

# STUDY GUIDE

## UNDISEC



**TOPIC A: NUCLEARIZATION OF SOUTH SSIA: REGIONAL STABILITY AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY**

**TOPIC B: FOREIGN MILITARY BASES IN CENTRAL ASIA: REGIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Table of Contents**

LETTER FROM CHAIR..... 3

LETTER FROM ASSISTANT COMMITTEE DIRECTOR ..... 4

INTRODUCTION TO COMMITTEE ..... 5

    TIPS FOR PREPARATION:..... 5

    COUNTRY PREPARATION: ..... 6

Topic A ..... 7

NUCLEARIZATION OF SOUTH ASIA: REGIONAL STABILITY AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE ..... 7

    INTRODUCTION:..... 7

    CONTEMPORARY SITUATION:..... 8

    RAGING TERRORISM IN SOUTH ASIA: ..... 9

    POLICIES NEEDED TO BE ADDRESSED:..... 9

    COUNTRIES OF INTEREST:..... 10

    ROLE OF U.S IN ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM S.A: ..... 10

    QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED:..... 11

Topic B ..... 12

FOREIGN MILITARY BASES IN CENTRAL ASIA: REGIONAL IMPLICATIONS ..... 12

    INTRODUCTION:..... 12

    STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE OF CENTRAL ASIA: ..... 12

    HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND MILITARY BASES: ..... 13

    CONTENTIOUS ISSUES:..... 14

    STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT: ..... 15

    NATO: ..... 15

    SOVEREIGNTY OF HOST COUNTRY: ..... 15

    COVERT OPERATIONS: ..... 16

    AIDING NATURAL DISASTER:..... 16

    DRAFTING YOUR POSITION PAPERS AND RESOLUTIONS: ..... 16

    BLOC POSITION: ..... 17

    QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE: ..... 17

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 18

## LETTER FROM CHAIR

Dear Delegates,

My name is Niddal Bin Tahir and I feel honored to be serving as your Chairperson for the Disarmament and International Security Committee at the NUML Model United Nations (NMUN) 2014. I am greatly looking forward to three exciting days of debating, diplomacy and resolution making.

For a brief background, I am currently in junior year at National University of Modern Languages; pursuing my Bachelors in Mass Communication. I have had a love hate relationship with the Model United Nations circuit since 2008, having attended numerous conferences since then. I have thoroughly enjoyed opportunities to discuss major international issues and politics with people from around the world and am returning to the Secretariat after long 4 years and with a different attitude this time round.

The Disarmament and International Security Committee, at NMUN this year will be focusing on two very pertinent topics, the guides for which are provided to you below. I am sure you will find the topics very engaging and thought-provoking. Go through the study guide very thoroughly and extensive research is something I need not request you to carry out. Feel free to email me if you have any questions or concerns, or would just like to introduce yourselves. I am excited for a heated debate and look forward to meeting you all.

Niddal Bin Tahir

[\(niddal.bin.tahir@gmail.com\)](mailto:niddal.bin.tahir@gmail.com)

## LETTER FROM ASSISTANT COMMITTEE DIRECTOR

Honorable Delegates,

My name is Rida Tanvir and I shall be your Assistant Committee Director for Disarmament and International Security Committee. I have recently completed my master's degree in International Relations from NUML. Apart from studies I have been an active debater in past and Stage Secretary on number of occasions which makes debating a vocation of mine. Pertaining to my MUN history which is not much but still I have been a delegate once and I have Chaired NUML inter University Model United Nations as well. As an ACD it's my very first experience and I am looking forward to it. I most humbly welcome you all to this conference NMUN'14 and assure you that this conference will turn you into a more accomplished and rational speaker. You will come across some challenges, some criticism and a-lot of fun as well but this platform is surely the soft aspect of what practical life looks like. With your hard work and keenness we will be able to take NMUN'14 to hitherto, unattained heights.

Along with my Chair I am looking forward to relish the experience of NMUN'14 with you all and trust you me we shall make this a memorable part of our lives. A piece of advice to you all is to work hard, be diplomatic as these are the key to any issue and will be helping you a-lot throughout the sessions.

I wish you all, the best and looking forward to meeting all soon.

