RENMUN VII

Peace in Permanence

March 5-6, 2022

Chair Report

Chair Introduction

Welcome delegates,

It is truly a delight to be welcoming all of you to DISEC at RENMUN VII! We are Howard Lee and Aidan Lai, from Diocesan Boys' School and Renaissance College respectively. It is an honour for us to be chairing DISEC this year.DISEC at times can be a council often neglected by the general public for its lack of immediate and binding action. However, don't be fooled by its purely advisory nature. As the first committee of the United Nations General Assembly, the council is of the utmost importance regarding security and demilitarisation throughout a plethora of nations and regions. Ensuring citizens throughout the globe stay safe.

It is a chair's responsibility to foster debate and encourage healthy rivalry between delegates - to ensure a productive yet opinionated council for delegates to enjoy. For these goals, we call on you delegates for assistance. Together, we hope to explore key concepts that foster a thoughtful and dynamic environment. MUN can be an experience that shapes long-term memories and lasting friendships - we mean to make this conference no different.

So go on and deliver that speech you've been unsure about for days on end. Write that clause you've been too nervous to mention to your allies in fear of rejection. Stay firm and clear with your stance in the midst of overwhelming pressure to change. We find that the best stories seldom come from delegates that allow others to push them around - but from those that stand against the tide of public opinion.

With that said, we truly hope that all delegates can find a fulfilling and entertaining experience in this council. There are times when a delegate is expected to do their best in furthering the debate and to continue the interests of the committee. There are also times however when they are encouraged not to take the matter at hand too seriously - to abandon etiquette in favour of having fun with their fellow delegates. We chairs wholly support delegates choosing these times at their own discretion.

Best wishes,
Head Chair Howard Lee (Howardsklee@gmail.com)
Deputy Chair Aidan Lai (laik13@rchk.edu.hk)

Discussing the roles and restrictions of satellites and military equipment in outer space

In a world where technology is advancing exponentially, in a world where we have entrepreneurs providing commercial flights into space and planning colonies in outer space, and in a world where a world superpower has a "Space Force''. The regulations and laws we have as a community and an international collective have not caught up to the same speed. Threats, issues and concerns that the public cannot see yet still present an ever looming threat. Agreements, and lines must be drawn before tensions can ever rise, to that end it is not implausible that we sit together and forge the groundworks for extraterrestrial security.

Such a discussion has occurred before, with the introduction of the "Outer Space Treaty" and "Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty II" (SALT II), but with those treaties dating back to the 60's and 70's. Things have changed alot since then and the Soviets Union who co-signed SALT II no longer exists. Many unforeseen developments in the field have occurred and it is safe to say a revision at the very least should be made.

Key Terms

Term	Definition
Orbital Weapons	Any weapon which is in orbit of a planet or moon
Satellites	a machine that is launched into space and moves around Earth or another body in space
Space Weaponry	Within this Council, the word "Space Weaponry" will be used to refer to technology that can be used in a militaristic way in space or from space.
Wunderwaffe	Term that the Nazi's used to describe their ambitious drafts or prototypes for weapons that could revolutionize warfare.

Background Information

On 4 October 1957, the Soviet launched the first satellite Sputnik 1 and forever changed how we were able to see the world and spread information literally. From

merely being a sci-fi looking tool for meteorologists to measure air density and the ozone layer. Gradually it evolved into being able to transmit and receive information and connected the world more and more as society witnessed the boom and birth of the internet which also started off life as a military project. With these things combined, GPS systems were also created and we were able to monitor the world and find our way to the nearest gas station from a satellite. In 2018 an estimated 5000+ satellites revolve around our greenish planet. We take many functions that require satellites for granted in our modern era. Yet a prevalent issue which curiously has never been clearly sorted out was the fact that many satellites are either privately owned or national, it is then logical to ask who is responsible for damages or data leakages?

The 1972 U.N. Convention on International Liability for Damage Caused by Space Objects has tried to tackle that issue but yet again given the age of the convention and how by nature the guidelines set back then were very vague, we do not really have much to go with. Data being transmitted through satellites have also been a major function of satellites for the public use as well as military use, we find ourselves in a awkward position where some lesser developed countries might not have a satellite of their own and have to rely on an international, private or other countries satellite, this does not directly pose any issue per say in a perfect world, but we do not have any guarantee or binding way specifically to protect the sovereignty or privacy of those in such a situation, it would seem almost natural given our society is so privacy sensitive and aware that we should also address such a grey area in an international scale.

