

DISARMAMENT AND SECURITY COMMITTEE (DISEC)

Letter from the Executive Board

Welcome to DISEC, delegates.

As we have you have gathered, this year's agenda revolves the controversial and contentious topic of Genocide. We hope that, through well researched and dynamic debate, this agenda can be explored by you all in a manner that is both, beneficial to your overall knowledge of world affairs and, perhaps more importantly, beneficial in your endeavour to recognise each other's common humanity and values.

We anticipate you will share our excitement over the course of the session, by demonstrating a good deal of independent research, showing an eagerness to understand, and respect for, all ideas and concepts related to our agenda, and by representing your allocated country with fervour.

Before we explain to you what to expect in this study guide and how it flows, we wish to share with you a piece of text we had to compose while pitching this agenda to the organisers. This short paragraph should be an important consideration while thinking about the agenda at hand; it will let you in on our understanding of the issue and the basis on which we plan to discuss it.

Sovereignty is an "essentially contested concept", i.e., that there is no singular definition for it, and this multiplicity leads to misunderstanding, mistrust and violence. For some states, sovereignty is their tool to exercise territorial autonomy. For others, sovereignty is their tool to exercise military intervention backed by political ideology. After the Rwandan genocide, Kofi Annan (then Secretary General) posed a challenge to the international community - 'What can be done then, if sovereignty is sacred, to combat violence against

civilian populations?' Born out of this difficult question was the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect. This committee will be based on this very norm so as to create an atmosphere where states manifestly failing to provide protection to their citizens are brought to justice. Systematic genocide (eg. Rohingyas in Myanmar) and crimes against humanity (eg. Venezuela, Iran) are motivated by intangible factors such as hatred due to religion or

ethnicity; DISEC will focus on restricting the tangible means to commit these atrocities by discussing ways to grapple with the accumulation of weaponry and breakdown of infrastructure around vulnerable societies. While the scope is both spatially and historically limited, the present Executive Board believes that delegates will find this agenda both intellectually and emotionally stimulating.

We're hoping you'll prove us right. All the best, and happy reading!

Introduction To Key Terms And Themes

Genocide

Genocide is understood by most to be the gravest crime against humanity it is possible to commit. ****It is the mass extermination of a whole group of people, an attempt to wipe them out of existence.

- What does genocide entail? (open toggle to view)

Think about these questions:

Is this definition of genocide too narrow? If your answer was "yes", what else should be included in a definition of genocide? Are we witnessing now or have witnessed in the last 20 years anything that we might term "genocide" or "genocidal"?

Crimes Against Humanity?

Under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, 'crime against humanity' means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack.

- The acts include - (open toggle to view)

Think about these questions:

Why is genocide the worst possible crime against humanity? Can all crimes against humanity be addressed in the same way, or do we need to address them differently in each case?

Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

According to the UN Website, "The responsibility to protect embodies a political commitment to end the worst forms of violence and persecution. It seeks to narrow the gap between Member States' pre-existing obligations under international humanitarian and human rights law and the reality faced by populations at risk of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity."

- What does R2P require a state to do?

Think about these questions:

Can R2P be misused: in the name of humanitarian intervention, what if a country invades another (for instance, the American invasion of Iraq in 2003)? Is R2P mandatory under international law, and if not, should it be made so?

Humanitarian Intervention

Simply put, humanitarian intervention is when Country A looks at Country B and goes: "The state of the human rights there are awful, it is our responsibility to go there and intervene to help there be fewer Crimes against Humanity in Country B."

Think about these questions:

Does Country A's sovereignty mean that they have complete control even outside their borders? Does humanitarian intervention violate the sovereignty of Country B? Is humanitarian intervention always acceptable, and if not, in which case is it acceptable? Should humanitarian intervention be Country A's decision alone, or should they consult other countries?

Security

Security is variously defined as the absence of war and conflict, the absence of a threatening predicament, the presence of a credible sense of peace - it goes on. What is important to realise is that security should be taken to be as much of a verb as it is taken to be a noun. This means security includes doing something - making sure that there is a credible sense of peace, for example. Within this committee of Disarmament and International Security, delegates will be expected to proceed with this productive nature of security, rather than a sentimental value based definition of security.

