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Delegates,

Welcome to the Disarmament and International Security Committee of 1962 at MSUMUN XVIII. DISEC is one of the six main committees if the United Nations, dealing with disarmament and challenges to international peace. This year, delegates will travel back in time to discuss three topics that threatened the international community in 1962. The topics that this committee will be discussing are: The International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space, the Risk of Nuclear Weapons, Thermonuclear Tests, and Research into Nuclear Energy, and UN Peacekeeping Missions and Reform in Conflict Areas.

This committee will begin on October 23, 2017. As this is a historical committee, any knowledge or action prior to this date are valid. However, any history or information past this date is not applicable to this committee, as it will not have occurred. We do encourage you to look at past international action for these topics and draw information from them. Be creative in your solutions and remember that you do not have to follow history. This is your chance to rewrite history and solve the issues how you see fit. Several countries will have drastically different governments in 1962 as opposed to the present day, so be sure to research the correct government. Some countries may also have very different or uncommon names. If you have any question regarding research, we as a dais are more than happy to help.

Unlike other general assembly committees, this committee will feature crisis elements. There will be no crisis notes, however there will be crisis drops, such as a newspaper article. The purpose of the crisis elements will be to foster debate and make this committee exciting.

Veronica Buschhaus - Chair

Hi everyone! I am a junior majoring in World Politics with a minor in African Studies. This is my third year at MSUMUN and it's been an incredible journey. Two years ago, I was an Assistant Crisis Director and last year I chaired the SpecPol: 2002 committee. I am a part of MSU’s competitive MUN team, International Relations Organization, where I serve as the Vice-President of Finance. When I’m not MUN, I enjoy baking and watching soccer. I cannot wait to meet all of you and make MSUMUN XVIII the best one yet!

Alison Shereda - Assistant Chair

Alison is a freshman at James Madison College planning to study International Relations. This is her fourth year participating in Model United Nations as she was a delegate in high school and is currently a member of the competitive team at MSU. Her interests in history and international security are what drew her to DISEC, 1962. When she’s not writing background guides or position papers, she’s binge watching Netflix or going to music festivals.

Spencer Cassetta - Assistant Chair

Spencer is a freshman at MSU aspiring to major in computer science. He previously participated in Model UN through his high school, Forest Hills Central, for 3 years before joining MSUMUN when he became a freshman in the fall of 2017. Spencer is looking forward to being able to participate in this event with all of you.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding your research, country, the topics, the committee, or MSUMUN, please do not hesitate to contact us at ga3@msumun.org. We cannot
wait to meet all of you in April!

Sincerely,
Veronica Buschhaus, Alison Shereda, and Spencer Cassetta
Disarmament and International Security Committee: 1962
ga3@msumun.org
Topic A: International Cooperation in the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space

Introduction

Following World War II, the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) became immersed in a global battle between democracy and communism. The Space Race has acted as a critical aspect of this ongoing feud, with each nation advancing technology to one up the other. The countries have begun to use space technology as a method to compete for a political and military advantage in the international community, this being a part of the larger arms race. The concept of space exploration has attracted many nations to pursue exploration, including the European Union, Japan, China, and India.

History

On 4 October 1957, Sputnik 1, the first artificial Earth satellite, was launched into orbit by the Soviet Union. Just 4 years later, on 12 April 1961, Lieutenant Yuri Gagarin became the first human to orbit the Earth in Vostok 1, with a flight lasting 108 minutes at an altitude of 202 miles (327 kilometers). Explorer 1, the first United States satellite went into orbit on 31 January 1958, just 8 months before the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). In 1961 Alan Shepard became the first American in space, being launched by Mercury Freedom 7 for a 15-minute suborbital flight (Timeline). Following this success, President John F. Kennedy addressed Congress and made it a national ambition to “[land] a man on the moon and [return] him safely within a decade” (A Brief History of Space Exploration).

