has to be humanitarian need based.
3. All sorts of atrocities etc. must be determined and highlighted by the concerning state The Security Council takes the lead in determining the existence of a threat to the peace or an act of aggression. <sup>8</sup>

It calls upon the parties to a disputation to settle issues by peaceful means and recommends methods of adjustments or terms of settlements. Under Chapter VII of the Charter, Security Council can take enforcement measures to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such measures range from economic sanctions to international military action. The Council also establishes UN Peacekeeping Operations and Special Political Missions.<sup>9</sup>

### ***Peacekeeping.***

Peacekeeping has proven to be one of the most effective tools available to the United Nations for assisting host countries to navigate the difficult path starting from conflict and arrives at peace. Today's multidimensional peacekeeping operations are called upon not only to maintain peace and security but also to facilitate political processes, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament and demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; support constitutional processes and the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights and assist in restoring the rule of law and extending legitimate state authority. Peacekeeping

---

<sup>8</sup><http://www.un.org/en/aboutun/history/>

<sup>9</sup> <https://www.cfr.org/backgrounder/role-un-general-assembly>

operations get their mandates from the UN Security Council; their troops and police are contributed by Members States; and they are managed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and supported by the Department of Field Support at the UN Headquarters in New York. There are 15 UN peacekeeping operations currently deployed and there have been a total of 71 deployed since 1948.

### ***International Law and Crime.***

Foreign military intervention in internal conflicts remains an important feature of today's international relations. At the same time, the paradigms of interventions in international law are changing. In today's world, questions related to legality and legitimacy of foreign military interventions are more often raised than ever. However, in many cases, there is a gap between legality and legitimacy of such interventions. Concepts such as humanitarian intervention and the responsibility to protect attempted to bridge this gap; however, both concepts remain contested. Complex questions of substantive law and the institutional framework of collective security are discussed in this context. Meanwhile, classic exceptions to the general prohibition on the use of force, such as self-defence, are broadly interpreted. Certain states aspire to revive their ambitions by using military means to protect nationals abroad. The paper examines four cases (Georgia, Libya, Syria and Ukraine) in which different arguments have been held to justify military interventions. It attempts to answer the question as to whether there are new paradigms of military intervention in international law and to what extent the arguments made by the States to justify military interventions have influenced relevant norms and the structure of international law.

An armed conflict frequently is getting solved with military interventions of the third parties. However, humanitarian crisis often occur in such conditions. Therefore UN clarifies the war crime under the UN Charter Article 8;

1. The Court shall have jurisdiction in respect of war crimes in particular when committed as part of a plan or policy or as part of a large-scale commission of such crimes.
2. For the purpose of this Statute, 'war crimes' means:
  - a. Grave breaches of the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, namely, any of the following acts against persons or property protected under the provisions of the relevant Geneva Convention:
    - i. Willful killing

- ii. Torture or inhuman treatment, including biological experiments;
- iii. Willfully causing great suffering, or serious injury to body or health;
- iv. Extensive destruction and appropriation of property, not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly;
- v. Compelling a prisoner of war or other protected person to serve in the forces of a hostile Power;
- vi. Willfully depriving a prisoner of war or other protected person of the rights of fair and regular trial;
- vii. Unlawful deportation or transfer or unlawful confinement;
- viii. Taking hostages.

### **c) Historical Background**

Throughout the history, international conflicts have been one of the most significant threats to societies' well being all around world because of their large scale and adverse affects ..According to statistics from 1946 to 2011 out of 255 general conflicts ,163 conflicts can be considered as internal conflicts. Internal conflicts have become the dominant form of conflict after the second world war.

Since the end of the Second World War, the focus of war has gradually shifted away from wars between states to wars within states. Charles Tilly's famous claim "States make war." does not hold true invariably anymore; instead, more and more groups seem to challenge states militarily. Very often, external powers and third party organizations intervene in those intrastate conflicts to defend their interests or sustain stability in the region. Especially since the end of the Cold War, when the balance of power between the NATO and the Warsaw pact broke down, many policy-makers seem to be faced with the decision over whether to intervene in civil wars. Currently NATO is an active and leading contributor to peace and security on the international stage. NATO plays a vital role as crisis management organization that has the capacity to undertake a wide range of military operations and missions meanwhile UN pays greater attention to humanitarian aids and protection of each countries sovereignty under the terms of an International Law. Additionally foreign states seems to take preventive measures when they faced possible threats from internal conflicts within states. Throughout the history internal conflicts had been tried to settled with interventions from third parties which can be exemplified as:

