



# HOMMUNC XXXIII

OCTOBER 27TH, 2018

33RD ANNUAL

**HORACE MANN MODEL UNITED NATIONS  
CONFERENCE**

## **DISEC**

**DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY  
COUNCIL**

**JULIA HORNSTEIN**  
CHAIR

**SIDH CHAWLA**  
MODERATOR



# HOMMUNC XXXIII

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>LETTER FROM THE SECRETARIAT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COMMITTEE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURE:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>TOPIC A: ASYMMETRIC WARFARE</b>	<b>6</b>
Overview	6
History	7
Current Situation	11
Possible Solutions	14
Bloc Positions	15
Questions to Consider	16
<b>TOPIC B: FOREIGN MILITARY INTERVENTION IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS</b>	<b>17</b>
Overview	17
History	18
Current Situation	20
Possible Solutions	21
Bloc Positions	22
Questions to Consider	23
<b>SOURCES</b>	<b>24</b>

# LETTER FROM THE SECRETARIAT

Connor Morris  
Julia Hornstein  
**Secretaries-General**

Shant Amerkian  
**Chairman of the Board**

Lauren Port  
James Berg  
**Vice Chairmen of the Board**

Alexa Watson  
Samuel Puckowitz  
Eli Laufer  
**Senior Executive Board**

Eliza Bender  
Arman Kumar  
Belle Beyer  
Charlotte Cebula  
Noah Fawer  
**Under Secretaries-General**

Amman Kejela  
Rohan Bhatia  
Side Chawla  
Jack Eagan  
Roey Nornberg  
Gloria Khafif  
Zachary Brooks  
**Conference Coordinators**

Jude Herwitz  
**Junior Executive Board**

Alexa Mark  
Alexandra Reich  
Sean Koons  
Arul Kapoor  
**Staff**

Aaron Thompson  
**Faculty Advisor**

**DEAR DELEGATES,**

It is our pleasure to welcome you to Horace Mann's 33rd Annual Model United Nations Conference, HoMMUNC XXXIII! Since 1985, HoMMUNC has brought together future world leaders in a day full of intellect, discourse, and compromise. The conference engages academically minded high school and middle school students to contemplate and discuss imperative global concerns. We are honored to have inherited the responsibility of organizing this conference for all of you, the over 1000 delegates that will attend HoMMUNC this year. We hope you are excited as we are for the conference to begin!

We encourage you to deeply explore your topics and arrive at HoMMUNC prepared to engage in the discourse of your committees and truly involve yourself in the negotiation process, regardless of your age or experience in Model UN. Each committee is comprised of a wide-ranging group of delegates and will address a pressing global issue. We challenge you to delve deep into your topics and think creatively. Take this opportunity to learn as much as you can, create the best solutions possible, and lead your committee to a world-changing resolution.

Model United Nations has played a tremendous role in our lives over the past three years, and we are thrilled to share this activity with all of you. It has been our pleasure preparing HoMMUNC XXXII along with our dedicated junior and senior staff over the past six months. We hope you have an enriching and enjoyable experience at the conference.

Sincerely,

**CONNOR MORRIS AND JULIA HORNSTEIN**  
Secretaries-General  
HoMMUNC XXXIII

# LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

Connor Morris  
Julia Hornstein  
**Secretaries-General**

Shant Amerkianian  
**Chairman of the Board**

Lauren Port  
James Berg  
**Vice Chairmen of the Board**

Alexa Watson  
Samuel Puckowitz  
Eli Laufer  
**Senior Executive Board**

Eliza Bender  
Arman Kumar  
Belle Beyer  
Charlotte Cebula  
Noah Fawer  
**Under Secretaries-General**

Amman Kejela  
Rohan Bhatia  
Side Chawla  
Jack Eagan  
Roey Nornberg  
Gloria Khafif  
Zachary Brooks  
**Conference Coordinators**

Jude Herwitz  
**Junior Executive Board**

Alexa Mark  
Alexandra Reich  
Sean Koons  
Arul Kapoor  
**Staff**

Aaron Thompson  
**Faculty Advisor**

## **DEAR DELEGATES,**

I'm Julia Hornstein, your chair; welcome to HoMMUNC XXXIII's Disarmament and International Security Committee! I've been on Model UN since my very first month of high school and am now one of HM MUN's Secretary Generals for the 2018-2019 year. I'm so beyond excited to be spending my fourth and final HoMMUNC with all of you in my favorite committee, DISEC! I will be chairing alongside Sidh Chawla, your moderator, who is a junior on the team.