In 1961 The “Commission préparatoire européenne de recherches spatiales’ (European Space Research Preparatory Commission, COPERS) established a scientific program, an 8-year budget, as well as an administrative structure for the European Space Research Organization (ESRO). The European nations then decided to establish a second agency, the European Launch Development Organization (ELDO), with the task of developing a launch system while ESRO was tasked with developing spacecraft (Fifty Years Since First ELDO Launch).

The United Nations General Assembly established the Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space (COPUOS) in 1959 in order to “govern the exploration and use of space for the benefit of all humanity: for peace, security, and development.” Its objective is to review international cooperation in the peaceful uses of outer space, studying space-related activities that could be undertaken by the United Nations, encouraging space research programs, and studying legal problems that arise from the exploration of outer space. Currently in its early stages, this body developed two subcommittees, one dealing with legal matters and the other with technical matters, “formalized the United Nation’s commitment to the use of outer space for peaceful purposes” (UNOOSA).
Current Issues

Protection of Astronauts

As the United States and Soviet Union announced intentions to send men to the moon at the beginning of the decade, the need for international standards regarding the rescue and distressed astronauts quickly assumed importance. In March, the USSR made the first steps towards action on the issue when Khrushchev urged President Kennedy to implement an “international agreement providing for the assistance in the and rescue of spaceships, sputniks, and capsules that the earth due to accident” (Hall). Beginning in May, the legal subcommittee began to deliberate the assistance and both personnel and space vehicles. As of right now, the States and Soviet Union are the only nations to have proposals for treaties on the rescue and return of astronauts spacecrafts.

Space Debris

Space debris refers to the collection of man-made objects within Earth’s orbit, including satellites, old rocket stages, fragments from disintegration and erosion. The beginning of the accumulation of space debris was not initiated by the launch of Sputnik 1, but rather Vanguard 1 in March 1958. This satellite is expected to stop radio transmission within the next 2 years, and at that point it will becoming classified as debris Just last month, a piece of Sputnik IV, a satellite that the Soviets had lost control of soon after its launch in May 1960, fell into the streets of a small town in Wisconsin, United States. While most of the satellite had burnt up in the atmosphere, most likely about 100 pounds of remnants landed in Lake Michigan, this piece being the only to make landfall (Wenz). No nation has taken any notable action on how to address space debris for the future decades. The primary issue that will arise from the increased presence of space debris in the atmosphere is how to reduce it to limit the risk it poses to Earth and other celestial bodies.

International Sovereignty and Space Law

The issue of international sovereignty is one that is beginning to become prevalent when discussing space exploration. This term refers to “the body of international and national laws and customs that govern human activities in outer space” (Kleiman). Prior to the launching of Sputnik, the legal status of space was unknown, but it was assumed that the laws that governed airspace would be extended up to the Earth’s orbit. However, Sputnik was launched tactfully into the orbit above the United States, ushering in the issue of space law. The principle of the freedom of space was formalized in United Nations Resolution 1721 (XVI), which states “outer space and celestial bodies are free for exploration and use by all States in conformity with international law and are not subject to national appropriation.” By extension, it can be inferred that this also means that no state is permitted to establish sovereign claims over any area of outer space, however no action has been taken by any nations regarding territorial claims to outer space (State Sovereignty in Space).
**Militarization of Outer Space**

The militarization of outer space refers to the placement and development of weaponry and military technology within outer space. The intense rivalry between the United States and Soviet Union has prompted their demonstration of ballistic missile technology in order to gain international attention. These nations primarily attempted to develop Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM), missiles with a minimum range of 5,500 kilometers (3,400 miles). The primary purpose of these weapons is the delivery of nuclear warheads, with the intent to hit any target within the United States or Soviet Union (Satellites, Spy). Before the development of satellites, spaceflight advocates suggested that “nuclear weapons could be based in orbit or on the Moon as a safeguard against a pre-emptive strike,” protecting not just the US and USSR, but other nations that developed nuclear weapons in the future. However, these ideas were never utilized because of the extreme cost of transporting these weapons, and the possible vulnerability of weapons left on the Moon (State Sovereignty in Space). Currently, there is no international action formally allowing or condemning the testing and usage of weapons in outer space.