***Break up of Yugoslavia.***

By 1992 the Yugoslav Federation was falling apart. Nationalism had once again replaced by communism as the dominant force in the Balkans. Slovenia and then Croatia were the first to break away, but only at the cost of renewed conflict with Serbia. The war in Croatia led millions of refugees to leave their homeland and reawakened memories of the brutality of the 1940s. By 1992, a further conflict had broken out in Bosnia, which had also declared independence of today's Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Serbs who lived there were determined to remain within Yugoslavia and to help building a greater Serbia. They received strong backing from extremist groups in Belgrade. Muslims were driven from their homes in carefully planned operations that become known as "ethnic cleansing".<sup>10</sup> By 1993 the Bosnian Muslim government was besieged in the capital Sarajevo, surrounded by Bosnian Serb forces who controlled around 70% of Bosnia. In Central Bosnia, mainly Muslim army was fighting separately against Bosnian Croats who wished to be part of a greater Croatia. The presence of UN Peacekeepers to contain the situation proved it's ineffectiveness on 22 May 1993, the foreign ministers of Britain, France, Spain, Russia and the United States met in Washington. As the outcome of the meeting, the foreign ministers decided that Bosnia's remaining two million Muslims would be allowed to congregate in a number of "safe areas", where they would be guarded by UN troops who were only allowed to use force if they and not their Muslim charges, come under attack. each based on some way to carve up Bosnia. Meanwhile, fighting continued throughout 1993.<sup>11</sup>

In February 1994, there was a significant change in policy in response to the Sarajevo market massacre in which 68 civilians were killed by a single mortar shell. This event provoked great public outcry and finally provided the political incentive to take action. Pushed by the United States and France, NATO declared an "exclusion zone" for heavy weaponry around Sarajevo and warned the Serb commanders that if their forces were not withdrawn they would be subject to NATO air attacks. At the end of February 1994, in one of the first of the NATO-authorized actions, US jets under NATO command shot down four warplanes in breach of the UN-imposed no-fly zone. The Serb forces, under the command of General Ratko Mladic, complied and the heavy bombardment of Sarajevo ended. But the fighting throughout Bosnia continued.

---

<sup>10</sup> <https://history.state.gov/milestones/1989-1992/breakup-yugoslavia>

<sup>11</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Breakup\\_of\\_Yugoslavia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Breakup_of_Yugoslavia)

In December 1994, as the situation in Bosnia continued to deteriorate, former US President Jimmy Carter tried to arrange a truce that would be in a limited duration (four months). If successful, the goal was to use this ceasefire as the first step toward formal peace talks, which were scheduled to begin early in 1995 under the auspices of a five-nation "contact group". This group, which consisted of the United States, France, United Kingdom, Germany and Russian Federation (and later Italy), met into 1995 but were unable to mediate a ceasefire. Through April and May 1995, the fighting intensified in many parts of Bosnia. In mid-May, Sarajevo received one of the heaviest artillery bombardments since the start of the war. At that time, a request by NATO commanders for permission to launch air strikes against Serb artillery positions was turned down by the UN. On 25 May, however, the UN finally granted permission to NATO to respond to those attacks with air strikes. Two ammunition supply bunkers in the hills near Pale were destroyed by NATO jets on the 25th, and another six on the following day.

### ***Libyan Civil War.***

Following the popular uprising against the Qaddafi regime in Benghazi, Libya, in February 2011, the UN Security Council adopted Resolutions 1970 and 1973 in support of the Libyan people, "*condemning the gross and systematic violation of human rights*". The resolutions introduced active measures including a no-fly zone, arms embargo and the authorization for member countries, acting as appropriate through regional organizations, to take "*all necessary measures*" to protect Libyan civilians. Initially, NATO enforced the no-fly zone and then, on 31 March 2011, NATO took over sole command and control of all military operations for Libya. The NATO-led Operation Unified Protector had three distinct components:

- the enforcement of an arms embargo on the high seas of the Mediterranean to prevent the transfer of arms, related material and mercenaries to Libya;
- the enforcement of a no-fly-zone in order to prevent any aircraft from bombing civilian targets; and
- air and naval strikes against those military forces involved in attacks or threats to attack Libyan civilians and civilian-populated areas.

The UN mandate was carried out to the letter and the operation was terminated on 31 October 2011 after having fulfilled its objectives.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>12</sup> <http://time.com/4746914/libya-civil-war-airplanes-haftar-uae/>

***Persian Gulf War.***

Persian Gulf War, also called the Gulf War (1990–91), international conflict that was triggered by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait on August 2, 1990. Iraq's leader, Saddam Hussein, ordered the invasion and occupation of Kuwait with the apparent aim of acquiring that nation's large oil reserves, canceling a large debt Iraq owed Kuwait and expanding Iraqi power in the region. On August 3 the United Nations Security Council called for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait, and on August 6 the council imposed a worldwide ban on trade with Iraq (The Iraqi government responded by formally annexing Kuwait on August 8.). Iraq's invasion and the potential threat it then posed to Saudi Arabia, the world's largest oil producer and exporter, prompted the United States and its western European NATO allies to rush troops to Saudi Arabia to deter a possible attack. Egypt and several other Arab nations joined the anti-Iraq coalition and contributed forces to the military buildup, known as Operation Desert Shield.<sup>13</sup> Iraq meanwhile built up its occupying army in Kuwait to about 300,000 troops. The allied coalition consisted of 39 member states including Afghanistan, Germany, Syria, UK, Turkey, US. The US Department of Defence has estimated the incremental costs of the Gulf War at \$61 billion, with US allies providing about \$54 billion also Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states covered \$36 billion. Germany and Japan covered \$16 billion. Estimates of Iraqi soldier deaths range from 1,500 to 100,000 whereas United States had 382 military casualties.<sup>14</sup>

***International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan.***

Established under the request of the Afghan authorities and a UN mandate in 2001, the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was led by NATO from August 2003 to December 2014.