State Security

Threats are posed to all countries. These threats come from different places. Terrorism, interstate war, trade war and such conflicts that affect the entire country are concerns under the umbrella of state security. Being free of these threats is known as having State Security. Similarly, making sure that a state is free of these threats is also known as State Security, now in the productive nature of the term.

Individual Security

Threats are posed to all individuals. These are not necessarily existential (that is, threats that can result in death). Examples of threats to individual security are debt, civil war, police brutality and so on. These threats happen inside the country far more than they do outside - as there are fewer examples of threats to individual security that are posed internationally.

Global Perspectives

What does the world think we should do when a state is practicing Crimes against Humanity? Of course, everyone is against this. But does everyone agree on steps to take? Measures include but are not limited to: international pressure and diplomacy, economic sanctions, and as previously mentioned even humanitarian intervention. With so many options, none necessarily better than the other, where do we go?

The Case For Humanitarian Intervention

Some countries believe they have a duty and a right to protect global human rights. This sounds obvious, but it is not because when considering "global" human rights, these countries are often "external actors" - not the country the violations are taking place in.

The people who believe this say that massive human rights violations in one place on Earth affect the political situation in other parts of the world too. Do you agree with this claim? The same leaders (or states more broadly) believe that all countries have agreed to certain minimum commitments to protect their citizens' rights, and if this commitment is not met, other states have the right to enter and enforce this protection. Do you agree with this claim?

Doesn't humanitarian intervention work?

Proponents of this belief have historically been Western countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom. At the MUN, you are expected to come prepared with the knowledge of your country's stance on humanitarian intervention - do they support it, do they reject it?

The Case against Humanitarian Intervention

The UN Charter says that force can be used in two conditions: (1) if the Security Council permits such an action, and (2) if force is used for self-defence. Does humanitarian intervention come under these points? You'll find that the answer is, often, no.

At the same time, countries have different structures - some are democracies, others dictatorships, and others monarchies. Is one structure better than the other? If you ask someone this, they will mostly say something like, "Yes, democracy is the best of the lot!" But let's propose to you something more arguable. Does having any one structure give you the right to invade a country that pursues another structure? In this case, you might ask how humanitarian intervention and invasion are related - and the people making the case against humanitarian intervention will say: "Humanitarian intervention is used as an excuse to allow wars that aren't humanitarian in any way!"

Do you agree that humanitarian intervention can be "abused"?

Do you believe that that countries can say "We will use force justified by humanitarian intervention" and then go ahead and use force to the opposite effect?

What other values does the right to humanitarian intervention go against?

Does humanitarian intervention work?

At the MUN, you are expected to come prepared with the knowledge of your country's stance on humanitarian intervention - do they support it, do they reject it?

The Case for Non-Violent Means

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) was not limited to only the use of military force and aggression, but extended to the sense that external states could use non-violent and transnational means to reduce the chances for genocide to take place. These include "diplomacy, sanctions, and embargoes, and legal measures such as referring crimes to the International Criminal Court."

Do you think we should only find genocide while it is happening? Isn't it our responsibility to make sure such atrocities do not happen in the first place?

If it is our responsibility to make sure such atrocities do not happen in the first place, can this be achieved by violent, or non-violent means?

Do we also have the responsibility to rebuild a society after it has faced such an atrocity, and in that case, what means are most appropriate and effective?

At the MUN, you are expected to come prepared with the knowledge of your country's stance on non-violent means - do they support these, do they reject these? And, which of these do they support, if any?

The Case against Non-Violent Means

To put it simply, most States that believe in the effectiveness of humanitarian intervention are convinced: "nothing else works." They ask the question: "Will the people who are committing genocide, ever be convinced to stop unless we use force against them?" They also ask the question: "The people who conduct such massive crimes against humanities, do you think they can step down because of economic or diplomatic threats?"

These are all important questions - please consider them while conducting research. At the MUN, you are expected to come prepared with the knowledge of your country's stance on non-violent means - do they support these, do they reject these? And, which of these do they support, if any?