**Current Positions**

As one of the major players in the space race, the development of space technology within the United States has become a major interest within the nation since the launch of Sputnik in 1957. Their feud with the USSR has become an extremely noticeable one within the past few years, as they are attempting to top the contemporary success of the Soviet Union. The possibility of these nations eventually working together in terms of developing space technology, is slim but not impossible, since Premier Khrushchev recently wrote a letter to President Kennedy raising the question of cooperation at a modest level. However, for the time being, both nations are still racing against one another (Sagdeev).

In 1960, European nations developed a coalition at which government officials would evaluate European cooperation in space. As of right now, the programs and funding have been allocated, however no notable progress on the development of technology has been made.

African nations are beginning to declare independence from colonial rule, with nations like Burundi, Rwanda, Algeria, and Uganda becoming independent just months ago. Because of this, the development of technology needed to begin space exploration is unfeasible at this time. These countries should still be heavily involved in this discussion as the rules and regulations decided now will impact them in the future.

Many Asian nations, notably China, India, and Japan, are beginning to show interest in the development of space programs. The nation that’s made the most progress thus far is Pakistan, which became the tenth country in the world to successfully launch an unmanned spacecraft. Just like the African nations, should still participate in the discussion on space usage.

**Conclusion**

Although space travel is something that has only recently come about many issues have already began to arise. It is extremely critical for the committee to take action on these problems before they escalate. Issues pertaining to international security, specifically those regarding space law, should be made a priority. Delegates should consider the risks of developing military technology and weaponry in outer space in order to protect the well-being of all citizens.
Questions to Consider

- Do nations have a right to territory within outer space?
- Are all nations entitled to develop a program for space exploration?
- Should action be taken against government programs that intend to use outer space for the development of military technology?
- How should space debris be taken care of as it starts to accumulate within Earth’s orbit?
- What action should nations take in order to protect astronauts and rescue them from dangerous situations whilst in outer space?
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Topic B: The Risk of Nuclear Weapons, Thermonuclear Tests, and Research into Nuclear Energy

Introduction
In the world of international relations, the question of national security is crucial. Nuclear power started with the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and now have led up to the current issues that are faced today. The international community is currently experiencing a heavy divide which threatens all nations with nuclear warfare. As a result, we must ask what benefits and potential threats nuclear technologies bring to the table.

History
Following the Peace Treaties from the Paris Peace Conference in 1946, the Allied Forces began enforcing their own agendas. The USSR began enforcing communist ideologies as well as using fascism as a fierce means of control in their newly gained territories. Harry S Truman saw this as a threat to capitalism as well as democracy, stating “the actions resulting from the Communist philosophy are a threat to the efforts of free nations to bring about world recovery and lasting peace.” (Shaw 1) at his Inaugural Speech. In 1949 Mao Zedong declared the independence of the People's Republic of China, establishing power for the communist regime after a civil war. With the declaration of the People's Republic of China, the nation of Taiwan emerged, employed heavily by previous Chinese officials. During this time communism also began to spread to regions such as Korea, Vietnam, and Cuba. Due to these events, western leaders are starting to fear other nations would convert to communism, making democracy and capitalism taboo. This caused tensions between these two regions to rise. From 1942-1946 The United States funded a top-secret science project created in efforts to bring the Japanese Empire to a prompt surrender. This later became known as the Manhattan Project. It was highly successful, providing research that would aid the nuclear age for the next century and beyond. However, while striving for efficiency this project lacked privacy. Secretly accompanying the allied scientists were Russian physicists given the task of uncovering the secrets of the ultimate bomb for mother Russia. When U.S officials discovered this, tensions between the USSR and the USA rose. By the 1950s the Soviets had used their stolen data to procure their own Atomic Bomb that they can use to deter the west from a war, causing an emergence of an arms race between the east and the west regions of the globe.