Its mission was to develop new Afghan security forces and enable Afghan authorities to provide effective security across the country in order to create an environment conducive to the functioning of democratic institutions and the establishment of the rule of law, with the aim to prevent Afghanistan from once again becoming a safe haven for terrorists.

---

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Operation-Desert-Shield>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/event/Persian-Gulf-War>

ISAF also contributed to reconstruction and development in Afghanistan. This was done primarily through multinational Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) led by individual ISAF troop-contributing countries, securing areas in which reconstruction work could be conducted by national and international actors. PRTs also helped the Afghan authorities progressively strengthen the institutions required to fully establish good governance and the rule of law, as well as to promote human rights. The principal role of the PRTs in this respect was to build capacity, support the growth of governance structures and promote an environment in which governance can improve.

ISAF was one of the largest international crisis management operations ever, bringing together contributions from up to 51 different countries. By end 2014, the process of transitioning full security responsibility from ISAF troops to the Afghan army and police forces was completed and the ISAF mission came to a close. On 1 January 2015, a new NATO-led, non-combat mission, (Resolute Support Mission) arrived to train, advise and assist the Afghan security forces and institutions was launched.

### ***Arab Spring.***

The Arab Spring was a series of pro-democracy uprisings that enveloped several largely Muslim countries, including Tunisia, Morocco, Syria, Libya, Egypt and Bahrain. The events in these nations generally began in the spring of 2011, which led to the name. However, the political and social impact of these popular uprisings remains significant today, years after many of them ended. The Arab Spring was a loosely related group of protests that ultimately resulted in regime changes in countries such as Tunisia, Egypt and Libya. Not all of the movements, however, could be deemed successful, at least if the end goal was increased democracy and cultural freedom. In fact, for many countries enveloped by the revolts of the Arab Spring, the period since has been hallmarked by increased instability and oppression. Given the significant impact of the Arab Spring throughout northern Africa and the Middle East, it's easy to forget the series of large-scale political and social movements arguably began with a single act of defiance.<sup>15</sup> Here are the key events in the Arab Spring, in chronological order:

---

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/event/Arab-Spring>

**December 17, 2010:** Mohammed Bouazizi sets himself on fire outside a local government office in an act of protest after being arrested by police for not having a permit to run a vegetable stall. Street protests begin soon after his death throughout the country.

**January 14, 2011:** Tunisian president Zine El Abidine Ben Ali resigns and flees to Saudi Arabia.

**January 25, 2011:** The first coordinated mass protests are held in Tahrir Square in Cairo, Egypt.

**February 2011:** Protestors in several predominantly Muslim countries stage “Days of Rage” to oppose authoritarian governments and push for democratic reforms.

**February 11, 2011:** Egypt’s Mubarak steps down.

**March 15, 2011:** Pro-democracy protests begin in Syria.

**July 1, 2011:** Moroccan voters approve constitutional changes that limit the power of the country’s monarchy.

**August 20, 2011:** Rebels in Libya launch battle to take control of Tripoli.

**September 23, 2011:** Yemenis hold a “Million Man March,” a large-scale pro-democracy protest.

**October 20, 2011:** Libyan dictator Colonel Muammar Gaddafi is captured by rebels, tortured and killed.

**October 23, 2011:** Tunisia holds first democratic parliamentary elections.

**November 23, 2011:** Yemen dictator Ali Abdullah Saleh signs a power-sharing agreement. He resigns altogether in February 2012 and is later killed, in 2017, while the country is still engulfed in a civil war.

**November 28, 2011:** Egypt holds first democratic elections for parliament. In June 2012, Morsi is elected president, but is removed from power by coup in July 2013.

#### **d) Current Situation**

No one can deny that unpolarized world is impossible. As Russian President Vladimir Putin states “Efforts for mono-polar world has been collapsed.” Ongoing armed and civil conflicts around the world are irrefutable. Unfortunately, international organizations seem to be ineffective in dealing with far-reaching domestic conflicts. Over the time, stage of history has witnessed various civil wars, armed conflicts and military tension among neighbour countries. These hottest regions can be listed as South America, Africa, Eastern Europe and especially in Middle East. However, these territories differ due to types of conflicts they

hold. South America diverges from other regions since the disorder in the continent occurs between local armed groups and gives no harm to government or disturbance to other states.

16

In order to investigate ongoing conflicts, we should focus on Middle East region where the internal conflicts occur and tension is at the top. Middle East has been target for supervisor countries of the world for about 30 years. Natural resources is the vital reason for past and ongoing conflicts in the region. Since the Gulf War, American invasion to Iraq and now Islamic State threat made Middle East a hot territory. Most recent events in the region is about Syrian Civil War.