I am a senior at Horace Mann, and other than Model UN, I'm a part of Student Ambassador (our group of students that give tours to families on campus), United Classrooms (a service learning group that teaches middle schoolers about foreign affairs and how to debate), and various other mentoring programs, like Middle Division Mentoring and Upper Division Orientation. I live in New York City, and I've been at Horace Mann for my entire life but left the school for a semester last year to go to the Mountain School of Milton Academy in Vershire, VT. Being a part of Model UN has made me really interested in politics and foreign affairs; it led me to intern for a congressman in DC this past summer. I'm an outdoors enthusiast and backpacked the 110 mile Tour du Mont Blanc in Switzerland, Italy, and France the summer before my junior year. I love hiking, sushi, dogs, MUN (!!), and my favorite band, Parachute (brownie points if you know who they are).

Model UN has truly been my favorite part of high school; I met my best friends through MUN and can't wait for you all to do the same. Cherish the time you have doing MUN; it feels like I just walked into the MUN room for the first time, and now I'm the Secretary General, chairing my last HoMMUNC. MUN has taught me how to voice my opinions, in and out of class, and truly changed my life. Invest time into researching these topics, motion for a moderated caucus if you haven't done so before, and don't be afraid to get up and give a speech. You really get as much out of MUN as you put in.

Sidh and I have spent countless hours preparing for this conference to make HoMMUNC XXXIII the best one yet. Asymmetric Warfare and Foreign Military Intervention in International Conflicts are two extremely pressing issues, and the background guide can only scratch the surface. I encourage you all to carry out extensive research prior to the conference. Sidh and I can't wait to see how engaged you all will be in committee; please reach out to me if you have any questions. See you in October!

Best,

**JULIA HORNSTEIN**

[julia\\_hornstien@horacemann.org](mailto:julia_hornstien@horacemann.org)

Chair, DISEC

## **COMMITTEE BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURE:**

The United Nations General Assembly First Committee is one of six main committees at the General Assembly of the United Nations which deals with matters concerning world peace. The First Committee deals with disarmament, global challenges and threats to peace that affect the international community. It considers all disarmament and international security matters within the scope of the Charter or relating to the powers and functions of any other organ of the United Nations; the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Committee works in close cooperation with the United Nations Disarmament Commission and the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament. It is the only Main Committee of the General Assembly entitled to verbatim records coverage.

It includes all nations that are United Nations Member States.

### ***Procedure***

**Roll Call:** at the beginning of every committee session, the chair will take attendance, and every delegate must respond “present.” If you are late coming to committee, send a note to the dais to let them know you are present.

**Motions:** used to open and close debate, decide to move to voting procedure, to propose a speakers list, moderated or unmoderated caucus. The chair will entertain several motions at one time, then will have all delegates vote on each motion in order of most to least disruptive, and the motion with the majority passes.

**Speaker’s List:** a type of debate used to start committee, often meant to set the agenda, in which the chair would create a list of speakers.

**Moderated Caucus:** another form of debate, used most often during committee, that has a set time,

speaking time, and specific topic to debate. Your chair will call upon countries to speak. When a delegate wishes to speak, they will raise their placard when told.

**Unmoderated Caucus:** a time when the rules of formal debate are suspended, during which delegates can leave their seats. This time is used for delegates to build blocs and write draft resolutions.

**Resolutions:** require a set number of sponsors who worked on drafting the resolution, and a list of signatories who would like to see the resolution debated. Resolutions are presented by the sponsors of the draft resolution, after which a Q&A session will be held.

## **TOPIC A: ASYMMETRIC WARFARE**

---

### Overview

Asymmetric Warfare is a conflict between belligerents whose military power, or strategy and tactics differs

significantly from one another.

Together with the growing involvement of non-state entities, the disparity between these belligerents is increasing, causing contemporary conflicts to have more of an asymmetric structure.<sup>1</sup> There are three well known examples of asymmetrical warfare in modern day society.

Guerrilla warfare is a small scale, fast paced type of combat that occurs between lightly armed partisans and a conventional army of a nation or territory. Terrorist attacks are another form as they are usually viewed as a much weaker, smaller group attacking a larger one and because it involves surprise attacks on civilians usually in the form of hijacking or suicide bombings. Attacks on civilians and the use of human shields, actions that have been outlawed by the international community are also being revived by smaller groups who are now using an asymmetric structure for combat.