Case Study - The Rwandan Genocide

Instead of explaining to you in writing the horrific details of the infamous Rwandan genocide, here are links to some of the resources we trust and used ourselves to learn from. Choose what you want to read, or watch - as long as you are satisfied with the amount of information obtained.

What happened, and why?

Articles and Text

[Rwanda genocide: 100 days of slaughter](#)

[What you need to know about the Rwandan genocide](#)

Combating the Genocide

The following picture shows where and when the genocide took place, how France responded and what results were attained.

Articles

[Rwanda: Justice After Genocide-20 Years On](#)

[Pleading for Help: A grave failure on part of the International Community](#)

A policy brief is a document that one office or portfolio presents to officials with suggestions about what the crisis at hand is, and how the officials must deal with crises. It is important for you to read this exemplar very carefully because the solutions you come up with in your resolutions can be variously influenced by what is mentioned here, although the format varies.

Week 6: Genocide and Crimes Against Humanity Policy Brief on Myanmar and Rohingya Genocide Context Briefing from the UN Office on Genocide Prevention and Responsibility to Protect to Marc Pecsteen de Buytsverve (current President of United Nations Security Council) Background Rohingya Muslims (a minority group in Buddhist-majority Myanmar) have faced persecution by Myanmar security forces (Tatmadaw, Border Guard Police, Rakhine villagers, regular police force) in the form of: physical assault, sexual violence, extra judicial killings, confiscation and destruction of foodstocks, killings while fleeing, since the 1970s. 700,000 have since fled to Bangladesh. In 2016, the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army (Rohingya militant group) emerged. Their killing of 12 police officers in August sparked a massive retaliation by Myanmar security

forces, described by the UN as “ethnic cleansing” involving “war crimes” and “crimes against humanity”. Aims Short-run: To prevent further acts of genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity. Long-run: Halt the persecution of religious minorities in Myanmar; facilitate reintegration and the establishment of a political platform for Rohingya individuals. Option 1 - Economics sanctions and Developmental assistance “Should adopt targeted individual sanctions: travel bans, asset freezes, against those who appear most responsible,” including an arms embargo (A/HRC/39/64). Additionally, developmental assistance to be provided to areas concentrated with Rohingya populations - making these communities robust enough to withstand the degeneration of political stability and protect imperiled civilians.

Benefits +The prevention of the spread of the means to commit atrocities (Arms Embargo, Chinese weapons) + Effectively reallocates resources, reduces strain on Bangladeshi authorities +Creates the context for future physical and institutional infrastructure and an inclusive environment Costs -International sanctions and embargoes curtailed frequently. - Opposed by major suppliers: Israel, China. -Trade off: Developmental costs divert UNHCR funds away from other repatriation projects Option 2 - Humanitarian intervention under the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect. Establishment of a safe zone by UN peacekeeping forces in northern Rakhine state for Rohingya individuals. Redirect humanitarian aid from Bangladeshi refugee camps to the safe area until it is self-sustaining. Benefits +Normative foundation set to carry out these processes; evidence for international consensus. +UN Peacekeeping force to establish safe havens most effective way to end and prevent ethnic cleansing, genocide, violence + Precise means of carrying out targeted military actions under multilateral agreement. Costs -Would set a dangerous precedent of military intervention into sovereign member states without their consent -Would require member states to volunteer military personnel and resources -Might create unstable peace, overdependence on UN peacekeepers

Option 3 - Prosecution of those responsible - establish a tribunal in the International Criminal Court Benefits +Persecute and hold accountable perpetrators of crimes against humanity +Raise awareness of the issue to the Burmese public to prevent future revisionism and denial Costs -Strong allies of Myanmar (Russia, China, India) will likely defend Myanmar army generals from international prosecution. -May incite hostile Burmese sentiment against international institutions -Difficulty in extraditing indicted individuals, the current government may harbor these individuals Option 4 - No action - Continue with the status quo Benefits +Myanmar autonomy and sovereignty would be maintained and the crisis would not escalate to a military level. +The UN can divert its attention to other, perhaps more pressing and severe crises. Costs -Unsolved human security issue: thousands of Rohingya individuals will continue to be victims of the aforementioned human rights violations. -Continued strain on Bangladesh to fund refugee camps. -UN will face continued criticism for not resolving the issue and will exacerbate 2 of the four 'highest global geostrategic threats' that Antonio Guterres stressed should be prioritized in 2020.