**Rida Tanvir**

(rida125tanvir@yahoo.com)

## INTRODUCTION TO COMMITTEE

The First Committee for the UN General Assembly, Disarmament and International Security Committee, rose after seeing the endless tyranny that the world went through from World War 1 and World War 2. Realizing the utter importance of the widely distributed weapons, gadgets, nuclear powers and outer space programs, DISEC strives to prevent global mayhem. Protecting the weak and intercepting the nefarious, DISEC's mandate dictates to ensure demilitarization and eradicate remilitarization and its sole goal is to envelope the world in a truce-sheath. According to Article 26 of United Nations

Charter, DISEC's mandate is "to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world's human and economic resources."

Like the other committees of the United Nations General Assembly, DISEC is unable to impose sanctions, authorize armed intervention or pass binding resolutions. That being said, DISEC has submitted recommendations to the United Nations Security Council and to the UN Secretariat on several occasions.

### TIPS FOR PREPARATION

Like any activity or sport, Model UN takes practice and skill. We hope that you will have the opportunity to improve your Model UN skills both before and during your committee at NMUN. If this is your first conference, then you need not worry. During committee, your committee director is trained to answer any questions you may have. Please do not hesitate to ask any of the committee dais staff or Secretariat about any questions about procedure, your topic area. Committee director e-mails will be listed on their respective committee page.

Students should familiarize themselves with the rules of formal debate, parliamentary procedure, and the proper format for a resolution. Our study guides are posted, and help both experienced and first-time delegates learn about the goals, accomplishments, limits, and powers of the UN and the international system.

Thorough preparation is essential to making NMUN an excellent educational experience. Pre-conference research about your topics, country and committee will make the conference more fun and rewarding, as delegates can then immerse themselves in their roles as high-ranking diplomats.

## **COUNTRY PREPARATION**

Delegates should learn as much as possible about the country they will be representing – both in general and in relation to the topics they will be discussing. You should stick to the foreign policy of the country you are representing. While our study guides include an analysis of bloc positions on topic areas, students should also learn about the specific positions of their respective nations.

## Topic A

# NUCLEARIZATION OF SOUTH ASIA: REGIONAL STABILITY AND INTERNATIONAL PEACE

## INTRODUCTION

*"The more nuclear weapons the better the better this world would be."*

**-Kenneth Walt**

*"The fewer nuclear weapons, the safer this world would be."*

**-Scott D. Sagan**

South Asia, a region when you think about, the first thing that clicks in your mind is Pakistan and India two rival countries who are still sore even after 67 years of independence. They don't leave the single opportunity to teach each other a lesson either through a cricket match or in this case the race in expanding their Nuclear Assets. They have to outrun each other no matter what price they have to pay themselves or the region or at bigger level the entire world. These are the main two actors of South Asia and they are not exactly setting a very good example to the rest of the region. If anything, the region has witnessed is, increased regional tensions, a rise in religious extremism, a growing arms race, tense stand-offs, and even armed conflict. Pakistan and India are the only two member states of South Asia who possess the Nuclear Weapon and the bigger picture here is that neither are the signatories of **NPT** *Non-Nuclear Proliferation Treaty*. This fact greatly contributes to the existing rivalries and which is of significant interest to the world powers and one might say here United States of America. Rivalry between Pakistan and India is going on and off which is really dangerous as no one knows for exact when it might trigger the anger of any country and may result in preposterous outcomes. Pakistan and India have both undergone number of sanctions from the world powers just to either stop them from proliferating the Nuclear Deterrence or sign the NPT so that the danger could be minimized. Contrary to this neither prevention of Nuclear Deterrence proliferation could be assured nor could any of the conflicting parties be forced into signing the NPT. Though at some point India drafted a Nuclear Doctrine stating that it wouldn't initiate the first strike but it was never enough. The Stability of the entire region depends upon the stabilized Nuclear powers of this region, which of-course are not. The region remains tense and there appears no scope of beginning a process of a structured dialogue between the two protagonists. Both India and Pakistan have barely managed the crises on their own, but still resist taking a reasoned approach that could assure stability and détente. Periodically, however, they take

modest steps in this direction, primarily in response to U.S. concerns. But still the fact remains that Pakistan and India have failed to develop sustained confidence building measures for the normalization of their bi-lateral relations.