Since World War 2, the Nazis have already been dabbling in creating a wunderwaffe called a sun gun or heliobeam as well as successfully launching a rocket (V-2) into space, the human mind has had no shortage of figuring out ways to put lethal tools up into space before space programmes were an official concept. For decades it has still been alluring minds and militaries capable of having a chance to develop it. To this day, currently no known such weapons are up in orbit but the continuous development of it can be seen as a relatively useful tool as well as the contribution of safety in space if colonies on other planets are to happen. Given this logic there is no reason for these weapons to ever be pointing towards our own planet if that's the case. These technologies are arguably even more terrifying and dangerous than regular missiles, take a kinetic bombardment type weapon as an example. If it was in orbit, range no longer becomes a concern delivering a high powered payload across the world by anyone with access to this technology is no longer a matter of how but when and why. For comparison the furthest a missile has ever gone is the Russian SS-18 which can go up only to 7500 miles/ 12000km. The existence of such weapons potentially can cause more alarm and tension than any nuclear weapon arsenal

could ever. As such limitations and development of such technology must be addressed.

Potential Clashes

To what extent should international limitations and treaties play a role as an influence to Space Weaponry?

Given that the main focus of this council sits upon satellites and orbital weaponry. We also have to understand that limiting these technologies' research is not as clean cut as one might initially imagine, given that satellites have already been characterized as a gadget that also supports many pillars of modern society that we take for granted. It would be up to delegates to decide whether or not potentially hampering the speed or rate of which development of more advanced technology that can also serve to benefit the daily lives of citizens and the interconnectedness or the globe is worth to tame and pacify the fears and dangers that can come from unrestricted technological development, striking a balance between safety and progression isn't the only solution though. Delegates if possible to find a fine line in specifically narrowing and clamping down on key traits that only really serve militaristic purposes could potentially strike the figurative moon rock and leave the public sector scot free.

What degree of Transparency for Satellite Technology?

This clash is mainly pertaining to civilians as a clash but ultimately this affects countries who have to share satellites or loan them, just as your network service provider will be able to see where you went online, so can satellite providers have the same access as they are the intermediary between your devices and servers and people far from you. In 2021 alone there were 155 million records exposed and thousands of data breaches in the US alone. This is an argument of how we deal and convey our information and who will have access to it. Sun Tsz once said the battle is won before it is ever won. Having the information of people and other countries in your disposal is quite the information stock one can get, as such people should be able to know more clearly who gets their information and how. For countries this pertains to how we are able to give countries an incentive or a promise at the very least that their information or their military bases governmental activity isn't also being monitored.

Long term plan or a treaty to see us through for the next decade?

Given the previous history of nations having discussed limiting arms and military usage of outer space, those treaties in their contemporary days were considered progressive and ahead of their times. But when we look back at them now after a few decades when they were signed and claimed to bring "everlasting peace and

prosperity". Our modern minds cannot help but to find fault and poke fun at how unhelpful and vague these treaties feel. Which brings us back to the clash; given that technological advancement is now even faster than decades prior, would we not run into the same exact issue of being outdated maybe a decade later? It is possible that we would look at these treaties in our terraformed martian homes a decade later laughing at the naivety and cringeful meaninglessness of these treaties in hampering militaristic use of technology. But perhaps if delegates can find a way, proposing principles or key yardsticks to limit weapons on which time does not erode quite so easily could be proposed and ultimately bring upon and fulfill the dreams and hopes that a more eternal and everlasting solution to see us potentially through a century could be created.