Civilian targeting is “one way” and is extremely unconventional in terms of

types of warfare. The last example is the use of nuclear weapons as there are a lot of countries that are either not willing or willing to use these kinds of destructive machines, or they simply do not have any at their disposal.<sup>2</sup> It is important to understand why

Asymmetric warfare happens in the first place. It can be explained by two complications that authors and scholars tend to spend their time on. If one side of a conflict is more “powerful” than the other, then why would it make sense for the weaker side to go to war? Weaker sides sometimes have secret weapons that others don’t know about, large allies, or they might have no other choice because of oppression individuals are experiencing in a certain area. The willingness, craftiness, and internal connection between smaller groups allows them to even reach victory in some cases.

Weaker sides often use different types of terrain to their advantage as it might move the opposition force out of their comfort zone. Examples of these kinds

of “difficult terrain” are: woods, swamps, mountains, jungles, or anywhere that would be effective in limiting the mobility of soldiers.<sup>3</sup>

Civilians can also play a large part in the outcome of an asymmetric conflict through information-centric framework in which civilians are a source of important strategic information for the current conflict. Asymmetric conflicts include both interstate and civil war.

Over the past two centuries, the bulk of conflicts like these have been dominated by the stronger force, however, in the past fifty years, there has been a shift in that most of asymmetric conflicts have been won by the weaker side.

---

#### History

Victory in war does not always side with the side that is more powerful than the other. In fact, colonial powers have had to deal with asymmetrical threats since the rise of great empires. Darius, I of Persia during the 6th century BCE was in command of the

largest, most advanced and powerful army in existence. He was tested by the Scythians, a group of Eurasian Nomads who were among the earliest people to master mounted warfare. The Scythians possessed a smaller but far more mobile force than Darius. The Scythians decided to retreat after the Persians started to attack but this only drew Darius further into Scythian territory. The Scythians then launched a surprise ambush which crumbled the Persian troops and forced Darius to give up a large chunk of land to the Scythians.<sup>4</sup>

The historical examples are tactics adopted by German chieftain Arminius against Roman legions in 9 AD, use of longbow in battle of Agincourt against French in 1415 AD, guerrilla campaign of Spanish irregulars against Napoleonic French army, Vietcong tactics against US troops in 1960 war, and in recent times the tactics used by insurgents against coalition troops in IRAQ are some of

the examples of asymmetric warfare from history.<sup>5</sup>

The theology of war is not new, and Asymmetric warfare is as old as warfare itself and as new as the most recent terrorist attack. The lesson, even from ancient times that military leaders were generating was to come up with a plan that would differ from the strategies of the opponent they would be fighting. Some of the oldest written works about the asymmetric structure of warfare derive from Sun Tzu during the 4th century BC. He highlighted the philosophy in his book “the art of war” where he makes the point to avoid what is strong and to attack what is weak; essentially the base for asymmetric warfare itself.<sup>6</sup>

Results from symmetrical conflicts or conventional wars with two orthodox forces have also been a factor in the rise of asymmetrical warfare. The victory of the United States and its allies in the gulf war proved to the world that Western (American) technology was superior to Eastern

(Soviet) technology. It also proved, however, that symmetrical warfare will always be won by the side that is more prepared and technologically advanced.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, this would imply that in any conventional conflict, the technologically inferior side would lose the war. After the fall of the Soviet Union in 1991, the threat of asymmetric warfare increased even more worldwide. The “bipolar world” with the United States and the Soviet Union as the primary leaders caused a lot of uneasy stability in the developing world. A lot of the countries that now pose a threat to the United States used to be forced to side with one of the two main powers during the cold war so that they could receive military assistance and foreign aid. The end of the bipolar world caused this aid to disappear leaving tons of developing nations to deal with conflict themselves. This new kind of instability led to poor economies with corrupt leaders and forced lots of power struggles among individuals in

the population. Since the United States is one of the sole superpowers in the international community today, it becomes an external threat or cause to the misfortunes of these developing nations which disenfranchised segments target in order to rally support for their causes.<sup>8</sup>

Terrorism is not a modern phenomenon either, as its routes derive from the Sicarii, an early Jewish organization that had the aim of overthrowing Romans in the Middle East. Modern terrorism however comes from World War II with the rise of nationalist movements in the place of old empires of the European powers. These early anti-colonial movements recognized the ability of terrorism to both generate publicity for the cause and influence global policy.<sup>9</sup> As a result, ever since the 1960s (cold war time), the amount of yearly attacks has increased dramatically. In 1970, there was a total of 651 terrorism related incidents, a much smaller number when compared to 13,488 incidents in