In 2011, protests began against President Bashar al-Assad and his regime. Protests escalated into a war between the Syrian government and antigovernment rebel groups. Assad regime was backed by Russia and Iran and antigovernment rebel groups was backed by the United States, Turkey, Saudi Arabia. The conflict has spilled over into neighbour states and drawn in other parties. Also, Islamic State was involved as recruiting foreign fighters to join the battle. In Islamic State terrorist attacks in Paris, 2015, France shot Syria and the United Kingdom blasted off air strikes to target the Islamic State. After shutting down the US train-equip program, Obama administration approved the deployment of US Special Operations in 2015 to support Kurdish forces fighting the Islamic State. United States, United Kingdom and France with the support of Turkey, Saudi Arabia and other Arab partners have conducted air strikes against Islamic State targets in Syria. Meanwhile, with the demand of the Syrian government in September 2015, Russia began launching air strikes against what Islamic State targets. However, it also targeted other groups opposed to Assad, including rebel groups considered moderate and backed by the United States.

In August 2016, Turkey conducted an offensive with international coalition forces to re-take the border town of Jarabulus from the Islamic State. Also that month, US backed rebels, with the support of coalition air strikes, set the strategic north Syrian city of Manbij free. The rebel victory dealt a major blow to the group, effectively cutting off smuggling routes to the north and supply routes between Raqqa and Turkey.

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker#!/conflict/civil-war-in-syria>

Initiatives that have been launched by third-party organizations have been unsuccessful. Geneva peace talks on Syria have far not been successful in finding a political solution, as opposition groups and Syrian officials struggle to find mutually acceptable terms for ending the conflict. In May 2017, peace talks started again in Geneva. At the same time, in Astana, another peace talks had been held with the participation of Russia, Turkey, Iran and members of Syria's opposition. However, this talks also have not led to any substantial agreement regarding the conflict.

According to the Syrian Center for Policy Research and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, since the beginning of the war, more than 450,000 people have been killed, 4.5 million have fled the country, and 6.1 million have been internally displaced. Many refugees have fled to Jordan and Lebanon, straining already weak infrastructure and restricted sources. More than 3 million Syrians have moved to Turkey, and many have attempted to stay in Europe as refugees.

Meanwhile, external military intervention including the supplement of arms and military equipment, training, air strikes, and even troops, in support of proxies in Syria threatens to extend the conflict. The role of outside actors, such as Russia, Iran, Turkey, Saudi Arabia, Qatar, and the US led coalition made the civil war more difficult. Ongoing brutality could allow terrorist groups already active in Syria to launch attacks against US personnel in the country.

Briefly, Since the Syrian civil war has begun, foreign actors have played an important role in the conflict. In May 2017, the United States significantly increased rapidly its actions in Syria after nearly three years of air strikes by deliberately hitting Syrian regime-backed forces near the town of al-Tanf, on the border with Jordan. According to the US Department of Defense, the targeted forces were advancing inside an established deconfliction zone and posed a threat to U.S. and partner forces.

In April, Syrian government carried out a chemical attack on citizens in the town, Idlib; killing many children. As a response United States shot Syrian airbase that chemical weapons were held. Furthermore, United States send marines to Syria, increasing US troop presence in the region. In February, Islamic State forces were officially cut off from their supply routes

from al-Bab, Iraq as Syrian government and Turkish military forces moved into the city. Turkish military forces also launched Operation Euphrates Shield in order to secure the region from the Islamic State and prevent advances by Kurdish forces.

Nevertheless, aforementioned Islamic State showed up in 2014, advancing into Iraq from Syria and taking over lands. In August, President Barack Obama authorized targeted strikes against Islamic State militants in Iraq and Syria. Regional forces also have launched an offensive to re-take their territories. Also, Iran has sent troops and resources to Shiite groups in Iraq. Beyond Shiite involvement from Iran and the international coalition's efforts to defeat the Islamic State, the Kurds, Yazidi and other Sunii groups have also been fighting to re-take territories.<sup>17</sup>

Since operations against the self-proclaimed Islamic State began in 2014, US led international coalition has conducted many air strikes in Iraq. Currently, Islamic State controls only 2.2 percent of Iraq, down from 40 percent in 2014. Islamic State still controls territory in the north, west and center of Iraq. However, these regions are either inhospitable or surrounded by Shiite or Iraqi government forces.