Current Issues
Nuclear Arms Stockpiles
The United States has acquired an arsenal of massive proportions in anticipation of a war with the Soviet Union. This collection consists of over 27,00 nuclear warheads, amongst are 176 Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles. Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (or ICBMs) are the deadliest weapon at their disposal. With a range of 8,600 miles, an ICBM from the U. S’s arsenal could reach any region of the Soviet Union (Dobbs 1). On top of this nuclear arsenal, which wields over 635 megatons of explosive potential, the U.S also has a total of 1,308 bomber planes capable of delivering WMD’s (Dobbs 1). In comparison to the U.S, the Soviet Union is at a huge disadvantage when it comes to nuclear might. With only 3,500 nuclear warheads, of which 36 are ICBMs with a range of only 2,000 miles, the Soviet Union’s arsenal is capable of 108 megatons of explosive potential and only...
equipped with 138 bomber planes (Dobbs 1). Along with these nations, the U.K and France have developed nuclear weapons of their own. With very limited research and arsenals, the 2 countries have delivered a handful of tests recently. This expansion of nuclearization is alarming and can be dangerous. With this in mind, we must take into consideration the importance of ensuring other states do not take nuclear arms. In this day in age, states are starting to view nuclear weapons as a means of power and legitimacy. They believe their nation will become more respected in the community if they hold nuclear arms. It is the opinion of the security council that this could lead to more issues. More nuclear weapons give a higher potential for nuclear warfare, something that would surely affect the entire globe. It is highly recommended that committees discuss and consider measures that could be taken and benefits that could be provided to promote the appropriate behavior amongst the international community.

**Suspicious Move in Cuba**

Recently, the USSR may have decided to make a strategic move designed to “deliver on the West's claim of ‘leveling the playing field’” (Dobbs 1). The U.S claims that during the start of October 1962, the Union secretly moved multiple of their ICBMs to Cuba and started construction to make them operational. On October 17, the U-2 reconnaissance aircraft spotted several SS-4 nuclear missiles in Cuba and relayed the information to U.S officials. While the Union fully denies any claims that they are housing WMD’s in Cuba, the evidence against them is convincing. To the right is a photo taken by the U-2 that shows silos capable of housing SS-4 nuclear missiles along with launch stands. The United States have voiced their concerns over the potential for nuclear warfare this situation creates, only to be denied a response from the USSR. It is inferable that the USSR’s decision to place warheads in Cuba (assuming said actions were taken) were motivated by the previous attempts by the US to take over Cuba along with the nuclear warheads that are placed in regions of Europe, near the Soviet border. It was also announced on October 23, 1962 on live television by president Kennedy that he plans to implement a naval blockade of Cuba. This blockade would be designed to stop economic and military resources being sent from the USSR from being delivered to Cuba. The Soviet Union has come forth and announced they consider this as an act of war. This is a very pressing issue for the national securities of nations everywhere. If nuclear fallout were to occur the radiation would spread and has the potential to threaten the existence of all life on earth. As citizens of the international community, it is our duty to assure calmer minds prevail within this situation.

**Risks of Nuclear Tests**

Environmentalists are arguing that nuclear tests practiced have caused a considerable amount of radioactive pollution. Massive amounts of carbon are being admitted into the atmosphere and transferred into the soil as a result of rain. This causes the soil to erode and not be able to sustain life as well as it once could.
and as a result, agriculture around the world is being handicapped (Remus 1). Around 500 nuclear tests have been carried out around the world in efforts to further the destruction of modern WMDs (Kimbell 1). Seeing the environmental effects, it has been discussed that a potential treaty banning the testing of nuclear weapons could benefit all nations and quell the tensions between the nuclear states. Such negotiations have taken place in the past decade and resulted in a moratorium that temporarily halted the U.S and USSR from carrying out nuclear tests from 1958-1961. However, in August of 1961, a US intelligence report revealed a Soviet Nuclear test had been conducted, rendering the agreement irrelevant. It is a view held by those in the UN security council that in this time where billions of global citizens are afraid for their futures all nations would benefit from a global denuclearization.