## **CONTEMPORARY SITUATION**

In contemporary era though there seems to be no conflicting hype as to the relation between Pakistan and India but still the danger remains. The danger that exists now is not only at one point the rivalry of both Pakistan and India but also the other emerging factors, among which Terrorism is at the peak. South Asia is one of the most instable regions in terms of security and rise of Talibanization. Therefore the presence of something as big and as destructive as Nuclear Weapon is of course a matter of concern for the rest of the world as well as the other member countries of the region. South Asia is facing a huge difficulty in countering terrorism and extremism and thus another burden to the existing problems seems quite a difficult task in the opinion of world powers. Critics have pointed out at number of occasions that the region is confronted with numbers of genuine fears of Nuclear Catastrophe due to growing terrorism problem. Even though the danger of terrorism prevails and it is a threat to Nuclear Stability in South Asia neither Pakistan nor India has given a thought to this serious matter getting out of hands and ending up in wrong hands most likely of terrorists. As overt as it may seem both the countries have reoriented their Nuclear Capabilities. If compared Pakistan has comparatively less nuclear weapons as compared to India but most effective ones in term of quality. Pakistani notion of the people in term of proliferating their nuclear capabilities was that they were ready to eat grass if the economy gets worst from all the expenses but won't let India dominate them and the region. This kind of attitude from both the rivalry parties is of world's concern as no one is ready for another war, which this time would be much more catastrophic than all the wars together that the world has ever faced. This time it would be a Nuclear war which is a lose-lose situation as there won't be any survivors to celebrate the victory and there is a Mutually Assured Destruction Scenario and will result in Nuclear Winter. World has not yet overcome the devastating effects of Nuclear attack on the cities of Japan, namely Nagasaki and Hiroshima and they are not ready to encounter another such scenario. The best interest here is that both Pakistan and India understand its duty not only towards its citizens but as well as the region and the rest of the world. In South Asia domestic realities and institutional chauvinism make concessions too costly and rapprochement untenable. Religious chauvinists in both Pakistan and India oppose rapprochement for a variety of reasons.

## **RAGING TERRORISM IN SOUTH ASIA**

The raging terrorism is a concern of the entire world in the contemporary era and South Asia is somehow considered a den of it so what Pakistan and India should do is that join hands and get rid of this growing problems which will not only clean this menace from its root but it will also bring too enemies closer, working together to achieve the same objectives. This will lessen the tension between both the countries and also help in eradicating their home from the vice of terrorism. But of course at the end it all is left with “what if”, “most likely”, “might help”. There is no for sure resolution to help South Asia out of its misery and instead of proliferating in nuclear capabilities it should proliferate in terms of Security, Economic Prosperity and Stable Democratic Government. But unfortunately the only solution and answer here is the deterrence and in this case the nuclear, the most deadly weapons.

## **POLICIES NEEDED TO BE ADDRESSED**

Pakistan and India justifies the presence of Nuclear Weapon as self-defense but everyone knows that this defense can turn into offense anytime when the relationship will get really tightened. What International powers like US and others assure is that they can make Pakistan and India both agree to formulate certain policies that would assure that neither sides would initiate first strike. This would mean defensive policies rather than offensive ones. Obviously this can't be done over a day but what should be done is that all the world powers must contribute and initiate peace talks among both the countries so that any problem can be avoided. Why world powers need to show concern is that the stability of this region can assure world peace similarly the instability of this region can jeopardize the world security. Already there have been three rounds of armed conflict between Pakistan and India and so world countries fear that this time it will be a much more lethal war which would be of mass destruction not only for the people of these two countries but also for the surrounding states like Bangladesh, Sri-Lanka, Maldives and Nepal etc. According to the Charter of United Nations when the rivalry of two countries is not only of grave danger to itself but also to the neighboring states as well as the world peace and security then the world powers have to take some certain action regarding that and the best in case of sovereign states is to talk them into formulating policies which can assure world peace. But considerable progress has been seen between these two countries over few months and they seem serious over the deteriorating condition of South Asia and they are willing to work together to achieve same goals. However without being dissuaded, both countries are taking some diplomatic initiatives to reverse the trend,

with a view eventually to transform the adversarial relationship of confrontation into adversary partnership of reciprocation. The Nuclear Weapon free zone, the no war pact and the mutual inspection proposal offered by Pakistan and the Treaty of Friendship offered by India could be viewed optimistically as an attempt to break from the bitterness of both the countries. This step somehow gives hope to the fact that maybe the deteriorating security condition of South Asia be made better.