Key Stakeholders

Stakeholder	Involvement with the Issue
The Public	Internet access, data privacy surveillance and more, these things pertain to very personal day to day information of people and it is understandable that where that information goes and gets passed around by should be known by the public and actively authorized. If conflict occurs, weapons of such mass destruction will ultimately also leave civilians just as in peril and in danger.
Less economically Developed Countries (LEDCs)	Given that many of these countries need to pool common resources or pay other more developed countries to have access to these technologies or equipment, they are the most exploitable and vulnerable group. They have a vested interest in having a better negotiating position that is backed by international treaties and agreements and ultimately have the most at stake in a sovereign level that affects the government and the people within them. If undealt with, this can also be seen as a slippery slope issue where LEDCs are less and less able to catch up to the progress and development of MEDCs

More economically Developed Countries (MEDCs)	These countries are the one most able and likely to have these technologies and or able to develop them, to reach peace, stability and a low tension world, the friction between countries amongst the More Developed section must be somehow dealt with in a way that would not lead to armed conflict. On top of that, since these countries inherently have more leverage and bargaining power when dealing with Lesser Developed Countries, a way to, if not level the discussion table at least safeguard those countries from being bullied by more developed countries should be established. Such as new international conventions or organizations or morally condemn these MEDCs.

Possible Solutions

The Compromise

It is possible that the council is able to find a comfortable middle ground between different countries with different agendas and goals to pursue. Ultimately, this boils down to what the international community values more and what key stakeholders are able to band together and do, resolutions could either be compromissory focused or relatively skewed to one side of the spectrum, DISEC is here to try to de-escalate situations before they blow up but that does not mean that no conflict will happen with all the measures taken, resentment and an imbalance is power and appeasement could just as easily lead to countries breaking off in the long run and end up with failed treaties. Delegates should give thought into the weight and ramifications that potentially each clause or resolution could in a real setting to gain the most of such a simulated experience.

The Fine Line

With that said it is also possible that all sides agree that limitations and restrictions are of the moral justification and that no country should have that amount of threat or leverage on another nation, and if that is able to happen that it could be argued that we would be able to see a much larger amount of cooperation from the international community eventually on the matters of future development. This could be relatively harder given a more utilitarian outlook from many different countries could prevent a majority compromise to be reached.

With both solutions above focusing on a more give and take approach, it is also possible for blocs to take a more hardline "extremist" approach and heavily swing the debate into one side or the other, this can be significant in affecting the balance power of the international community. It all boils down to ultimately what is there to gain and lose, for example it is possible for LEDCs to try and push to acquire a much more better negotiation terms by inciting equality as a main philosophy in balancing power and for MEDCs it is also possible for them to push for a more strongman international diplomacy as a means to prevent any other countries from attaining a level of threat large enough to shake global security.

Past Actions

Time	Event	Significance
1963	Partial Test Ban Treaty	First step towards the acknowledgement of needing to strict the military arsenal of the international community. It is a significant starting point of which nations began to recognize the potential dangers and the unfathomable scope of the unknown in the arms industry.
1967	Outer Space Treaty	Specifically banned nuclear weapons from being deployed in orbit. Yet another moment where nations recognized that some weapons were just too great of a threat.
1972	Liability Convention	Convention concerning the responsibilities and consequences of satellite damage as well as satellites damaging Earth and it's populous. A starting point for future discussion on liability and responsibility of satellites.
1974	Registration Convention	Convention concerning that all objects launched into space has to be internationally registered.
1979	SALT II (space related section)	Treaty between US and USSR to limit orbital weapon development.

1979	Moon Treaty	Treaty on the right to outer space and setting up the legal framework for outer space. Considered a failure of a treaty in trying to lay the groundworks of cooperation in space.

With the limited amount of action taken, delegates are highly encouraged to think outside the box and develop new ideas!!

Guiding Questions

- How do we draw the line between civilian use and military use in technology?

- How do we make trade offs between different countries so that we can reach an agreeable middle point for conflicts?

- How are we able to create guiding principles in technological development so that the creation of militaristic technologies can be hampered before it starts?

- How significant is it that other sovereign states have access to potentially all your information and sees everything in a country?

Bibliography

- https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introouterspacetreaty.html
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kinetic_bombardment
- https://2009-2017.state.gov/t/isn/5195.htm
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_Space_Force
- https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wunderwaffe#Orbital
- https://www.satellitetoday.com/government-military/2011/12/01/if-a-satellite-falls-who-is-responsible-for-damages/
- https://www.nti.org/education-center/treaties-and-regimes/treaty-banning-nuclear-test-atmosphere-outer-space-and-under-water-partial-test-ban-treaty-ptbt/
- https://www.unoosa.org/
- https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/copuos/index.html
- https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/intromoon-agreement.html

- https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/introregistration-convention.html