

Security Council

Topic 1: Private Military Companies and Mercenaries

While mercenaries have always been historically prevalent and integral in the roles of past wars, Private Military Companies (PMC's) are the modern reincarnation of mercenaries. Mercenaries were essentially irrelevant in military conflict during the 19th and 20th centuries but have been re-established and widely increasing in use since the 1960's. The first modern use of PMC's was during the wars of decolonization in Africa during the 1960's with dramatic growth in prevalence during the period of the Cold War and steady increase in use since then.

Mercenaries are unequivocally defined in the General Assembly's resolution "International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing, and Training of Mercenaries" which was drafted and signed at the United Nations Mercenary Convention in 1989. This convention was held to specifically address the problems of international use of mercenaries in armed conflict. The resolution went into effect in 2001, and in addition to merely defining mercenaries, the resolution strictly prohibited the use of mercenaries. The resolution is highly controversial, however, as many countries, including the very influential United States and United Kingdom, refused to be signatories of this resolution. Additionally, the United States has outright rejected this resolution's classification of Private Military Companies as mercenaries. Countries that are opposed to mercenaries but support the use of PMC's assert that PMC's are hired for the purpose of security and not military action; however, PMC's have the ability to move large amounts of devastating weaponry parallel to that of the world's largest armies. As valid companies, PMC's are currently protected as they are technically registered, law-abiding, independent companies. The greatest concern facing PMC's is that since they are independent companies, with employees of all races, they may be able to act with impunity and disregard the UN's regulation of warfare, thus exonerating their client country from blame of violating UN regulations

The United States has especially utilized PMC's in the conflict in the Middle-East. The United States has hired PMC's to protect troops overseas; however, a controversy arises here as contractors who utilize offensive action in hostile zones are considered unlawful combatants as outlined by the Geneva Convention and specifically stated in the 2006 American Military Commission Act. The rare case of NGO's hiring PMC's is a concern of all nations, due to their detachment from any government. Essentially a new entity may arise with enough technology and manpower to rival the world's greatest militaries; this case is the most probable scenario for the unlikely event of worldwide anarchy and world domination to arise, but nevertheless should still be addressed. With PMC's currently being a \$100 billion per year industry and increasing, in addition to the current UN regulation of mercenaries and the debatable disobedience of such regulation by world powers, this topic must be addressed by the Security Council as PMC's threaten international safety.

Discussion Questions

1. Should PMC's be classified as mercenaries and too be prohibited? If not classified as mercenaries, should they be prohibited, regulated, or ignored?
2. How should countries currently utilizing mercenaries and/or PMC's be dealt with?

3. With PMC's being such a large industry, how would regulation or extinction of PMC's affect the economies of nations? What effect would any changes to the current usage of PMC's have on warfare, policy, etc. and how can negative effects be circumvented?

Resources:

1. "A/RES/44/34. International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/44/a44r034.htm>>.

Description: A General Assembly Resolution regarding mercenaries

2. "Military." Mercenary / Private Companies (PMCs). N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/para/pmc-list.htm>>.

Description: A list and directory to the most prominent PMC's

3. "Modern-Day Mercenaries." Modern-Day Mercenaries. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<http://www.sandline.com/hotlinks/Yale_Modern-day-mercs.html>.

Description: An account of mercenaries and PMC's being used in the Middle East

4. "The Rise of Modern Mercenaries and Private Military Contractors." The Rise of Modern Mercenaries and Private Military Contractors. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.nickryan.net/articles/mercenary.html>>.

Description: A detailed article on the history of PMC's and mercenaries, elaborating on modern PMC's and mercenaries

5. "The Threat of Private Military Companies." Global Research. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.globalresearch.ca/the-threat-of-private-military-companies/24896>>.

Description: An article outlining the threats of PMC's

6. "Beyond Blackwater." The Economist. The Economist Newspaper, 23 Nov. 2013. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.economist.com/news/business/21590370-industry-reinvents-itself-after-demise-its-most-controversial-firm-beyond-blackwater>>.

Description: A newspaper article regarding a specific PMC: Blackwater

7. "The Rise of Private Military Companies (Part 2/2) - Fair Observer." Fair Observer. N.p., 20 Aug. 2014. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<http://www.fairobserver.com/region/north_america/the-rise-of-private-military-companies-98361/>.

Description: An article detailing the modern roles and influences of PMC's from a global standpoint

8. "Is There an Appropriate Role for Private Military Companies (PMCs) in the Contemporary Security Context?" Is There an Appropriate Role for Private Military Companies (PMCs) in the Contemporary Security Context? N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.

<http://www.academia.edu/2074469/Is_there_an_appropriate_role_for_Private_Military_Companies_PMCs_in_the_contemporary_security_context>

Description: Fifty page examination of the role of PMC's, questioning their necessity

9. "Mercenaries, Private Military and Security Companies and International Law" UN. UN Working Group on the Use of Mercenaries. By Jose L. Gomez. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015.
<https://media.law.wisc.edu/s/c_360/kxzdv/gomez_del_prado_paper.doc>.