### **COUNTRIES OF INTEREST**

Well apart from the mutual dis-consent of both countries in resolving this issue there are other actors which are taking great interest in deteriorating the condition of South Asia. Some countries like China is giving Pakistan its utmost support in matter of building Nuclear Deterrent without the fear of any country and God forbid if the time desperate like war times emerge then Pakistan will have complete and utmost support of China. Similarly India is getting support from its allies in the matter of nuclear deterrents. The only country that is showing most concern in regard for decreasing the nuclear capability is United States as it fears that both these countries might engage in something similar to that it did in Nagasaki and Hiroshima. US further fears that something similar to Cuban Missile Crisis can occur again or in worst scenario it can come true. Cuban Missile Crisis failed but there is a great deal of chance that this time the anger of both the countries might be too much to overcome and a worst sort of situation can arise. France has provided Pakistan with the parts of nuclear parts as well as the heavy water which helps in cooling down the nuclear radiations. Iran, Saudi Arabia, Turkey and other Muslim countries are giving their support to Pakistan in matter of making nuclear deterrent for self-defense as they consider it to be the right of Pakistan, plus not to forget Pakistan is the very first Muslim state to have built a nuclear weapon which is sometime confused by the west with Islamic Bomb which has often been denied by the Muslim Countries.

### **ROLE OF U.S IN ELIMINATION OF NUCLEAR WEAPONS FROM S.A**

United States here can't ask other countries to move away from nuclear weapons when itself is not ready to so. Yet United States cannot recognize India as legitimate Nuclear Weapon State without irreparably damaging the Nuclear Non Proliferation Regime and similarly US can't allow Pakistan to do the same no matter how much helpful Pakistan is in terms of helping US in fighting its war against terrorism in Afghanistan. Yet India and Pakistan are deviant cases. Once United States assumes the responsibility of leading the international community towards the marginalization of

nuclear weapons (as a step on their way to their total elimination) India will have to make good on its “unconditional commitment” to the global nuclear disarmament, on non-discriminatory basis. Pakistan has long supported regional denuclearization as long as India takes first step in that direction. The primary objective of US here is the denuclearization of South Asia, as a part of broader effort to break the proliferation network in the Asia Pacific region and beyond, in-order to increase the prospects for global nuclear disarmament. Firstly the difficulty to stabilize nuclear deterrence between Pakistan and India and the danger of an Asian “nuclear reaction chain” exists. Secondly because of the danger of a nuclear exchange in a future Indo-Pakistani War. The United States should change the course in South Asia before it is too late and Pakistan and India slide into nuclear use by accident or miscalculation. A nuclear war in South Asia would not only be a tragedy for these two countries and the region but also for the whole world. So even from a narrow perspective of US National Security perspective the denuclearization of South Asia is in best interest of everyone.

### **QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED**

- How is Nuclearization of South Asia contributing in instability of the region?
- Will denuclearization of South Asia bring peace to the region or the other way around?
- How is Nuclearization of South Asia a threat to world security?
- Is Nuclearization of South Asia a necessity in contemporary era?
- Can nuclear war heads end up in the hands of terrorist and jeopardize the security of the entire region?
- What is the real reason behind the nuclear proliferation in South Asia?
- What are the chances of Nuclear Warheads ending up in wrong hands?
- Why is the entire world and especially U.S concerned about the proliferation of nuclear weapons?
- Is becoming a nuclear state an act of defense or offense? How can this be explained in reference with South Asia?
- Apart from defense what other motives might Pakistan and India have behind having a nuclear program?

## **Topic B**

# **FOREIGN MILITARY BASES IN CENTRAL ASIA: REGIONAL IMPLICATIONS**

## **INTRODUCTION**

Under international law, a government possesses full control over affairs within a territorial or geographical area or limit. This principle is called sovereignty. The United Nations—being an international body facilitating cooperation in international law, international security, economic and social development, and human rights—must be mindful to not violate national sovereignty.