2016.<sup>10</sup> In the past 15 years especially, terrorism organizations such as ISIS in the Middle East have been able to become so powerful and resilient because of popular support. Due to governments usually taking a superior role within their respective countries, terrorist organizations look to irregular forms of warfare to advance their goal or agenda. Since a selection of these organizations have been able to add to their population so much through actions like asymmetric warfare, it has become a much more difficult task for individual governments when it comes to counter terrorism initiatives. The 9/11 attacks marked a turning point in world history and the official beginning of the “war on terror”. The attacks are estimated to have killed around 3,000 people making it the deadliest terrorist related incident to have ever occurred.<sup>11</sup> This kind of asymmetric warfare of driving planes into buildings led to the invasion of Afghanistan in 2001 and later Iraq in 2003. Pre- 9/11, the highest

concentration of terrorism related incidents had been in Latin American and Asia but shifted to the Middle East post 9/11.

Along with the rise of terrorism in World War II, the United States also introduced the atomic bomb after test dropping the first one in New Mexico on July 16th, 1945. The creation of the atomic bomb created the “arms race” with the Soviet Union. The Soviets finally could build their own atomic bomb in 1949, when they tested a U.S. design based weapon.<sup>12</sup> The “arms race” between the Soviets and the United States propelled the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 which was a 13-day political and military standoff over the installation of nuclear-armed soviet missiles on Cuba, which is just 90 miles off U.S. shores.<sup>13</sup> Experts predict that the two atomic bombs dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima were equivalent to 15,000 tons of TNT which would be powerful enough to kill 300,000 people in Manhattan. Meanwhile, North Korea has recently

tested a nuclear weapon that is nearly equivalent to around 150,000 tons of TNT.<sup>14</sup> The improvements made in nuclear technology only create more opportunity for asymmetric warfare that could be massively destructive to land masses around the world.

Especially with countries like North Korea on the rise who are already threatening to use their technology on other nations who are not willing to use them or do not even have them in the first place. It is important that the DISEC committee comes up with solutions that can help mediate asymmetric warfare with the use of nuclear weapons.

Guerrilla warfare has also been on the rise along with terrorism and nuclear weapons. The use of this type of combat has varied considerably throughout history. It was traditionally a weapon of protest to highlight wrongs committed by an oppressive government or foreign entity. It has both scored great victories and defeats as a use of protest. An example of this

is after the military failure of the Easter Rising in 1916, the Irish Republican Army (IRA) used guerrilla tactics involving both urban guerrilla warfare and flying columns in the countryside during the Irish War of Independence of 1919 to 1922. After this type of warfare had been transformed during World War II, the prolonged Cold War period gave way to numerous guerrilla forces of varying political beliefs which were showered with money, modern weapons, and equipment from assorted benefactors. Guerrilla warfare is highly dangerous because of how greatly destructive it can be to a large group of people in a very short period.<sup>15</sup>

---

#### Current Situation

In modern times, larger Western powers fighting in developing nations have been defeated by smaller local forces despite a large asymmetry in terms of military power. There is a need to elaborate on the fact that modern asymmetric conflicts consist of

a lot more senseless violence. Incidents of mass rape are an especially gruesome form of violence intended to take the identities of individuals. The use of child soldiers, although not a new “tactic”, has also started to receive increased attention from media outlets around the world. As a result, the media has been able to bring ordinary people much closer to the suffering of these children.

Along the Gaza strip, there is currently a frustrating conflict: there is asymmetry that exists and is the main factor that is prolonging the war. Israel is a democratic state with a body of elected institutions and government that is highly susceptible to lots of criticisms from the media. Hamas, on the other hand, is widely not seen as an entity that is defined to be a state. Therefore, it would make sense for Hamas to be less affected by the media or public opinion. While Israel is a state that acts on a basis of primarily Western values, the Gaza strip is a government with only one cause that

they are willing to make huge sacrifices for. The focus of Israel is to achieve peaceful coexistence in the current geopolitical madness.<sup>16</sup> Hamas is religiously committed to the destruction of Israel and it has no commitment, religious or secular, to the welfare of the people it rules in Gaza. Israel claims that Hamas uses citizens of Gaza as “human shields”, however it seems as if the real goal of the organization is to deliberately show these people to harm, which would be one way to try and win an “asymmetric war.”<sup>17</sup>

At a structural level, the armed forces of Israel follow a more traditional path with set hierarchies, uniforms, and a code of conduct alike most traditional armies around the world. The army of the Gaza Strip uses a mixture of traditional uniformed troops and soldiers that blend in with the civilian population which makes it much harder for Israeli troops to target.