**Nuclear Power**

Unlike nuclear warfare, nuclear energy is supported by many nations who believe it yields the potential to someday be the energy source of the future. Nuclear power is generated in large plants using machines that combine atoms and then harvest the produced energy. Using this process scientists around the globe have been able to use small amounts of uranium to produce massive amounts of energy. The safety of such actions are currently being debated among members of the international community. What regulations could be put in place to ensure that a global catastrophe does not occur? If a nuclear meltdown of a power plant were to occur it could devastate the ecosystem of the entire region including all the neighboring nations. It is important for the benefit of humanity to discuss this topic.

Along with the question of waste disposal is another important question of aiding nations that wish to start nuclear programs as a means of energy. Nuclear energy has the potential to seriously benefit developing nations. With the proper equipment, a nation could bring running water and lights to their community. It could seriously decrease poverty, disease, and starvation around the world. Regarding this situation, the international community should ask itself “How could we help developing nations benefit from nuclear power?”, “What resources would be fair to provide these developing nations?”, and “How do we ensure these nations nuclear program do not start to develop WMD’s?”

Another element to take into consideration is the byproduct produced by such methods. When nuclear energy is produced, a radioactive waste that seriously poses a threat to all life everywhere is created. The waste produced is highly radioactive and has the potential to seriously harm the environment. The topic of radioactive waste disposal is very debated in the nuclear community. Scientists have suggested methods such as enclosing it in synthetic rocks, shooting the waste into space and even burying it in a subduction zone within the sea.
Bloc Positions
The international community is currently harshly divided among eastern and western cultures. With the USSR and members of the Warsaw Pact practicing communism along with Cuba, and China the growth of communism can be noted. Many world economies currently are in shambles due to colonization, civil war, and effects carrying over from WWII. With poverty amongst nations, many are forced to make the decision on whether to turn to the developed eastern or western nations for financial aid. Many nations in Latin America, Africa, and western Europe are turning to the U.S for economic and military aid while nations in the regions of eastern Europe, the middle east, and resistance groups in southeast Asia along with parts of Korea are turning to powerful eastern nations such as China and The Soviet Union. Along with financial aid, the two sides also seem to be dealing a large number of military bases, troops, and weapons as well. This has created a very heavy divide between eastern and western societies, as one sees the other as an enemy. On the topic of nuclear arms, while the main nuclear arsenals belong to the U.S and the USSR, the U.K and France have also shown the potential of wielding nuclear weapons. Since the 1950s France has conducted 5 nuclear weapons tests and the U.K has conducted 21. This shows us that the expansion of nuclear arms is occurring and has the potential to lead to bigger conflicts. With all variables in regards, it is our duty to serve the benefit of the international community and to properly quell this situation.

Previous U.N Actions on the Topic
Since the foundation of the UN in 1945, select progress in the realms of negotiations related to nuclear technologies have been made. Aside from a temporary nuclear test ban between the U.S and the USSR from 1958-1961 that was negotiated outside of the U.N., not much progress has been made on these topics at all. The security council has failed to produce a resolution on this topic anytime it has made its way to discussion due to how controversial the elements of this topic truly are.

Questions to Consider
- How can the international community ensure other nations don't seek nuclear arms?
- What resources would it be fair to provide to nations wishing to construct nuclear energy programs?
- How could developing nations benefit from nuclear power?
- What negotiations could be made in attempts to negotiate a nuclear test ban?
- How could the international community help prevent the situation in Cuba from escalating to nuclear warfare?
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Topic C: UN Peacekeeping Missions and Reform in Conflict Areas

Introduction

Peacekeeping missions are a method for the international community to monitor and deescalate conflicts in the international community. A mission is established through the request of a country and the authorization from the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Every peacekeeping mission follows three key principles: consent of the parties, impartiality, and non-use of force. Peacekeepers are not deployed unless they are invited in by the host country and a ceasefire is in place. Peacekeepers are not authorized to use force, but are only to mediate the conflict and ensure stability. It is imperative that they remain impartial to keep the ceasefire in place as well as protect the local populations. They only carry light weapons for self-defense and to not seem threatening to civilians. While peacekeeping is a new form of maintaining security in the international community, some concerns from the already established missions have arisen.