Foreign military bases are found in more than 120 countries and territories. The number of military bases grew substantially after the Cold War. While the number of large military bases has been decreasing, the number of smaller bases has been increasing. These military bases are typically sites leftover from past wars or conflicts. Military bases serve many functions: launching platforms for military maneuvers, weaponry storage facilities, test-ranges for new weaponry, intelligence operations, extra-judiciary transport, and as a host for citizens from the base's country of origin.

The two principle issues regarding military bases are their purpose and their location. Military bases are facilities that are integral to preparations for war. Their function alone undermines international peace and security. The bases facilitate the proliferation of weapons, thereby increasing violence and international instability. Their location causes environmental and social problems at a local level. Military bases have an impact on land, water resources, communications, environment, health, and cultural identity.

## **STRATEGIC SIGNIFICANCE OF CENTRAL ASIA**

A unique feature of the location of this region is that it is totally land locked. Even the access of Turkmenistan and Kazakhstan to the Caspian Sea does not give them access beyond their immediate neighbors. This region is also unique in that it is enclosed by more frontiers than any other region in the world – the frontiers of Russia, China, Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan meet in Central Asia. Central Asia may, therefore, more appropriately be called as a zone of convergence of the major geo-cultural regions of Eurasia, with its secular interactions spanning both these continents. The region has been divided and tied under various political boundaries but it had

natural resources but never the sedentary population to exploit. It has been the battleground of various world powers for supremacy. It has withstood the sweep of Hans, Islamic sways of the 'Caliphate', torn between capitalism and communism, and has been the flower bed to the 'Color Revolution'. The enigma continues with sudden rush by the world as well as regional powers.

The importance of this region is also contributed to the fact that it is located next to what may be termed as a geo-strategic melting pot, West Asia. The cross currents of Arab-Israeli rivalry, intra-Arab hostility and the conflict between Iran and Iraq, have all combined to keep this oil rich region in a state of continuous turmoil and instability, leading to periodic wars. In the changed geo-political environment, it is not entirely unlikely that the CAR may now be dragged into these conflicts, with some scholars already talking in terms of a greater Middle East. From the geo-strategic point of view, all CAR states fall within the parameters of Russia's security cover. Their independent statehood rests on the bedrock of the geo-strategic understanding with Russia. The geo-political factors in the region are expected to operate within this particular geo-strategic framework where Russia ensures the protection of the Central Asian Region and the established borders.

## **HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND MILITARY BASES**

In the first decade of the 21st century Central Asia became the main test site for politico-military cooperation between the new post-cold war partners in the aftermath of the events of September 2001. The suddenly upgraded political significance of Central Asia created considerable unease in Russia. On the one hand, it was unable to shoulder the burden of control and protection of the former Soviet republics and challenge the USA; on the other, political and other benefits stemmed from the rapprochement with the USA and Western Europe. Russia thus consented to tolerate the temporary installation of NATO and US bases in the hope of meeting the new security threats posed also for itself by terrorism, crime, insurgency, Islamic radicalism, smuggling of narcotics and nuclear materials, and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The former Soviet republics in the region took advantage of their newly acquired autonomy in international politics and security, and in the latter half of 2001 NATO and US troops (predominantly air forces) arrived at the former Soviet bases in Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan. Tajikistan also opened its airfields to US aircraft, while Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Turkmenistan extended over flight rights to NATO and the USA. These steps heralded the building of a broad US military infrastructure in the region. In early 2002 some 8000– 10 000 NATO personnel were present in