Hamas, along with being accused of using human shields, has also been

accused of abusing the vagueness of its army to fight in more urban areas which has neutralized the huge advantage Israel seems to have. Higher moral standards of Israel also give way to more constraints in the way Hamas can be attacked. Constraints exist in some weapons and which targets can be specifically attacked. The only real constraint that exists for Hamas is the difficulty of certain tasks and attacks that they might be planning on carrying out as the forces of Israel are larger and superior.

The major differences in tactics between the two sides, and the ambiguity Hamas uses by blending in with innocent civilians makes it impossible for Israeli forces to fight effectively. These tactics used by Hamas, importantly, also dramatically increases civilian casualties while causing more collateral damage. When a soldier cannot differentiate a soldier and a civilian, there becomes a much higher chance that civilians will die for no reason.

The war in Iraq starting in 2003 is also another more recent conflict that represents asymmetry and why the transition from third generation warfare to fourth generation warfare took place. Third generation warfare, primarily a product of World War I was developed by the German army and is commonly known by the terms blitzkrieg or maneuver warfare. Third generation warfare is not so much about firepower and attrition as it is about surprise and speed. Tactically, in the attack, a Third-Generation military seeks to get into the enemy's rear areas and collapse him from the rear forward. In the defense, it attempts to draw the enemy in, then cut him off. War ceases to be a shoving contest, where forces attempt to hold or advance a line. In fourth generation warfare, a state loses its monopoly over the war. State militaries find themselves constantly fighting non-state actors such as al-Qaeda, Hamas, and ISIL.<sup>18</sup> The war on Iraq represented a time in American

military history where U.S. forces were being attacked by a large variety of non-state actors located in or around Iraq. All aspects of fourth generation warfare are considered to fall under an asymmetric structure of combat.

The invasion of Iraq began on March 20, 2003 when American and English troops launched a “shock and awe” bombing campaign. The bombings led to the collapse of the Ba'athist government and the eventual capture of Saddam Hussein under operation “red dawn.” However, the absence of Saddam gave way to a major power vacuum and the complete mismanagement of Saddam’s former ruler led to widespread violence between the Shias and Sunnis. It also created a surge of asymmetric attacks against American forces primarily led by al-Qaeda.<sup>19</sup>

---

### Possible Solutions

When assessing solutions to asymmetric warfare and the mass destruction it insights, different conflict

prevention initiatives could prove to be very effective. A new body with a primary goal of conflict prevention could be created. The body would work for preventive deployment and diplomacy to help mediate any tensions that might exists between two entities. If two sides are on the edge of engaging in conflict, a third party should be able to intervene (under agreement with the created body) with a small number of troops and officers to help mediate the tension. This preventive deployment strategy will also be effective in highlighting a willingness among the international community to react to situations like these. Preventive diplomacy can be used in the same way, but it would be more peaceful and would go through different NGOs or intellectual officials who are willing to do so.

The United Nations could suggest adaptive initiatives for asymmetry, but it is first more urgent that different blocs decide if embracing asymmetric warfare is the correct way

to proceed. Warfare, especially asymmetric is inevitably going to happen meaning that there potentially must be certain solutions delegates must come up with that will aid different countries in adapting to this kind of structure of combat. While it is possible to create a set of standards for what actions can and cannot be done in times of war, non-state groups will completely overlook these measures. Education of different military tactics used by non-state recognized entities such as Hamas would allow for traditional armies to adjust and cope. Education within different forces should be coupled with training specifically directed towards defending asymmetric tactics that might be used by opposing troops.

---

#### Bloc Positions

##### ***United States and its Allies:***

The United States has been involved in multiple asymmetric wars in the past, most recently the long lasting civil war

in Syria. Large powers like the United States are never failed to be recognized as military power houses as they are always looking to enhance their current philosophy to win wars by providing the most advanced technology to its armed forces. This current philosophy is victory through one traditional army out playing the other in battle.