#### e) Role Playing Countries

##### *United States of America.*

The historical record of the majority of inter- and intra-state conflicts indicates frequent third-party interventions in these conflicts. In the decades following World War II, the United States has been one of the most frequent interveners in third world internal wars. The US has also played a key role in many of the past interventions in regards to funding, providing personnel or expertise or flexing its soft power, as the global hegemony through international pressure. After the Cold war era with rise in the conflicts occur mostly in Middle east US took series of actions starting with Kuwait.<sup>1819</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup><https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker#!/conflict/war-against-islamic-state-in-iraq>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/place/Kuwait>

<sup>19</sup><https://www.britannica.com/place/United-States>

- US intervened in Kuwait after a series of failed diplomatic negotiations led a coalition to remove the Iraqi invader forces, in what became known as the Gulf War. In spite of the fact that these operations went successfully and drove out the Iraqi forces, it also led to 1,000 Kuwaiti civilians' deaths.
- At the beginning of the 1990s, US intervened in Somalia as part of UNOSOM, United Nations Humanitarian Relief Operation. The mission saved hundreds of lives.
- After the September 11, 2001 attacks, under President George W. Bush, the US and NATO intervened to depose the Taliban government in the Afghan War. In 2003, the US and a multinational coalition invaded Iraq to depose Saddam. Afghanistan remains under military occupation, while the Iraq War officially ended on December 15, 2011.
- US intervened in the 2011 Libyan Civil War with the provision of air force. Former President Barack Obama issued a covert action that authorized the CIA to carry out clandestine efforts to provide arms and support to the Libyan Opposition. Muammar Gaddafi was ultimately overthrown and killed.
- In August 2014 US began airstrikes against ISIS in Iraq in response to recent developments such as; a terrorist attack which threatens American assets in Iraqi government forces.
- This was followed by more airstrikes on the 23rd of September in Syria, where the US-led coalition group targeted ISIS positions throughout the war-ravaged nation.
- In March 2015 the former President Barack Obama declared their logistic and intelligence support to Saudi forces on their military intervention in Yemen.

### ***The Russian Federation.***

Foreign relations of the Russian Federation are rather considered as aggressive and unstable. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Russian Armed Forces were in near complete disarray by 1992, one year after dissolution. Until 1994, the Chechen War, Russia's military effectiveness was not all clear. This war posed some significant practical challenges for global security and arms control, therefore Russia led the Lisbon Protocol which ensures former Soviet republics to disarm themselves of nuclear weapons.

Vladimir Putin's presidency lasted from 2000 until 2008 and again from 2012. In international affairs, Putin made increasingly critical public statements regarding the foreign

policy of the US and other Western Countries. Russia also traces a friendly policy towards China and Iran.

Throughout the history Russia involved many military based conflicts. However they were part of two major interventions: Ukraine, Syria.

### ***Russia's Military intervention in Ukraine.***

The former president of Ukraine, Viktor Yanukovich declared that they may suspend the talks on a trade pack with EU. This led pro-European protests occur in Kiev. On contrary pro-Russian protests started in Crimea, a peninsula in the south of Ukraine. Therefore Ukraine Parliament called for Russia's help which led Russia to effectively control Crimea. Briefly Ukraine escalated into an armed conflict between the Ukrainian Government and the Russia-backed separatists forces of the self declared Donetsk and Luhansk People's Republics. In August Russian military forces crossed the border in several locations. The incursion by the Russian military was seen as responsible for the defeat of Ukrainian forces in early September.

### ***Russia's Military intervention in Syrian Civil War.***

Syria's complex and devastating Civil War has drawn in multiple foreign powers since it broke out in 2011. Vladimir Putin has allegedly supported the Assad regime. It has provided the government; troops, air support and weapons. Furthermore they supported Bashar al-Assad in diplomatic ways in international talks under the UN. Russian Federation has military airbase in western province of Latakia and naval base in the Syrian port city of Tartus. Russian involvement in the Syrian civil war mainly consisted of supplying the Syrian army. At the end of the December 2017 Russia declared its troops would be based in Syria permanently. Shortly after the operations begins Russian officials has reported a part from fighting terrorist organizations such as ISIS they supported Syrian government to retake varies territories from anti government groups that are labelled by the US government as 'moderate opposition'. Vladimir Putin stated to Russian media that stabilizing the legitimate power in Syria and creating the conditions for political compromise' as their main aim in Syria. By the end of 2017 Syrian government recaptured the city of Palmyra from ISIS and

retook the major city of Aleppo and finally they established the control by some regions with the support of Russia.<sup>20</sup>

### ***Republic of Turkey.***

Terrorist organizations such as ISIS and PKK occurs serious threat to Turkey given its geographical condition therefore Turkey has strong diplomatic ties with US. Prior to ISIS rise to forefront of international politics in 2014, Turkey's regional ambitions were fairly clear-cut in 2011 prime minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan severed diplomatic ties with Bashar Al-Assad's regime in Syria, citing its use of violence against its own citizens, and directed his country's foreign policy towards funding Syria's many disparate militant opposition groups. In January 2018 the Turkish military launched a military operation in the SDF (Syrian Democratic Forces) controlled Afrin district and had series of battles which might be considered as successful against several terrorist organisations starting with PKK.

