



Arizona Model United Nations 64

Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC)

Background Guide

Chair Introduction

Hi! My name is Rishi R. Suresh. I am a sophomore at the University of Arizona, and I will be your chair for this committee! I am studying Neuroscience and Cognitive Science, and minoring in Health and Human Values. When I was a junior at Mountain Ridge High School, I consistently heard from seniors to branch out and explore new opportunities before graduating high school. So, I decided to join MUN during my senior year and was even a delegate like you back in the AZMUN 62 Conference! I was drawn in by MUN's emphasis on professionalism and public speaking, a skill I'm still working on. I wanted to chair the Disarmament and International Security Committee (DISEC) because I had participated as a delegate in November 2025 at the American Model United Nations (AMUN) conference on a committee with a similar focus, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and enjoyed my time debating and collaborating with my fellow delegates from across the nation on resolutions.

Committee Introduction and Purview:

The General Assembly is the primary deliberative body of the United Nations. It is represented by all 193 UN member states and seeks solutions to a wide array of the world's problems. Established when the UN Charter was signed in 1945, General Assembly One is one of six general assembly committees, and it is also known as the "Disarmament and International Security Committee" or DISEC. DISEC's objective is to uphold international security and peace through disarmament and the regulation of armaments. The committee typically deals with questions of nuclear weapons and other such weapons of mass destruction, regional and international security, including the use of drones in warfare, protecting civilians, preventing nuclear war, and promoting disarmament. DISEC works closely with the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs (UNODA) to draft resolutions that provide recommendations for member states with regards to disarmament. It's important to note that DISEC differs from the Security Council in representation and functions. Unlike the Security Council, every one of the 193 UN Member States has an equal seat and one vote in DISEC. Despite universal representation, DISEC does not have the power to authorize military action or impose sanctions; those powers belong exclusively to the UN Security Council. While DISEC cannot directly influence the Security Council's decisions, it can suggest topics for the Security Council to consider. While General Assembly Committees do possess significant potential to

impact the international community, it is crucial to note that in accordance with “Article 2” of the UN charter, all member states are promised sovereignty in action. Therefore, none of the GA committees can take definitive action or provide resolutions that go beyond recommendations to sovereign member states. For the 64th annual Arizona Model United Nations conference, we will abide by the rules of the [General Assembly](#). Now let's move on to the agenda items!

Topic I : Protecting Civilians During Armed Conflicts

Civilian deaths in conflict surged by 40% globally from 2023 to 2024 according to the UN human rights office (OHCHR) with marginalized groups facing disproportionate levels of discrimination. Over the years, the Middle East has been in the global spotlight for many political violence and armed conflicts that have violated international humanitarian law through the killing of civilians by armed and non-armed state groups. At least 48,384 individuals – mostly civilians – were killed in 2024, based on casualties recorded by OHCHR. The alarming rise in civilian casualties, especially during armed conflict, calls for member states of DISEC to take proactive action to protect some of the most vulnerable populations, including children, human rights defenders, and journalists.

Other major issues that should be considered include the involvement of non-state actors. More work also needs to be put forth to address disruption of humanitarian aid into conflict zones by warring parties. While DISEC does not directly oversee humanitarian responses or civilian protection, it has the ability to draft resolutions that can recommend action taken by other committees such as UNODA or the Security Council. In recent decades, the UN has taken some key actions to maximize protection and minimize civilian deaths. The Security Council’s adoption of Resolution 1265 in 1999 is considered to be the first resolution that explicitly focused on the protection of civilians in armed conflicts. Resolution 1265 set a precedent for subsequent resolutions by the UN such as 1296, 1738, and 2573. For example, 1738 affirms the points of 1265 while strongly condemning attacks against journalists and media personnel documenting the conflict.

Having faced multiple conflicts stemming from colonialism and ethnic tensions, such as the Rwanda genocide, Africa took a significant step with adoption of the AU Constitutive Act (2000) that allowed it to intervene in a member state during war crimes, genocide, and crimes against humanity. A notable way the UNSC has addressed civilian casualties is through peacekeeping missions with explicit Protection of Civilians (PoC). This legally authorizes “Blue Helmets” to use force to stop attacks on civilians. Since its recognition in 2022, EWIPA

has been endorsed by 90 countries committing to restrict the use of heavy "area-effect" bombs in cities. Since 2024, UNODA has given special attention to Lethal Autonomous Weapon Systems (LAWS) to address the alarming concept of weapon systems with potential for lethal force operating by themselves without human input.

Questions to Consider

1. Has your country signed or ratified key disarmament treaties (e.g., Arms Trade Treaty, Chemical Weapons Convention, Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons)?
2. Has your country endorsed EWIPA? How does your military doctrine minimize the use of wide-area effect weapons in cities
3. When a civilian is accidentally killed by a drone or a high-tech weapon, what is your country's official process for investigation, public reporting, and offering reparations or payments to the victims' families?
4. Does your country export arms, and how does it ensure that such weapons don't end up in the hands of actors who target civilians? What is a 'red line' for your country regarding civilian harm?
5. At what point would your country stop selling weapons to an ally if they were found to be targeting civilians?
6. What support does your country need from DISEC or the international community to better equip peacekeepers?