However, with ambiguity of asymmetric warfare and increasing attention to national sovereignty, it has become more and more difficult for the United States to engage in asymmetric wars in the Middle East or anywhere else. The United States also faces the problem of having to deal with the cruelty of asymmetric warfare as it puts policy makers and the soldiers themselves at great risk.<sup>20</sup>

##### ***Russian Federation and its Allies:***

The Russian Federation and its history as the Soviet Union has also been involved in multiple asymmetric style wars. There was a need for the Russians to fight asymmetrically

during World War II in a time where the Russian forces were far weaker than the Germans. Even though they have used guerrilla tactics in the past, Russia does realize the importance for a healthy balance between conventional and unconventional war tactics.

***Countries in Favor of Asymmetric Warfare:***

This group includes small nations that do not have any means other than asymmetric warfare to fight larger nations. While completely getting rid of an asymmetric structure could allow these smaller countries to block insurgency groups, the long-term effects are much greater. This is because these countries would also be getting rid of their only viable way to fight wars; not to mention that an asymmetric structure is extremely cost effective.

1. Should certain boundaries of national sovereignty be reconsidered by the international community?
2. Should the international community be willing to adapt asymmetric warfare and make the correct adjustments within their respective nations to deal with it?
3. How can non-state entities such as large terrorist groups be held up to the same moral and warfare standards that already recognized states are held to?
4. Are initiatives such as conflict prevention effective for dealing with asymmetric wars and tensions?
- 5.

---

Questions to Consider

## **TOPIC B: FOREIGN MILITARY INTERVENTION IN INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS**

---

### Overview

Military intervention is the deliberate act of a nation or group of nations to introduce its own military forces into an existing conflict or controversy.<sup>21</sup> Ever since the end of the Cold War, military intervention used for conflict resolution and humanitarian reasons has increased dramatically. Sometimes, foreign entities send in troops for unconventional reasons for issues like disaster relief. This was done by the United States in 1990 when they sent troop to Honduras for this reason. However, the far more common and controversial intervention type is when nations send troops to increase the speed of a conflict. Major powers of the world must decide if their large variety of resources will make a significant change from a humanitarian

aspect in nations where conflict exists, or how much of an effect a certain outcome will have on the interests of the nation looking to get involved.<sup>22</sup> In addressing these problems, foreign interventions aim to construct a preferable state of affairs in these societies from the standpoint of those intervening. This may or may not align with what those in the foreign society view as a preferred state of affairs. The conflict between two contradicting viewpoints of major countries often makes it much harder for areas where the conflict is occurring to maintain a status of long term peace.<sup>23</sup> There also needs to be a good chance that the operation of intervening will be successful for the foreign entity looking to engage. Success is usually qualified as ending the conflict that is at hand, but one major issue is that the larger powers that intervene in conflicts sometimes end up abusing the humanitarian rights of the weaker powers who are also involved. There are many different types of foreign

interventions which can be understood in the context of Nye's (2004) distinction between 'soft power' and 'hard power.' Soft power refers to the use of persuasion to achieve the desired ends, while hard power refers to the use of force. Examples of soft power include the dissemination of certain information, or cultural products, as well as monetary aid. Examples of hard power include military occupation and the removal of government regimes through force.<sup>24</sup>

---

## History

Ever since its creation, the United Nations has often been called upon to prevent disputes from escalating into a war, and if some kind of conflict does break out, then it is their job to promote peace within these societies. There have been 138 intrastate wars since the end of World War II, and outside parties have intervened in roughly two-thirds of them. The United States alone has been involved in 35. In only about 30 percent of the cases

did outside action help settle the war, and intervention on behalf of the government has been more successful than that on behalf of the opposition.<sup>25</sup>

An intrastate war, or more commonly known as a civil war is a violent conflict between a state and one or more organized non-state actors in the state's territory.<sup>26</sup> Over the past 70

years, more than 1 million men and women have served in more than 70

UN peacekeeping operations. More

than 100,000 military, police and civilian personnel from 125 countries

currently serve in 14 peacekeeping

operations.<sup>27</sup> Many of these were

interventions into civil wars, and each

has relied upon a resolution made

specifically for the situation by the

Security Council. UN peacemaking

expanded in the 1990s, as the end of

the Cold War created new opportunities

to end civil wars through negotiated

peace settlements. Efforts at making

intervention more successful and

efficient is a point that delegates must

focus on when coming up with solutions for their resolutions.