Description: Extensive UN publication relating PMC's and mercenaries to international law

10. "Honduras - Non-State Armed Groups." Honduras - Non-State Armed Groups. N.p., n.d. Web. 29 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.geneva-academy.ch/RULAC/non->

state_armed_groups.php?id_state=85>.

Description: Article providing information to the relation between PMC's and Non-State Actors

Topic 2: Responsibility to Protect

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a proposed norm initiated by the UN asserting that a country forfeits its sovereignty when it fails to protect its people, specifically from genocide and crimes against humanity. While humanitarian intervention is a solely militaristic action, R2P first takes preventative measures to protect civilians, but can lead to military action if necessary. The UN can initiate preventative measures namely by utilizing mediation, economic sanctions, and non-militaristic authority authorized by Chapter VII in the UN Charter.

The concept of R2P first arose after the 1994 Rwanda Genocide in which the Rwandan people were massacred and the Rwandan government failed to take necessary measures. Assistant Secretary General at the time Kofi Annan proposed the idea of R2P claiming that the UN has a responsibility to protect people that are being violated of their human rights outlined by the UN. Asserting that since humanitarian intervention was deemed an infringement on a nation's sovereignty, preventative methods utilized by R2P would allow for nations to maintain sovereignty and provide for more humane intervention. In 2000, the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty was formed to protect the sovereignty of nations from R2P and humanitarian intervention. The committee outlined guidelines for proper R2P intervention. The committee reaffirmed the idea that when a state government is unable or unwilling to protect the basic rights of its people, the burden shifts to the international community. The ICISS also asserted that military intervention may only be applicable in extreme cases and must meet the following criteria to be justified: just cause, right intention, last resort, proportional means, reasonable prospects, and right authority.

The "right authority" criteria mentioned above alludes to the proper method in which the UN must follow in order for the militaristic action to be considered lawful. As stated in the UN Charter, any militaristic order given by the UN must come from the Security Council. As such, the Security Council has the greatest power and responsibility regarding R2P. The Security Council has issued resolutions confirming their support for R2P and has issued eleven country-specific resolutions since 2006 exerting their power of R2P. These eleven resolutions (ten of which issued between 2011-2013) in total have affected seven states. Since the Security Council plays an integral role in R2P and the usage of of R2P varies with time and countries, the Security Council must be able to maintain international order by studying conflicts all over the world and dealing with each on an individual basis.

A general concern facing R2P is the use of the UN's peacekeepers. The United Nations first started using peacekeepers in 1948 when the Security Council created and organized these blue-helmeted troops to be sent to the Middle East to observe an Armistice Agreement. Since then the peacekeepers have been used as the UN's police and military. The peacekeepers are composed of 97,000 men and women from 110 different countries. These men and women are considered to be a member of their country's army first and a

UN peacekeeper second. The peacekeepers are used in all matters concerning R2P, as they are the enforcers for the UN. They may be sent to patrol disputed lands or be used to protect a state's people from war crimes or genocide. The relatively minuscule size of the peacekeeping force, the secondary loyalty, and restricted power of the the peacekeepers makes for an ineffective army. A revision to the peacekeepers would need to be passed by the Security Council in addition to the General Assembly, but would only be necessary if an imminent international crisis called for the augmentation of the UN's military power.

Discussion Questions

1. Would any regions of the world currently benefit from R2P methods? What methods would best aid these regions?
2. How can the intentions of R2P be optimized? Is some facet of international protection ignored by R2P or is there currently some superfluous notions associated with R2P?
3. Are all the necessary conditions outlined by the ICISS necessary to justify UN military actions? Is the stigma surrounded by a country forfeiting their sovereignty for protection inhibiting international security?
4. Generally, does R2P have positive effects? Or does it surpass the jurisdiction the UN should have?
5. Do peacekeepers need reform? If so, what changes in size, policy, authority would optimize international security conditions? Should changes be made on a case by case basis for varying international threats to security?

Resources:

1. "Office of The Special Adviser on The Prevention of Genocide." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/en/preventgenocide/adviser/responsibility.shtml>>.

Description: About the Responsibility to Protect

2. "Learn About RtoP." Learn About RtoP. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<<http://www.responsibilitytoprotect.org/index.php/about-rtop>>.

Description: More Information about the Responsibility to Protect

3. "Current Peacekeeping Operations. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/current.shtml>>.

Description: List of countries with UN Peacekeepers

4. "United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/>>.

Description: About UN Peacekeeping operations

5. "United Nations Peacekeeping Forces - History." United Nations Peacekeeping Forces - History. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1988/un-history.html>.

Description: History of UN Peacekeeping

6. "Peacekeeping Issues. United Nations Peacekeeping." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/>>.

Description: Key Challenges of UN Peacekeeping

7. "Critical Reforms Required for U.N. Peacekeeping." The Heritage Foundation. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.
<<http://www.heritage.org/research/reports/2009/09/critical-reforms-required-for-un-peace-keeping>>.