### ***Yemen.***

As one of the poorest countries of Arab region, Yemen has endured nearly three years of war between Houthi rebels and Saudi-backed forces loyal to exiled President Abd-Rabbu Mansour Hadi. The war in Yemen, which escalated in March 2015 when a Saudi-led coalition intervened on behalf of the internationally recognised government against Houthi rebels aligned with former President Ali Abdullah Saleh, has turned a poor country into a humanitarian catastrophe: hunger and fighting could provoke mass famine and waves of refugees; the conflict could destabilise Saudi Arabia; and both sides appear locked in a cycle of escalating violence, derailing UN peace talks. Concerted effort is required to convince the parties to accept the UN's roadmap as the basis for a compromise that would end foreign intervention and allow Yemenis to make peace. The conflict is having a devastating effect, causing widespread food shortages and a major cholera outbreak as well as leaving millions in need of humanitarian assistance. UN had stated its concerns by calling on a press meeting as; "The situation in Yemen; today, right now, to the population of the country looks like the

---

<sup>20</sup><https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/09/syria-bashar-al-assad-power-160904081138141.html>

apocalypse," Mark Lowcock, the head of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).<sup>21</sup>

### ***Syrian Arab Republic.***

Syria has faced many conflicts in its history. In 2011, successful uprisings that became known as the Arab Spring toppled Tunisia's and Egypt's presidents. This gave hope to Syrian pro-democracy activists. That March, peaceful protests erupted in Syria as well, after 15 boys were detained and tortured for writing graffiti in support of the Arab Spring. One of the boys, a 13-year-old, was killed after having been brutally tortured. The Syrian government, led by President Bashar al-Assad, responded to the protests by killing hundreds of demonstrators and imprisoning many more. In July 2011, defectors from the military announced the formation of the Free Syrian Army, a rebel group aiming to overthrow the government, and Syria began to slide into civil war. While the protests in 2011 were mostly non-sectarian, the armed conflict surfaced starker sectarian divisions. Most Syrians are Sunni Muslims, but Syria's security establishment has long been dominated by members of the Alawi sect, of which Assad is a member. Severe drought plagued Syria from 2007 to 2010, causing as many as 1.5 million people to migrate from the countryside into cities, exacerbating poverty and social unrest. Foreign interventions had a crucial role in the conflict since its first started. Most parties involved in the war in Syria receive various types of support from foreign countries and entities based outside Syria. The ongoing conflict in Syria is widely described as a series of overlapping proxy wars between the regional and world powers, primarily between the US and Russia as well as between Iran and Saudi Arabia.

## **3) Agenda Item 2: Possible Challenges to Space Security and Sustainability**

### **a) Introduction to the Agenda Item B**

The amalgamation of growing technological advancements and collective vision of brilliant people has allowed mankind to explore and document what is beyond our atmosphere. Through the information gathered from these explorations we have developed a vast network of communications, possible means for interplanetary voyages, space stations and many more. Despite the fact that these developments propelled us forward as a species, they have also

---

<sup>21</sup><https://www.britannica.com/place/Middle-East>

brought with discussions about the possible challenges that arose as a result of these advancements in outer space.

As a result of these discussions, a legal framework was realized under the umbrella of the United Nations and its relevant bodies. This framework has proven to be competent but there are still points that must be clarified by the honourable delegates of Disarmament and International Security Committee, to be better equipped against these challenges.

Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies ( or Outer Space Treaty)

The **Outer Space Treaty**, formally the **Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies**, is a treaty that forms the basis of international space law. The treaty was opened for signature in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on 27 January 1967, and entered into force on 10 October 1967. As of July 2017, 107 countries are parties to the treaty, while another 23 have signed the treaty but have not completed ratification.<sup>[1]</sup> In addition, the Republic of China(Taiwan), which is currently only recognized by 19 UN member states, ratified the treaty prior to the United Nations General Assembly's vote to transfer China's seat to the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1971.<sup>22</sup>

The Outer Space Treaty provides the basic framework on international space law, including the following principles:

- the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind;
- outer space shall be free for exploration and use by all States;
- outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means;
- States shall not place nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit or on celestial bodies or station them in outer space in any other manner;
- the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes;
- astronauts shall be regarded as the envoys of mankind;

---

<sup>22</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outer\\_Space\\_Treaty](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Outer_Space_Treaty)

- States shall be responsible for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities;
- States shall be liable for damage caused by their space objects; and
- States shall avoid harmful contamination of space and celestial bodies.

#### **b) A Brief History of Outer Space Activities**

Today, space is a vital part of many national and international infrastructures. Since the humans first contact with space, the the launch of Sputnik in 1957, humanity has been using space for the purposes of communications, monitoring our environment, tracking the planets in the solar system and the stars in the galaxies, proving data for global positioning, navigation and timing, and conducting vital scientific experiments. As the technology moves forward, we become more and more dependent global space-based satellite constellations for the workings of the national and international infrastructure such as the piloting of aircrafts, navigation at sea, military manoeuvre, financial transactions and internet and phone communications. Considering these, it has been agreed that space should be used for peaceful purposes, and for the benefit of all humankind. These benefits include weather monitoring, help in search and rescue, help in potential natural disaster detection, coordinating efforts on detecting and dealing with issues of space debris and minimizing harmful impacts on Earth, research in sciences, health, etc.