First major military intervention occurred in the First Opium War from 1839-142 between the Chinese and the English. The English had been illegally exporting large amounts of opium from India to China. The rising addiction of opium caused there to be horrible economic and social conditions in China, and the government was now ready to crush the trade and stop the British. This resulted in the Chinese intervening into the affairs of British trade creating a war between the two nations.<sup>28</sup>

Colonialism in Africa fell apart after the end of World War II, opening up political and military intervention opportunities for major cold war powers that competed with older imperial powers to control the entire decolonization process. External support for many African regimes that promoted outside interests, however, led to many decades of corruption and misruling that served as the foundation

for many post war conflicts. After the cold war, the motive for military intervention was no longer the “communist threat” or African liberation, but rather the “responsibility to protect” or the ‘war on terror.’” During both periods, humanitarian justifications frequently outweighed parochial interests, external remedies often failed to address underlying grievances, and African civil society was generally excluded from negotiations for a new order.<sup>29</sup> As a result, foreign political and military intervention often harmed the people they were officially intended to help.

Despite the US military's significant involvement in major conflicts such as the Korean War, the Vietnam War and several Middle East conflicts, there hasn't been an official US declaration of war since WWII.<sup>30</sup> The US constitution specifically gives the US Congress the power to declare war, but provides no specifics describing how such a declaration should be made. This proves a high

level of military intervention if different conflicts for the better of the United States. The Korean war started in 1950 after the invasion of South Korea by North Korea. The invasion represented communist advancement in Asia and scared the United States because of the popular domino theory where if one nation fell to the Soviets and communism, many others would fall soon after.<sup>31</sup> As a result, the United States felt a need to intervene in the conflict for the sole purpose of stopping the rise of communism and the Soviet Union. A total of 21 nations from the United Nations came to the aid of South Korea but the United States still represented 90% of the total troops that were fighting.<sup>32</sup> The fighting between the two sides continued until 1953 when an armistice was signed creating the Korean demilitarized zone that separated North and South Korea. However, there was no real peace treaty signed to end the conflict, so many still believe that

North and South Korea are still technically at war.

---

#### Current Situation

The Syrian conflict is one of the most important intervention conflicts occurring currently. More than 250,000 Syrians have lost their lives over multiple years of conflict, a war that began with anti-government protests and escalated into a war soon after. More than 11 million Syrians have been displaced from their homes as forces loyal to President Bashar al-Assad and the Islamic State (ISIS) battle rebel troops. In 2014 the United States held a series of air strikes in an attempt to wipe out groups a part of the Islamic State. Around the same time, the Russian Federation also carried out air strikes targeted at Syrian terrorists but it is said that these strikes mostly killed Western backed rebels and civilians instead of terrorists.<sup>33</sup> Russia and China support Syria for significant trade and military reasons. Russian Navy's only port in the Mediterranean

is leased from the Syrian government. Also, Syrian contracts in the Russian defense industry exceed \$4 billion, with a signed deal of \$550 million for combat training jets. The profit coming from Arms trade deals between Syria and Russia is nearly \$162 million a year.<sup>34</sup> This comes to a complete contrast to the position of the US, France and the UK, who support the rebel groups in the war. France has done well to provide mostly material aid for the rebels, but they have not provided anything like lethal weapons. The UK as well has provided the rebel groups with material aid, and has condemned the Assad regime. In 2012, the United States, United Kingdom and France provided opposition forces with non-lethal military aid, including communications equipment and medical supplies.<sup>35</sup> There have been many attempts to come up with resolutions that oppose the Assad regime, however, they have been impossible to pass as Russia and China, being the major powers that

they are, constantly veto these resolutions. Until a framework created by the international community and the United Nations is created that demands peace, there will be no effective solutions to combat the foreign conflict intervention currently taking place.

---

### Possible Solutions

This committee's purpose is the establishment of a clear and effective framework for foreign intervention into civil conflicts. It must take into consideration many factors, which include elections, social reconciliation, military goals, reconstruction, and other issues that delegates find.

Resolutions should also deal with the social, economic, and political aspects conflicts have on certain nations.

One major problem that currently exists with intrastate wars, is the ability to reintegrate civilians and combatants back into their original societies efficiently. There could be the creation of groups or task forces that deal with this purpose of reintegration.

The establishment of a new stable government is also needed to be put in place, and it should be the job of the United Nations to effectively monitor and mediate the creation of these government. This would be to stop any kinds of serious corruption that might occur.