Description: Struggles in UN Peacekeeping

8. "New U.N. Force May Increase Risks for Civilians | Spotlight | The Stimson Center | Pragmatic Steps for Global Security." New U.N. Force May Increase Risks for Civilians | Spotlight | The Stimson Center | Pragmatic Steps for Global Security. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<<http://www.stimson.org/spotlight/new-un-force-may-increase-risks-for-civilians/>>.

Description: Potential Risks of UN Peacekeeping Interventions

Topic 3: Weapons of Mass Destruction and Non-State Actors

While the term "weapons of mass destruction" (WMD) is a relatively new one, the effort to control the spread of armaments and weapons that can inflict harm on a mass population is by no means a new battle. There have been several steps in the right direction concerning the production and use of these deadly weapons, much of which were extremely successful. From agreements following World War I to the ban of mustard gas to the establishment of the International Atomic Energy Agency to the nearly universal acceptance of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, the international community has worked hand in hand with one another to assure the safety of their people and the regulation/limitation of WMDs.

"Unless the world community acts decisively and with great urgency, it is more likely than not that a weapon of mass destruction will be used in a terrorist attack somewhere in the world by the end of 2013," says the Commission on Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism reported in December 2008. Nevertheless, there is a new issue at hand concerning the controls of WMD in the hands of Non-State Actors. A Non-state actor, or NSA defined by the General Assembly is "an entity that participates in or act in international relations. They are organizations with sufficient power to influence and cause a change even though they do not belong to any established institution of a state."

During the mid 1990's, Libya secretly set out to acquire equipment and materials to create a gas centrifuge plant that could produce highly enriched uranium (HEU) to make roughly 10 nuclear weapons annually. It is sufficient to say that the procurement of these materials was not difficult and was largely invisible to intelligence agencies such as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG). This highly unstructured network is commonly called the "Khan" Network, located in Pakistan, has supplied several countries much like Libya with key nuclear supplies to build large scale nuclear weaponry. It was not until 2003 that the IAEA seized control of Libya's secret gas centrifuge program, and put a halt to the illegal creation of WMDs with materials supplied from the Khan Network. To this day, IAEA and other national investigators are still trying to

piece together a full understanding of this network and the procurement of such black market activities.

Although the black market network known as the Khan network was shut down, its existence has confirmed the fear that nuclear technology is no longer limited to industrially advanced countries. It raised the worries that these WMDs can now be purchased and sold under the radar on the black market. It is the job of the Security Council to advise on this situation and come up with a solution that will regulate the proliferation of such weapons, and control the worry of these WMD's falling into the wrong hands. Further the United Nations is calling upon the Security Council to address the situation of new underground organizations similar to the Khan Network coming into play. The threat of nuclear power falling in the hands of these organizations with little to no governmental structure is alarming, and should be put to a stop immediately.

Discussion Questions

1. How can countries work hand and hand with one another to come up with an effective way to regulate the sale of WMD's on the black market?
2. What is an effective way to prevent organizations like the Khan Network from gaining so much control? How can the Security Council and the United Nations intervene with such matters?
3. Should there be further regulation on the proliferation of WMDs in established countries?
4. How should the removal of WMDs on the black market be handled? Who should take control of these weapons? Should they be destroyed?
5. If a NSA does take control of nuclear weaponry, how should it be handled?

Resources:

1. "Security Council Statement Reaffirms Concern over Weapons of Mass Destruction." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/press/en/2014/sc11382.doc.htm>>.

Description: Recent Updates about UN stance on Non-State Actors

2. "The Role of Non-state Actors in International Relations." The Role of Non-state Actors in International Relations. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <http://www.academia.edu/5124220/The_Role_of_Non-state_Actors_in_International_Relations>.

Description: The role of Non-State Actors in International Relations

3. "WMDC - The Weapons Of Mass Destruction Commission." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/education/wmdcommission/>>.

Description: About the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission

4. "UNODA - The UN Disarmament Commission." UN News Center. UN, n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.un.org/disarmament/HomePage/DisarmamentCommission/UNDiscom.shtml>>.

Description: About the UNODA and various forms for WMDs. Information of regulations of these WMDs

5. Sanger, David E. "The Khan Network" (n.d.): n. pag. Stanford Institute for International Studies. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<http://iis-db.stanford.edu/evnts/3889/Khan_network-paper.pdf>.

Description: About the Khan Network, from start to end

6. "The Global Challenge of WMD and Terrorism." Acta Neurologica Scandinavica 92 (1995): 41-44. Web. 30 Apr. 2015. <<http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/65477.pdf>>.

Description: The effect of WMDs on terrorist activity

7. "Resource Center." Non-Proliferation Sanctions. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<<http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/Programs/Pages/wmd.aspx>>.

Description: List of Non-Proliferation Sanctions and their effects

8. "Non-state Actors and World Governance." Non-state Actors and World Governance. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Apr. 2015.

<http://www.world-governance.org/spip.php?page=comprecis&id_rubrique=37>.

Description: About Non-State Actors