UN Documents

- [Resolution 1265\(1999\) /](#)
- [Resolution 1269 \(1999\) /](#)
- [Resolution 1738 \(2006\) /](#)
- [Resolution 2573 \(2021\) /](#)
- [EWIPA_Political_Declaration](#)

References

- <https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2025/06/un-data-shows-surge-civilian-deaths-conflict-globally-highlights-pervasive>
- [UNODA 2024 Yearbook](#)
- [The Political Declaration — UNODA](#)
- [Protection of civilians | OCHA](#)
- [International Framework to Protect Civilians during Armed Conflict Unraveling.](#)

[Speakers Warn Security Council, Urging Enforcement of Existing Laws | UN Meetings Coverage and Press Releases](#)

- [Civilians ‘trapped and terrorised’: UN sounds alarm over collapse of critical protections | The United Nations Office at Geneva](#)
- [Transferring Policy: The African Union's Protection of Civilians Policy in Peacekeeping Missions in Somalia and South Sudan](#)
- [Microsoft Word - civilians.doc](#)

Topic II : Preventing the Spread of Nuclear Weapons

Nuclear weapons can destroy a whole city, potentially killing millions, and jeopardizing the natural environment and lives of future generations through its long-term catastrophic effects as seen in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945. The dangers from such weapons arise from their very existence and are worsened by their proliferation. Although nuclear weapons have only been used twice in warfare — in the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 — over 12,500 nuclear weapons reportedly remain in our world today. Disarmament is the best protection against such dangers, but achieving this goal has been a tremendously difficult challenge even by the UNSC. For example, when non-state actors such as terrorist organizations are involved it is much more difficult to hold them accountable and make them adhere to international humanitarian law since they are not affiliated with a government recognized by the UN. Furthermore, when disarmament is not policed properly, illegal weapons can make their way into the arsenals of non-state actors.

The first resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946 established the Atomic Energy Commission to deal with problems related to the discovery of atomic energy among others. It was tasked with recommending measures to ensure atomic energy was used solely for peaceful purposes and with proposing ways to eliminate atomic weapons and other WMDs from national arsenals. The resolution also decided that the Commission should make proposals for “the elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adaptable to mass destruction.”

Since the dissolution of the Atomic Energy Commission, a number of multilateral treaties have been established with the aim of preventing nuclear proliferation and testing, while promoting progress in nuclear disarmament. These include the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests In The Atmosphere, In Outer Space And Under Water, also known as the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT). “Securing Our Common Future: An Agenda for Disarmament” created by the UN Secretariat calls for resuming dialogue and negotiations for nuclear arms control and disarmament. The agenda proposes preparing for

a world free of nuclear weapons by increasing transparency in nuclear-weapon programs, reducing all types of nuclear weapons, and undertaking mutual commitments never to use nuclear weapons and to further diminish their role in national security strategies.

The Secretary-General's policy brief on A New Agenda for Peace (NAFP) emphasizes the urgency of States recommitting to the pursuit of nuclear disarmament and reversing the erosion of international norms against the spread and use of nuclear weapons. The policy brief also stresses the importance of reducing the role of nuclear weapons in national security doctrines.

The Pact for the Future, adopted at the 2024 Summit of the Future, contains the first multilateral recommitment to nuclear disarmament in over a decade, with a clear commitment to the goal of the total elimination of nuclear weapons. It contains pledges to strengthen the disarmament and non-proliferation architecture and work to prevent any erosion of existing international norms to prevent nuclear war. The Pact aligns nuclear disarmament with broader goals of sustainable development and peace, reflecting the global vision for a safer, more inclusive future.

The European Union has championed nuclear non-proliferation and several European nations are focused on practical measures to achieve the reality envisioned by the NPT. China maintains an unconditional "No-First-Use" pledge that it will never be the first to use nuclear weapons while rapidly modernizing its nuclear arsenal for "assured retaliation," a stark contrast between policy and action. Latin America has been a global leader in non-proliferation through its proactive actions towards disarmament such as with the Treaty of Tlatelolco (1967), a non-proliferation agreement that predated the NPT.

Questions to Consider

- Does your country have nuclear power capabilities? If so, how does it ensure peaceful use under international safeguards?
- How has your country used nuclear energy for peaceful purposes (e.g., radiation-based diagnostic tools, small module reactors, etc.)
- Is your country willing to collaborate on nuclear disarmament education, capacity building, or verification technologies?
- What is your country's official stance on nuclear weapons — should they be eliminated entirely or maintained under deterrence?
- What is your country's position on 'nuclear sharing' agreements (where nuclear-weapon states station weapons in non-nuclear states)? Does your country view this as a violation of the NPT, or a necessary deterrent for regional security?