Foreign aid, or any kind of intervention in wars involving developing nations also usually leads to these countries relying on foreign aid for basic needs. This calls for further long-term solutions to be made so that these nations can fend for themselves when foreign aid is not there anymore. This could require the need for policy-aid and guidance from other stable powers. One effective way of dealing with this, is to have the international community aid these countries to do things by themselves instead of doing it for them.

Instructing, say, on institutions - the tolerable rule of law, reasonable taxes - and even paying for such if necessary.

Delegates could also consider making peacekeeping efforts more effective, as it is well known that many of these workers have engaged in acts of sexual violence. Are peacekeepers even worth using, or should there be other groups created or used to deal with military intervention and its side effects.

---

## Bloc Positions

### ***United States and Europe:***

These countries have some of the highest involvement in military intervention in the world. They have been involved in both UN intervention and intervention efforts of their own. The United States has huge involvement, especially with intervention efforts recently in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria. It is also one of the few countries in the world that has the economic and political willingness to engage in so many conflicts for the sole purpose of advancing their own interests. Therefore, countries in this

bloc actively fight for interventionism rights.

***South:***

This bloc includes countries like China who are mostly opposed to interventionism as these countries do not have the military or economic stability to intervene in different conflicts around the world. A clear majority of intervention conflicts also exist in Southern nations, making the South in favor of a resolution that opposes any act of interventionism.

***Middle East:***

Countries in this bloc are usually in favor of letting wars play out without the influence of foreign powers. However, there are already a lot of United Nations peacekeeping and interventionism acts that have been crucial to the well-being of these countries.

---

Questions to Consider

1. How can the United Nations effectively help nations in trouble from an internal conflict?
2. When should it be allowed for nations and the United Nations to intervene in different conflicts? To what extent should these parties be able to mediate conflict and post conflict times?
3. How will civilians within war-torn nations be dealt with correctly?
4. How can social reconciliation be managed in areas where conflict has been happening for years?
5. How does national sovereignty effect different peacekeeping missions and the extent countries can intervene in foreign conflicts?

## SOURCES

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/asymmetrical-warfare>

<sup>2</sup> ibid

<sup>3</sup> Paul, Thazha Varkey (1994). Asymmetric conflicts: war initiation by weaker powers. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/asymmetrical-warfare>

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.ukessays.com/essays/history/historical-examples-of-asymmetric-war-history-essay.php>

<sup>6</sup> ibid

<sup>7</sup> ibid

<sup>8</sup> ibid

<sup>9</sup> <https://ourworldindata.org/terrorism>

<sup>10</sup> ibid

<sup>11</sup> ibid

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.history.com/topics/atomic-bomb-history>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.history.com/topics/cold-war/cuban-missile-crisis>

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.pri.org/stories/2017-10-21/what-you-need-know-about-modern-nuclear-war>

<sup>15</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/guerrilla-warfare>

<sup>16</sup> <https://newrepublic.com/article/118908/2014-gaza-war-how-should-israel-fight-asymmetrical-war-hamas>

<sup>17</sup> ibid

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/milreview/lind.pdf>

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/event/Iraq-War>

<sup>20</sup> <https://surreymun.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/DISEC-3.pdf>

<sup>21</sup> <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/military+intervention>

<sup>22</sup> [https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/military\\_intervention](https://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/military_intervention)

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.masonlec.org/site/rte\\_uploads/files/Coyne%20-%20L%26E%20of%20Foreign%20Intervention..pdf](http://www.masonlec.org/site/rte_uploads/files/Coyne%20-%20L%26E%20of%20Foreign%20Intervention..pdf)

<sup>24</sup> *ibid*

<sup>25</sup> <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/reviews/capsule-review/2000-07-01/civil-wars-and-foreign-powers-outside-intervention-intrastate>

<sup>26</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/civil-war>

<sup>27</sup> <https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/un-peacekeeping-70-years-of-service-sacrifice>

<sup>28</sup> <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Opium-Wars>

<sup>29</sup> <https://events.temple.edu/foreign-intervention-in-africa-from-the-cold-war-to-the-war-on-terror>

<sup>30</sup> <http://time.com/3399479/war-powers-bush-obama/>

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.history.com/topics/korean-war>

<sup>32</sup> Pembroke, Michael (2018). *Korea: Where the American Century Began*. Hardie Grant Books. p. 141.

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26116868>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.cnn.com/2013/08/29/world/meast/syria-iran-china-russia-supporters/index.html>

<sup>35</sup> <https://foreignpolicy.com/2012/09/20/whats-non-lethal-about-aid-to-the-syrian-opposition/>