History

The first peacekeeping mission established was the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) in 1948 during the end of the Arab-Israeli War to serve as military observers. In 1949, UNTSO remained to help enforce the Armistice Agreements that ended the war between Israel and its Arab neighbors. Currently, the UNTSO exists in Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, and Syria. The mandate for the mission is to monitor ceasefires, supervise and implement armistice agreements, prevent isolated incidents from escalating, and assist in other UN peacekeeping operations. After the Suez Crisis in 1956, the UNTSO helped establish the UNEF (the United Nations Emergency Force), which separated the two sides of the conflict and now helps maintain peace on the Sinai Peninsula. It also helped implement the armistice agreement drafted after the crisis.

There are four other current UN Peacekeeping missions: The United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP) in 1949, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) in 1956, the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC) in 1960, and the United Nations Security Force in West New Guinea (UNOGIL) in 1962. There is only one mission that has ended: United Nations Observation Group in Lebanon (UNOGIL), which started and ended in 1958. Each mission was created through the protocol established by the UNTSO and has similar mandates in maintaining peace and protecting the populations. The missions are funded by the regular UN budget and the troops are supplied by willing member states. There is a correlation between the amount funded and how many troops a member state is encouraged to donate. Those states that cannot provide much in monetary aid, should supply more troops.

This will be the first discussion on issues regarding peacekeeping. There is no previous international action or debate on any of the issues listed below. This is the historic opportunity for delegates to debate the issue, and create and implement solutions.
Current Issues

Effectiveness

A new perspective in peacekeeping is if the missions are effective in conflict zones. The ideology of a central method to maintain peace in conflict zones is inherently good, but the question that the international community must entertain is the potential effectiveness of peacekeeping. The majority of peacekeeping operations have not ended, as there is still request from the host countries to keep the missions or the mandate has not been fulfilled. Other than the UNSF, the current peacekeeping missions have been around for two years or more. In the case of the UNTSO, it has been in place for the past 14 years.

It is necessary to look at the costs of these operations and whether they have fulfilled their missions or not. The costs for peacekeeping missions are increasing each year and as the mission grows. If they have not completed the mission, what is the status of the surrounding issues? It is necessary for this body to consider solutions on how to make peacekeeping more effective, by evaluating both the role of the UN, as well as the host country. One possible solution would be to give more responsibility to host nations instead of the UN, in order to alleviate some of the pressure that the UN faces. Current bureaucratic structure also has made peacekeeping inefficient, as there is no central office for peacekeeping. Rather, the missions report to the Secretary-General, the General Assembly, the Security Council, and any other relevant states or bodies. Is this the most effective method, or should the bureaucratic structure be changed?

Use of Force

Current peacekeepers are only given light artillery for self-defense, or no weapons at all. The procedure for peacekeepers clearly states that peacekeepers cannot use force in any situation, unless it is to defend themselves. While this ensures that peacekeepers cannot harm civilians and that states cannot use their troops posed as peacekeepers to execute their political ideology, it leaves peacekeepers incapable of defending civilians when the need arises. For example, following the Arab-Israeli War, there have been several armed instances between Israelis and Palestinians. The peacekeepers under the UNTSO could do nothing to protect individuals when this occurred. How can peacekeepers be able to maintain peace when they cannot intervene in armed conflicts? When discussing this, it is necessary for any solution to ensure peacekeepers cannot intentionally harm civilians, and remain a neutral party. One solution may be to have weapons other than guns, such as a police baton.

Diversity

Diversity in peacekeeping has not been brought up as an issue before, however serious concerns persist. The only military training that troops receive are from their own country, so there is a range of training standards. Troops may also not be trained to adapt to the environmental climate and weather where they are deployed to. However, troops do receive briefings once they are assigned to a mission, and there is a clear command structure. This body should work to standardize training in terms of skill, but also conditions in host countries. Other than military training, it might be necessary for troops to be trained in how to deescalate conflicts and how to maintain peace in a high stress situation.
Troops currently do not receive cultural training where they are deployed. Is it necessary for troops to be trained in the culture of their destination before deployment, or should civilians from the host countries be expected to adapt? For example, it is necessary to understand the religions and cultural customs of a place where troops are going. This could be beneficial when they work to implement the mandate of the mission and work to keep peace in the area. Another issue is the lack of language training, as troops often do not speak the language of their destination. This hinders the ability of peacekeepers to interact with the local population. There is also a large disparity between men and women in peacekeeping missions. Certain cultures dictate certain interactions between men and women, and women troops may better relate with women civilians. If there is an increase of women in peacekeepers, it will be up to this body to ensure their safety and equality.