Recommendation - The Office on Genocide Prevention and Responsibility to Protect recommends a combination of options 1-3. A gradual escalation is proposed, beginning with economic sanctions and developmental assistance as outlined in option 1; this will mean diplomatic pressure on the Burmese government and a space for the growth of the Rohingya community. In the event that the Myanmar government is not responsive to the above measures, humanitarian intervention is recommended under the framework of the R2P doctrine, creating a multilateral UN peacekeeping force to safeguard Rohingya communities in the Northern Rakhine state. Depending on either the compliance of the Myanmar government or the success of the humanitarian intervention, a special tribunal should be established as outlined in option 3 to prosecute those guilty of crimes against humanity. Bibliography -"No Other Conclusion,' Ethnic Cleansing of Rohingyas in Myanmar Continues – Senior UN Rights Official | UN News." United Nations. United Nations. Accessed February 17, 2020. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2018/03/1004232>. -Bhaumik,

Subir. "Why Do China, India Back Myanmar over the Rohingya Crisis?" South China Morning Post, July 20, 2018. <https://www.scmp.com/week-asia/geopolitics/article/2115839/why-do-china-india-back-myanmar-over-rohingya-crisis>. -Bowman, Bryan, Rudabeh Shahid, Cresa Pugh, Javier Eskauriatza, and Imogen Francis. "UN Rapporteur Says Little Chance Myanmar Will Be Tried at ICC Over Rohingya." The Globe Post, July 8, 2018. <https://theglobepost.com/2018/07/08/yanghee-lee-myanmar-rohingya-icc/>. -Maza, Cristina. "Israel Arms Expo Hosts Myanmar Military Officials despite Saying It Banned Weapons Sales over Alleged Genocide." Newsweek. Newsweek, June 4, 2019. <https://www.newsweek.com/israel-myanmar-genocide-weapons-sales>. -"Myanmar: Who Are the Arakan Rohingya Salvation Army?" BBC News. BBC, September 6, 2017. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-asia-41160679>.-"Rohingya Refugee Crisis." OCHA, April 18, 2019. <https://www.unocha.org/rohingya-refugee-crisis>.-United Nations, General Assembly, Report of the independent international fact-finding mission on Myanmar, A/HRC/39/64 (12 September 2018), available from undocs.org/en/A/HRC/39/64

Final Thoughts and Talking Points

If security is productive, a verb that expects us to make ourselves and our state secure, isn't security the same as emancipation? This process of securing individuals and freeing them from oppression by their own home state is more relevant today than ever before - and we hope you appreciate the magnitude of the issues we are discussing.

To help you attain a rounded understanding of our agenda, we have provided you with this study guide that covers main themes, popular international perspectives, and example based information on how Genocide can transpire and how states may alleviate such a massive concern to international peace and security.

Every underlined question in the first two sub-topics is relevant - please consider these questions very carefully and systematically. These questions will translate into your discussion points, and can influence your moderated and unmoderated caucus debates as well. We are not going to tell you exactly what your resolution should answer, as we trust that this is something you will comfortably compose with finesse. We hope you go back and conduct further research on your country's foreign policy - because this will tell you where your country stands on the issues of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity, and what measures your country deems most appropriate to tackle the same.

Remember: what we discuss in our committee has a lasting impact on our personal politics, and consequently to global politics. We are dealing with the big issues of the world in this agenda, and we believe that you will come prepared to tackle them!

The cover picture of the Study Guide, the one on the landing page with the letter from the EB, is of a Genocide memorial in Armenia. Picture the memorial while you research, because while this topic deals with how to disarm, it also deals with how a country should never need such a memorial. How do you plan on painting this hopeful picture?