UN Documents

- [Securing Our Common Future: An Agenda for Disarmament](#)
- [INFCIRC/140 - Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons](#)
- [Our-common-agenda-policy-brief-new-agenda-for-peace-en.pdf](#)
- [Pact for the Future, Global Digital Compact and Declaration on Future Generations](#)
- [Establishment of a Commission to deal with the problems raised by the discovery of atomic energy.](#)

References

- [Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones | United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs](#)
- [Stockholm Initiative for Nuclear Disarmament - Government.se](#)
- [Bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki - Causes, Impact & Deaths](#)
- [International Day for the Total Elimination of Nuclear Weapons | United Nations](#)
- [Only way to end nuclear risk 'is to eliminate nuclear weapons': Guterres | UN News](#)

Topic III: Addressing the Use of Drones in Warfare

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) are a powerful and versatile tool in combat. Low in cost and easy to use, UAVs can conduct many different types of missions. For instance, UAVs are used during wars for spying. This is done through cameras, sensors, and microphones for surveillance. Other UAVs can be fitted with explosives and act as bomb-dropping machines. However, UAVs, in this case drones, can be viewed as double-edge swords in the context of warfare.

Using drones for precision strikes can offer humanitarian benefits by minimizing civilian casualties. Drones can also reduce the severity of a conflict by eliminating the risk of a member state's pilot losing their life in armed conflict. So, with less casualties on the civilian and militant side, drones can allow for less dangerous forms of warfare. They can carry small bombs or gather information. In particular, First-Person View (FPV) drones — often quadcopters operated through a front-facing camera — are less technologically sophisticated than larger fixed-wing drones and can be flown by individuals with no flight training or special qualifications. They are increasingly used for one-way missions, where the drone crashes into a target while carrying an explosive weapon. Since these kamikaze drones are so affordable, some countries are spending less money on big, expensive weapons and using more small drones instead. For example, in the war between Russia and Ukraine, both sides are using FPV drones. In Ukraine, some workshops are making up to 100,000 drones every month.

Drone usage also brings up serious legal and moral problems. Long-distance drone attacks are not always accurate. They can hit the wrong targets and kill innocent people. Still, some countries prefer it because a drone that costs about \$1,000 can destroy a tank worth millions of USD. Drones can offer a unique blend of precision, surveillance capabilities, and reduced risk to human life, making them an attractive option for military operations. In the wrong hands, regular consumer drones can be used as lethal weapons, enabling terrorists to plan, coordinate and launch a vast range of deadly and potentially disruptive attacks against civilians, soft targets, and critical infrastructure.

Delegates will need to consider who is responsible if a drone makes a mistake and if countries are following the rules of war when using drones. Delegates in DISEC need to help create fair and clear international rules to guide the use of drones in future conflicts. The United States has used drones extensively for counter-terrorism worldwide. The Middle East has developed some of the widely used drones today. For example, Israel is credited with pioneering modern surveillance drones. Turkey is the largest exporter of military drones and developed the Bayraktar TB-2, a UAV that has gained prominence in conflicts in the Middle East region and the Russia-Ukraine War.

Questions

- Should drone technology transfers be restricted, similar to nuclear or missile technology under the MTCR (Missile Technology Control Regime)?
- Would your country support expanding the use of drones for peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, and surveillance rather than armed conflict?
- How does your country propose to address the rapid spread of armed drones to non-state actors and terrorist groups?
- What is your country's specific, technical definition of 'meaningful human control'? In other words, to what extent, if any, should humans be involved in supervising the decisions of autonomous weapons to avoid unnecessary casualties?
- Civilians living under 24/7 drone surveillance can face persistent trauma. Should constant aerial surveillance be classified as a form of psychological torture or a violation of the right to privacy under international law?

UN Documents

- [The Use of Armed Drones in the Context of Counter-Terrorism](#)
- [Increasing Transparency, Oversight and Accountability of Armed Unmanned Aerial Vehicles → UNIDIR](#)

- [The Use of Uncrewed Aerial Systems by Non-State Armed Groups: Exploring Trends in Africa → UNIDIR](#)
- [A/HRC/59/CRP.2](#)

References

- [Frequently Asked Questions: International humanitarian law and the use of drones in armed conflict | International Committee of the Red Cross](#)
- [In the Crosshairs? Addressing Military Drone Use and Proliferation → UNIDIR](#)
- [How are Drones Changing War? The Future of the Battlefield - CEPA](#)
- [Drones in Modern War – Science Technology and Society a Student Led Exploration](#)
- [How drone combat in Ukraine is changing warfare](#)
- [Sudan: UN strongly condemns deadly drone attack on peacekeeping base in Kordofan | UN News](#)
- [As AI evolves, pressure mounts to regulate 'killer robots' | UN News](#)
- [Killer Drones: Can We Stop Autonomous Weapons? | United Nations](#)