However, there is a new phenomenon called space weaponization. This trend can be defined as the placement and development of weaponry and military technology in outer space. In 1927, members of the *Verein für Raumschiffahrt (VfR) (Spaceflight Society)* had started experimenting with liquid-fuel rockets in Germany. The activities of this society was continued since the Treaty of Versailles forbade only solid fuel rocket research in Germany. In 1932, German military started to observe and support this society and its achievements. They have designed and launched many rockets, but the the launch executed on October 3, 1942 was extraordinary. It was the first rocket that followed its trajectory perfectly. The rocket travelled 192 km and entered the space for the first time in history. This launched made this rocket the the first man-made object to enter space. Rocket's production was started in 1943 with the name of V-2.

Cold War is also an important time period for the militarization of space. The superpowers of this time, the Soviet Union and the United States of America spent very large amounts of money for military technologies that included space technologies to obtain a certain supremacy in Space. They wanted to place objects in orbit and this paved the way for a Space Race between the USA and the USSR. The first concrete step was the launch of the first artificial satellite, Sputnik 1. After a few years, both of the countries managed to deploy satellites to Space. These satellites were heavily used for military reconnaissance which means taking accurate pictures of other military installations in the times of war or danger. The deployment of these reconnaissance satellites alarmed both of the countries and they had begun to develop anti-satellite weapons to destroy their enemies' satellites. Weapons which had directed energy to the space and caused orbital nuclear explosions were used for this purpose. In addition, in this period, satellites were also used as kamikazes to destroy other satellites. These nations also developed spy satellites to verify the correct implementation of arms control treaties signed between them. The concept of ballistic missiles also was born in this period, specifically designed for carrying nuclear weaponry for great distances.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the cold war ended and consequently the Space Race between the Soviet Union and the USA came to an end. The USA was the only superpower in the world with the most advanced space technologies. However, soon after the Cold War, individual countries such as China, Japan, and India, and international collaborations such as the European Union developed space and satellite systems which could be considered as rivals to the US space technology. After the Cold War, these space technologies, mainly satellites, were continued to be used for spying or reconnaissance matters, observing and predicting the nuclear detonations on ground and space and any missile launches. The satellites are the main apparatus in the usage of Global Positioning System (GPS). This system was designed by the US Department of Defense but later it was attributed to the public domain, free of charge. But the system is still controlled by the USA, and this situation leads to concerns over the level of control over the GPS network and its commercial issues. Due to this factor, countries and organizations started to develop their systems similar to GPS such as European Union's Galileo Positioning System, Russia's Global Navigation System (GLONASS), and China's (regional) Beidou system. Additionally, India is currently developing its own regional satellite navigation system, the Indian Regional Navigational Satellite System.

**c) Existing Legal Framework, International Bodies and Activities -**

**i) Outer Space Treaty**

The **Outer Space Treaty**, formally the **Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies**, is a treaty that forms the basis of international space law. The treaty was opened for signature in the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union on 27 January 1967, and entered into force on 10 October 1967. As of July 2017, 107 countries are parties to the treaty, while another 23 have signed the treaty but have not completed ratification.<sup>[4]</sup> In addition, the Republic of China(Taiwan), which is currently only recognized by 19 UN member states, ratified the treaty prior to the United Nations General Assembly's vote to transfer China's seat to the People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1971.

The Outer Space Treaty provides the basic framework on international space law, including the following principles:

- the exploration and use of outer space shall be carried out for the benefit and in the interests of all countries and shall be the province of all mankind;
- outer space shall be free for exploration and use by all States;
- outer space is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means;
- States shall not place nuclear weapons or other weapons of mass destruction in orbit or on celestial bodies or station them in outer space in any other manner;
- the Moon and other celestial bodies shall be used exclusively for peaceful purposes;
- astronauts shall be regarded as the envoys of mankind;
- States shall be responsible for national space activities whether carried out by governmental or non-governmental entities;
- States shall be liable for damage caused by their space objects; and
- States shall avoid harmful contamination of space and celestial bodies.

For further reading: <https://www.state.gov/t/isn/5181.html>

#### d) Conference of Disarmament and Its Efforts

The CD was formed in 1979 as the single multilateral disarmament negotiation forum of the international community, after agreement was reached among Member States during the first special session of the UN General Assembly (UNGA) devoted to disarmament (1978). The CD is the successor to the Ten-Nation Committee on Disarmament (TNDC), Geneva, 1960; the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament (ENDC), Geneva, 1962-68; and the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD), Geneva, 1969-78.

As originally constituted, the CD had 40 members; however, following the unification of Germany and the breakup of former Yugoslavia, only 38 countries participated in the work of the Conference until 1995. On 17 June 1995, the CD unanimously decided to admit 23 additional members.

The CD has a special relationship with the United Nations. It adopts its own rules of procedure and its own agenda, taking into account the recommendations made by the UNGA and the proposals presented by its members, although its secretary is appointed by the UN Secretary-General. It reports to the General Assembly annually or more frequently, as appropriate. The budget of the CD is included in that of the United Nations, the CD meets on UN premises and is serviced by UN personnel. The Conference conducts its work by consensus. The CD has a permanent agenda agreed upon in 1978 at the first special session of the UNGA devoted to disarmament.