**Politicizing**

Peacekeeping is inherently neutral, and countries have been able to retain their sovereignty thus far in peacekeeping. However, member states are beginning to politicize peacekeeping, and using it to promote their own agenda. For example, member states may not show up to a General Assembly or Security Council vote to deploy peacekeeping missions, effectively boycotting in protest. If one of these bodies does not have quorum, they cannot entertain a vote on a draft resolution. Also, in the Security Council, the permanent five have the power to veto a resolution proposing a peacekeeping mission if they do not like the host country or those who will be executing the mission. These situations have not occurred yet, but there is still the possibility.

Member states can also withhold payments to the UN in protest to a political situation. There are two ways a member state can do this: directly withhold payments or reduce the amount they pay to the UN by withholding payments in increments or not paying their dues in full. Peacekeeping operations are funded through the Administrative and Budgetary Committee, which decides the annual UN budget. The budget consists of dues that UN member states pay, as well as other donations. There is no direct punishment for countries that withhold funds, but eventually repercussions such as the loss of voting power occur. For peacekeeping missions, there is no clear funding procedure outside of the Administrative and Budgetary Committee. So far, of the six peacekeeping missions that have existed, two of them had funding issues. The UNEF faced funding problems in the past few years when member states withheld funds in protest, stating that the host countries should be responsible for financing peacekeeping operations. In 1960, the Soviet Union led a group of countries to withhold funds from the ONUC due to policy disputes. As this has been the most expensive mission yet, it has created serious funding issues for the mission. For example, troops may not get the supplies they need to fully operate because there is no money. In 1962, the UN established USD 169 million in bonds to pay for everything in the budget, but this is not a permanent solution and other avenues should be explored, as well as repercussions for countries that withhold funds.

**Current Positions**

Peacekeeping reform has not yet been talked about in the United Nations and hence there has been no international action on any of the issues. The issues themselves are not very well known. There are no positions from any bloc or country on how to reform peacekeepers. Member states should look at what involvement they have had with peacekeeping missions, for example hosting a mission, funding, or supplying troops, and how this involvement has affected their country. States should also look at how their allies and other states have been impacted by peacekeeping, or have possibly responded to an issue in peacekeeping.
Developed countries may not want to fund peacekeeping operations, and have the responsibility fall solely on host countries. Developing countries may have a different opinion, as if they are the host country they may not have the financial capability to fund such an operation. Countries with different cultures may have different opinions on how to deal with diversity. One possible opinion is that civilians will need to adapt to the peacekeepers to fit with the increasingly globalized world. Another opinion is that the troops deployed to a mission must learn about the culture where they are going and adapt. There will be differing opinions for all issues and it is highly encouraged that delegates work together to solve the issues.

What to Include in a Resolution

While peacekeeping is young, there are still several issues that this committee can address to hopefully ensure that these issues do not become bigger problems in the future. It is necessary to ensure that states will retain the sovereignty that they currently possess in peacekeeping missions, but also address the use of individual politics when making decisions on peacekeeping missions. Diversity is another important issue, and the UN needs to consider what types of people they need in the field and what cultural training troops need. Peacekeeping needs to be efficient and effective in order to complete the missions in a timely manner.

Questions to Consider

- Is the current administrative structure for peacekeeping mission the most efficient?
- What can be done to ensure that other countries are not using peacekeeping as a method to further their own political agenda?
- Should peacekeepers be allowed to use force?
- To what extent are missions still effective if they have lasted longer that they were expected to?
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