Central Asia. China soon expressed concern over the long-term NATO and US presence by sending an envoy to the former Soviet republics and convening a meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO). The formation in 2002–2003 of the CSTO demonstrated Russia's determination to stop the erosion of its interests in the region and revive its multilateral and bilateral political, military and security relationships with the Central Asian states. The rationale was purportedly counterterrorism. In 2003 Russian Defense Minister Sergei Ivanov announced that Russia reserves the right to defend Russians who live in the former Soviet republics. Ivanov expressed Russia's determination to increase its military presence in the CIS, especially in Central Asia, and called for the eventual withdrawal of the military bases established there by the US-led international anti-terrorism coalition. Russia, the CIS and the CSTO repeatedly stressed that such bases were only permitted for the period necessary to stabilize Afghanistan and to achieve the goals set forth by the coalition. The Russian military also feared that the USA might deploy missile defenses in Central Asia that could hit Russian intercontinental ballistic missiles in their boost phase. In granting basing permission, the governments of the Central Asian states were motivated by a desire to maintain the right balance between China, Russia and the USA and the other players in the region (a multi-vector policy). In addition to protection against terrorism and assistance to bolster their military structures, the Central Asian states apparently counted on lavish economic and financial assistance and, more importantly, direct or indirect support for the existing regimes. However, US military assistance was increasingly linked to a commitment to political and economic reform and further democratization. This created difficulties in cooperation that also affected basing rights. In contrast, Russia was keen to provide seemingly no-strings-attached military assistance, including compatible equipment, spare parts and weapons as well as political support in the event of domestic upheaval. The dynamics of the region thus led in a relatively short time to expulsion of the NATO and US forces or attempts to renegotiate the terms of basing.

## **CONTENTIOUS ISSUES**

The issues raised due to the presence of foreign military assets in a nation are varied ranging from how the sovereignty of the host nation is affected, to the judicial implications and legal bindings for the foreign soldiers and the effect on the local law and order situation. Despite an overwhelmingly negative response towards such bases there are its adherent supporters as well. This study guide will highlight the various issues of contention and

the dilemma presented to the international lawmakers with respect to designing an international framework to deal with the myriad questions that arise from the presence of foreign military bases globally.

## **STATUS OF FORCES AGREEMENT**

Status of Force Agreements (SOFAs) is an agreement upon a framework which dictates how and within what capacity foreign military personal will operate within a host country. SOFAs often discuss many provisions but the most important provision agreed upon is the right of jurisdiction in event of a crime committed by the said military personal. The biggest issue with respect to SOFAs is that there is no singular agreed framework, upon which it can be based, which results in that a SOFA signed between two countries may address but is not limited to, criminal and civil jurisdiction, the wearing of uniforms, taxes and fees, carrying of weapons, radio frequency allocation and usage, license requirements and customs regulations.

## **NATO**

North Atlantic Treaty Organization: is an intergovernmental military alliance based on the North Atlantic Treaty which was signed on 4 April 1949. The organization constitutes a system of collective defense whereby its member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party. The admission of forces of a member state of the alliance remains subject to the consent of the receiving state.

### **Legal Framework within NATO**

-The admission of forces of a member state of the alliance remains subject to the consent of the receiving state

-This precondition has not been diminished in any way by the increased level of the defense integration that has taken place since the NAT entered into force.

## **SOVEREIGNTY OF HOST COUNTRY**

Sovereignty is by far the most essential characteristic of an international state. The term strongly implies political independence from any higher authority and also suggests at least theoretical equality established the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) to secure Kabul and the surrounding areas from foreign threat. NATO assumed the control of the ISAF in 2003 and these forces are trained to advise and assist the Afghans and fight alongside.

## **COVERT OPERATIONS**

According to the Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, a covert operation (covert ops) is "an operation that is so planned and executed as to conceal the identity of or permit plausible denial by the sponsor." It is intended to create a political effect which can have implications in the military, intelligence or law enforcement arenas. Foreign military bases play a vital role in such operations as they serve as forward base of operations for covert activities and intelligence gathering without fear of liability due to the provisions often provided within SOFAs. Throughout history there have been many such operations carried out which caused great controversy such as the Bay of pig invasion, or the training of Afghan rebels during the Soviet-Afghan war. However a more recent example is the operation against Bin Laden on 2nd May 2011 by Navy Seals which was carried out without knowledge or approval of the Pakistani Government and was launched from one of the bases near Pak-Afghan border. Such operation highlights a gross violation of the sovereignty of a nation and is responsible for the global trust deficit, anti-base movements, local unrest and instability.

## **AIDING NATURAL DISASTER**

The role of modern militaries has expanded over the years to encompass not just matters of war, but the concept of humanitarian warrior has arisen which propagates the usage of military assets in disaster relief. Ideally the responsibility lies with the civilian authorities, but there has been a gradual increase in foreign military involvement in disaster relief. Although the Oslo guidelines set a parameter in which such involvement is deemed necessary however the interpretation of the guidelines is left to individual nations.