The CD and its predecessors have negotiated multilateral arms control, nonproliferation, and disarmament agreements such as the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), Environmental Modification and Seabed treaties, the Biological and Toxic Weapons Convention (BTWC), the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). In 1959, the UN General Assembly established the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in Resolution 1472 (XIV). This committee identified areas for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, devised programs to be undertaken by the United Nations, encouraged research on matters relating to outer space, and studied legal problems arising from the exploration of outer space.

During the 1960s and 1970s a number of agreements were adopted to prevent the weaponization of outer space. These include the Partial Test Ban Treaty, formally titled the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water

(1963), the Outer Space Treaty, formally titled the Treaty on the Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (1967), the Rescue Agreement, formally titled the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1968), the Agreement Relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization "Intelsat" (1971), the Liability Convention, formally titled the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (1972), the Launch Registration Convention, formally titled the Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1975), the Moon Agreement, formally entitled the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (1979).

Although these treaties ban the placement of weapons of mass destruction in space, they do not prevent states from placing other types of weapons in space. As a result, many states argue that existing treaties are insufficient for safeguarding outer space as “the common heritage of mankind.” In order to address this, the final document of the UN General Assembly’s Special Session on Disarmament mandated that negotiations should take place in what is now the Conference on Disarmament (CD), “in order to prevent an arms race in outer space” that are “held in accordance with the spirit of the [Outer Space Treaty].”

In 1985 the CD established an ad hoc committee to identify and examine issues relevant to PAROS such as the legal protection of satellites, nuclear power systems in space, and various confidence-building measures. The United States resolutely opposed giving the committee a negotiating mandate, preferring bilateral talks with the Soviet Union. The committee convened each year through 1994. No further committee meeting occurred due to objections made by the United States. In 1990 the United States stated that it “has not identified any practical outer space arms control measures that can be dealt within a multilateral environment.” With its large missile defence program and technical advantages in potential space weaponry, the United States has consistently refused to negotiate PAROS in the CD.

Under the draft treaty submitted to the CD by Russia in 2008, State Parties would commit to refrain from placing objects carrying any type of weapon into orbit, installing weapons on celestial bodies, and threatening to use force against objects in outer space. State Parties would also agree to practice agreed confidence-building measures.

A PAROS treaty would complement and reaffirm the importance of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, which aims to preserve space for peaceful uses by prohibiting the use of space weapons, the development of space-weapon technology, and technology related to “missile defence.” The treaty would prevent any nation from gaining a military advantage in outer space.

#### **e) Prevention of An Arms Race In Outer Space (PAROS) Treaty**

In 1959, the UN General Assembly established the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in Resolution 1472 (XIV). This committee identified areas for international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, devised programs to be undertaken by the United Nations, encouraged research on matters relating to outer space, and studied legal problems arising from the exploration of outer space.

During the 1960s and 1970s a number of agreements were adopted to prevent the weaponization of outer space. These include the Partial Test Ban Treaty, formally titled the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and Under Water (1963), the Outer Space Treaty, formally titled the Treaty on the Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (1967), the Rescue Agreement, formally titled the Agreement on the Rescue of Astronauts, the Return of Astronauts and the Return of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1968), the Agreement Relating to the International Telecommunications Satellite Organization "Intelsat" (1971), the Liability Convention, formally titled the Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects (1972), the Launch Registration Convention, formally titled the Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space (1975), the Moon Agreement, formally entitled the Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies (1979).

Although these treaties ban the placement of weapons of mass destruction in space, they do not prevent states from placing other types of weapons in space. As a result, many states argue that existing treaties are insufficient for safeguarding outer space as “the common heritage of mankind.” In order to address this, the final document of the UN General Assembly’s Special Session on Disarmament mandated that negotiations should take place in what is now the Conference on Disarmament (CD), “in order to prevent an arms race in outer space” that are “held in accordance with the spirit of the [Outer Space Treaty].”

In 1985 the CD established an ad hoc committee to identify and examine issues relevant to PAROS such as the legal protection of satellites, nuclear power systems in space, and various confidence-building measures. The United States resolutely opposed giving the committee a negotiating mandate, preferring bilateral talks with the Soviet Union. The committee convened each year through 1994. No further committee meeting occurred due to objections made by the United States. In 1990 the United States stated that it “has not identified any practical outer space arms control measures that can be dealt within a multilateral environment.” With its large missile defence program and technical advantages in potential space weaponry, the United States has consistently refused to negotiate PAROS in the CD.

**f) Lacking Points and Issues Regarding Previous Documents**

-There doesn't appear to be a dispute that the right to self defense is applicable to activities in outer space. Yet, there is a lack of common understanding of how this right could be applied to outer in conformity with international law and without resulting in severely damaging consequences. How can the right to self defence in outer space be implanted without straining international relations ?

-Some states fear that transparency measures might reveal sensitive or classified information to the outside world. How can transparency measures be designed in a way to render these fears pointless ?

-Cooperation and information exchange in outer space is crucial for development in this area. States should be encouraged to share information with other governmental and non-governmental spacecraft operators and relevant international organizations in a timely manner. What are the solutions that can be adopted to ensure that ?