## **DRAFTING YOUR POSITION PAPERS AND RESOLUTIONS**

In considering the possible solutions to this issue, delegates must be very cautious to view the situation from each of the political, economic, and social aspects. One of the main concerns that the host countries have is related to national sovereignty. The deaths of thousands of innocent civilians in countries such as Afghanistan and Iraq are a clear contradiction to the stated intention of nations possessing foreign bases: to bring security to unstable regions around the world. In addition, foreign militaries must ensure that individuals under their authority are abiding by the laws of the host country, and that in the event of an individual is charged with a crime, a trial must be held without delay.

A successful solution will consider methods to coordinate stability and security operations, improve and develop the capabilities of the host country's own security forces, support humanitarian assistance, and most importantly, initiate joint civilian-military infra-structure projects.

Possible Solutions in considering the possible solutions to this issue, delegates must be very cautious to view the situation from each of the political, economic, and social aspects.

## **BLOC POSITION**

Foreign military bases concern the following major regions

The Persian Gulf

The Mediterranean Sea

The Indian Ocean

The East China Sea and South China Sea (The Pacific)

## **QUESTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE:**

- How can nations be held accountable for damages, from humanitarian to environmental, related to their foreign military bases?
- Should there be legal repercussions for countries offering explicit or implicit economic incentives in return for the establishment of military bases in Central Asian states?
- What kind of military bases should countries be allowed to deploy abroad?
- Are foreign military bases by the big military powers essential for the maintenance of world-wide security and the protection of trade routes?
- What is the optimal amount of legal jurisdiction the host nation should have over a foreign military base?
- What actions can DISEC take to protect national sovereignty of all parties involved while still tackling the issue of foreign military bases?
- Which countries are benefitting from these bases in Central Asia and what can be done to negotiate with these parties?
- To what extent can the establishment, maintenance and closure of bases be monitored by the international community?

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- <http://cns.miis.edu/archive/wtc01/cabases.htm>
- [http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central\\_Asia/CEN-01-080114.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Central_Asia/CEN-01-080114.html)
- <http://russiamil.wordpress.com/2013/09/19/central-asian-military-and-security-forces-assessing-the-impact-of-foreign-assistance>
- [http://csis.org/files/publication/130122\\_Mankoff\\_USCentralAsia\\_Web.pdf](http://csis.org/files/publication/130122_Mankoff_USCentralAsia_Web.pdf)
- <http://strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/parameters/Articles/08spring/blank.pdf>
- <http://www.worldcrunch.com/world-affairs/new-us-military-bases-in-central-asia-guess-who-isn-039-t-happy/kyrgyzistan-moscow-afghanistan-military-terrorism/c1s9425/#.UxYUfvmSxYQ>
- <http://www.isn.ethz.ch/Digital-Library/Articles/Detail/?id=167520>
- <http://cns.miis.edu/npr/pdfs/101khan.pdf>
- <http://books.google.com.pk/books?id=W->
- <http://books.google.com.pk/books?id=OKhChGd7nP0C&pg=PA114&lpg=PA114&dq=de-nuclearization+of+South+Asia&source=bl&ots=kAjLSa6OWP&sig=QS3ULXcUfni2GOIvCpklgfjm1Co&hl=en&sa=X&ei=MOUWU8GvFKKn0gG13oC4AQ&ved=0CEgQ6AEwBQ#v=onepage&q=de-nuclearization%20of%20South%20Asia&f=false>
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South\\_Asia](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Asia)
- <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00358538608453764?journalCode=ctr20#.UxbRUM5xPX4>
- [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southeast\\_Asian\\_Nuclear-Weapon-Free\\_Zone\\_Treaty](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Southeast_Asian_Nuclear-Weapon-Free_Zone_Treaty)
- <http://pu.edu.pk/images/journal/pols/Currentissue-pdf/NAZIR%20HUSSAIN.pdf>
- <http://www.desistore.com/nuclear.html>
- <http://www.nti.org/treaties-and-regimes/southeast-asian-nuclear-weapon-free-zone-seanwfpz-treaty-bangkok-treaty/>
- <http://www.dawn.com/news/661927/nuclear-deterrence-in-south-asia>